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Abstract

This research investigated the effects on two remote Indigenous communities of a Northern Territory (NT) of Australia education language policy, *Compulsory Teaching in English for the First Four Hours of each School Day* (FFHP). Although the policy was introduced in 2008, it continues to have profound effects on the policy landscape of the NT which has never re-established the bilingual policy platform.

The investigation involved a critical analysis of the FFHP and an ethnographic study of its effects. The research reported here follows two qualitative lines of study – the policy text (the process and content of the policy) and policy discourse (the discourse around the policy) in addition to its effects on those it was targeting.

The data gathering methods entailed collecting key texts from critical moments of the FFHP implementation - the policy itself and operational guidelines in addition to media texts and a Hansard record. The field data collection comprised interviews with both Indigenous and non-Indigenous language education experts, two community case studies (one of which retained its bilingual program at the school and one which did not as a result of the FFHP) and critical ethnographical research. The latter used purposively selected adult and child participants for group and individual interviews (a total of 53). Given the Indigenous context of the field research and the desire to accurately depict remote Indigenous perspectives, Indigenous methodologies and participatory research approaches were employed. This entailed culturally appropriate consultation with participants, checking the accuracy and interpretation of interview data and Indigenous led participant selection.

The analysis of the policy and key community interviews was achieved with critical discourse analysis (CDA). The particular approach to CDA employed was that developed by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) called Historical Discourse Approach (HDA) which emphasises the historical situatedness of discourse and the political dimensions and contexts at work in political texts. CDA is also frequently paired with ethnographic data collection. All community interviews were subjected to content analysis (CA) in order to deduce the major patterns and themes that arose in relation to the effects of the FFHP.
This study revealed a language and cultural hierarchy operating with the adoption of the FFHP that entails a postcolonial construction of Indigenous people as ‘invisible’ and deficient. Although not as blatant as the texts associated with the separately occurring Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER), there are distinctly covert negative representations that similarly allude to Indigenous abnormality and failure and imply criminality. In addition, the ideologies, presuppositions and assumptions of neo-liberalism and symbolism of the nation-state operating in the policy, construe, if only covertly, Indigenous languages (ILs), culture and people as in need of mainstreaming to achieve higher socio-economic status, well-being and national ‘belonging’. This is despite evidence that categorically demonstrates attachment to language and culture enhances well-being and socio-economic status.

The effects of the policy on the two communities were surprisingly similar. Both communities complained of erosion in community participation and employment at the local schools that undermined the economic independence, self-determination and governance of the local population. Community participants were critical of the erratic policy creation and implementation and marginalisation of community members. The community with suspended bilingual programs complained of greater negative academic, well-being, behaviour and cognitive effects on children and a deterioration in resilience, all of which were difficult, if not impossible, to address given the oppressive political climate ‘out bush’. Such policy failure is common throughout the Indigenous policy landscape in Australia. As a consequence of the lack of legislative protection offered to Indigenous people and abuse of international human rights entailed in the FFHP, this study highlights the need for future policy creation and evaluation to be conducted from an Indigenous perspective and governance.
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Glossary of Terms

**Bilingualism**
The degree of language ability in two languages. There are a number of important terms related to this and they include ‘balanced’ (more or less equal competency in two languages) and limited (in which one language is dominant and the other emergent) fluency in one language and emergent in another) (Baker, 2011). These terms are discussed in more detail in Ch2: Literature Review. While the term bilingualism is still in common use in the literature, multilingualism is a more descriptive term for fully developed remote Indigenous language (IL) users given the many languages involved in IL contexts.

**Bilingual Education**
Bilingual education can refer to a range of language programs from immersion (involving dominant language students immersed in a second language with the gradual introduction of first language across the curriculum), transitional (where the language of instruction in lower grades is the first language and this transits to the dominant language in higher grades), maintenance (where the language of instruction is initially the first language with the gradual introduction of the dominant language until the curriculum is divided more or less equally between the two), to dual (same as maintenance except the students comprise both dominant and second language speakers) (Baker, 2011). Maintenance and dual language programs offer the best outcomes for second language learners in English as a Foreign Language contexts since they are more likely to result in competence in two languages (balanced bilingualism). A more detailed account of bilingual education is given in Ch2: Literature Review.

**Both Ways**
Both Ways is a description of bilingual and bicultural education largely based on constructivist principles of learning (particularly social interaction, symbolic communication, cooperative learning and communities of practice). Both ways is student centred with a focus on the centrality of Indigenous culture (in terms of both ontology and practices), self-determination and Indigenous identity (Ober and Bat, 2008). However, there is a certain flexibility associated with its interpretation which results in varying degrees of the implementation of Indigenous and Western knowledges and practices. It is best represented by the Arnhem Land Yolngu metaphor of Garna or the point where salty and fresh water mix to create, Devlin (personal interview, 16 January 2014) explains, a “hybridisation”, “co-mingling” and a “cross-fertilisation” in “one of the most fertile places”. The principal element of Both Ways is “balance between the two cultures” which involves equal use of Indigenous and dominant languages (Lee, Fasoli, Ford, Stephensen and McInerney, 2014: 58). As Batchelor Institute researcher Robyn Ober explained, “Both-ways education is about drawing on and acknowledging skills, language, knowledge, concepts and understandings from both Indigenous and Western knowledge systems ... It is our way of telling our stories, it’s about our way of making meaning in our world, both-ways is about going from the known to the unknown, using current knowledge as a springboard to gain new conceptual academic understandings, both-ways teaching and
learning is being open-minded enough to see that there are alternative methods of reaching a goal, than following a strictly mainstream approach” (Ober, 2009: 39)

Black This is a term used to describe Indigenous people. It is commonly used by NT Indigenous people to differentiate between Aboriginal groups and non-Aboriginal groups that arrived after the British invasion in 1788.

Ceremony Ceremonies are large gatherings of kinship (see below) or bigger groups and entail ancient stories, songs and dance related to initiation, births, funerals and gender. Sustaining ceremonies ensures the supply of fauna and flora and the transference of knowledge and creation stories or Tjulkurlpa where ancestral beings formed the world.

Neo-liberal Globalisation This term refers to the global manifestation of a market based philosophy of economic management that views individuals as economically self-interested and responsive to instruments of government technologies (Olssen, Codd and O’Neill, 2004). It has involved the transfer of financial systems of management to historically unrelated areas like health and education and the emergence of financial criteria (accountability, competition and atomisation or individual ‘choice’ and freedom) to monitor, control and fiscally manage these areas (Clarke, 2012). One of its prevailing features is the failure to acknowledge institutional and structural inequality, as well as the effects of dominant control account for low socio-economic, academic and health status (Clarke, 2012).

Indigenous The term Indigenous refers to the first human inhabitants of Australia, both Aboriginal (mainland and Tasmania) and Torres Strait Islanders. Torres Strait Islander is the term used to describe the Indigenous people between Queensland and Papua New Guinea but still within Australian borders. In this thesis, Indigenous refers predominantly to Aboriginal people.

English language learners Indigenous and other English language learners have been described variously in this thesis as English language learners, non-dominant students and bilingual students. I have refrained from using prescriptive nominations – such as LEP (Limited English Proficiency), EFL (English as a Foreign Language learner), ESL (English as a Second Language learner) and NESB (Non-English Speaking Background) to describe learners due to the deficits that this infers (Molyneux, 2005). Rather, the environments of language use at times contain these descriptors (such as ESL or EFL environments).

Postcolonialism Postcolonialism is a term used to describe the “continuing cultural effects of colonisation” (Ashcroft, 2001: 9-10). That is, it is a recognition of the ongoing negative effects of invasion and colonial domination that continues to ensure the political, cultural, linguistic and economic marginalisation of Indigenous groups (Crowley and Matthews, 2006).

Settler Colonialism Settler colonialism is characterised by mass migration of colonising populations and the perpetuation of colonised-colonising interactions.
This results in the “creation and consumption of a whole array of spaces” by those colonising (Barker, 2012) as well as the mass extinction and endangerment of non-dominant (migrant) and ILs but the emergence of creoles, pidgins and dominant language varieties such as Australian English (Mufwene, 2002). It is characterised by a distinct ‘absence’ of indigeneity (particularly language) in national identity except in the acquisition of some Indigenous symbolism to denote a cultural distinction from imperial roots (Barker, 2012; Veracini, 2007).

Skin

‘Skin’ is a term used to refer to the complex kinship system that operates in but is nuanced across Central Australian Indigenous communities. The skin system subdivides and categorises group members and most language groups in the region use four to 16 categories or sub-categories (or alternatively, a moiety system – division into two groups). Acquired at birth, a skin (category) name determines who can marry who, relationships within the kinship system, kinship obligations and responsibilities to group members, the land and ceremony (Central Land Council, 2016).

Subtractive and Additive Bilingual Education

Terms used to describe how a minority language is regarded as a problem (subtractive) or an asset (additive) in educational institutions in addition to the outcomes of language programs based on these evaluations. For instance, in subtractive programs where a minority language is viewed as a problem these programs aim to reduce the number of languages learnt so that only the dominant language remains such as in mainstreaming or submersion (dominant language instruction) and transitional language programs (where, over time, language instruction moves from first to the dominant language). Students in these programs invariably have poor language acquisition, academic, identity, well-being and cognitive outcomes (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000). In contrast, maintenance or dual language programs (where different languages of instruction are added but commence in a first language initially and, over time, transition to a second but for no more than 50% of the time) occur where a minority language is viewed as an asset. They result in higher cognitive, academic, language acquisition, health and well-being outcomes (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000). These programs are more effective in Indigenous contexts if they are bicultural with a high ratio of Indigenous teaching staff (Devlin, 2009a). A more detailed description of these terms and concepts appear in Ch2: Literature Review.

White

Term used to describe the dominant ‘invading’ and colonising culture or individuals with it. Largely an invisible unmarked category, ‘white’ settler colonial Australians perceive themselves as having “a unique managerial right over national space” where ‘Others’ are "constructed as an object of spatial exclusion” in a “fantasy of domination” (Hage, 2000: 48, 186). Those with “governmental belonging” or what Bourdieau has termed ‘fields of power’ (as opposed to passive belonging) are imbued with Anglo cultural descent and have desirable traits (national capital) associated with that group (that is, “dominant linguistic, physical and cultural dispositions”) (Hage, 2000: 49, 53). However, as Hage (2000) notes not all members possess all characteristics and the degree to which they possess white normativity and national capital determines the degree of
membership. Such national capital can be acquired, Hage (2000) notes through assimilation. Despite birth in Australia being a strong determiner of governmental membership, Indigenous Australians only have “functional and passive belonging” ensuring their perpetual exclusion (Hage, 2000:57). Their exclusion is strategic since it allows the continuation of a black-white divide and an illusory “solidity” of a White category (Hage, 2000: 57). The inherently racialized power base of ‘whites’ gives rise to racialized discourse and a “discourse of decline” associated with non-white entry into the national space (Hage, 2000: 88). These discourses perpetuate the process of “racializing the (white) Australian nation against its internal and external Others” (Boucher, 2007: 16).
Chapter 1 – Introduction

Teaching and learning programs in Northern Territory (NT) schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day, in order to improve literacy and numeracy results, particularly for Indigenous students [from Compulsory Teaching in English for the First Four Hours of each School Day, Northern Territory Department of Education and Training - NTDET, 2008]

There are two profound Indigenous policy moments in my life and the lives of remote Indigenous community members in Central Australia. One is the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER, also known as the Intervention) in 2007, an Australian Federal Government initiative which comprised a set of reforms that included the suspension of human rights legislation for Northern Territory (NT) Indigenous Australians as well as the forcible acquisition and government control of Indigenous land, assets and housing. This legislation was enacted in response to child abuse allegations directed at remote Indigenous communities in the NT (please see below for more information). The second policy was the 2008, Compulsory Teaching in English for the First Four Hours of each School Day (FFHP) (some of which is extracted above) that sought to extinguish bilingual education in these same communities. Both represent erratic impulsive reactions to a growing media portrayal of crisis in remote Indigenous communities (Waller, 2012) fuelled by the release of national standardised test results (National Assessment Program, Literacy and Numeracy - NAPLAN) and the Little Children are Sacred report (Anderson & Wild, 2007) on child abuse in Indigenous communities.

I vividly recall my husband (an Anangu elder) telephoning me about the Intervention from Mutitjulu, a community of approximately 300 people and the first to experience the full force of the Intervention policy¹. He told me 600 army personnel had arrived and were camping outside the community.² In the days prior to this, all the computer hard drives in the community,

¹ Anangu is the Luritja/Pitjantjatjara word for ‘people’ and is the lexis used to denote those who belong to the Luritja/Pitjantjatjara lands (please see Figure 2.1: AIATSIS map of Indigenous Australia, p.23 in Chapter 2 for the location of Luritja/ Pitjantjatjara lands).
² Uluru is an iconic tourist site of Central Australia. A large sandstone rock formation, it represents high spiritual significance to the local Pitantantjarra people who live there. In 1985, Uluru and another rock formation, Kata Juta (many heads) were handed back to the local Anangu (people) but with the proviso that they lease the area to a resort company and Parks Australia (a Federal Government national park body). The conditions of the lease were quite poor for the local people. Even so, both government and local hoteliers have failed to live up to its requirements with the continued marginalisation of local people and businesses (Vincent Forrester, personal communication, 22 March 2015).
containing all the health, education, work and welfare files of community members, had been forcibly removed by Federal Police. They were never returned. With the arrival of the army, my husband could not tell me whether they intended to invade the community, arrest any people there, or indeed, shoot anybody. As a precaution, all the women and children ran to the hills to ensure their safety and prevent any children being forcibly removed – a common policy in the history of Indigenous-government relations in Australia. When I relayed this information to a friend at work, I burst into tears. My husband’s high political profile could have meant that we were a government target whereby our assets, freedom and child - and even possibly our lives - were at risk.

The second profound policy moment occurred at a gathering of high profile Indigenous leaders in Central Australia in meeting rooms at Alice Springs Town Council in December 2008. The FFHP was due to be implemented in the coming year in remote multilingual regions that comprised language ecologies which entailed language mixes, creoles and traditional Indigenous Languages (IL) and where (Standard) Australian English (SAE) was foreign, or a second language (L2). The meeting represented a discussion on the implications of the FFHP. Speakers were highly emotive about the role of ILs and culture in their lives and how integral bilingual education was to the educational achievements, well-being and identities of remote students. Despite the much more mundane and ordinary introduction of this policy, given the assault against IL, culture and educational rights in its instruction for monolingual English education, it seemed to represent an extension of the Intervention and a more intense attack on Indigenous identity and culture. In the intervening years, this initial monolingual prescription was to largely ensure the perpetual absence of any Indigenous bilingual education policy and an erratically programmed use of IL in educational settings.

These profound policy moments, having such a direct personal impact changed my life and the lives of my family and friends. Those of us intimately connected to remote Indigenous Australia entered a period of darkness as policy intertwined with the life of its subjects through suicide, unemployment and the loss of language, cultural and identity. Every week involved attendance at funerals for youth. It was in this period of darkness, and with a background in education, that I knew my research should be devoted to unravelling the ideologies (and motivation) behind

---

3 Although there is now some NT Education Department (NTDE) support for bilingual education, since the FFHP, bilingual education is still not recognised in official policy and few of the allocated ‘bilingual’ schools (those that receive 20% more funding than monolingual schools) have more than (very) part-time IL programs.
FFHP and how remote communities experienced and perceived its effects. This thesis represents the culmination of this journey to give voice to Indigenous community worries and sorrows in remote NT Indigenous schools these past few years. This study, in its systematic examination of policy text and impact of the FFHP, also represents a possible means to redress any policy failings that have given rise to such sorrows. This study is also timely given the continued dominance of monolingual English education in the NT with the NT government’s recent release of the Implementation Plan 2015–2024 Indigenous Education policy, A Share in the Future (NTDE, 2015), despite the ongoing and accelerating loss of language and culture in Indigenous communities.

1.1 Statement of Problem

A number of studies have been conducted on FFHP and they have largely focused on the legal and human rights implications of the policy (Charles, 2010), the social dynamics that existed between academics, the media, politicians and community members in the making of Indigenous policy (Waller, 2012) and histories of and educational and linguistic implications of the policy (Devlin, 2009a, 2009b, 2010, 2011a, 2011b; Simpson, 2010; Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). None of these sought to explore and understand the motivation or ideology underpinning the FFHP and none has conducted systematic case research of its effects, although these elements require focused empirical research.

As such, this thesis examines both the FFHP policy text (the policy itself as well as the guidelines – Appendix 4.1), and policy discourse (media and government texts on the policy - Appendices 4.2 to 4.4) in addition to its implementation in and effects on two communities (through 53 semi-structured adult and children interviews). One of these communities retained its bilingual program and one suspended it. Analysis of data was achieved through CA of community texts and CDA of policy texts and key community texts. The in-depth examination of qualitative interviews at these sites will highlight Indigenous voices that are rarely heard in Indigenous policy debates.

4 Full transcripts of community interviews do not appear in this thesis due to their considerable size. Excerpts appear in Chapters 6 and 7.
The remainder of this chapter will

- describe the historical context of bilingual education in the NT,
- introduce the research questions,
- justify the study,
- justify the choice of research sites,
- position my personal interest in the study,
- justify the research design, and
- elucidate the thesis structure.

1.2 Reducing Bilingualism – the historical context of bilingual education in the NT

Nancy Hornberger in 2008 noted that there were then 6800 languages spoken throughout the world with at least half heading towards extinction by 2100. Of this half, 95 per cent were spoken by less than five per cent of the world’s population. Of these, the majority were Indigenous. Hornberger (2008) also wrote that only 500 languages were used in the world’s schools and more than half of the world’s nation-states were monolingual. In Australia, the number of ILs spoken by children prior to British invasion in 1788 (estimated at 270) (Dixon, 1980) dropped to 13% in 1996 and the extinction of all Australian ILs is predicted by 2050 (McConvell & Thieberger, 2001). The vast majority of extant Australian ILs are in the NT.

The NT has a land mass the size of Germany, France and the United Kingdom combined but only a population of approximately 230,000 people (roughly one per cent of Australia’s population), currently has the largest number of IL speakers (55,000), the highest percentage (30%) of Indigenous people (the national average is 2.5%), the highest proportion of Indigenous school aged children (40% compared to the national average of 4.8%) and the greatest proportion of people living in remote areas (44%) (Devlin, 2011b; Lee, Fasoli, Ford, Stephenson & McInerney, 2014). Linguists Jane Simpson, Jo Caffery and Patrick McConvell (2009) contend that remote Indigenous communities represent some of the most multilingual environments in Australia. Apart from speaking their own IL, an English based creole (such as Kriol and Yumpla Tok) or a mixed language, community members may speak up to six other languages, or at the very least
understand them (Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). For many Indigenous learners in remote areas, English is not used outside of school or only rarely (Devlin, 2014).

In such a linguistically diverse environment, teaching in languages other than English began quite early but sporadically in the colonial settlement period with only a few isolated schools. The first bilingual program commenced in 1896 at the Lutheran Hermannsburg (Ntaria) mission where lessons were conducted orally in both English and Western Arrente (Nicholls, 2005).^5^ The lack of bilingual schools was indicative of the paucity of schooling offered generally to Indigenous people prior to the 1967 referendum granting Indigenous people the right to Australian government legislature. It was not until 1950 that Indigenous children received schooling through ‘special’ (assimilative) Indigenous schools set up by the Australian Commonwealth Office of Education.^6^ Initially four schools with 160 students were created and this increased to 75 schools with 5900 children by 1975 (Lee at al, 2014). From 1953, Indigenous teaching assistants were employed but only received training in the late 1960s (Lee at al, 2014; Appendix 1.2). From 1968, residential Indigenous secondary colleges were introduced in Darwin (Kormilda College), in Alice Springs (Yirara College) and Yirrkala (Dhupuma College) and near the mining town of Nhulunbuy in North East Arnhem Land (Lee at al, 2014).^7^ With the establishment of the NT Government and the NT Education Act in 1978, management of the mission and special schools came under the control of the NT Government (Lee at al, 2014). Today, there are 190 schools and nearly 44,000 students in total in the NT, 85 in very remote areas have nearly 100% Indigenous enrolment, 154 are government run and 38 are Homeland learning centres of which two are independent (Lee at al, 2014).^8^ The early failure to provide primary education, in addition to adequate health and housing in the NT, was a consequence of the status of Indigenous people. The first half of the twentieth century represented a time, not unlike Canada, New Zealand and the United States, where Indigenous people were not recognised as citizens (or, in the case of Australia, were bizarrely governed under the Flora and Fauna Act) (May, 2012; Wells & Christie, 2000). They also did not

---

^5^ For a more comprehensive early history of bilingual schools in the NT, please see Gale (1990).
^6^ However, Aboriginals of ‘mixed blood’ could attend some public schools such as Alice Springs primary school (Lee at al, 2014).
^7^ High school classes in remote communities were established far later with the first high school graduates in remote areas not occurring until 2003 (Kronemann, 2007).
^8^ In 2011, there were 63 ‘provincial schools’ in Darwin and surrounding areas. All other schools were classified as remote (Alice Springs, Katherine, areas beyond Bees Creek such as Batchelor, Adelaide River and Jabaru (Lee, et al, 2014) or very remote. High schools only exist in provincial and some remote areas.
have the right to vote and received rations of food for work or very reduced wages (Wells & Christie, 2000). In addition, they were under the legal jurisdiction of Aboriginal chief protectors and directors of native affairs through Aboriginal ordinances that completely governed their lives and wrought guardianship over their children (Wells & Christie, 2000).9

As educational policy analyst Fogarty (2011: 2) notes, the main focus of education at this time was assimilationist and “Educational policy aimed at disenfranchising the cultural fabric of Indigenous communities”.10 However, the 1967 referendum granted Indigenous people the right to Australian legislature and the election of the Labor Whitlam Government in December 1972 initiated a period of change. Charles Perkins (an Arrernte Australian Aboriginal activist well-known in Federal Indigenous politics) biographer, Peter Read (2001), observed:

Whitlam, at the head of an energetically reformist government, came to power in December 1972 and almost immediately created the Department of Aboriginal Affairs...The government abolished the law which prevented Aborigines leaving the country without permission, established a commission to determine how (not if) land rights should be granted...dropped the charges against those arrested at the [Aboriginal land rights tent] embassy [in front of parliament house], stepped up recruitment of Aborigines to the public service and froze uranium mining [on Aboriginal land] in the Northern Territory [Read, 2001: 160].11

Although bilingual education had been advocated some years earlier in a Watts-Gallacher Report (1964: 71 in Devlin, 2009a) and a 1968 Joy Kinslow-Harris paper (in Devlin, 2009a) proposing team-teaching between Indigenous teachers and White counterparts, no form of bilingual education was seriously considered. However, within hours of taking office, the Whitlam government announced the introduction of bilingual education in remote Indigenous areas in the NT and by March 1973 the first programs were being implemented (Watts, McGrath

---

9 Lee at al (2014) note that jurisdiction over the NT was removed from South Australia to the Australian Government in 1911 due to its failure to address the abuse of human rights against Indigenous people occurring at that time in the region.

10 Assimilationist goals, according to Roberts (1995: 371) “seek to assimilate minority language speakers into the majority language and culture; in doing so, the minority language would become less important or even disappear.” This is driven by a fear of separatism and disorder. Pluralism, on the other hand, acknowledges and supports a group’s language rights, identity and autonomy (Roberts, 1995). These issues are discussed in more detail in Ch2.

11 This determination on land rights led to the 1976, Aboriginal Land Rights (NT) Act which allowed Indigenous people to make legal claims for their traditional land in areas not designated Aboriginal Land (Lee at al, 2014). This occurred at a time when increasing numbers of Indigenous people were returning to their traditional country to set up outstations and homelands (or small settlements) in what was to become known as the Homelands Movement (Lee at al, 2014). By 1990, there were 600 homelands in the NT (Lee at al, 2014). Access to and residency on homelands, due to the more traditional lifestyle, has been shown to increase IL use, cultural practises, health status and reduce drug and alcohol abuse (Lee at al, 2014).
& Tandy, 1973 in Devlin, 2009a). This involved teaching literacy in English and the vernacular with more Aboriginal literacy and language in the first years of schooling, with the ratio of languages reversed in upper primary (Devlin, 2009a). A definitive domain of Aboriginal education - that resulted in state, territory and federal government Indigenous education branches, as well as Aboriginal representation on parent committees and school boards - began to surface as a consequence of national, state and local levels of Indigenous governance (Fogarty, 2011).

This ideological shift to limited kinds of self-determination away from previous assimilationist policies led to the rise of a number of Indigenous governance organizations at state and federal level (including the first indigenous representative body, the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee) as well as “community government” such as Aboriginal Community Councils (Fogarty, 2011; Nicholls, 2005; Read, 2001). However, Fogarty (2011: 3) has stated that “tensions” arose between Aboriginal self-governance and representation and state and federal governance. The latter aimed to keep Aboriginal education under the control of state and federal governments but permitted distinctive ‘Aboriginal’ education developments to occur such as creating Indigenous education branches in bureaucracies, ‘Aboriginalisation’ of schools, including (often limited) community control, and the evolution of roughly 30 Indigenous bilingual schools in the NT (Fogarty, 2011; Watt, 1993). However, in the main, administration remained directive and centrally controlled. Aboriginal educators in most programs continued to be dissatisfied with the lack of opportunity for bilingual programs to accommodate local “needs and issues” and the continuing White bureaucratic domination and authority over programs (Ober, 2009: 35; Watt, 1993; Appendix 1.2).

Concurrently, powerful economic interests exercised influence over successive Federal Governments in Aboriginal policy formation and execution. Beginning with the Bob Hawke Labor Government failure in 1983 to enact national uniform Indigenous Land Rights legislation (the recognition of Indigenous economic and spiritual rights over land), the control by powerful economic interests was accelerated in 1998 by the decision to amend the 1976 NT Land Rights Act and reduce the negotiating rights of Indigenous land holders with mining companies (Roberts, 1994). NT Indigenous bilingual education programs also began to be heavily affected

---

12 Self-determination in the Australian context, while including Indigenous decision making, remained subordinate to Australian state interests (Roberts, 1994).
13 Please see Appendix 1.1 and Appendix 1.2 for a detailed history of NT Bilingual Education schools and relevant language education policies.
by cuts in staff and funding from 1984 (Devlin, 2009a; Watt, 1993). However, Devlin (2009a) noted, the impact of this was reduced by sustained training of remote Indigenous teachers at Batchelor Institute, an Indigenous tertiary education provider, and their use of ‘Both-Way’s philosophy.\(^{14}\) Bilingual programs were also sustained by Lo Bianco’s (1987) *National Policy on Languages* which gave a “broad, pluralistic basis of support for ILS” (Devlin, 2009a). These factors combined to allow bilingual programs to flourish in some schools and to develop in community influenced directions.

By the 1990s, however, with the election of the John Howard Federal Government in 1996, ideas of ‘mutual responsibility’ and ‘social contracts’ between remote Indigenous people and government began to replace these notions of self-determination and empowerment (Fogarty, 2011).\(^{15}\) Education systems became commodified, centralised and increasingly monitored through testing mechanisms and less reflective of the economic and social realities of remote Australia and, over time, there developed an almost exclusive focus on English and testing English literacy and numeracy standards based on Standard Australian English (SAE) norms (Fogarty, 2011). Such educational reforms were tied to overarching national goals to increase competition in global markets.

This domination of SAE, Lo Bianco (2007) argued, was also a consequence of the fact that language policy makers in Australia are overwhelming monolingual and more than half are completely monolingual (monoglots) with no experience of another language at all (either through family or study). This means that “our representatives are … unrepresentative of an important characteristic of our population” (Lo Bianco, 2007: 21). That is, although there is no official language in Australia, and the 2006 Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) identified 400 languages as spoken here, monolingualism in SAE prevails in education, the media and parliament and tends to be viewed as the foundation of policy (Ellis, Gogolin & Clyne, 2010; Lo Bianco, 2007). This, according to Ellis, Gogolin and Clyne (2010: 440), is not a condition restricted to Australian shores but is apparent in other colonised industrialised countries where

\(^{14}\) Both Ways philosophy as developed by Batchelor Institute is described as the integration of Indigenous and western knowledge systems (Ober & Bat, 2008). For a detailed description please refer to the glossary.

\(^{15}\) ‘Shared responsibility agreements’ and ‘mutual obligation’ began in the Indigenous self-governing nation body, ATSIC and then with mainstream and non-government providers after ATSIC was abolished. They were premised on the notion that welfare dependency was a ‘choice’ and that welfare recipients had a mutual obligation to exchange or return to society what was given (Anderson, 2006). This often resulted in agreements where personal hygiene (washing hands and face), child school or clinic attendance and complex health issues such as trachoma, that require both primary and secondary health care initiatives were linked to unrelated discretionary benefits (such as a fuel pump in Mulan, WA) (Anderson, 2006). This implied a causality of health issues that were the ‘will’ or ‘choice’ of welfare recipients as opposed to structural inequalities.
“monolingual, monoethnic, monoreligious and monoideological” properties have become regarded as a “natural state”.

In Australia, this has effectively meant, according to McKay (2011) and Walsh (2005), that despite only approximately 100 largely endangered ILs remaining out of a total of 270 (in 600 communities) since pre-contact, there has been little support for language maintenance or revitalisation (see also Wilkins, 2008). Nicholls (2005: 160), a previous Lajamanu school principal, maintained that any existing support for bilingual education was eroded in the NT in 1998 with the introduction of the Schools Our Focus policy in 1998 which aimed to eliminate all bilingual programs as a consequence, policy makers argued, of poor standards in English literacy in bilingual schools and the axing of recurrent federal funding from the Howard Government for bilingual programs (Nicholls, 2005). However, as with the 2008 FFHP, no empirical or statistical evidence was produced to support the claim of lower English literacy levels, Nicholls (2005) and Devlin (2009a) document.16 Despite Aboriginal community resistance and public outrage, the NT Government succeeded in closing down all but 10 (according to the Department’s own figures in NTDET, 2006: 24-25) of the original approximately 30 (public and private) bilingual schools that had existed in the 1980s and 1990s. These were transformed from bilingual schools to Two Way learning programs (Devlin, 2009a: 6; Nicholls, 2005).17

Although there was sufficient support for the 10 remaining bilingual programs in the intervening decade, on 14 October 2008, then NT Minister for Education and Training, Marion Scrymgour, announced the FFHP where all schools would be required to teach their first four hours of lessons exclusively in English, effectively reducing all bilingual programs to monolingual education. This policy, in its prescription of monolingual dominant English education, continues to have a profound effect on IL education today (Devlin, 2009a; Truscott & Malcolm, 2010). The policy was proposed by a Minister who was herself Indigenous and self-described as a “passionate Aboriginal advocate” (Australian Associated Press, 2007), but with little cognizance of or affiliation with remote living or remote Indigenous culture and language, having grown up...

16 Devlin (2009a) states that although Indigenous parent concern as well as budgetary concerns and the redistribution of funds to better source English language programs across all schools were other reasons given by NTDEET for the closures of bilingual programs, they could not produce evidence to support the former claims and failed to redistribute the funding saved.
17 This is discussed in more detail in the literature review.
in a suburb of the NT capital Darwin. These factors underscore the complexity and language hierarchy operating in public discourse on Indigenous education.

The FFHP policy was released soon after the NTER of 2007, which, according to Brown and Brown (2007: 621) “demonised and exposed [remote Indigenous NT Communities] to a level of scrutiny unparalleled in recent times”. The NTER represented the culmination of a ‘mainstreaming’ general agenda (see below) with a large number of sweeping changes to Indigenous life and rights. NTER involved measures reported above, in addition to a package of legislation that quarantined welfare payments, prohibited alcohol and pornography, increased policing and mandated the forcible acquisition of Aboriginal land (Altman & Russell, 2012). It tied school attendance to income support and family assistance, led to the collapse of a Commonwealth Development Employment Projects (CDEP) Scheme18, suspension of human rights legislation for NT Indigenous Australians, appointment of community managers to oversee all community business among other measures in prescribed areas (Altman & Russell, 2012). The NTER, although ostensibly created for the protection of children after the release of a report on child abuse in remote Indigenous communities, Little Children are Sacred by Anderson and Wild (2007), and justified with tropes of child protection (Kelada, 2008), in fact had few reforms relating directly to children (Altman, 2013). Rather, the NTER worsened conditions that presented a danger to children: extremely high unemployment, destitution, high incarceration rates, very poor housing, worse morbidity and mortality rates, social dysfunction, drug abuse, high rates of suicides, as well as low school attendance (Altman, 2009; Altman & Hinkson, 2010; Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC), 2010: XIV; Brown & Brown, 2007; Shaw, 2013). The consequences of these policy events were magnified with the NT Government decision to collapse Indigenous (self-governing) Community Councils into Super Shire councils and thus strip remote Indigenous communities of assets, industries, employment and governance (Gibson, 2013).

---

18 The CDEP scheme subsidised low wages to create economic development in remote communities that had experienced “historical underinvestment by the state” (Kronemann, 2007: 14). The employment discrepancy is visible in government statistics for the NT whereby 17% of Indigenous people are unemployed (receive no paid employment) as opposed to 2% for non-Indigenous people (Lee at al, 2014). CDEP has now been replaced in 60 communities by the Remote Jobs and Communities Program (RJCP). This will entail a phasing out of CDEP wages by 2017 in addition to the termination of three job services and an increase in training, including English literacy and numeracy training (Lee at al, 2014). This suggests a strong neo-liberal rationale (discussed later) underpins this program, given the focus on dominant language and literacy skills and the failure to account for the economic realities in remote communities.
Altman and Hinkson (2010) state that the NTER was a response to the perceived increasing risk that remote Indigenous Australians posed to the Australian nation-state of high future economic, industry and welfare costs and a social risk to the public health and criminal justice systems from the attempt to sustain “an unhealthy and impoverished population” (Altman & Hinkson, 2010: 187). The fact that “Indigenous population concentrations” shared many characteristics with a ‘weak state’ of “poverty, conflict and poorly functioning political systems” also meant that there was growing criticism of government and questions of government “legitimacy … in the lives of remote Indigenous people” (Altman & Hinkson, 2010: 187). The NTER, as such, was viewed as an attempt to remove these risks by forcing remote Indigenous people into the mainstream. It was legitimated, according to Anthony (2010: 90, 91), through “technologies, discourses and metaphors of crime” in relation to a “racialised offender”.

The temporal proximity of the release of the NTER and FFHP suggested that these policies possibly shared views, values and ideologies relating to remote Indigenous people. That is, the NTER influenced the linguistic culture (as discussed by Schiffman, 1996, in Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001: 414) or presuppositions, ideas and attitudes regarding language entailed in the FFHP. For example, at the time of the 2008 announcement, as with the 1998 policy and the NTER, there appeared to be little consultation with communities (Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009) which would suggest a lack of ‘value’ associated with such consultations. The 2008 FFHP also appeared to contravene; the Federal Government calls for supporting ILs in schools in the 2008 *ILs Programs in Australian Schools - A Way Forward* report (Purdie, et al, 2008); the NT Department of Education’s 2004-2005 own report that showed marginally enhanced outcomes in English skills in remote bilingual schools; and, according to Devlin (2009a), multilevel assessment program results. This failure to recognise ILs in educational achievement suggests the same cultural hierarchy operating in the FFHP as the NTER and, in turn, implies the possibility of a mainstreaming (assimilationist) agenda operating in the FFHP.

Devlin (pi, 16 January 2014) maintains that the FFHP decision was influenced primarily by alarming results of the 2008 NAPLAN test for the NT (also Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009; Devlin, 2009a; Truscott & Malcolm, 2010). NAPLAN are a set of standardized SAE literacy and numeracy assessments designed for monolingual language speakers. The tests are criticised by Wigglesworth, Simpson and Loakes (2011) for questionable validity and fairness.¹⁹ The link of

---

¹⁹ These researchers also identified the problems associated with creating language convention tests for those who have quite wide variations in English language dialects and creoles (including ESL, EFL and native English speakers)
NAPLAN to the FFHP also indicates a possible tie to the monolingualism and monoethnicism of the colonised industrial Australian state (Ellis, Gogolin & Clyne, 2010). The focus on SAE testing results for non-SAE speaking and non-English speaking remote Indigenous students, in fact, prompted one prominent Indigenous teacher at Yirrkala, Dr R. Marika (1999), to remark that:

The premise from the NT Department’s view of profiling and the National Benchmarks is that only the *Balanda* [non-Indigenous mainstream] knowledge system transmitted in English is important. They are making a value judgment which is assimilationist and unfair to our children because our children are learning in and through two languages and knowledge systems [Marika, 1999: 118].

With the announcement of the FFHP, Scrymgour criticised poor implementation of bilingual programs in an environment of greatly reduced resourcing for such programs, thus seeming to blame those most affected by government marginalisation for this inequity. This appeared to belie a rationale that ran counter to “actual encountered realities”, in the words of language policy analyst Lo Bianco (2001a: 17). The aim of this study is thereby to investigate the rationale, beliefs and attitudes in the policy as well as the impact of the policy on two remote communities.

### 1.3 Research Questions

The central questions that will be investigated by this study are

**What beliefs and attitudes underpin the First Four Hours of English policy?**

**What were its effects?**

These questions can be further broken down into three additional questions:

1. What ideologies are evident in the framing of this policy and in the political and media discourses about the policy?

---

that are norm referenced for a small select group of respondents. This narrow range of meanings and conventions in such standard tests merely highlights what respondents do not know as opposed to what they do know, Wigglesworth, Simpson and Loakes (2011) argue.
2. How are they indicated by the construction and representation of languages, culture and people?

3. What were the consequences of this policy for two remote Indigenous communities which had, to that point, implemented bilingual education programs in their schools?

A discussion of these questions appears below.

A discourse of fundamental ‘difference’ in Indigenous identity from mainstream Australia as the explanatory tool for educational underachievement has permeated Indigenous education since the 1960s (Fogarty, 2011; Nicholls, 2005; Read, 2001). This discourse of ‘difference’ and underachievement is now heavily embedded in notions of deficits and a ‘gap’. We can see this reflected in the Australian Labor Party key strategy for Indigenous education and health, called Closing the Gap (the NT section inherited the same goals, maxims and some statutory limitations as the NTER). This policy aims to have Indigenous communities attain State-Federal agreed targets in health, education and employment. It was one of the aims of this study to ascertain whether the FFHP shared these same ideologies and representations.

Given the apparent influence of accountability mechanisms (NAPLAN) on the FFHP policy decision, there are indications that this policy may also be influenced by globalisation discourse, albeit moderated by local conditions. Globalisation discourse is heavily tied to neo-liberalism which is underlined by the assumption that the ‘market’ is politically neutral and innately equalizing and proposes that improved economic and social outcomes from education result from instruction in the dominant language (Apple, 1999).

This research also examines if the FFHP has been influenced by dominant ideologies such as globalisation and, if so, how these ideologies have become realised in FFHP policy text and discourse constructions and representations of Indigenous people, language and culture. Finally, it examines the impact of

---

20 The NT agreement of the Closing the Gap policy, Stronger Futures of the NT, relates directed to and succeeded the NTER construed by its Australian Liberal Government predecessor. While the NTER differed from the Closing the Gap in that it entailed the suspension of sections within the Racial Discrimination Act, both feature dominant language education prominently as solutions to distressing socio-economic and health statistics. This non-structuralist approach also suggests the operation of neo-liberal globalisation with social and economic non-intervention (see below, Kendall, 2003).

21 This view is opposed to the alternative perspective that the domination of one language is simply a consequence of domination and power of one group which results in their increased institutional and economic control, their wealth protection, an elevated status and use of their language and an elevation in poverty of the non-dominant in real terms (Macoun, 2011, Ozga & Lingard, 2007: 66; Ricento, 2010; Watson, 2009, Watson, 2011; Wolfe, 2006).
the FFHP on two Indigenous communities, one where a bilingual program was retained and one where it was suspended, ensuring an Indigenous ‘voice’ and perspective overlays this analysis.

1.4 Justification for the Research Method

The methodologies for this investigation, CDA and CA and participatory ethnographic qualitative research, are in accordance with critical postmodern methodologies outlined by Denzin and Lincoln (2008, 2011). This research orientation has an underlying epistemology of the subjectivity of knowledge and the premise that knowledge which is valued in the postmodern Western state is a product of power, control and oppressive structures (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This aligns well with the aims of Critical Language Planning and Policy studies (CLPP) to analyse language hierarchies that evolve as a consequence of power differentials. As such, the methodology employed attempts to capture multifarious perspectives, critique text to discern power inequalities and integrate analysis across disciplines including sociology, history, psychology, linguistics, political science and anthropology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, 2011; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This is in order to effect, through explanation and description, a moral, empowering and emancipatory alternative and voice for the marginalised ‘other’ that is tempered by my own subjectivities, experiences and predispositions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, 2011; Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

The policy analysis entails the use of CDA which is applied to a number of different texts – the policy text, policy guidelines and policy discourse. 22 CDA ascertains key constructions in the policy texts such as those of literacy, Indigeneity and bilingual education. The effects of the policy were analysed in two case studies with interviews and an analytical methodology that uses both CA and CDA. This involved the examination of the views of Indigenous community respondents at two sites - one where bilingual education remained and the other where it was suspended.

---

22 In this case, I will be using Lo Bianco’s (2009a: 103-106) categorisation of policy texts as; public texts (the “declarative” and “official documentation” of a policy); public discourse (“debates...discussions... arguments on issues of languages”) and performative action (language practice which can reinforce or “destabilise” and “contest” understandings of the policy and its discourse).
1.5 Justification for the Study

This study is important for a number of reasons. It is the first CDA of its type applied to IL education in the NT. It is also important due to; the need to scrutinize a policy that has major implications for human rights, self-determination and self-governance of Indigenous people; the need to interrogate and refine policy development and funding methods in order to enhance their effectiveness; the need to increase research on remote education systems; the need to increase theoretical research on policy in specific contexts; and the need to enrich academic scholarship with Indigenous perspectives.

This research represents the second study of its type that has employed CDA in the examination of Indigenous education language policy discourse in the NT and the first to employ the Historical Discourse Approach (a socio-linguistic analysis that focuses on rhetoric and argument) in the analysis of IL education policy in Australia.23 Given the enormous impact that policy has on institutional discourse “and shaping institutional practices”, ways of thinking, speaking and understanding that influences educational professional interaction with others and professional conduct (Turunen & Raffety, 2011: 44), this research represents an extremely important contribution to Indigenous education. As Turunen and Raffety contend:

Questions about the origins of dominant discourses, the ways in which discourses have been promoted, the ideological climate which has enabled a particular discourse to gain currency, and the groups that benefit from it are paramount in developing perspectives on what is happening to particular individuals within particular institutions at particular times (Turunen & Raffety, 2011: 45).

Such a contribution is particularly poignant in lieu of consistently poor Indigenous policy outcomes. Eva Cox (2014b), Jumbunna Professional Fellow, University of Technology Sydney, has noted the disheartening statistics that “regularly appear in Closing the Gap reports”. Cox (2014b) argues that this is a consequence of defective policy development and implementation

---

23 Lo Bianco’s 1999 appraisal of a senate Hansard question time text is the only exception. This is detailed in the literature review.
that fails to meet the Commonwealth Government’s own “clear criteria for what works”\(^\text{24}\) and points out that rather than address such flaws:

> It is easier to blame others when good intentions fail, but there is a much more mundane explanation, backed by substantial evidence: poor outcomes could be the result of flaws in how officials devise and deliver programs and funding [Cox, 2014b].

Remote education researcher Maughan (2012) notes the small amount of research on remote Indigenous education systems generally, despite the fact that it is these groups in these regions that are repeatedly identified as the ones most in ‘need’ of educational research and enhancement. By focusing the research on two Indigenous communities, this study responds directly to Maughan’s (2012) call.

The need for determining the effects of policy in specific contexts has also been identified as an area requiring research. Hornberger and Johnson (2007: 511, 510) note the lack of CLPP ethnographic research that both examines the hegemonic power relations in policies (the “ideological spaces”) in addition to “contextual slippages” and local agentive roles and resistance (or ‘implementational spaces’). Policy analysts Ozga and Lingard (2007: 67) also advocate the need to analyse policy in order to determine the extent to which it “reflect[s] democratic principles” as opposed to “protecting and sustaining bureaucratic logics of practice ... [that constrain] democratic possibilities”. This study proposes such an investigation.

In addition, the need to engage with Indigenous knowledge systems by the academy is an area identified as vitally important in *The Review of Australian Higher Education Final Report* (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales, 2008). This study, in response, included remote Indigenous perspectives and understandings as well as interrogations of mainstream epistemological assumptions.

Perhaps the most compelling reason for this study is the close examination of previous Lajamanu school principal Christine Nichol’s (2005) assertion that legislation that leads to the dissolution of bilingual education in the NT strikes at the core of Indigenous identity. Nicholls (2001) noted

\(^{24}\) The main criteria for “What works” in policy development and implementation, Cox (2014b) claims; is “flexibility in design and delivery” to adapt to local conditions; “community involvement and engagement in both the development and delivery of programs”; an emphasis on relationships and trust; “a well-trained and well-resourced workforce, with an emphasis on retention of staff; continuity and co-ordination of services”.
that the increasing focus on English only was a “continuity with the social engineering policies and projects of the past” (Nicholls, 2001: 325). As such, Nicholls (2001: 326, 327) noted, the attempt to remove bilingual education cannot be regarded as “anomalous” but, rather, “a very recent manifestation of that earlier discursive regime” and one where the “affected Indigenous groups are well aware of the historical and discursive continuities at work”.

Closing down bilingual education thus represents a continuation of cultural, language, land and religious dispossession in the colonising process and the continuation of previous assimilation policies. The 2009 FFHP in particular, is pivotal in Indigenous policy with enormous – though under-researched – implications for Indigenous self-determination and self-governance in education. It is against this critique and the hegemony that this implies that this study investigates the policy discourse, the discourse around the policy, the policy performance and the actual lived experience and impact on two remote Indigenous communities. The FFHP and the context in which it was created, thereby, requires scrutiny and elucidation so that we might fully understand its actual consequences.

1.6 Why Now? Further Contextualisation of the Study

The examination of the FFHP is timely given the NT Department of Education’s continued retreat from bilingual programs in remote Indigenous communities in terms of policy and the socio-political, human rights and educational implications that this entails. For instance, Australia is a signatory of various United Nations (UN) International Human Rights treaties that ensure Indigenous people the right to establish and control their own educational systems as well as participate in language and cultural education for their children using culturally appropriate methods. Despite some federal government policy that aimed to ensure some of these rights

---

25 While the FFHP has been replaced by subsequent policies, such as the Framework for Learning English as an Additional Language (from 4 June 2012 to June 2014) and A Share in the Future – Indigenous Education Strategy (2015-2024), the onus on monolingual SAE literacy education remains.

26 These treaties include the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989a), which relates education to the full mental, physical, creative and personality development of a child with a particular focus on cultural identity, cultural values and language, national and international values and social responsibility and ratified by Australia in 1990. It also includes the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UN, 1966), which gives “all people the right to self-determination” and the right to pursue social, economic and cultural development in addition to “the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standards of physical and mental health”. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (UN, 1989b) restates the right to self-determination and the development of social, economic and cultural pursuits, the right to use and practice one’s own, religion, language and culture and that these rights can be remedied judicially, legally or administratively. This is thus meant to ensure equality before the law. These rights are reiterated for Indigenous people in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN, 2007) which was ratified by Australia in 2009.
are expressed there appears to have been consistent failure in the NT since 1998 to implement these measures extensively either legally or institutionally (in terms of policy) (Charles, 2010; Kalantry, Getgen & Koh, 2010).

In addition, contemporary coverage in the press on the FFHP, IL education and Indigenous bilingual education generally demonstrates highly skewed and contentious debates that evince what some have perceived as a destructive socio-political hierarchy. Law critique, Sophie Charles (2010), for instance, claims that language education policy has become crafted in a similar way to other Indigenous policies due to the intertextuality that results from authors borrowing and co-creating across policy platforms. Waller (2012: 80) notes the mainstream media’s inability to deal with the complexities associated with the bilingual debate. More recent developments, such as the NT Department of Education Wilson (2014a) report (with an onus on English language teaching in order to correct remote Indigenous student ‘deficits’ in English oracy and literacy), the subsequent policy, A Share in the Future (NTDE, 2015) and the 2014 Abbott Federal Government cuts of $9.5 million to IL programs, indicate that assimilative policy to remedy Indigenous deficits remains a consistent approach (Nordlinger & Singer, 2014).

As noted above, the ideology behind ‘deficits’ in remote Indigenous students in terms of their language, culture, families and communities embodies a socio-political hierarchy. This hierarchy is reflected in the marginalisation and oppression of many bilingual or multilingual groups, their languages and cultures in societies where a dominant higher status language exists (Baker, 2011; Molyneux, 2005). As bilingual researcher Paul Molyneux (2005) notes:

It is a drama being played out in the contemporary international and domestic political climate all too often marked by xenophobia and racism ... which has seen the abandonment of commitments to linguistic diversity in settings as diverse as remote Australian Aboriginal communities to urban immigrant communities in several U.S. states (Crawford, 1997, 2000a; Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001). Additional research in the area of bilingual

27 See for instance National ILs Policy, 2009 that stipulated support for critically endangered languages, the use of ILs in strategies for Closing the Gap and assistance for IL programs in schools (McKay, 2011). Charles (2010) notes the failure of the NT Government with the introduction of the FFHP to conform to the 4A UN education framework (in Charles, 2010: 10). This framework stipulates the rights of Indigenous children to have education that affords availability, accessibility, acceptability and adaptability. This is achieved in terms of provision, reducing any difficulties or cultural clashes as well as increasing pedagogical and curricula relevance by including the learning of one’s own language and culture (Charles, 2010).

28 Lisa Waller (2012: 80), in her analysis of media coverage of the FFHP issue, claims that one of the main impetuses for the restructuring of bilingual schools was the negative and biased coverage of Indigenous bilingual education. Koch-Baumgarten and Voltmer (2010: 4) argue such a power of the media resides in its ability to impose “operational logic on the institutional procedures of public policy”.
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learning is sorely needed, as the impact of these policy shifts may have long-lasting and detrimental consequences in the communities affected - and in the wider community.

As such, this research, situated as it is in two remote Indigenous communities where bilingual education had a long history and where local languages remain strong, could make a very valuable contribution to current research on Indigenous bilingual education and language policy. I will now discuss the justification for the research sites.

1.7 Justification for the Research Sites

The two communities that were invited to participate in this research comprise two Central Australian communities of different language groups. The main reasons for their identification and selection was the context of these communities. Both communities had long term bilingual programs that began in the early 1970s until the FFHP. One community continued its program without official sanctioning by the NT Government while the other abandoned its bilingual program, but retained some IL teaching. Both communities also have outspoken and well-known linguistic and Indigenous educators of long service at the school, still connected to the school or residing within the community (Baarda, 2008a; Whitmont, 2009). Each community was also keenly interested after I discussed the project with a number of members when I was working for Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education (BIITE). The communities thus represent ones that were keen to have a ‘voice’ in the bilingual debate and their differences afford points of comparison and contrast.

1.8 Personal Interest in the Study

My personal interest in this study stems from my experience of living for over a decade in Central Australia. For approximately 12 years, I have worked in Central Australia at BIITE as an ESL teacher and teacher educator both in remote locations and on campus in Alice Springs and Batchelor. I also married into an Indigenous family, one that is known for its Aboriginal political activism. It was through these experiences that I became acquainted with and befriended dozens of remote community students, including some at the research sites. Marrying into an Indigenous family and the personal changes that this entailed (including encountering discrimination and a process of acculturation) meant that I came to identify with my ‘family’ and
so came to identify, in some respects, with some aspects of Indigeneity. I thereby can offer an appraisal of the issue through both an insider’s perspective to a degree, but with the necessary academic cultural capital of an outsider.

In addition, while I have married into an Indigenous family, I have ethnocultural characteristics that also place my identity as a privileged White person. This privilege has come at the expense of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination which are factors whose absence have been identified as contributing to an appalling Indigenous socio-economic and health situation (Daly & Smith, 2003). Failure to critique the colonial process results in complicity with this oppression and this, in fact, contradicts my own interests, in terms of my family’s and daughter’s welfare. There is therefore a personal need in my case, one identified by Giroux (1997), to critique racial positionings and constructions, and to engage in reflexivity. This can liberate racial identity and hence create a more pluralistic society that no longer enables White identity to justify inequality (Giroux, 1997). The desire to do such a study, therefore, comes from a personal desire for social justice.

Although motivated by a passion for and sense of social justice, the reflexivity and particular subjectivities of self can afford advantages. These include a multiple perspective appraisal of the context that can provide a greater depth of research data gathering and analysis as a consequence of my established and privileged place within the context.

The following provides an overview of how this thesis is structured.

1.9 Thesis Structure

**Chapter 1: Introduction** entails a synopsis of the study. It includes a brief summary of the major issues, the research question, a background offering more details and justification of the field of inquiry, a brief summary of the methodology as well as justification for this methodology and justification for the study itself. In addition, reasons for the two sites selected are given as well as my personal interest in the study.

**Chapter 2: Literature Review** contains the major Bilingual Education and CLPP theoretical tenets that are examined in this thesis. It commences with an overview of the language ecology of the
NT and Indigenous ontologies (more of which is discussed in Ch3). It then addresses the different types of bilingual education that reflect language and cultural hierarchies common in colonial contexts. The chapter then provides an overview of both national and international research from other fields that support the theories and research findings on bilingual education that indicate positive cognitive, academic, well-being and health effects.

Following this is a description of the field of CLPP in relation to language hierarchies and language congruence of nation-states. After discussing how this is related to ideologies of settler colonialism and neo-liberal globalisation, there is an examination of the influence of these tenets on global, Australian and Indigenous education policy.

**Chapter 3: Methodology** outlines the methodological approaches selected for this study given the context of cross-cultural research. It describes methodology and research philosophy that underpins it, the strategies of case study and ethnography. It pays attention to Indigenous perspectives and methodologies that are used in this research and so a deeper discussion of the importance of ‘place’ is situated here. It then details the data gathered and implications associated with the use of such data in terms of recruitment, ethics, interpretation and transcription. Finally, it examines the data analysis and issues of validity, transferability, dependability, confirmability, credibility, ethics and limitations associated with this process.

**Chapter 4: Boss Talk – weapon of choice** shows the CDA data analysis of the policy texts and policy discourse. It describes the importance of the texts in addition to the means by which they are analysed using HDA. An analysis of each text is then presented in terms of the research sub-questions being answered. An overview of the findings in constructions and representations of people and language as well as ideologies is given.

**Chapter 5: Analysis at Site 1** presents the data analysis from interviews at Site 1. This chapter gives an overview of the issues discussed; how they were analysed; the categories that evolved from this analysis and how they inter-related; a deeper discussion on the content in each category and example texts; the CDA of selected interviews that best represented each category; and student responses and how these related to the adult responses.

**Chapter 6: Analysis at Site 2** presents the same elements in Chapter 6 but for Site 2.
Chapter 7: Discussion, Conclusion provides an overview of the research findings, a discussion on their links to CLPP and bilingual education literature, conclusions and implications as well as recommendations. Implications of this research are viewed in terms of policy analysis, methodology, Indigenous evaluation of policy and in relation to social justice and the protection of ILs and culture. Recommendations relate to the need to ‘reimagine’ the nation-state of Australia in order to achieve language and cultural rights for all, the need to reinstate bilingual education in Indigenous contexts, the need to change policy evaluation systems so that they encompass Indigenous evaluation and the need for Indigenous self-governance.

Some concluding remarks are then offered that tie this research to Indigenous led solutions to address the problem of failed Indigenous policy.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

In this chapter, I review literature that provides the foundation for this research by justifying the guided questions and methodology. The chapter positions the study in relation to sociolinguistic context, other research literature and identifies ways it can contribute to the academic debate on bilingual education in remote Indigenous contexts. The chapter commences with a contextualization of the IL ecology of the NT, outlining the relationship between L1 and L2 acquisition which are key elements of this study. The chapter reports international and national research that supports socio-economic and well-being issues associated with bilingualism and bilingual education and then provides an overview of Language Planning, specifically CLPP, within which this study is positioned.

2.1 IL Ecology

Figure 2.1: AIATSIS map of Indigenous Australia. This map attempts to represent the language, social or nation groups of Aboriginal Australia. It shows only the general locations of larger groupings of people which may include clans, dialects or individual languages in a group. It used published resources from 1988-1994 and is not intended to be exact, nor the boundaries fixed. It is not suitable for native title or other land claims. David R Horton (creator), © Aboriginal Studies Press, AIATSIS, 1996. No reproduction without permission.
The map above shows the historical diversity of Australian languages. It is estimated that between 700 and 800 dialects were spoken by up to one million Indigenous people in the late 1700s on the Australian mainland, Tasmania and the Torres Strait (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; McConvell & Thieberger, 2001). Koch and Nordlinger (2014) note that most of these dialects were spoken by no more than 30 to 40 people, with the largest population of speakers at 3000 to 4000. However, McConvell and Thieberger (2001) contended that violence against Indigenous people at the frontier of white settlement and decimation of Indigenous populations through disease could have masked the much higher number of speakers of each language.

Research indicates the mainland dialects and languages have a “genetic unity” (Koch, 2007: 28), that these languages share common phonemic resources (Dixon, 1980), a “distinctive typological profile” (Dixon, 2002: 691), experience similarities partly as a consequence of linguistic heritage and partly because of diffusion (although linguistic characteristics are gained and lost through a cyclical process) and are synthetic (where words are composed of a sequence of morphemes and where complex verb forms may incorporate nouns). Meaning in such linguistic structures thereby contrasts considerably with the largely analytical structure of English (of unbound morphemes and little inflection resulting in a semantic focus on word order) (Eades, 1988; Malcolm, 2003). Also of difference from English are the quite disparate sounds (Eades, 1988; Malcolm, 2003: 6).

---

29 I am using Koch’s (2007) definition of a traditional IL as the forms of language that existed prior to colonisation in 1788. Although the terms dialect and language are used in this thesis, it is recognised that they are problematic given the nation-state ideology that historically underpins them whereby a dialect was the term used to denote less prestigious language varieties while the term ‘language’ denoted a standard ‘correct’ variety of a language which was historically equated with a particular culture and was used to define nations. There is, thus, an implied hierarchy and ranking associated with these terms that is ideologically driven (Gal & Irvine, 1995). Dialects, thereby, can be regarded as naturally occurring varieties in a particular language group that are “mutually intelligible” (Dixon, 2002: 5). The terms are used in this thesis in this way (dialects as varieties within a language) since they also represent the conventions of the linguists, such as Koch & Nordlinger (2014), Dixon (2002) and others cited in this treatise. However, they are used with the recognition that all language varieties are fluid and dynamic (Eades, 2013). In terms of traditional Indigenous languages, linguistically dialects refer to the language varieties spoken by a tribal group or tribal subdivision and many in the Central Desert are named (e.g. the Pintubi, Pitjantjatjarra and Yankuntjatjarra that comprise the Western Desert Language) (Dixon, 2002).

30 See Dixon (1980) and Wurm (1972). There has been some dispute historically as to how traditional ILs are related but the general current linguistic position according to Koch & Nordlinger (2014) is that they arose from 25 families of languages across Australia, including Tasmania, but a vast number of languages across the continent appear to have come from one family.

31 It is beyond the scope of this resource to detail the qualities and diversity of Australian traditional languages given the focus on a language policy and its effects. The details given thus far were used to illustrate the diversity between traditional ILs and English which poses problems in educational settings (see below). Readers interested in this area should refer to Dixon (1980), Dixon (2002), Evans (2010), Koch (2007), Koch and Nordlinger (2014), Leitner & Graham (2007), McGregor (2004), Mushin and Baker (2008) and Simpson, Nash, Laughren, Austin and Alpher (2001). Some of these resources give a detailed account of linguistic classes and qualities.
Traditional ILs additionally contained a considerable amount of ecological, environmental and geological knowledge. Dixon (2002) noted the ‘Dreamtime’ (spiritual history) stories of some Australian languages that describe the land mass joining Australia to New Guinea 10,000 years ago and the extension of the eastern seaboard to where the Great Barrier Reef now exists. The richness of knowledge in traditional ILs led McConvell and Thieberger (2001) to comment:

The knowledge which a people possesses, which enables them to live fruitfully in a particular ecological niche in the physical and biological environment is encoded in the language that they use to describe and work with the land, animals and plants. Studies both overseas and in Australia have shown the immense richness of the language associated with Indigenous ethnobiological concepts and practices (McConvell & Thieberger, 2001: 28).

Indigenous speaking groups were highly multilingual and commonly spoke four to six proximal languages (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). Some languages had male and female versions where children knew both and a number of groups would speak the language of the ‘land’ (see below) they were travelling on (Evans, 2010). This multilingualism persists today with Standard (SAE), Creoles and Aboriginal English comprising additional languages to traditional ILs (Lee at al, 2014). While a language often has a strong relationship to identity, the relationship between traditional ILs, identity and land is particularly intense (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Marmion, Obata & Troy, 2014), with McKay (2011: 299) remarking that the “inherent relationship between language and land in Aboriginal societies ... has no parallel in non-Aboriginal thinking”.

Traditional stories often related to the narratives of ancestral spiritual beings giving the land a language (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014). In this study, language was commonly identified as land, law and spirituality (see also Larkin, 2005). Language speaking groups are also denoted by the language name since they belong to the places where that language is spoken (was created by ancestral beings), such as Warlpali people of Central Australia (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Larkin, 2005). This denotation also identifies family and clan. Consequently, those who come from a particular region where a language is or was spoken, own that language regardless of whether they speak it or not (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014).32

32 A far more detailed account of the importance of land and ‘place’ is provided in Ch3.
However, “contact with White civilisation” and colonisation have left their mark (Dixon, 2002: 2). Dixon (2002) notes that within 100 years of first contact with White settlement, children invariably stopped learning traditional ILs. Of the approximately 270 traditional ILs that were spoken across Australia at the time of White colonisation, 145 are critically endangered and only 15-18 remain spoken as a L1 by children but three or four of these show indications of endangerment (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Lee et al, 2014; Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011). For many other languages, they are restricted to small groups of speakers more than 40 years old and the vast majority have no fluent speakers at all (Dixon, 2002; Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011). This history of traditional Indigenous languages since colonisation has led Zuckermann & Monaghan (2012) to exclaim;

... Australia has been made the ‘Unlucky Country’ through the historical processes of linguicide (language killing) and glottophagy (language eating). These twin forces were in operation early in the colonial period (Zuckermann & Monaghan, 2012: 119).

This change in traditional IL use occurred unequally and unevenly so that Victoria, Tasmania and some regions in NSW such as Sydney have few if any fluent IL speakers and remain largely unrecorded as a consequence of various factors including the longer history of White contact and English variety use while others, such as Warlpari in remote Central Australia, have a sizable proportion of fluent speakers in addition to a high level of linguistic documentation and literature (Disbray, 2014; Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Laughren, 2013). Given the fact that the NT was one of the last areas to be invaded with less White settlement and Indigenous dispersal in its shorter colonial history, it has the most sizable populations of fluent IL speakers and the majority of the “strongest” traditional ILs (Lee, et al, 2014: 91).

This deterioration in Australian ILs, the “greatest and most rapid loss of language over the last century” anywhere in the world (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014: 4), has been marked by both language rupture (extreme and sudden loss of language that characterized early white settlement) and language attrition (a slower generational loss of language where sufficient language resources remain for language revival and revitalization) (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001).

Primary reasons for this deterioration are Australia’s official language policy of monolingual SAE education (Dixon, 1992; Koch & Nordlinger, 2014) and the concerted efforts historically that went into preventing Indigenous people from speaking their own language “in order to civilize
them” (Zuckermann, Shakuto-Neoh & Giovanni Matteo, 2014: 55; see also Zuckermann & Monaghan, 2012). Other factors include the widespread massacre and dispersal of Indigenous people, the more sedentary settlement patterns in Indigenous communities that resulted in language loss and shift to an Indigenous lingua franca or form of English in institutions (Church or School)\textsuperscript{33}, the ‘shame’ in some regions associated with speaking an IL (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001) and the association of traditional ILs with “old people and their ways” (McConvell, 1991: 154 in Dickson, 2015: 5). The policy of forcibly removing children from their families where the children were then institutionalised (largely through church organisations) or raised by White families also meant a dramatic rupture in both traditional IL and Aboriginal English due to the lack of socialisation in an Indigenous family or the coercion to not speak an IL (Eades, 2013; National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, 1997). This loss of ILs, which particularly affected the south east regions but was common also in the NT, resulted in generational rupture and psychological trauma largely because of the inability to communicate with family members (National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, 1997). Dixon (1992) also lists parental choice for children to adopt English in the belief of enhanced chances in life. The use of the media, information technology, as noted also by Simpson (2008), Lo Bianco and Rhydwen (2001: 398), has also influenced greater English language use and made even the strongest ILs “extremely vulnerable” (see also Dixon, 1992).\textsuperscript{34}

McConvell and Thieberger (2001) argue distance from and access to homelands as opposed to proximity to white settlements (that is, whether groups reside in cities, inner regional areas, remote and very remote areas), is more of a determining factor in traditional language retention given the links between land and language. This could be accounted for by the continuation of traditional cultural practises (hunting, land management and ceremonies) on traditional lands that require the continued use of specialised traditional IL vocabulary and grammar. Indeed, a study on Central Australian language and cultural transmission (Douglas, 2011) noted that country visits were recognised to enhance Indigenous cultural and language transmission and maintenance of Indigenous community members and make families ‘strong’, but the growing dependence on outside resources (White support in terms of finance and transport to ‘get out bush’ as well as school Principals and teachers recognising country visits as pedagogically

\textsuperscript{33} Lo Bianco and Rhydwen (2001) contend that this reduction to contexts of sedentary town or community life can be accompanied by an increasing use of more dominant ILs.

\textsuperscript{34} Simpson (2008), for instance, observes that a child’s exposure to television in remote communities reduces their time spent with grandparents and this, in addition to the linguistic influence of a peer group, can accelerate language shift.
important) meant this form of learning was more infrequent than in the past (Douglas, 2011). This is supported by Dixon (1992) who claimed change in cultural practices (that is, less time spent hunting and in ceremony) has meant a reduction in traditional language use or at least aspects of it (Dixon, 1992). This is being compounded by “demographic trends impacting on social interaction between the generations” where very young parents may be absent and young grandparents may not be equipped or mature enough to take on “the roles and responsibilities normally performed by grandparents” such as bush trips and visits to sites of kinship and cultural significance (Douglas, 2011: 19). These factors appear to have all contributed to less generational transmission of traditional IL knowledge and language (although a considerable amount is still being learned because of family life and the language socialisation that this entails, Douglas, 2011).

Since Indigenous Australian languages are intimately tied to land, occur in unique socio-cultural, multi-cultural and multi-lingual contexts, and are not spoken beyond Australia, the “transfer of the communicative practices of speakers to other forms of speech results in death and extinction of these languages” (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001: 392). This is a consequence of the fact that as the dominant language encroaches into everyday domains, the great power differentials between ILs and a dominant language means that the dominant language eclipses the use of ILs to the degree that diglossia is not possible (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001). In order to retain ILs, the community needs to attain “control of institutional resources and processes” so that “the ‘outside’ language cannot be permitted to invade the boundaries of the ‘inside’ since it will erode its distinctive domain and undermine its transmission prospects” (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001: 393). The only likely means to achieve this is to address language ecologies in these regions so that there remains “social space for minority speech communities” and domain separation (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001).35 The imposition of SAE education in remote schools through such policies as the FFHP reduces community linguistic control of those institutions, thus eroding distinctive IL domains and transmission. This loss of ILs and dialects also limits the prospects of Indigenous groups either claiming or retaining their land given the fact that traditional land claims are often intimately linked to IL knowledge (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001).

During the early stages of IL recording beginning mainly in the 1960s, it was predominantly linguists and some missionaries who ensured the grammar and lexicon were documented (often

---

35 Indeed, greater IL and English language mixing in Lajamanu, a Warlpari community in Central Australia, was arrested through a community developed bilingual Warlpari and English language program in the 1980s (Simpson, 2008).
for bible translations), as is the case in the two communities in this study (see also Dixon, 2002). This recording occurred well into the 1970s and 1980s when academic journals and publications of tertiary education sector institutions (such as the Institute for Aboriginal Development and BIITE in the NT) began to record and document languages (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014). This late start has resulted in “fairly good materials (a reasonable grammar, together with a dictionary or word list)” for only about 95 languages (Dixon, 2002). It has only been since the 1967 referendum to include Indigenous people under the laws of the Commonwealth and in population censuses, that there has been a will by government to accommodate ILs (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014). This accommodation also reflects the far higher influence minority groups had on language policy creation in the 1980s (see below).

However, support for ILs fluctuates and invariably involves non-recurrent funding allocations (that, albeit, can and do extend over a number of years such as the 2011-2012 $9.6 million Indigenous Languages Support, HRSCATSIA, 2012). Although this is periodically boosted by additional finance such as the $14 million over 4 years since 2013 (a portion of funding from the $235 million Creative Australia policy), given the fact that this results in a small amount per IL to teach children, train language teachers and provide IL resources such as books and recordings, Dickson (2013) questions whether this funding is;

... significant enough to tackle the attrition of Aboriginal languages in Australia or bring about significant community development outcomes, employment or other measures (Dickson, 2013).

So, despite Australian and international reports advocating language rights for Indigenous Australians, and the creation of the National Indigenous Languages policy in 2009 (which allocates resources to support the learning and use of ILs) this provision has not been accompanied by legislative changes or sufficient resourcing (Dickson, 2013; Evans, 2010; House of Representative Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, HRSCATSIA, 2012; McConvell & Thieberger, 2001; McKay, 2011). This has led linguist K. David Harrison (2007) to remark:

The extinction of ideas we now face has no parallel in human history. Since most of the world’s languages remain undescribed by scientists, we do not even know what it is that we stand to lose (David Harrison, 2007: viii).
2.1a Current IL Ecology

Due to the effects on language of colonisation and White settlement and the interaction of English with traditional ILs (Eades, 2013) as well as the unwillingness of English speaking invaders to learn and speak traditional ILs or their pointed exclusion (by Indigenous groups) from these activities (Troy, 1994), Australia now has a diversity of new (modern Indigenous) languages. These languages include English/Indigenous mixed languages (a fusion of two languages with both IL and English grammar and lexicon, Simpson, 2008); pidgins (a form of English and Indigenous languages mix with simplified grammar and lexicon compared to the source languages, Troy, 1994); two northern Australian creoles – the Torres Strait creole and Kriol (that have developed from a pidgin into a “full language used as the main language for a new generation of speakers” Malcolm, 2003: 6); and English varieties such as Aboriginal English (that both evolved from early pidgin and the “Aboriginalisation of English as speakers learnt the language”) (Eades, 2013:80; see also Malcolm, 2003; Simpson & Wigglesworth, 2008; Troy, 1994; Watts, 1982).

36 Dickson (2015: 124) maintains that mixed languages, “feature a high degree of borrowing from the corresponding traditional languages, including case marking and other morphological features that rarely transfer into creoles.” These languages develop from “intense contact between contributing languages” and “lexical and grammatical features of both languages [feature] substantially in the new language” (Dickson, 2015: 124).

37 Troy (1994) notes that Pidgin arose early in NSW after colonisation by the British in 1788. It partly arose from communication events where invaders desired information from Indigenous people that would help colonists as well as the mode of communication for trade and because of the increasing dependence of Indigenous people on the colony and their integration into it (Troy, 1990, 1994). It also evolved through kidnapping Indigenous children and men in order to teach them English so that they could become interpreters, a practise begun by the first colonial Governor, Captain Arthur Phillip (Troy, 1990, 1994). Troy (1994) notes pidgin was composed of Indigenous languages and English, with English as the substrate but was likely influenced by Gaelic and Irish and other languages because of the multicultural and multilingual environment of early NSW. It was used initially as a second language in contexts of limited contact between English speaking invaders and Indigenous people and others, including non-English speaking migrants, convicts and sailors, Eades, 2013; Troy, 1994). It is suggested that Pidgin developed rapidly as the *lingua franca* also for a number of Indigenous groups because of population decimation and displacement caused by disease, forced removal from lands and massacres that led to these groups living in much smaller numbers and in much closer proximity to each other (but with no shared language) than prior to colonisation (Troy, 1990). By the 1850s, NSW pidgin had a “stable core grammar and lexicon” with some dialectic variations in lexicon and was “widely spoken throughout the [NSW] colony” by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous residents (Troy, 1994: 3). A more extensive detailed account of Pidgin can be found in Troy (1990) and Troy (1994).

38 Kriol evolved as a consequence of the expansion of the pastoral industry and the massacre of large numbers of traditional IL speakers (Meakins and O’Shanessy, 2016). Troy (1994) suggests it evolved from Pidgin but that other sources of origin are also possible. At Ngukurr, in north east NT, children from diverse language groups were placed in a missionary centre and were only able to use Pidgin English which then developed into a full rule-governed language (Dickson, 2016). While English largely forms the vocabulary, some traditional IL words have crept into the lexicon and these differ according to the traditional IL source (Dickson, 2016). Kriol has since intermixed with traditional ILs to create Light Warlpari and Gurindji Kriol, according to Dickson (2016). Pidgin has also traversed across to the Kimberleys in Western Australia. Meakins and O’Shanessy (2016) maintain that current theories on Kriol formation suggest it arose multi-regionally across the north of Australia. Kriol is not the common language of the region in this study and so will not be discussed further. For more information on Pidgins and/or Kriol, please refer to Harris (1984), Harris (1986) and Dickson (2015).
The most common ILs in the region of this study are traditional ILs and Aboriginal English. Non-standard Aboriginal English varieties arose initially through language contact early in Australia’s colonial history and quickly spread across the mainland (Malcolm, 2003). These English “overlapping” dialects, ranging from light (linguistically closer to SAE) to heavy (linguistically more removed from SAE), now represent the most common English varieties spoken by Indigenous people across Australia and contain within them Aboriginal “cultural conceptions”, “speech use conventions” and pronunciation, semantics and grammar “which are distinctively Aboriginal” (Eades, 2013: 3,6). The term Aboriginal English has also come to refer to some very heavy varieties that are in fact “Aboriginal interlanguage varieties of English” (varieties used by multilingual traditional IL speakers who have a limited use for and/or acquisition of English) according to Eades (2013: 4; see also Sellwood & Angelo, 2013). This is the case for some speakers in the remote communities of this study. The languages of remote NT regions may also represent a mix of English with modern ILs and traditional ILs (such as those discussed above).

In addition, because of normal translanguaging practices and multilingualism, commonly spoken traditional ILs may have more English grammatical structures and/or lexemes loaned from English into some lexical domains (which is the case of the language in one of the communities in this study) (Dickson, 2015: 124; Langlois, 2004: 132-133). Attached to these environments of dominant and/or IL use is a language hierarchy that reflects the institutional and structural dominant bias against Indigenous people, particularly those with a strong attachment to IL (traditional or new) and culture, that exists across Australia (Altman, 2013; discussed further below).

In the two communities in this study, any English varieties are spoken in a contracted set of domains (the school and the council) and so these contexts could be regarded as English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environments. EFL Indigenous environments generally represent the regions most remote from institutions of power and suffer a magnification of the discrimination against Indigenous people. This is particularly so in terms of a lack of access to resources and services, being more vulnerable to exploitation by outsiders, as well as representing the prime policy targets in recent NT and Federal policy given the socio-economic ‘risk’ associated with

---

39 Much of the work on Aboriginal English has derived from legal and educational contexts. Eades (2008) groundbreaking work on ethnography and communication has elucidated how the legal system has disadvantaged Aboriginal English speakers as a consequence of the miscommunication between Aboriginal English and SAE speakers.

40 See also Mushin and Gardner, 2009, on the mixing of Aboriginal English, Kriol and Garrwa in a community on the Gulf of Carpentaria.

their pronounced linguistic and cultural difference and low socio-economic status (Altman, 2013; Altman & Hinkson, 2010). That is, remote Indigenous communities are generally characterised by extreme poverty, unemployment and underemployment, lack of availability of secondary and tertiary education, poor housing, high morbidity and mortality (Brown & Brown, 2007; Paradies, Harris & Anderson, 2008). Many students, due to their living conditions, experience hearing loss from chronic ear infections (Otitis Media) from early childhood which can result in permanent hearing loss or delay their “normal speech and language development” at a critical period of their development (Lee et al, 2014). This can result in the poor development of “auditory discrimination and processing skills, phonological awareness, short-term auditory memory skills, and auditory sequential memory skills” according to Burrows, Galloway & Weissofner (2009: 4). Consequently, these children in a typical school educational context may experience;

... delays in language comprehension and production, poor listening skills, problems with attention, distraction and memory, reduced mathematical skills ... (Burrow, Galloway, Weissofner (2009: 3).

These factors are related to problems in language socialisation and academic development which are intensified when learning in an L2 (Lee, et al, 2014; this is discussed in more detail under bilingual education).

The recognition in the 1970s of the benefits, such as enhanced cognition, academic development, enhanced L2 learning, well-being, health and a strong sense of identity, that bilingual bicultural education can confer on students and communities with such marginalisation (and consequential health risks) meant that these NT communities became the typical sites of the few bilingual/bidialectic education programs that began in 1974. The next section discusses the national and international research on bilingualism and bilingual education that supports the underlying rational for bilingual education in the NT.

### 2.2 Bilingualism and Multilingualism

Bilingualism and multilingualism are terms used to describe individual or societal characteristics (Baker, 2011). Societal bilingualism can be classified as endogenous, common use of two languages across diverse everyday domains; or exogenous where a L2 (Standard English
language) community is absent. Bilingual exogenous contexts can also be subtractive, where a politically dominant language replaces a L1 and can lead to language death in contexts of monoglossic ideologies (also known as obligatory) (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009b). Alternatively, contexts can be additive, where a L2 is not acquired to the detriment of a L1 which commonly occurs in high status dominant individuals (and known as elective) (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009b). The two communities in this study can be regarded as exogenous subtractive (obligatory) contexts with a very limited range of dominant language use within each community that occurs in a limited number of domains (and one that are not everyday for most of the community).

In education, bilingualism specifies the degree of personal bilingual abilities of learners, also termed proficiency, competence or language achievement when related to formal instructional outcomes (Baker, 2011). In addition to ability, we need to consider functionalism, use of a language and particular registers within various social domains which have a particular relevance in this research (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000). Commonly, bi- or multilingual individuals will access “different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximise communicative potential” (Garcia, 2009a: 140). Such language users will have unequal abilities in each language in various domains and functionalities. This can result in code-switching between languages for different language purposes (where there is an alternation between different languages or varieties but the lexicon and grammar of each is preserved) or translanguaging (“the grammatical mixing of elements from different languages ... [for] multiple discursive practices”) in emergent language users to maximise language use for “social needs or social conditions” and socially meaningful interactions (Garcia, 2009b: 45, 46, 50). This allows the multi- or bi-lingual speaker linguistic resources that are unavailable to the monolingual speaker creating a more differentiated linguistic repertoire and choice (Garcia, 2009b).

Baker (2011) has tried to account for such differences in language use by categorising different language abilities (listening, speaking, reading and writing) into two dimensions (reception and production). The level of performance depends on context which determines the use of sub-skills. As such, bilinguals may be passive in one language with a stronger focus on reception

42 Baker (2011: 5) defines language skills as “highly specific, observable, clearly definable components such as handwriting.” Contrastingly, language competence is a “broad and general term used particularly to describe inner, mental representation of language, something latent, rather than overt. Such competence refers to an underlying system inferred from language performance. By observing general language comprehension and production, language competence may be presumed” (Baker, 2011: 5).
skills rather than productive competence but both passive and productive in another (Baker, 2011).

Bachman (1990 in Brown, 1994) has categorised language competence in divisions - Organisational Competence and Pragmatic Competence - which attempt to capture the illocutionary and sociolinguistic contexts discussed above (figure 2.2, p. 34). These elements have two different sets of sub-skills. Organisational Competence involves the subskills of grammar (phonology, morphology, lexis and syntax) as well as textual competence (or creation of a text with utterances or sentences). Pragmatic competence requires illocutionary competence (the expression of experiences and ideas to afford intended meanings and to achieve goals and manipulate) as well as Sociolinguistic Competence (the suitability of particular language varieties or dialects, register or formality for context and culture of audience and appropriate social meaning) (Brown, 1994).

![Language Competence Diagram](modified from Bachman, 1990, in Brown, 1994: 229)

Cummins (2000) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) have made a distinction between two levels: conversational language (or surface fluency) and academic language proficiency. Cummins (2000) also included cognitive, reasoning and thinking abilities (such as inner speech)
related to language use. Cummins (2000) maintained that conversational ability is acquired relatively quickly whereas cognitively more complex academic language proficiency can take five to seven years. An apparent fluency in conversational language and the perceived parity with peers has led to student relocation from bilingual programs to dominant language ones. This has resulted in bilingual education programs being blamed for bilingual students’ academic failures (Cummins, 1996). It has also given rise to the perception of bilingual students as “learning disabled” and being persistently shunted off to special education classes and this further delays their academic development (Cummins, 1996: 55). In a desire not to blame schooling for academic failures, this has given rise to policy makers and politicians engaging in deficit discourse about the child, the child’s language, culture, family and or community (Cummins, 1996).

Both the range and skills entailed in language abilities can be variously defined and measured giving rise to considerable debate. However, abilities, while multidimensional, have traditionally in academic and classroom environments related to “pronunciation, extent of vocabulary, correctness of grammar, the ability to convey exact meanings in different situations and variations in style” (Baker, 2011: 7). However, any categorisation of bilingualism depends on the degree to which categorisers wish to include or exclude specific language users (Baker, 2011). It is for these reasons that minimum and maximum levels of bilingualism, being a value judgment, are considered highly arbitrary measures (Baker, 2011).

An important term related to bilingual levels is necessary to discuss in order to evaluate policy and outcomes of research on bilingualism. This is ‘balanced’ bilingualism. Balanced bilingualism refers to “Someone who is approximately equally fluent in two languages across various contexts” (Baker, 2011: 8). It is often regarded as an ideal, given the fact that different languages will be used for different purposes and in different situations and one language or certain language abilities will tend to dominate in one or many contexts (Baker, 2011). However, a ‘balanced’ but good proficiency (“appropriate competence”) is the level generally referred to in research when discussing a child who can operate in and comprehend classroom activities and curriculum in two languages (Baker, 2011: 9). It is also the level referred to in research when discussing cognitive advantages of bilingualism (more on this below).

Balanced bilinguals do not necessary share the same linguistic profiles as monolinguals in either language, Baker (2011) explains, since they will develop a unique linguistic profile if we take a
'holistic' view. In contradiction to this, if one takes a ‘fractional’ and deficit view, as occurs often in monolingual contexts or where one language politically dominates such as in Australia, bilinguals are often judged as the equivalent of two monolinguals in one. This gives rise to comparisons of bilinguals with monolinguals in tests and the “educational system’s denial of the bilingual potential of children”, according to Garcia (2009a: 141). Baker (2011) and others (Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009) concur that this is unfair given the linguistic, and often highly contextual differences between the two groups and the fact that context dictates language use. If bilingual differences result in less competence in the dominant language or language variety, these bilinguals will be regarded as inferior regardless of their competence in a L1 (Baker, 2011). In the 1970s in Northern Europe, they were termed semilingual when norm-referenced to monolingualism but this term has been discarded with greater sociolinguistic research. In the United States of America (USA), they have been referred to as Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and English Language Learners (ELL) and in Australia as English as a L2 (ESL) as opposed to their actual status as emergent or incipient bilinguals who have fluency in one language but are emerging language users in the other (Baker, 2011; Garcia, Kleifgen & Falchi, 2008).

Garcia (2009a), in fact, believes this persistent construal of bilingualism or multilingualism in terms of monolingual proficiency is extremely rare. With globalisation giving rise to increasingly varied languages in developed contexts, multilingualism or ‘pluralingualism’, where communication is dynamic, multimodal and involves multiple discursive practices from a variety of languages, has become the norm (Garcia, 2009b). Garcia (2009a) claims that this consistent construal of bilingualism as double monolingualism is directly related to the mechanisms of governmentality or management of others (as outlined by Foucault, 1991) that relate to regulation of language use and hierarchy (and value) of languages. Given the fact that “monolingualism is routinely accepted as the norm ... then monolingual and monoglossic language ideologies, policies and practices ... are imposed by schools” (Garcia, 2009a: 140). Bilingualism is only accepted in terms of the “total control of two bounded autonomous language systems”, Garcia (2009a: 140) contends. This results in the “silencing” of complex language use by bi- or multilinguals, “thus limiting their educational and life opportunities” (Garcia, 2009a: 140). This monolingual focus on language use, thereby, has particular implications in policy in this study in terms of how remote Indigenous bi- or multilingual students are represented, constructed and managed.
The next section will detail the various types of bilingual education and how they relate to language and language user hierarchies and are thus influenced by language policy.

2.3 Bilingual Education

Any discussions on language education will necessarily entail typologies that reflect the power dynamics operating in society to create language programs that either enrich or ‘cure’ problems associated with a student’s linguistic repertoire (Cummins, 2000). The policies that prefer one language program over another arise from the ideological language planning positions identified by Ruiz (1984, 2010). These ideological orientations include language as a problem, language as a right or language as a resource.

The bulk of language planning entails solving language problems – such as standardisation, literacy, language hierarchy and code selection – or language “handicaps” experienced by non-dominant language users – such as dominant language training to overcome poverty, low education and lack of social mobility (Ruiz, 1984: 19, 2010). That is, there is an assumption that a lack of non-dominant language is the underlying problem for economic disadvantage, the cause of “intellectual limitation, linguistic deficiency … provincialism, irrationalism, disruption” of non-dominant language groups (Ruiz, 1984: 20). Language rights involve being free from discrimination based on the use of a non-dominant language (negative) and the right to use one’s own language and ensure cultural reproduction (positive) (Garcia, 2009b). Both these aspects have civil participatory and cognitive (skill and knowledge acquisition) implications, given the fact that learning deprivation occurs where there is a language barrier, and language identification becomes “both a legal entitlement and a natural endowment” (Ruiz, 1984: 23). Language rights also involve transnational language rights as outlined in Human Rights Charters. Despite any rights expressed by policy or federal legislation, there is often widespread non-compliance with language rights (Ruiz, 1984). Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) contends that promotion-orientated rights (where linguistic minorities can enjoy language rights both at home and to participate democratically), traditional codified rights in law and those in declarations and conventions as well as territorial (language defined by geographic locations) and personal (home) language rights are necessary for language right compliance and a working democracy.

Language as a resource has been described by Ruiz (2010) as the foundation of language planning since it has often been linked to the utilitarian role of language where there must be
some kind of extrinsic (economic, military or material) value. This line of argument, however, can lead to the exclusion of minority languages since a language resource may possibly only be maintained if it is “useful for wielding power over others” (Ruiz, 2010: 158). However, there are economic advantages (language jobs and language related industries) to minority languages when they are actively pursued in the linguistic marketplace (Ruiz, 2010). There is also critique that the “economic argument” is too narrow and that there are additional important social, academic, cultural, and political reasons for multilingualism (due to the link of language with identity, culture, transgenerational and transcultural knowledge transmission and personal development - discussed below) (Ruiz, 2010: 160).

These orientations of language planning, Field (2008) and Ruiz (1984, 2010) argue, have given rise to various permutations of language education, including; language maintenance programs (language as a right), revitalisation programs to develop and extend the minority language (language as a resource) or language shift, language loss or language death (as a consequence of monolingual or transitional bilingual programs that have the aim of acquiring the dominant L2 at the expense of aptitude in a L1) for language minority students (language as a problem). Other researchers, including May (2008), have identified a fourth program, heritage bilingual program, that caters largely for IL groups, but can also cater for some immigrant groups, and depending on the context, have either maintenance or enrichment attributes. There is also a further language position not identified by Ruiz but identified by Baker (2011) – of language segregation where the politically dominant exclude the minority from education in the dominant language in order to ensure their marginalisation.44 A greater discussion on language planning and policy and power dynamics occurs further in the chapter. It is sufficient here to provide the typologies, how they relate to the educational aims of the state and their pedagogical outcomes (in Table 2.1, p. 39).

44 However, Roberts (1995) directs us to acknowledge the high degree of variability in these categorisations as a consequence of the number of students in a class, the number of teachers, their curriculum specialisations and language, hours in the program and subjects taught. Lo Bianco (2010a) also argues teachers act as language planners in their implementation of curriculum and classroom routines. This may not be acknowledged when comparing outcomes of bilingual schools with non-bilingual schools, particularly in the NT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of program</th>
<th>Typical type of child</th>
<th>Language of the classroom</th>
<th>Societal goals</th>
<th>Educational Outcomes</th>
<th>Type of planning</th>
<th>Aim in outcome</th>
<th>Language as a problem</th>
<th>Monolingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstreaming/Submersion</strong></td>
<td>Language Minority</td>
<td>Majority language</td>
<td>Assimilationist</td>
<td>Subtractive&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt; - Poorer language outcomes – no understanding of classroom and instructional interaction. Poor literacy development - Possible arrest of L1 development which is required for L2 acquisition</td>
<td>Language as a problem</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students placed in language majority class with language majority speakers and no assistance - Student placed in language majority school but in a class of language minority students. Teacher uses a simplified form of English. Usually no L1 support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstreaming/Submersion with</strong></td>
<td>Language Minority</td>
<td>Majority language with ‘pull-out’ L2 lessons</td>
<td>Assimilationist</td>
<td>Subtractive</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Withdrawal leads to falling behind in curriculum. Sheltered English with Content based ESL – have particularly poor development of higher order thinking, high dropout rate and low interaction rate</td>
<td>Language as a problem</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Withdrawal classes – students pulled out from content and curriculum lessons for ESL tuition. - Sheltered English with content based ESL - taught parts of curriculum through (simplified) English without total focus on English as a language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segregationist</strong></td>
<td>Language Minority</td>
<td>Minority Language (forced, no choice)</td>
<td>Apartheid</td>
<td>Subtractive</td>
<td>Minorities do not learn enough of the dominant language to make an impact</td>
<td>Language Exclusion</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>45</sup> See Ch1 and below for a descriptive meaning of ‘subtractive’ and ‘additive’. Subtractive generally relates to programs that lead to a loss of a L1 while additive relates to programs that result in the retention of a L1 and the learning of a L2.
Separatist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Minority</th>
<th>Minority language (out of choice)</th>
<th>Detachment/Autonomy</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Language as a Right</th>
<th>Language as a Resource</th>
<th>Limited Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority language</td>
<td>Detachment/Autonomy</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Language as a Right</td>
<td>Language as a Resource</td>
<td>Limited Bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bilingual programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immersion – dominant</th>
<th>Language majority</th>
<th>Minority language</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Language as a resource</th>
<th>Bilingualism and Biliteracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are immersed in a L2 (with instruction)</td>
<td>Their L1 is introduced across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Language minority</th>
<th>Majority Language</th>
<th>Assimilationist</th>
<th>Subtractive (particularly early exit)</th>
<th>Language as a problem</th>
<th>Relative Monolingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-use of a L1 to ‘transition’ to a second. Involves gradual introduction and total replacement in upper grades of second or dominant language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has been critiqued for being remedial. The time required for English language teaching disrupts and interferes with the teaching of the curriculum which results in a ‘dumbing down’ of the curriculum. Higher staffing positions at schools generally reserved for dominant language teachers (as is the case in the NT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Exit – use of L1 for only the first two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late exit – use of 40% of L1 to year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance or revitalisation</th>
<th>Language minority</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Language as a right or resource</th>
<th>Bilingualism and Biliteracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-students are initially taught in their L1 or heritage language and the dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

46 Common in Canada, Finland, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Basque country and Catalonia (McMahon & Murray, 2000; Cummins, 2000).
Language is gradually introduced but does not exceed 50%. That is, content areas are taught in both a L1 and dominant language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual language programs - dominant and non-dominant groups learn the two languages simultaneously.</th>
<th>Language minorities and language majorities</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Language as a right or resource</th>
<th>Bilingualism and Biliteracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In early grades, different language speakers are often separated until sufficient proficiency in both languages is achieved (Roberts, 1995). The two groups are then united in the one class and support each other’s L2 acquisitions (Roberts, 1995).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Bilingual - occurs where there is more than one majority language used</th>
<th>Language Majority</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Pluralism</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Language as a resource</th>
<th>Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Found sparingly at elementary levels in the USA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2.1</strong>: Language Programs (Taken and modified from Baker, 2011: 210 and including work by Cummins, 2000; McMahon &amp; Murray, 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

47 Programs of this type have been implemented in Catalan in Spain, Navajo in the USA, Ukrainian in Canada, Finnish in Sweden, Gaelic in Scotland and early implementation of Māori in New Zealand when this was not a L1 (McMahon & Murray, 2000; Cummins, 2000).

48 Found sparingly at elementary levels in the USA.

49 Found in Taiwan, Brunei, Singapore, Japan, Nigeria and Luxembourg (McMahon & Murray, 2000).
2.4 Additive/Subtractive Bilingual Education

The pedagogical outcomes listed in the language program in Table 2.1 (p.39) have a direct relationship to how minority and majority languages are viewed within language programs. Although largely referring to migrant language programs, Cummins (2000) notes research that is equally related to IL education issues. He has shown that the desirable levels of bilingualism and educational outcomes, and even L2 acquisition, can generally only be achieved in positive learning, or ‘additive’ language, environments (where there is no ‘cost’ to a L1 and it is regarded as an asset and classroom resource) (Cummins, 2000). Its antithesis is ‘subtractive’ language education where a child’s language or languages are regarded as a problem, remain undeveloped and are replaced by a L2.

Cummins (1996) contends that additive or subtractive bilingual education is a direct result of societal human relationships that impact on the classroom. These human relations, Cummins (1996) explains, underpinned by issues of power and status and the dominant/subordinate group relationships in the wider community, are elements that determine interactions in schools. These interactions, in turn, can negatively or positively affect knowledge generation and identity. This can lead to social inclusion and higher academic outcomes (supported by studies examined in Barac & Bialystok, 2012; Comeau, Cormier, Grandmaison & Lacroix, 1999; Lindsey, Manis & Bailey, 2003; Luk & Bialystok, 2008). Alternatively, it can result in social exclusion and lower academic outcomes (supported by research from Kilman, 2009; Piller & Takahashi, 2011; see also Anders-Baer, Henrik-Magga, Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008). These ideas have considerable synergy with those of CLLP discussed below in terms of language hierarchies.

These classroom “macrointeractions”, Cummins (2000: 43) asserted, determine the structures and roles in educational institutions. In the past, for non-mainstream students this has meant relinquishing identities and languages and becoming mainstream, thereby adopting the dominant perspective or “truth” and a dominant-contrived negative or deficient identity (Cummins, 2000: 43). These structures and roles, in turn, inform student and teacher interactions. That is, unequal relations of power can forge negative outcomes where “coercive
relations of power” are reinforced, effectively excluding parents and non-dominant language communities who then view themselves as having no influence on their children’s school outcomes (Cummins, 2000:43). In this scenario, students suffer resource deprivation (including teacher attention), cultural conflict with the teacher, are unable to use their own language or dominant language dialect and are unable to demonstrate what they know (Cummins, 2000: 43). The pedagogy is transmission based and the aim is assimilation. There is a slow annihilation of student identity which can lead to the outright rejection of the dominant language and culture (if there is sufficient investment in L1) and failure to achieve is couched in terms of student cultural and linguistic deficits (Cummins, 2000). This process can cause deleterious academic and cognitive effects and undermine the “personal and conceptual foundation of learning” Cummins (2003: 62) admonished.

This type of approach for non-dominant students is often seen in language submersion educational programs where students receive schooling in the dominant language only in a program aimed at assimilation and monolingualism that, consequently, results in the student’s mother tongue remaining undeveloped (Table 2.1, p.39). It is also evident in language submersion programs where students are withdrawn from dominant language instruction for intensive ESL tuition (Cummins, 2000). It is also said to occur in transitional bilingual education where students work exclusively in their L1 for a few years and then ‘transit’ to exclusively English language instruction – the predominant model used in the NT (discussed in more detail below; see also McMahon & Murray, 2000).

Alternatively, outcomes can be positive where “collaborative relations of power”, values, cultures and prior experience of learners are utilised to create positive identity formations (discussed in more detail below), L1 legitimacy, in addition to enhanced participation of parents and the community in the school (Cummins, 2003: 43). In these programs, there is also equal access to resources, such as teacher tuition and attention, with the aim of bi- or multilingualism and culturalism that, in turn, results in cross-cultural tolerance, understanding and functionalism.

---

50 NT linguist Hoogenraad (2001) suggests poor English literacy and numeracy results in remote Indigenous schools is largely a consequence of student resistance to colonisation via English language education.

51 This was reiterated by Garcia (2009b), Wei (2011) and Tsui (2015) in their studies that demonstrated the dominance in transmission teaching when teaching students in a foreign language.
(Cummins, 2000: 43). This approach is typically seen in bilingual maintenance and revitalisation programs (Table 2.1, p. 39).

2.5 Academic and Cognitive Benefits of Bilingualism

Findings on the academic and cognitive benefits of bilingual education in well-structured and long term programs appear to be borne out by other bilingual research. Positive bilingual environments have been shown to imbue an individual with certain cognitive and academic advantages over monolingual or subtractive bilingual education (Baker, 2008; Carlson & Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008; Meltzoff, 2008; Krashen & Field, 2005; Lee, 1996; Martin-Rhee & Bialystok, 2008; Thomas & Coillier, 1997, 2002).

A raft of bilingual studies from the 1970s, but in settings that differ from remote Indigenous contexts and where there is a high level of L1 and L2 and literacy development, have shown significant cognitive gains for bilingualism. These studies included long term ones such as those in Baker (2008), Hakuta and Diaz (1985) as well as DeVilliers and De Villiers (1978), Hakuta (1986), Lindfors (1991), Lanco-Worrall (1972) Ben-Zeev (1977), Cummins (1978), Galambos (1982), Bain (1974), Balkan (1970), Bain (1975) and Cummins and Gulutsan, (1974)(all in Lee, 1996). Many of these studies strongly suggested that bilinguals had a greater metalinguistic awareness such as comprehension of grammar rules, word or sentence construction and meaning (Lee, 1996: 504-505). These are elements thought to be required for intellectual development and reading since they lead to elevated aptitude in analogical reasoning, divergent thinking (flexible perceptions and interpretations), concept formation and classification, creativity, rule generation, problem solving, critical, symbolic and abstract thinking (Garcia, 2009b; Lee, 1996).

---

52 Identity in this thesis relates to Norton’s (1997) definition. Norton (1997) notes that identity construction is a continuous process, multidimensional and socially mediated. It influences how “people understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future” (Norton, 1997: 410). Norton agrees with Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977: 75) analysis that marginal Indigenous group identities are frequently constructed as outsiders, without “the right to speak” or the “power to impose reception”. An IL contrasts with this, ensuring the Indigenous subject remains central, integral and elevated. Definitions of identity in this thesis also, however, acknowledge the ideas of Indigenous people from the two communities in this study in what they perceive as identity markers - country, language, Tjukurrpa (knowledge) and Kanyini (relationships or connectedness – also known as Ngurra-kurlu).
Cognitive and academic benefits of bi- and multilingualism were also supported in research by Thomas and Collier (2002) involving minority and IL education. This research showed that the length of time a child was involved in L1 as the medium of instruction was the most important component in determining educational success, far outweighing other elements including socio-economic status. However, this research differed slightly from that cited by Cummins (2009, in Johnson & Swain, 1997) in Canada where dominant (English) language speakers immersed in a second (French) language in early primary years (with bilingual teachers as well as extensive L1 support and the use of English instruction across most subject matter by grade 3 or 4) became very successful receptive and productive bilinguals. This suggests that the political status of dominant languages and their speakers, the cultural relevance of pedagogy and curriculum (since the curriculum in the above study paralleled that of English speaking schools) and the continued development of an L1 play a strong role in successful L2 acquisition (Cummins, 2009).

Cummins (2009: 163) did note, however, the immersion programs of immigrant students (and by extension Indigenous students in the NT), “fall far short of the conditions” above required for successful bilingualism and L2 acquisition.

Various other studies have consistently recorded enhanced outcomes and higher retention rates for additive L1 immersion and bilingual maintenance or enrichment programs for non-dominant students (May, 2008). In these studies, the longer duration of L1 as the language of instruction, the higher non-dominant student achievement in L2 (May, 2008). These studies included those of Ramírez, Pasta, Yuen, Ramey and Billings (1991) who compared early exit (1-2 years) and late exit (4-6 years) 2,352 Spanish speaking bilingual Spanish-English students. They also included findings by Thomas and Collier (2002) of 210,000 immigrant students in full immersion Spanish instructional classes, transitional Spanish-English bilingual classes, ESL and English submersion programs. Similar findings have also been found in a large Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) sub-Saharan African study over four decades involving 25 countries and 42 L1 and multilingual education programs (Alidou, Boly, Brock-Utne, Diallo, Heugh & Wolff, 2006).53

Meta-analysis of aggregated data from a number of studies by Wilig (1985, 1987 in May, 2008) that controlled for 183 variables also found cognitive improvements as a consequence of

---

53 A South African national report (in Ouane & Glanz, 2010: 34) also stated that students who learned through their L1 doubled their national achievement scores compared to those who learned through a L2.
bilingual education, even in programs where students exited early.\textsuperscript{54} A USA meta-analysis by Greene (1998) of 11 studies involving 2719 students showed categorically that even with only minimal L1, children “perform significantly better on standardised tests than similar children who are taught only in English”. There is also considerable evidence generally that high L1 language proficiency resulted in higher academic achievement in L2 and that L1 readings skills were predicators of a child’s reading in L2 (Fitzgerald, 1995; Gottardo, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Yamashita, 2002 in Laija-Rodriguez, Ochoa & Parker, 2006). Research by Hornberger (1989, 1990), William and Snipper (1990), Lanauze and Snow (1989) Torres (1991, all in Baker, 2011), also showed that literacy skills acquired in a L1 will transfer easily to the L2 in a far shorter time-frame than monolingual L2 literacy acquisition as long as there has been a certain level of development achieved in L1. Another later meta-analysis by Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass (2005: 572), involving 17 studies that examined different programs of English language teaching, concluded that only bilingual education “was consistently superior to all-English approaches and that developmental bilingual education programs [programs to develop academic proficiency in both L1 and L2] are superior to transitional bilingual education programs”.

The interdependence between a L1 and a L2 is thought to be underpinned by using the L1 in decontextualised ways, such as in writing and using language as a cognitive tool. This became known from the 1970s as cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). This ability is said to be transferred to the L2 (Ball, 2010: 13; Cummins, 2003; Magga, Nicolaisen, Trask, Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2005). Cummins (1980 in Baker, 2011: 165) referred to this phenomenon of language interdependence as the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model of bilingualism. Baker metaphorically linked this rationale to two icebergs both with different protrusions but with a shared base since “both languages operate through the same central processing system” and so there is “one integrated source of thought” (Baker, 2011: 166).

Whereas academic proficiency in the 1970s began to be referred to as CALP (although it is now referred to as academic language), conversational proficiency began to be termed surface fluency and Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) (and this now is referred to as social language) (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000). Indeed, the differences between BICS and CALP are so disparate that there appears to be no cognitive relationship between the acquisition of

\textsuperscript{54} This was also replicated in longitudinal USA studies in the second volume of a report by Ramírez, et al (1991).
conversational (L2) English (BICS) and academic (L2) English (CALP) (Cummins, 2000; Baker, 2011). Cummins (2000), as such, has explained that delays in exposure to L2 academic English, therefore, as occurs in cognitively unchallenging dominant literacy programs (such as mainstreaming/submersion programs that entail simplified dominant language or withdrawal classes) can result in academic English acquisition not being realised prior to secondary school or, perhaps, very poorly. This then causes considerable problems for students in these later school years.

This theory is supported by the ‘Threshold Theory’ of Toukomaa and Skutnabb Kangas (1977 in Baker, 2011) who proposed that critical levels, or ‘thresholds’ of language acquisition, need to be reached in language proficiency to achieve balanced bilingualism or multilingualism. Cummins (2000) stated that where there is insufficient or inadequate language competence in both languages, a child cannot process classroom information in either language. This is a condition that can (but not necessarily always will) arise predominantly where there is insufficient instruction in L1 or support of L1 outside of the classroom and language immersion in L2 (which is not possible in remote NT Indigenous contexts, Hoogenraad, 2001). At the next level, a child may be competent in and have a language more developed than the other, be dependent on that language in the classroom, and so operate effectively as a monolingual language user with bilingualism having a neutral effect. At the positive extreme, children are regarded as “balanced” bilinguals with age appropriate competence and classroom language use in both languages (Baker, 2011).

This phenomenon of threshold levels appears to be supported in studies by Collier (1989, 1995) and similar results in studies by Hakuta, Butler and Witt (2000) and Ovando and Collier (1998). These researchers noted students schooled bilingually from primary years can reach L2 national levels between four to seven years in social studies, science and reading and two years for mathematics and English literacy (grammar, spelling, punctuation). This contrasted with non-dominant students who, educated in a dominant L2 exclusively, took 7 to 10 years to achieve or never achieved L2 national levels at school (Collier, 1989). Although not a condition that has occurred in the NT, Collier (1989), in her metanalysis concluded that older children aged 8 to 12 years who had been in programs exclusively involving L1 learning were far more proficient at acquiring an L2. She also established that the exposure to L2 before puberty did not matter in terms of L2 parity with other nationals as long as there was continued L1 language that enhanced
cognitive development until aged 12. Collier (1989) accounted for her results by referring to both the Cummins threshold theory as well as similar work by Lambert (1984 in Collier, 1989: 511) that suggests lower cognitive development and L2 acquisition will occur if cognitive development in L1 is discontinued in non-dominant students while acquiring a L2.

These results, thereby, suggest that the language hierarchies operating in society preclude non-dominant students from having sufficient exposure to their L1 and culture in the classroom to achieve the necessary school cognitive and academic development for academic success but allow dominant students to have such exposure to the degree necessary for academic achievement and L2 transference (if they so desired). That is, there is a significant language and cultural barrier as well as disparity and inequity operating in these education systems that prevents successful pedagogical outcomes in non-dominant L2 speaking students since a L1 is generally not being developed.

Cummins theory has since been critiqued for its ill-defined definitions of BICS and CALP, the fact that the theory is “not operationally defined or researched” (Laïja-Rodriguez, Ochoa & Parker, 2006) and because of the vagueness inherent in these levels (Baker, 2011). There are also still no definitive prescriptions as to when a L2 should be introduced as a language of instruction, the amount of time that should be spent in earlier levels in either language or the threshold level in literacy skills in a L1 that needs to be attained before introducing literacy in a second (Lo Bianco, 2008b; Baker, 2011). This, however, is largely a consequence of the diverse contexts and situations that exist with L2 teaching which makes such prescription counterproductive. Despite criticism levelled at the details of these theories, there is sufficient meta-analysis (as discussed above) to confirm positive effects of L1 learning on the academic and cognitive outcomes of marginalised children in schools with bilingual programs.

2.5a Indigenous Studies

Research findings in Indigenous studies also support these claims of enhanced academic and L2 transference outcomes in IL programs. Cummins (2000), for instance, detailed cognitive and academic gains in Indigenous Canadian students in additive bilingual programs that were similar to migrant students. Contrastingly, he found that Indigenous Canadians submerged in English consistently underperformed in language skills and academic studies. This suggests Canadian
Indigenous students can experience the same socio-political and linguistic conditions and effects on language proficiency as migrant students, that of dominant language interference in everyday domains in addition to the institutional imposition of dominant language learning at the expense of an L1.

Positive results for additive Indigenous immersion and bilingual language have also been recorded in the USA. Hawaiian-immersion schooling - where the native heritage language is used as the medium of instruction across the curriculum, English instruction is introduced in Year 5 for one hour per day and there is culturally responsive pedagogy and curriculum - documented 100% high school matriculation and 80% attendance at tertiary institutions (Luning & Yamauchi, 2012; Wilson & Kamana, 2011). In addition, graduates of these immersion programs left school with sufficient English fluency for tertiary education, work and other civic English dominated contexts (Wilson & Kamana, 2011). These Hawaiian schools differ, however, from those in remote NT in that students may not have the IL as a L1 when they enter schooling.

A number of studies on mainland USA Indian immersion and bilingual programs showed similar findings. These students in these programs consistently equalled or exceeded the results of non-immersion non-bilingual native students in Year 3 and Year 8 national standardised tests in English and mathematics (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). In Rough Rock - the first USA Indigenous community school where McCarty has conducted long term studies on student bilingualism and biliteracy - students consistently outperformed those who attended non-bilingual schools on standardised tests, reaching near parity with national norms in standardised reading tests and achieving 91% mean average in English listening after four years of the bilingual program (McCarty, 2003). These programs were delivered using co-operative learning centres and involved culturally responsive pedagogy that was “tied to affirmations of tribal sovereignty”, Indigenous educational sovereignty and involved “respect, relationship building, reciprocity, and accountability to participants’ communities” (McCarty & Lee, 2014: 102, 106).

These results have been confirmed by a meta-analysis of US national data sets for Indigenous youth on standardised literacy and numeracy tests and government reports on culturally responsive pedagogy dating back to 1928 (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). Culturally responsive

---

55 Defined below.
pedagogy often entails Indigenous control of schools, curriculum organised around culturally relevant themes, intergenerational transfer of knowledge where elders and parents are regular participants in the program and the teaching of mainstream academic subjects “to be able to negotiate [Western culture] successfully and make decisions about how and when they will negotiate it” (McCarty, 2003; Brayboy, & Castagno, 2009: 37). The Brayboy & Castagno (2009: 31) study, in fact found:

...there is no evidence that the assimilative model does improve academic success; there is growing evidence that the culturally responsive model does, in fact, improve academic success for American Indian/Alaska Native children (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009: 31).

They argued that a culturally responsive pedagogy - where the local community’s language and culture structure the entire educational experience but not at the expense of English and academic subjects - allows the transmission of “values, beliefs, knowledge and norms that are consistent with their students’ home communities”, a type of schooling that “makes sense” and provides a “‘both/and’ approach rather than an ‘either/or’ approach” (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009: 32, 37). Not only is this very reminiscent of the NT’s Both or Two Ways method (see below, Glossary of Terms and Ch1), it represents the principal component in the creation of the successful USA Indian student since, they claim, it is a “fundamental prerequisite for the development of culturally healthy students and communities associated with that place” (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009: 32). As such, it is schools and teachers that must be “viewed as the primary sites of change, rather than maintaining the dominant and often discriminatory belief that it is the students that must change”, they admonished (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009: 48).

A study on New Zealand Māori culturally responsive immersion, where Māori was used as the language of instruction from between 80-100% of the time for six to eight years, and bilingual culturally responsive programs, in which Māori was used for 50% of the time, found that these programs also consistently outperformed all other Māori education programs with Māori

56 Again, students do not necessarily have the IL when they entered these programs.
57 They also found in their research that “there is no scientific evidence in the USA that phonics-based approaches serve American Indian and Alaska native students” (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009: 32).
58 This is related to a comment by Malcolm (1998) that appears below where conceptualisations and classifications are determined by language.
59 This will be discussed in more detail below.
Immersion programs achieving the highest academic results (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006). The researchers concluded that the success of Māori language programs in education was a result of language inter-dependence where the development of Māori led to stronger English acquisition. McCarty (2014) notes in her studies on native USA immersion programs similar results when programs were accumulative (programs that used native language 90 to 100% across the curriculum and were long term) and accompanied by high quality English instruction at the end of these programs. In relation to these results, McCarty (2014) states, “Children get one chance at their P-12 education, and it serves them for life. They deserve the opportunities and academic benefits that Native-language immersion provides.”

Positive IL bilingual results have also been recorded in Asia. Although the Vietnamese constitution recognises IL revitalisation education, there are currently only a small number of programs in operation but these programs have all shown “a big difference in minority student participation and achievement” (Gouleta, 2010: 7). While the above studies have dealt largely with revitalisation language programs, positive results have also been found in maintenance programs. For instance, a UNICEF late exit transitional bilingual program in Vietnam has also demonstrated good results (Gouleta, 2010). Cambodian pilot transitional Indigenous bilingual programs in 2003 and 2010, where the national language, Khmer, is a L2, showed improved Khmer and IL comprehension and literacy (He & Thomas, 2003). In addition, an East Timorese multilingual pilot program (in six rural early childhood and primary schools throughout three regions) resulted in students doubling their academic performance with accelerated rates of academic readiness (Walter, 2016).

In Australian Indigenous contexts, Chandler, Haid, Jones, Lowe and Munro (2008) did a study documenting higher English decoding skills in lower primary NSW Aboriginal children who learned an IL. Malcolm (2003) related research and advocacy by Devlin (1991) and Turner (1997) (in Malcolm, 2003) for culturally based (responsive) language programs that allow ESL and EFL Torres Strait learners to “re-construct” themselves as achievers (as opposed to SAE non-achievers) with IL and creole literacy programs. This study also categorically established that more effective teaching and learning and L2 acquisition occurred with the use of a L1 to achieve comprehension and to demystify “the purpose of grammatical conventions and grammar
‘rules’ (Malcolm, 2003: 9). Similar findings have also been established by Krashen (1985) and Cummins and Swain (1986).  

2.5b NT Context

The two Indigenous bilingual programs that existed in the NT up until the FFHP were half L1 and half L2 literacy instruction (a maintenance bilingual program which was used at Site 2) as well as what was termed the Step Program or ‘staircase model’ (a transitional bilingual program that operated at Site 1). Both models entailed an initial large proportion of vernacular oracy and literacy and English oracy that gradually transitioned to instruction and literacy in dominant SAE. In the 50: 50 program, this amount never exceeded 50%-60% SAE. In the Step Program, it led to up to 90% to 100% instruction and literacy in dominant SAE by year 6 in early exit programs and 40%-50% in L1 and 60-50% in SAE by year 6 in late exit programs (see Collins, 1999 for further information on these types of programs). Other programs involving L1 literacy, referred to as part-time IL programs by the NT Department of Education staff, are generally too limited in L1 literacy instruction and delivery to be considered ‘members’ of either of these two programs. Indeed, the early exit Step Program, given its ‘tapering’ of L1 instruction is also problematic and could be regarded as subtractive in relation to the typology given in Table 2.1 (p.39) and its focus on assimilation. In both cases, however, bilingual education in remote Indigenous NT contexts is best represented by the notion of bicultural (culturally responsive) education and a holistic appraisal of language skill development that uses an IL in literacy and oral teaching and learning activities across the curriculum in “well-planned and formally organised programs” (Devlin, 2009a: 3). Its role, Devlin (2009a) contends, was as a:

...tool for survival in a fast-changing, often confusing world. It can open up new, inspiring perspectives as learners from one culture come to grips with the metaphors, the core concepts, the key insights, the poetry, the art and music of the other culture (Devlin, 2009a: 3).

---

60 An extensive discussion of NT bilingual education occurs in Appendix 1.2.
61 The element of program planning and organisation for bilingual education is one of the most important elements in this study given the policy discourse of successive NT governments that have construed dominant language programs as bilingual since L1 oracy, used in translation, may also be used in a class. This factor becomes apparent in the policy text and discourse analysis chapter in this thesis.
2.6 Well-being, Socio-Economic Outcomes and Status and Language Instruction

Of equal concern to the cognitive, academic and language outcomes in language education are the social and well-being impacts that result from monolingual or bilingual education since these can have long term effects on the academic and social development of individuals as well as on individual and community resilience. Contemporary studies, for instance, confirm Cummin’s (2000) tenet that dominant language instruction is accompanied by resource deprivation for non-dominant students and this can affect not only language and learning outcomes but well-being and identity formation. Piller and Takahashi (2011: 371-372) for instance, report that the rise in social inclusion policies - those policies that promote “economic well-being, particularly through employment” - are informed by “linguistic ideologies of monolingualism” and correlate linguistic assimilation with social justice and so invariably lead to exclusion. This is a consequence of non-native speakers being constructed and positioned in such a way that they (and their linguistic capabilities) are excluded from a number of social domains including those in the school (Piller & Takahashi, 2011). Kilman (2009: 17) examined this phenomenon in more detail and found strategies that “undermined supported social relations”, such as teacher exclusionary positioning of immigrant students, were imitated by other students. Kilman (2009) also documented that typical English language learner teaching strategies of withdrawing students from mainstream classes result in extreme social withdrawal of immigrant students.

Anders-Baer, et al (2008: 3) and Magga, et al (2005) have argued that not only does dominant language-only instruction in schools “curtail the development of capabilities”, but due to negative effects on identity and self-esteem, it can also result in sustained poverty. They contend that this type of instruction results in deleterious long term effects, not only leading to poor educational attainment but the highest levels of suicide, language endangerment and extinction in terms of ILs and global loss of linguistic diversity. The economic marginalisation of Indigenous students and their acculturation and deculturation that results from mono-cultural, monolingual dominant education systems, in turn, results in, according to Dunbar and Skutnabb-Kangas (2008) (see also Spiakovksy, 2009):

no or lacking maternity care, high infant mortality, undernourishment, dangerous work (e.g. mines, logging, chemicals in agriculture) or

### 2.6a Indigenous Studies

In fact, a raft of educational and other Australian and international research has also shown that culture and language are intimately linked to health and well-being in Indigenous populations. As such, Schmidt (1990) has stated:

[language]...is the lynchpin in self-esteem, cultural respect and social identification...Language is the most basic manifestation of a world view and cultural heritage. It captures the ideas of a people, their philosophies, and the experience of its speakers (Schmidt, 1990: 27).

The function of language and culture in relation to identity formation and well-being also relates to intergenerational transfer of knowledge and cultural identity. Nicholls (2005: 165) contends that language is the “crucial intergenerational link” and a “conduit and a solid and stable foundation for identity formation for the coming generations”.

The role of language in enhancing well-being has been confirmed more recently in an Australian IL survey by Marmion, Obata and Troy (2014). The survey reported that the purpose of IL studies for Australian Indigenous people was to connect to language and culture, develop identity (91%)

---

62 This study will follow the definition of social and emotional health and well-being from Kelly, Dudgeon, Gee and Glaskin (2009). They claimed that emotional and social well-being is a much broader concept than mental health since protective factors focus on how such elements as ancestry, family, community, land, spirituality and culture impact on individual health.

63 Malcolm (1998) noted how language defines distinct Indigenous cultural groups and speech communities and provides a window into a group’s conceptualisations and classification through verbal imagery (such as that present in metonymy and metaphor and other image schemas) (Malcolm, 1998). May (2012) borrowed from Sapir-Whorf and Bourdieu to explain this phenomenon as arising from the fact that through grammatical categories, structures and types, there develops a linguistic habitus through which to interpret experience and, indeed, structure reality and behaviours. That is, “one’s social and cultural experiences are organised by language and thus each language represents a particular worldview” (May, 2012: 139).
and well-being (98%). Indigenous respondents linked identity and belonging “to their tradition, culture, ancestor, spirit, family, community, land and/or country” (57%) in addition to “self-esteem, pride, and positive feelings in general” (38%) (Marmion, Obata & Troy, 2014: 29).

These studies are in agreement with another Central Australian study that noted the lowest mortality and morbidity rates in Homeland (traditional land with small family settlements) residents due to attachment to language and culture and the ability to reap the rewards onsite of the environmental and food knowledge embedded in language (Rowley, et al, 2008; Brown, 2008). The idea of an IL ensuring the transfer of Indigenous culture and the development of identity and well-being was also supported by a 2011 ABS report that stated 15 to 24-year-old Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (ATSI) who spoke an IL were less inclined to consume alcohol at high levels or suffer or inflict violence (ABS, 2011). This finding was also endorsed by social scientist Biddle (2012b) who noted studies by ABS (2010, 2011) that demonstrated lower levels of suicide and substance abuse in Indigenous people who spoke an IL. Two studies by economist Dockery (2010, 2013) that examined the effects of culture on health and socio-economic status showed unequivocally that Indigenous people with the highest cultural attachment (most commonly in regional and remote Indigenous people) have the highest self-assessed health, the highest educational standard, the highest employment levels (the latter two pertaining only to Indigenous people in major cities and regional centres due to educational access issues and lack of Indigenous employment opportunities in remote areas). They are also less likely to drink alcohol or take other drugs and are the least likely to have been arrested in the past five years (again, due to overt structural inequalities, this does not apply in remote areas) (Dockery, 2010).64

McKay (2011: 299) noted the findings of a Steering Committee for Government Service Provision’s (2009) report which, although acknowledging a proficiency in English helped Indigenous people access education and employment, advocated the use of “an IL indicator” since the link between an IL and economic and social well-being was so profound that it directly affected community resilience. Dockery (2013) states that the higher outcomes associated with
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64 Biddle (2012a: 302) argued that “Encouraging Indigenous Australians to move from remote to non-remote Australia can be seen as a solution to low levels of Indigenous education and employment. However, there are likely to be considerable trade-offs in terms of a number of measures of social capital” which would have negative effects on social and emotional well-being and health. He (p. 298) used the ABS measure of social capital as “four aspects of a person’s networks: quality, structure, transactions and type”.
Indigenous culture and language was a consequence of an enhanced “sense of control over their future outcomes” (as opposed to lack of control experienced with past and present government policy practises). Biddle (2012b: 216) also states that language is particularly important for Indigenous people because it “provides meaning and value to people’s lives, contributing to psychological stability”. This has socio-economic ramifications Canberra economic researchers, Daly and Smith (2003: v), claimed, in their literature review. In the review they noted that:

...key aspects of Indigenous cultural wellbeing and social reproduction may be directly linked to breaking the cycle of intergenerational welfare dependency and economic exclusion that is being transmitted to Indigenous children (Daly & Smith, 2003: v).

Where language and culture are implemented in pedagogy, the results are distinctly different for well-being, social and academic outcomes. For example, de la Sablonnière, Saint-Pierre, Taylor and Annahatak’s (2011: 304) research findings on 17 young Indigenous Inuit Canadian students show that where Inuit have a “clear understanding of the events that define Inuit history and, by extension, a clear and well-defined cultural identity” they achieve significantly higher academic outcomes. In addition, they cite research by Chandler and Lalonde (2008 in de la Sablonnière, et al, 2011: 304) that demonstrate Inuit communities who act to “preserve” their culture and “regain control over their community” through greater self-government suffer considerably less youth suicide rates indicating a causal link between cultural identity, emotional and social personal and collective (social group) well-being.

This is also confirmed in the educational researcher of Hopkins (2012: 234) who notes in her study of North West Tlįchǫ Canadian Indigenous college students that “autonomy and independence figured prominently” in academic success as well as place based identity. Place based identity means being situated in your own community to allow a connection to “reflexive thinking” (reflection before "action") which is "limited" in those who attend outside schools where "physical, social, and service ecologies" are foreign (Hopkins, 2012: 236). This sentiment is echoed by social researcher McGuire Kishebakabaykwe (2010, in Hopkins, 2012) when discussing Tlįchǫ and NT linguist Christie and Yolngu researchers Yingiya, Gurruiwiwi, Greatorex, Garnggulkpuy and Guthadjaka, (2010: 2) findings on Yolngu (Arnhem land in the NT of
Zuckerman and Walsh (2011: 113) have similarly found enhanced social and well-being outcomes with language revival programs that include “social reconciliation, cultural tourism … capacity building, and improved community health for Indigenous peoples (Walsh forthcoming).” They contend that:

In the process of language revival, some Aboriginal people will go from being dysfunctional (Sutton, 2009) to well-balanced, positive people. The benefits to the wider community and to Australian society are immense.

Reversing language shift (RLS) (Fishman, 1991, 2001, Hagège, 2009, Evans, 2010, Walsh, 2005a, Zuckermann, 2011) is thus of great social benefit. Language revival does not only do historical justice and address inequality but can also result in the empowerment of people who have lost their heritage and purpose in life (Zuckerman & Walsh, 2011: 113).

It stands to reason that if IL revival has such a profound positive impact on those Indigenous people that have ‘lost’ their language, then language maintenance through bilingual programs would have the same positive social results without the loss of original vocabulary and language functions that represent the hallmark of reclaimed languages (Zuckerman & Walsh, 2011).

These findings above appear to be underpinned by the crucial role of language socialisation in a child’s personal and cognitive development, as noted by linguist David Wilkins (2008). Wilkins (2008) worked for many years in Central Australian Indigenous communities and declared language socialisation was integral to important “cognitive self-regulatory mechanisms”. These self-regulatory mechanisms included, “[t]he ability to resist temptations, distractions, destructive high-risk situations as well as the facility for holding information and skills in working memory?”, according to Heath (2008: XII in Wilkins, 2008). Ochs and Schieffelin (1996: 252) maintain these mechanisms are hallmarks of language socialisation, language competence and “becoming a competent member of a society”. In this regard, Wilkins (2008) argued:

The clear message …. Is that messing unthinkingly with child socialisation processes, especially language socialisation processes, means messing with children’s cognitive and personal development, familial and community cohesion, and cultural and linguistic continuity [Wilkins, 2008].

The devaluation of and distance from Indigenous cultures and language for Indigenous people can also produce unintended outcomes. Canadian researchers, de la Sablonnière, et al (2011) note that colonisation has resulted in:

... the worst possible situation. The former norms associated with the traditional Inuit identity do not exist anymore, and have not been replaced by new norms, leaving the Inuit communities in a state of social dysfunction [de la Sablonnière, et al, 2011: 303].

The implication here is that Indigenous de-culturation through monolingual dominant education does not lead to the acquisition of the norms, ethics or values of a (dominant) culture or language but rather arrests social development.

This implies that imposing a dominant monolingual education on Indigenous students, apart from possibly leading to less cognitive and linguistic development, can result in a lack of Indigenous cultural transmission, generational fracture and failure to belong, feelings of inadequacy, a lack of cultural self-worth and high social dysfunction that impedes academic and socio-economic participation. Indeed, Anderson and Wild (2007: 147) critiqued dominant English education in remote Indigenous NT contexts as leading to “a failure syndrome”, child depression, increased drug abuse and feelings of hopelessness. They maintained that this form of education was both “intellectually limiting” and provoked feelings of despair given the fact that children failed to understand the foreign language concepts and so could not recall what they were taught (Anderson & Wild, 2007: 147). In addition, Anderson and Wild (2007) reported, dominant English language education has been associated with a widening language and cross-cultural communication gap amongst Indigenous youth. Not only do these findings concur with those of additive and subtractive education discussed earlier, they have particularly important implications in the analysis of policy effects on the two communities in this study. The next section examines the most successful forms of language pedagogy in remote locations of the NT.

2.6b Best Practise Indigenous Education in the NT

In terms of how successful pedagogy for Indigenous students has been realised in the NT, a number of researchers have examined the factors required for successful education programs
in remote areas. Linguist Stephen Harris in 1990, for instance, concluded that the most successful form of schooling for remote Indigenous children was where communities developed and controlled a bicultural and bilingual curriculum relevant to their children (that is, a culturally responsive pedagogy). This is affirmed by educational researcher Maughan (2012), who studied remote Australian and International Indigenous education systems. She found the following elements led to higher Indigenous academic success; IL and cultural education where learning is underpinned by a strong Indigenous identity and sense of belonging; a focus on the positive attributes of students; “shared governance [and partnerships] between the school (principal, teachers, students), the community (parents, elders, wider community) and others (NTDET personnel and researchers)”; community engagement in schools (access to school resources, school sponsored community events, involvement of local members in the school); and a strong instructional leadership that results in a shared vision of and belief in a best practice for Indigenous children (Maughan, 2012: iii, 15). Additional factors include a locally responsive curriculum; high expectations; ability to translate educational theory into practice that is “aligned with community concerns and relationships”; teaching practices and strategies that incorporate Indigenous pedagogy and other innovative approaches (Maughan, 2012: iii, 15). This is further supported in an Australian government report by National Curriculum Services (Fotheringham, 2012: 18) which explicitly states school leadership that shows a positive response to ILs and culture, have communities and schools working in close partnership, have high expectations of students in addition to making sure learning is “engaging, accessible and culturally responsive” have higher academic outcomes and whole school use of evidence based literacy and numeracy teaching (Fotheringham, 2012: 6-7).66

The inclusion and consideration of remote Indigenous contexts, place, languages and cultures appears thus to be of great importance to the academic and social success of education programs generally in remote Indigenous communities. IL and culture has also been linked to significantly higher attendance and engagement as well as self-esteem of Indigenous children at

66 Social researcher, Eva Cox (2014a), as noted in Chapter 1, drawing on a number of government reports (the Ombudsman, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2012), the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO), Closing the Gap Clearinghouse and a variety of internal evaluation organisations) reiterated the main factors responsible for the success of any remote programs as; involvement of, partnership with and respect for the community, language and culture; collaborative and co-ordinated relationships between the community, government and non-government agencies; adequate resourcing; individualised and contextually dependent responses; awareness of institutional and structural inequalities; long term commitment and development of social capital (no fly-in and fly-out personnel). Unfortunately, Cox (2014a) reports, the majority of programs are flawed in their design, funding and delivery and there is a consistent failure to consult communities adequately before decisions are taken or to act on such consultations that indicate program problems.
schools by the HRSCATSIA (2012). The Committee (p. 86) also recognises the importance of integrating ILs into schools in order for Indigenous students to “forge connections between Indigenous and non-Indigenous worlds, and so provide them with the skills to succeed in both”.

The links between culture, language and school are also recognised by the NT’s own Chief Executive of NT Department of Employment, Education and Training (NTDEET), Margaret Banks, when she notes in ILs and Culture 2004-2005 Report that the acknowledgement of IL and culture is the basis of quality Indigenous education:

...there is irresistible evidence to show that when the home languages and cultures of students are reflected in their learning experiences and learning environments, students achieve better levels of learning. We owe it to our Indigenous students, who constitute forty percent of our student population, to provide the best possible standard of education we can, to ensure participation and achievement outcomes for Indigenous students continue to improve. [Banks, NTDEET, 2005]

Indeed, Valerie Dhaykamalu (1999), at the time a Principal at Galiwinku, noted in an article in BIITE’s Ngoonjook the role that culture and language plays in engaging, not just students, but entire communities in schools thus facilitating school success as well as community and generational cohesion:

Bilingual Education has enabled parents and the community to be involved in the school. They feel they are a part of the school culture and feel empowered to take part in activities. I see this as important for our community schools. Without the co-operation of the community it becomes a hard task to manage the school. Through Bilingual Education the community has come to understand the values of education because there is a language through which they can identify with kids and education issues. For me particularly it is always a proud moment when I observe highly motivated parents who come to school each morning wanting to work alongside teachers in classrooms even if for part of the day [Dhaykamalu, 1999: 68-69]

67 Charles Darwin University educational researchers, Cowey, Harper, Dunn, Wolgemuth (2008), suggest that attendance must also be linked to engagement and such engagement in Indigenous contexts is more easily achieved with cultural inclusion. Their own study in 2008 (Cowey et al, 2009: 7) using data from the literacy projects, National Accelerated Literacy Project (NALP) and the ABRACADABRA: Improving Literacy through Technology (ABRA) Project, found that there was only a “small positive correlation between student attendance and academic Achievement” in the 40-80% percentile band but none in the less than 40% or greater than 80% percentile attendance bands (Cowey et al, 2009: 12). This seems to agree with Central Australian researcher Osborne’s (2014) figure of attendance only accounting for 10% of variation in NAPLAN results.
In addition, Wilkins (2008) claims those children with parents assisting in a bilingual school tend to have the strongest L1 and English literacy skills.

These elements above are also factors that appear to be recognised by the Indigenous communities themselves. In an extensive three year study by the Cooperative Research Centre for Remote Education (Guenther, 2015d), it was found that the remote Indigenous criteria for successful outcomes of remote schools entailed: high community and parent involvement and empowerment; increasing the local professional capacity of community members and increasingly the presence of local language teachers; cultural (including pedagogical) competency and responsiveness of teachers to the health and well-being of students; high attendance, academic (commensurate with the ESL status of students) and socio-economic outcomes; a sense of belonging, agency and control for students; and recognizing and catering to the ESL status of students. It was the aim of this study, therefore, to establish whether these elements of successful remote Indigenous education are common responses for participants on the two remote Indigenous communities and/or were affected in any way by the FFHP.

The next section positions this research within CLPP. It first identifies what CLPP is, the history of CLPP, the key themes of CLPP related to this research, the major ideologies explored in this study as well as how these ideologies relate to language policy in Australia and Indigenous education.

### 2.7 Critical Language Policy and Planning Studies (CLPP)

CLPP uses critical analysis of language planning and policy in terms of critical literacy studies, CDA and critical pedagogy to research why some “languages thrive whereas other languages are marginalized” (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996: 401). The following will briefly outline the history of the field, define the issues researched in CLPP and discuss how they relate to this study.
2.7a How did CLPP arise?

Johnson and Ricento (2013: 7) note that language planning and policy studies largely arose in the 1960s when language scholars were employed to solve the language problems of “new, developing and postcolonial nations” and record ILs. This work was mostly that of corpus (activities related to the form, grammar, syntax and spelling of a language), status (use and functions of languages in society) and acquisition planning (planning for new users of a language) (Garcia, 2009b; Johnson & Ricento, 2013). These activities were often related to unification through and homogenisation of language. They were regarded as ideologically and politically neutral and devoid of ecology or context (Ricento, 2000a). These studies were also largely macro level overt policy studies (government initiated policies). Johnson and Ricento (2013: 9) argue that the focus on efficiency and failure to account for sociolinguistic context led to models of language hierarchy by Taulli and Kloss in the late 1960s and early 1970s that posited ethnic and ILs below the “more carefully planned, like colonial languages.” That is, LPP initially focused on colonial languages that were viewed as being more capable of accommodating social and technological advances as well as standardisation. LPP thus often reflected the nationalist imperative for cultural and ethnic unity and the view that language could expedite modernity and economic development (Lo Bianco, 2001a, 2013, 2010b; Muhlhausler, 1996; Ricento, 2000a).

Despite the hierarchy evident in planning of this nature, it was not until the 1980s that scholars across different disciplines began to seriously address the “positivist linguistic paradigms” embedded in LPP (Johnson & Ricento, 2013: 10). LPP became influenced by a growing critique related to language policy ethnography. It also became influenced by the emphasis on the sociocultural in the study of speech acts with such work as Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics (Johnson & Ricento, 2013: 10). This was integral to the development of LPP theories that related language to power and the development of CDA (as in Fairclough, 1989). This critique was also fuelled by the growing emergence of colonial resistance as well as large scale migration in developed countries (Ricento, 2000a). That is, language policy became regarded as an expression of these power structures and desire to manage others.

Language planning also became viewed in much broader terms than simply an outcome of government planning. It came to include language-in-education (or acquisition) policy and
planning and prestige planning with an understanding that policy could, according to Baldauf (2004: 1), be “overt (explicit, planned) or covert (implicit, unplanned) and may occur at several different levels (macro, meso and micro)”.

Over the decades there has been an increasing focus on; microplanning (or “specific practice” in language education) in regards to covert language planning (which influences “how languages are learned ... taught ... contextualised and viewed”); the role and goal of planners; as well as the outcomes of the compulsory learning of English and impact of this on national, minority and Indigenous learners of which this study forms a part (Baldauf, 2004: 2, see also Lo Bianco, 2010a).

Language policy analysts, Liddicoat (2013: 1, 3-4) and Ricento (2006), contend that language education policies, both the obvious manifestations in terms of policy texts and the “less tangible and less codified forms” of policy discourse, represent the most influential on societal members since their purpose is to define “plans for the future” of these members. Policies generally articulate the values, beliefs, assumptions, desires and strategies to achieve the desires that a community holds about particular issues (Liddicoat, 2013). Language policies, Liddicoat (2013: 3) contends, act in a similar manner, implicitly or explicitly articulating the ‘normal’ linguistic practices or repertoire of a speech community, the beliefs and ideologies held about language use and ‘other’ languages within that community in addition to strategies to “modify or influence the practices of the speech community”. That is, they map and promote the “ideological spaces”, the institutional discourses and their inherent values and understandings (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007: 511). Language policies, thereby, contain judgments or values of language use and language varieties that are “inherently contextualised in language ideologies” (Liddicoat, 2013: 4). Viewed as texts, they can delimit “what can be said and thought about the social world” (Liddicoat, 2013: 11). They can thereby divulge both the beliefs about “the nature of linguistic communication”, the language “hierarchies of prestige”,

68 Baldauf (2004: 4) notes that language-in-education policy entails “access policy, personnel policy, curriculum policy, methodology and materials policy, resourcing policy, community policy and evaluation policy”.

69 The “goals” or motives of language planning include: Identity; Ideology (when a language is imposed by a group or state for reasons of ideology such as the United State ‘No Child Left Behind’ policy where student progress is gauged by standard English written assessments); Image Creation (where a national language is promoted to project a “favourable view” of a state’s language and history); Insecurity (where a state rejects a language because it is perceived to pose a threat); Inequality (when a state acts to “correct inequalities in society” such as introducing non-sexist language); Integration (when a state seeks to force a different language group to integrate with the majority by prohibiting the use of that group’s language); and Instrumental goals (when a group or individual acquires a L2 because of perceived benefits, such as job or market gain with the learning of English) (Garcia, 2009b: 85-86). According to these criteria, language policy in the NT in relation to Indigenous people could be regarded as largely having the goals of ideology, insecurity and integration.
hierarchies in the speech community itself and, indeed, “ideological constructions of the world” (Liddicoat, 2013: 4, 5, 12). Examining the ideologies, beliefs, assumptions and hierarchies in language education policies, thereby, allows one to determine why particular and even contradictory language planning and policies evolve. Tied as they are to issues of power and legitimacy at the highest national levels, May (2012: 132) has proclaimed; “the battle for nationhood is most often a battle for linguistic and cultural hegemony”. 70

In CLPP, the power structures, values, ideologies, beliefs and hierarchy of dominant and non-dominant languages implicit or explicit in language and language education policies are examined in terms of positioning, discursive framings and subjectivities. In settler-colonial contexts, they do this by positioning assimilationism and self-determination in ideological domains (such as globalisation, postcolonialism and settler-colonial relations) that are common in colonial nation-states.71

2.8 Key Themes in CLPP

In order to more easily examine the ideologies inherent in language hierarchies, Tollefson (2006: 46) has identified key ideas in CLPP research that seek to explain this inequity in nation-states. I have used these as the basis for discussing how CLPP relates to this research. These categories include power (how the state seeks to influence language behaviour), struggle (where language policies are both contrived as a means of oppression and empowerment), colonisation (the impact that major dominant institutions have on non-dominant groups), hegemony (practices of domination in institutional settings) and resistance (the sustaining of Indigenous identities).

70 Gramsci (1999: 145) defines hegemony as the “organisation and connective” power and prestige “which the dominant group exercises throughout society” that results in consensual subjugation as well as the “direct domination’ or command exercised through the State and ‘juridical’ government.”

71 Assimilationism is a persistent ideology of assimilation and cultural Indigenous deficits, as defined by McConaghy (2000), an Australian Indigenous education researcher. Nielson (2014), a New Zealand trained Canadian Critical Education Policy analyst, defined self-determination in education as the recognition of hegemony in knowledge domains, the desire to enhance the status and recognition of Indigenous knowledges and languages and Indigenous authority in educational domains. Settler colony is a term that refers to previous European colonies whose Indigenous residents represents the overwhelming minority such as in Australia, Canada, and the United States and who have little political authority. Territorial colonies, on the other hand, refer to previous European colonies with a majority Indigenous (although not necessarily homogenous) population that ‘took control’ of the state after imperial rule such as India, Trinidad, and Kenya (Krishna, 2009). One other distinction of settler colonialism, according to Wolfe (2006: 388) is that it “destroys to replace”. However, in colonies such as Australia, Indigeneity is used symbolically “to express its difference – and, accordingly, its independence – from the mother country” (Wolfe, 2006: 389). As such, we witness a contradiction in such colonies of the destruction of Indigeneity but the use of Indigenous motifs and language (place names particularly) by the nation state and its institutions.
For the purposes of this thesis, however, below I will explore research literature in the categories that impact particularly on this study, colonisation and hegemony.

2.8a Hegemony and Ideology

A major CLPP key idea of interest in this study is that of hegemony and ideology.\(^{72}\) Tollefson (2006) maintains that the link between hegemony and ideology is the naturalisation of hegemonic privileges and rights.\(^{73}\) CLPP literature that addresses hegemony and ideology analyses the role of ideology in language policies and practices at the institutional level and is tied closely to critical social theory (particularly that of Foucault, 1977, 1982; Bourdieu, 1986, 1991, 1998). It thus examines the imposition of standardised dominant languages at the expense of non-standard varieties in terms of both the macro (state) and micro (school and classroom) level. This is explored in the works of Corson (2001), Tollefson (2008), Lippi-Green (1997), Shohamy (2006) and Wiley (2000, 2010). Studies on the influence of ethnically and linguistically homogenous national identities on language policies are also common in the work of Lo Bianco (1999, 2008a, 2008b, 2009), Liddicoat (2013), May (2008, 2012) and Ricento (2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2008). Fairclough (2000, 20003, 2011), Wodak (2001a, 2001b, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2009) and Reisigl and Wodak (2001, 2009), in their socio-political examination of dominant ideology in policy text and policy discourse, are also linked to this field. This thesis also fits in this area, dealing as it does with dominant ideology, attitudes and values and how this has influenced the discourse in the FFHP policy text and policy discourse. The hegemonic ideology most relevant to this thesis is that which links to colonisation - nation-state legitimacy. This is discussed in more detail below.

2.8a1 Language and the Nation-state

Lo Bianco (2001a) and Fishman (1972) contend that, in the project of modernisation, language has symbolically been united with expressions of nationality in many (particularly settler-colonial) contexts. In fact, it has become regarded as more imperative than other symbols (Lo

\(^{72}\) In this study, I will use the definition of ideologies by Billig (1995). Billig (1995: 15) maintains, in line with ‘regimes of truth’, that ideologies “are patterns of belief and practise that makes existing social relations appear ‘natural’ and ‘inevitable’”.

\(^{73}\) Tollefson (2006: 47) uses a more Foucault definition for ideology that “refers to unconscious beliefs and assumptions that are naturalised”.
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Bianco, 2001a; Fishman, 1972). This has become even more evident with the rise of global terrorism and “the growing intolerance towards cultural commitments that are of another kind,” (Altman & Hinkson, 2010: 192). Since the rise of nationalism, language policy has come to be regarded as an “effective mechanism for imposing and legitimising socio-political systems” (Tollefson, 2013: 19). Indeed, May (2012: 5) declares that “languages are ‘created’ out of the politics of state-making, not – as we often assume – the other way around”. This process is underpinned by a contrived notion of political legitimacy that encompasses “national state congruence” or linguistic and cultural homogeneity (May, 2012). This linguistic congruity, in turn, leads to the exclusion of minority cultures and languages in addition to the ascent of English and the descent of nation-state languages associated with lesser global and colonial forces (May, 2012). The domination of the idea of linguistic and cultural homogeneity in the nation-state at the expense of migrant or ILs and culture is so pervasive, it has become normative, May (2012) argues.

The conceptualisation of a linguistic and cultural homogeneity for the nation-state has manifested also in the opposition associated with “particularist ‘ethnic’ rights” or pluralism (May, 2012: 98). In this regard, pluralism is associated with a fear of “ethnic stratification” and the consequential fragmentation, separatism and inequality this is said to entail (May, 2012: 98). Conversely, “individual and universal ‘citizenship’ rights” or civism is said to confer choice, personal autonomy, equality and freedom (May, 2012: 98). Linguistic and cultural homogeneity and domination in addition to notions of liberal individualism and equality that reinforce the norms of the dominant group have, in turn, created a national “symbolic repertoire, including language, religion, customs and institutions”, May (2012: 75) contends. This national cultural repertoire constructs minorities, particularly Indigenous ones, as “deviants” to be coerced to assimilate to dominant group norms (May, 2012: 80).

Given the congruence of language with the effective function of and ethno-symbolism of the modern nation-state, language policy is thus generally linked to discoursal notions of ‘national’ economic health, national identity, uniformity, ‘nationality planning’ (from Fishman, 1972: 31), social capital as well as ‘belonging’ to an imaginary national space (see Anderson, 1991; Hage, 2000). Thus, the supremacy of dominant languages across national institutional domains, Lo Bianco (2001a: 18) explained, is ideologically linked to the contemporary economic development of neo-liberal globalisation (discussed below). Dominant standard languages
become imbued with the promise of social capital gains and an individual asset that leads to economic outcomes for education as well as mainstream employment (Balatti, Black & Falk, 2007). Thereby, the use of a dominant standard language becomes a determinant of national economic health. Conversely, multilingualism and multiculturalism become associated with chaos and discordance and viewed as aberrations (Ellis, Gogolin & Clyne, 2010; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996). Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) contend that their minimisation becomes a means by which power and resources are unequally distributed since those without the dominant linguistic repertoire become economically and socially isolated (see also Ricento, 2000b).

Bourdieu (1991: 55) noted this status of linguistic repertoires is reproduced institutionally so that speakers who are deficient in particular levels of competence are “excluded from the social domains in which competence is required or are condemned to silence”. This exclusion encourages those speakers of languages with devalued capital to discontinue that language’s reproduction (Simpson, 2013). When such reproduction does not occur (such as in educational institutions), Bourdieu (1991) stated, the language or dialect begins to recede in the community since the exclusion contributes to the decrease in producers and consumers of this linguistic commodity (that is an L2 eclipses the use of an L1 as noted earlier by Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001). The community thereby loses its social cohesion and identity (Bourdieu, 1991) and this, as outlined earlier (in section 2.6), can lead to social dysfunction. Concurrently, because of hegemony (particularly consensual subjugation), Corson (2001: 24) contends, the community sees this phenomenon as inevitable and “the way things must be”.

Both Hornberger (2002) and Lo Bianco (2001a) have argued the attempts to social engineer non-dominant groups in order to sustain nation-state legitimacy can lead to language policy and policy discourse reflecting views unsupported by scholarly research. Cummins (1999) agreed, noting that the academic debate on bilingual education, which is overwhelmingly in favour of bilingual education, is generally at complete odds with media coverage on the issue. Only those academics with no background in applied linguistics oppose bilingual education (Cummins, 1999). Indeed, Lo Bianco (2001a: 84-85) contended, those in the United State who oppose bilingual education consistently construe the problem in terms of “patriotism”, portrayed as “a

---

74 Simpson (2013: 388) argued this in relation to the Gaelic language experience in the UK where “the dominant language sharply increases once the number of active speakers drops below 67% of the population.”
virtue and an obligation” and a “kind of epistemology”, as opposed to using “research evidence and specialist practitioner knowledge” as the foundation of arguments. This lends credence to Wiley’s (2000: 74) claim of ideologies (such as racism) in language policies being “used for the purposes of social control”. It is an aim of this research, thereby, to ascertain the influence of nation-state legitimacy in terms of the validity of policy claims and “specialist practitioner knowledge”.

2.8b Colonisation

The other major key idea of relevance to this research is ‘Colonisation’. Colonisation refers to the analysis of the impact that major dominant institutions have on non-dominant groups. Congo born linguist, Mufwene (2002), examined this in detail, creating a number of economic divisions of colonisation that had particular social and linguistic implications. The first stage was trade colonisation, which represented the intermittent first stage of colonial contact where relations were sporadic and equitable (Mufwene, 2002). This either transformed into exploitation colonisation or settler colonisation or arose concurrently with settler colonisation. Exploitation colonisation occurred when the more economically powerful dominated the weaker, thus determining trade terms and resource exploitation. However, any colonial migration was temporary, existing languages in the location remained and often a new “intermediary class of Indigenous bureaucrats or low-level administrators” emerged (Mufwene, 2002: 14). This condition also led to the rise of pidgins based on the language of the coloniser or the IL in addition to a decline in rural ILs and dominance of particular ILs in areas of high settlement (since the economies became increasingly located in major metropolitan centres) (Mufwene, 2002). Settler colonialism, in contrast, was characterised by mass migration of the coloniser, extinction and endangerment of non-dominant (migrant) and ILs but the emergence of creoles, pidgins and dominant language varieties such as Australian English (Mufwene, 2002).


75 It is important to note Mufwene (2002) regarded globalisation as a form of colonisation that differed principally from historical forms in “complexity and speed of communication”.
and studies of postcolonialism which arose in the aftermath of World War II, of which this study has a particular focus.

2.8c1 Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism developed from the works of critical literacy authors, Said (1978), Spivak and Bhabha (in Ashcroft, 2001: 9, see below) who developed cultural and language critique. Originally conceived as a term denoting the “post-independence” period of former colonies, postcolonialism came to imbue, in literary studies, the continuing “cultural effects of colonisation”, according to Ashcroft (2001: 9-10). It thereby became a term that encompassed all features of colonisation from incipient colonial contact to the present where colonial subjugation still occurs (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2000). While acknowledging the non-uniformity and conceptual diversity of postcolonialism, in this thesis it will only be used to address, in the words of postcolonial theorists, Crowley and Matthews (2006: 268), the “ongoing oppressive practices of Whiteness in its contemporary enactments”.

Postcolonialism initially analysed the binary oppositions of the colonised and coloniser and the flawed essentialising of the colonised or ‘other’ using the language critiques of Lacan, Foucault, Derrida and others (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 2000). Martinique born psychiatrist and philosopher Frantz Fanon is of particular note in the struggle for decolonisation. Fanon’s Black Skin, White Masks (1986) and the Wretched of the Earth (1963) examined colonisation and its mirroring in decolonisation in terms of Marxian socio-economic theory, race, class, culture and violence and colonisation’s psychopathological effects. Edward Said (1978) was also a highly influential postcolonial literary critique who focused on the relationship between empire, culture and power and the striking similarities between strategies of colonisation in different colonial contexts. Of particular note in relation to this study is Homi Bhabha (2004: 95, 96) who examined the stereotypical colonial subject (which functioned in the “process of subjectivation” on both the oppressed and the oppressor) and ‘regimes of truth’ (defined below) in more detail. Bhabah (2004) viewed education as a means to create more governable subjects. That is, the colonial aim in education was to make colonised subjects sufficiently like those with colonial
power to enable management but ensure difference so that they did not pose a threat to this power (Bhabah, 2004).  

Most theorists who have contributed to the evolution of language critique that has informed postcolonialism note the impact of social relations and networks on discourse that result in or reinforce stereotypical discoursal constructions and, thereby, stratification of groups (such as Gramsci, 1971; Bourdieu, 1977, 1983, 1991; Foucault, 1977). This study took a particular focus on two of Foucault’s tenets as they relate to postcolonialism and globalisation. One is the ‘regime of truth’ (Foucault, 2000), described as a process whereby statements and utterances become acceptable dogma, doctrines and canons as a consequence of their creation, regulation and dissemination by decentralised regimes of power. This occurs to the degree that they become ‘discursive formations’ with particular views or frames of topics or ideas and located across a number of fields. The other is the conception of power. Foucault (1982: 788) defined the exercise of power as “a way in which certain actions modify others”. Government power, Foucault (1982: 790) explained, is the “designated ... way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed”. Of particular importance in this process of governance are the discursive formations since, according to Kumaravadivelu (2012: 460) they contain the discursive practices, an integrated and intergenerational system of signifiers and ‘regimes of truths’ that determine our “thinking and knowing, speaking and doing”.

Bourdieu (1991: 56) determined that when signs and significations confer advantage, they function as ‘cultural capital’ privileging some and marginalising others and thus creating a “hierarchical universe”. This, Muhlhausler (1996) and Lo Bianco (2001a) have stated, can lead to the high status and linguistic capital of some languages which is reproduced institutionally while others, particularly Indigenous ones, struggle to be recognised beyond dialect.  

---

76 Bhabha’s (2004) major theoretical contribution was his theorising of the repetitive link between the colonised and the Other ‘sign’ or stereotype as an essential process in colonial discourse since its absence destabilised the relationship between the signified and signifier. However, the repetition of this relationship also connotes the fact that their relationship was tenuous (or false) to begin with. Concurrently, a psychoanalytical process of ‘disavowel’ occurs which aims to undermine this anomaly (the cause of anxiety) to create a fantasy of a coherent whole. These psychoanalytical ideas are derived from those of Jacques Lacan who used the metaphor of the child’s first glance of himself in a mirror to describe both the threat posed by and desire for the ‘Other’ to realise an “undifferentiated unity with otherness” (Fugellie, 2011: 40). These ideas are investigated more thoroughly below.

77 Bourdieu (1991) refers to the elevation of the status and value of one language or variety, or indeed, one group over another, as ‘miserconception’ since its superiority is an imagined status. This imagining harks back to Benedict Anderson’s (1991) treatise, Imagined Communities, of rising nationalism in developing states as a consequence of imagined communality. The status is sustained by habitus or learned (but historically, culturally and linguistically derived) patterns of group behaviors, dispositions and ways of being in particular fields of action (or social arenas
(1991) claims, it is the state that plays a decisive role in orchestrating and promulgating this status through the dominance it has in the production and reproduction of ideologies and discursive formations in the public domain, thereby ensuring a particular view of reality (Bourdieu, 1991).

In postcolonial theory, the focus of domination, discursive formation and framing is the Indigenous subject. Discourse on the Indigenous subject, including that implied or explicit in policy, is used as a strategy to govern this subject. It is used to guide and regulate their behaviour according to dominant values, stereotypes and ideologies in order to manage difference within the social parameters of the nation-state (Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006). In Indigenous Australian education policy, it was applied initially by McConaghy (2000) but now more commonly uses the contemporary postcolonial streams of critical race and, particularly in Australia, settler-colonial studies (such as those of Lovell, 2007, 2012; Moran, 2005, 2008; Wolfe, 1999, 2002, 2006). Settler colonialism has a direct bearing on this research in terms of the elucidating the attitudes and beliefs that underpin the FFHP and is explored below.

2.8c2 Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism represents the culmination of the work of contemporary theorists who have developed more diffuse notions of identity and more complex analysis in colonial discursive strategies. Stuart Hall (1992: 254), for instance, explored the social and political ‘formative’ effects of discursive representation “as opposed to the ‘merely … expressive’”. This led to the recognition of a wide variety of discursive positions across gender, race, class and ethnicity, the “internalisation of self-as-other” and a de-stabilised construction of ethnicity (that is, an acknowledgement of the historical, cultural and political construction of and engagement with difference) (Hall, 1992: 256). This has consequently led to studies of ‘Whiteness’, colonial

with their own rules and structures) (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). It is the misrecognition of this superiority of particular dominant habitus in these social fields that sustains and legitimizes discursive, and thereby, symbolic power differentials and violence. This misrecognition is produced and reproduced through hierarchical language ideologies to such a degree that the ideologies are naturalized and become common sense, thereby providing the mechanism for subordinate complicity (Bourdieu, 1991). In turn, it is the complicity of the dominated that allows the entire process to occur.

Rebellion against the state is often encapsulated in narratives of the wilful child, “the not-yet-subject, or the subject-to-come, the one who comes after” which in turn links closely to the container metaphor (inside, outside) common in postcolonial theory (Ahmed, 2012: 7).
authority in site specific contexts and mechanisms of colonial resistance in terms of maintaining a distinct identity and culture, and includes research most pertinent to this treatise of settler colonialism studies (such as the Australian studies of Kelada, 2008; Moran, 2005; Moreton-Robinson, 2004, 2011; Wolfe, 1999, 2006).  

According to Barker (2012: 1), settler colonialism is now regarded as a “distinct method of colonising involving the creation and consumption of a whole array of spaces by settler collectives that claim and transform places through the exercise of their sovereign capacity”. Barker (2012), Bonds and Inwood (2015) and Veracini (2007) argue that these settler collectives, given their design to dispossess and control such territory, never entail Indigenous populations. Indigenous people, largely ignored and invisible, generally hold a problematic and obscured position within White colonised settler nations and national identity. 

Settler colonialism gives rise to unique permutations of national identity that remain culturally distinct from their imperialist roots, thus masking the perpetuation and continuation of domination and self-imaging practices (Barker, 2012; Veracini, 2007). Barker (2012:3) notes they thus represent a distinct form of colonisation in terms of “methods of expansion”, structures and “relationships to place” that differs from colonisation with less permanent colonisers. Despite the scale associated with this type of colonisation, the normalisation of its institutions, structures and “myriad lifestyles” ensures settler colonialism remains largely “invisible” and unacknowledged as does the state’s pursuit of it (Barker, 2012: 1; Lovell, 2007). Indeed, Australian sociologists Walter and Butler (2013: 399) remark on the absence in Australian sociological theorising of Australia as a “colonised settler society” which results in the positioning of Indigenous people as “as an ethnic minority along with other non-Anglo immigrants [that] form a standard category of the usual suspects of Australian disadvantage, wedged between migrants and sole parents.” 

---

79 Settler colonialism as an “interpretive category” refers, Australian trained academic historian Veracini (2007, 2013: 318) explains, to a term that arose from the 1970s in the aftermath of “protracted anti-colonial struggles involving settler minorities”. In this period, continued colonial-colonised interaction was acknowledged in the processes of colonisation and ‘land settlement’ in settler colonial contexts (Veracini, 2013: 318). Prior to this, the process of ‘land settlement’ was conceived in an empty “Indigenousless” land (Veracini, 2013: 317).

80 According to Sellwood and Angelo (2013), Indigenous invisibility, while beginning with the myth of ‘terra nullius, continues with homogenisation of Indigenous peoples into one group and the failure to recognise the ILs and the ESL contexts of Indigenous communities. This results in the “role of language(s)” being “completely overlooked or subsumed entirely under an overarching category of literacy” (Sellwood & Angelo, 2013: 251).
Settler colonial discourse in Indigenous education and IL education fields, apart from invisibility, can emerge in positive and utopian ideals of a dominant colonial ‘self’ in addition to devalued, deficient and negative constructions of an Indigenous non-White ‘other’. They can also appear in the construction of a ‘pure’ and uncorrupt ‘noble’ ideal of the ‘savage’ (as opposed to the “ignoble” savage) which is in effect the original pure ‘self’ before societal corruption (Attwood, 1992: 4). These representations are underpinned by logics that define and characterise difference from the self often in homogenous, stereotypical and, even, contradictory ways (Attwood, 1992; Riggins, 1997).

Such logics have come to be explained by postcolonial researchers, including social critique Homi Bhabha (2004) and social researchers Pajaczkowska and Young (1992: 200), in terms of psychoanalysis, the unconscious, a “highly structured form of subjective reality”, and ‘denial’, a defence mechanism that allows a subject to deny or ignore an unpleasant reality. They have examined in colonial contexts, the projection of negative qualities onto the ‘other’, particularly the projection of dependence that effects both a “denial of imperialism” and the creation of a colonial normativity (Pajaczkowska & Young, 1992: 202). This justifies “violence or indifference”, they argue, while concurrently maintaining an absence of White identity (Pajaczkowska & Young, 1992: 201). Clarke (2012) has scrutinised this in terms of Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, particularly in relation to the element of (colonial) fantasy or fantasmatic logic that is underpinned by an ideal of “fullness” and “harmony” and its binary opposite of ‘lack’ (Clarke, 2012: 179). In settler colonial contexts, this has come to manifest in policy that is assimilative whereby Indigenous ‘lack’ is thought to be overcome by making the ‘other’ more like the colonial ‘ideal’ (Clarke, 2012). McConaghy (2000: 151) referred to this phenomenon as colonial mimicry and declared it arises from the “shameful phenomenon” of the Indigenous experience that is resolved by assimilative strategies since they implement liberal notions of justice (“sameness and uniform rights”).

Failure to assimilate has become embroiled in a fear of national and cultural non-cohesion and Indigenous “negative and dangerous” difference (Spiakovksy, 2009: 218) as well as Indigene

---

81 Riggs (2007: 354) has developed this further in relation to Australian postcoloniality by suggesting that Terra Nullius, acting as it does as the primary “tool for justifying White belonging”, in fact undermines the White “right to belong” on an ontological level since it fails to recognise Indigenous sovereignty. A means to eradicate this ontological failure is particularly evident in the ‘normalising’ and mainstreaming agenda of recent Federal and State Government Indigenous policies, including the FFHP, that attempt to dissolve Indigenous sovereignty, history and Indigenous identity.
cultural incompetence and the failure to adapt (Moran, 2005; Kumar, 2006; Wolfe, 2006). This failure to ‘adapt’, the threat this poses to national cohesion and the ‘crisis’ manufactured by Indigenous cultural deficiencies (derived from historical constructions of primitiveness and savagery) became normalised in Australia in the late 1990s with the rise of the overtly racist and anti-Aboriginal Pauline Hanson political party (May, 2012). These discoursal constructions figure prominently in the examination of recent Howard Government NTER policy discourse analysis of Watson (2011) and Macoun (2011) and the Australian national language policy and Indigenous Education policy studies of Liddicoat (2013). The works of Lo Bianco (1999, 2001a), the discourse analysis of Watson (2011) and Macoun (2011) and particularly the postcolonial and neo-liberal globalisation policy studies of Clarke (2012) directly inform the policy analysis and its effects on the two communities in this research.

2.8c3 Postcolonialism and Australian Indigenous Education

In the realm of Australian Indigenous education policy, Indigenous failure to adapt has become construed over time in terms of deficiencies or gaps in outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous settler colonial subjects (Guenther, 2012). Remote education systems analyst, Guenther (2012), argues this has led to policies such as ‘Closing the Gap’ (the successor to the NTER) and a “pervasive rhetoric of disadvantage”. Schwab (1998: 6) notes how such deficit discourse in Indigenous education, expressed in terms of “cultural difference”, gives rise to a “weakness” in tasks while “deprivation”, “impoverishment”, “inadequate ante- and post-natal care” as well as poor nutrition leads to the failure of Indigenous students to reach particular developmental milestones and acquire particular knowledge and skills.

Guenther (2015b: 7) admonished that such discourse and policy direction can lead to the logic that merely being an Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander “is the disadvantage” since there emerges a racialised discourse of “cultural dysfunction”. Secondly, advantage and disadvantage becomes exclusively interpreted from a non-Indigenous perspective and results in the creation of an “Aboriginal problem” he argued (Guenther, 2015b: 7). Thirdly, the construal of racialised disadvantage leads to “exceptionalism” whereby racial categorisation and discrimination becomes justified (Guenther, 2015b: 7). Fourthly, he writes:
... the disadvantage discourse may idealise the interests of the privileged, reinforcing a hegemony that in turn reinforces existing power dynamics in society and results in ‘self-fulfilling prophecies’ of the disadvantaged [Guenther, 2015b: 3].

One of the aims of this study is to interrogate the FFHP policy text and discourse for such representations, constructions of difference and disadvantage and the use of non-Indigenous values in the interpretation of this difference. It is also an aim to investigate the views of community participants in how these have impacted on their lives.

2.8c4 Globalisation

Colonisation is additionally connected to studies of globalisation and the increasing influence that global institutions, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation (OECD) and the World Bank, have on national and state education systems, education policy and language education policy. The rationale here is that globalisation, framed as modernisation, has inherently the same aims as colonisation – that of cultural and economic domination by dominant Western states (Petrovic, 2005; Sethi, 2011). There is, in fact, an intimate synergy operating between globalisation and postcolonialism. Rizvi (2009), for instance, maintains postcolonialism can frame globalisation dialectically within specific cultural and situation contexts. Bunda and McConville (2002) and Howard-Wagner (2007) have examined how postcolonial influences have exacerbated the effects of globalisation in all sectors of Indigenous policy development. This has occurred in terms of the ‘normalising’ agenda embarked on by the Howard government, the policy of ‘social inclusion’ and the ‘mainstreaming’ of Indigenous organisations and services (moving them to mainstream agencies as opposed to Indigenous specific). This has effectively undermined Indigenous self-determination and self-representation (Bunda & McConville, 2002; Howard-Wagner, 2007). Community interviews reveal if and how these impacted in school and community contexts.

Globalisation in education has evolved over the past four decades to achieve what Lingard, Martino and Rezai-Rashi (2013: 540) have claimed as “global governance in education”. International organisations and programs, such as the OECD’s Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IAEEA), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Progress in
International Reading and Literacy Study (PIRLS), played an important role in this. Through international testing instruments, globalisation of educational standards and an emerging globalised educational policy discourse, these organisations have promoted globalisation in education to the degree that there now exists “policy convergence” across national and international borders (Ball, 2000: XXVIII).

Education globalised discourse maintains that “high standards” are achieved with “standardised [dominant language] testing” and that these higher standards will contribute to a higher national human capital and competitive edge in the global market (Lingard, Martino & Rezai-Rashi, 2013: 540). That is, they contain the rationale that standardisation (including language) leads to social capital and social mobility. According to de Silva and Heller (2009: 96), this rationale is a product of the fact that globalisation discourses are heavily tied to the ideology of neo-liberalism (often termed Hayek liberalism) which has displaced welfarism as the main logic of governance and so has displaced ethnolinguistic rights with “community economic development”. Neo-liberal discourses are underpinned by radical concerns with ‘freedom’ and ‘liberty’ expressed in terms of unfettered government controls such as ‘free trade’, ‘privatisation’ and ‘deregulation’. This is despite the fact that, according to Petrovic (2005):

...the global market is never really permitted to be “free” but is executed through sanctions, tariffs, and other coercive means by the powerful at the expense of the less powerful [Petrovic, 2005: 401].

The principle metaphor that operates in neo-liberalism and fortifies this neo-liberal notion of human freedom is that of the market: that liberty and democracy are better served by a freemarket which promotes individualism and confers all individuals with the same and equal “ordinary” freedoms and rights (Howard-Wagner, 2007: 3). This has led to a contracted view of social justice as distributive justice which has led to a focus on material goods, wealth, income,

---

82 However, this contradicts existing evidence on productivity and social capital. For instance, Levin and Kelley (2002: 241) revealed in a macro-study of education and its relationship to the economy, that “test scores have never shown a strong connection with either earnings or productivity” and that the rise in the cognitive skill base of jobs actually deteriorated from the 1960s to the 1980s.

83 Carusi (2011), in his PhD on the critical analysis of Federal United States education policy, provides a comprehensive outline of the history of neo-liberal discourse. He notes the rise of neo-liberalism as a response to the hostility of Vienna economists, Karl Menger, Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek (in particular), to the growth of centralised economies in Europe.
resources and socio-economic position that “ignores the social structure and institutional context that often help determine distributive patterns” (Young, 1990: 15).

The change in government as a consequence of neo-liberalism from a welfare state to one that enables the individual has transformed citizens from passive to active consumers where they are the “economic entrepreneurs of their own lives” and responsible for governmentality (Davies & Bansel, 2007: 248, 259). As such, government is no longer responsible for the health, education and security of the individual or protection of minorities (Davies & Bansel, 2007). Rather, the “survival” of the individual and the nation become tied through the metaphor of the market and the governing of individuals becomes a process of enabling individuals to make their own choice “to further their own interests and those of their family” (Davies & Bansel, 2007: 251, 249). Since the agency of the individual is now conceived as a series of choices, restricted choice becomes interpreted as a personal failing or ‘poor choice’ (Davis, 2007). Dependency on the state is thus viewed as passive, a consequence of paternalism and a moral failing as opposed to the reality of institutional and structural domination and oppression. The engineering and acceptance of this discourse is achieved with “technologies of surveillance” as well as “heightened nationalism” driven by a fear of economic failure and “moral absolutism” (Davies & Bansel, 2007: 253).

The onus on the same ordinary rights for all individuals and freemarket principles has resulted generally in moves against collectives, the judicial interference that favours employers and multi-nationals and the erosion of wages, unions, representation, employment conditions and skills training (Pattison, 2008). For marginalised Indigenous people in Australia this has resulted in the abolition of the only federal representative Indigenous body in Australia through which Indigenous people held a democratic voice that lasted from 1990 to 2005: the ATSI Commission (ATSIC) (Moran, 2008). It has also resulted in the withdrawal of funding for local community services and organisations and outsourcing of these activities to outside providers (Moran, 2008). As such, despite social justice claims and policy moves to close gaps, neo-liberal governance has resulted in “rising poverty, social exclusion and social inequalities” in Indigenous communities (Pattison, 2008: 94).

Critique of globalisation in education policy is common in the international works of Apple (1999), Petrovic (2005) and Piller and Takahashi (2011) as well as Australian based studies of
Ozga and Lingard (2007) and Rizvi (2007). Ozga & Lingard (2007), for instance, have examined the increasing role of organisations such as the OECD in promoting ‘value free’ but in reality highly ideological business models and practices in ‘modernising’ education systems which has led to standardisation in curricula, testing and target setting. Apple (1999), Ozga and Lingard (2007), Petrovic (2005) as well as Piller and Takahashi (2011) also interrogate neo-liberal assumptions such as the market being inherently egalitarian. They trace how this has led to a closer association between the ‘market’ and schools and a rationale for the use of dominant languages such as English as the means to enhance human capital, increase market equity and international competitiveness. Piller and Takahashi (2011) and Petrovic (2005) have traced how English as the language of instruction has come to dominate language education policy as a mechanism of ‘social inclusion’ where English is constructed as integral to participation in the economy and as a means to resolve threats to social stability as a result of inequality, particularly in Western colonial states.

In Australia, two of the primary manifestations of globalised discourse in Indigenous education are the dominance of English language teaching and standardised English language testing. The failure of Indigenous students to achieve SAE literacy and numeracy levels (to normalise English as the langue franca and to embrace an English identity) and strategies to enable this ‘gap’ to be breached have become the foci of much of the literature in this field (Freeman & Bochner, 2008; Taylor, 2010; Warren & deVries, 2009; Wheldall, Beaman & Langstaff, 2010). They also repeatedly occur and re-occur in the arguments of Noel Pearson (2000), Marcia Langton and Warren Mundine (Fielder, 2008; Langton & Rhea, 2009) where language and culture are presented as a ‘personal choice’ and where correcting socio-economic inequity becomes an ‘individual [Indigenous] responsibility’ (see also Altman & Hinkson, 2010).

However, there has also been language policy critique on the negative effects of such persistent dominant language of instruction practices and policies in schools and tertiary institutions (Duncan & Guenther, 2011; Guenther, 2012; Harrison, 2007; Kostogriz, 2011; Lowell & Devlin, 1998; Luke, 2003). In addition, there has been critical examination of standardised language testing regimes (such as NAPLAN) on remote Indigenous students (due to their ESL or additional language status and unique cultural context) such as that of Unsworth (2013) and, as mentioned earlier, the work of Wigglesworth, Simpson and Loakes (2011) and Duncan and Guenther (2011). Critique has also centred on the fact that standardised tests generally are static as opposed to
dynamic (interactional) and so fail to reveal a student’s interactive language abilities and language use in a social context (Hoffman-Hicks, 1992; Wigglesworth, Simpson & Loakes, 2011). The failure to achieve these standards results in perceived ‘gaps’ which implies deficits and ties in with postcolonial discourse of the deficient ‘other’. Given the impact of NAPLAN (standardised test) results on the inception of the FFHP (as noted in the introduction), and its association with Indigenous deficits and ‘gaps’, there would appear to be a direct relationship between globalisation and the values and beliefs implicit and explicit in the FFHP.

2.8c5 Ideologies in Globalisation, Metaphors and Governmentality

It is an aim in this research, thereby, to ascertain the influence of neo-liberalism in the FFHP on the two remote communities in terms of: individual responsibility for educational outcomes and individual and national wealth; education as a means of acquiring the cultural capital necessary for this responsibility; the construal of educational achievement as a matter of ‘choice’ in a ‘free’ competitive market; the standardisation of educational achievement to ensure accountability and quality control; and the failure to acquire adequate dominant norms of educational achievement as a matter of ‘poor choice’, all of which conceal structural and institutional marginalisation and exclusion. Clarke (2012) explains that these elements appear in dominant themes or logics of neo-liberalism that according to Ball (2000: xxxi) act as “forms of discipline … new working practices and worker subjectivities”.

Although globalisation discourses tend to manifest as vernacular discourses in different contexts, they all share dominant themes or particular elements (‘social logics’ or floating signifiers that traverse across discourses) identified by Glynos and Howard (2007 in Clarke, 2012). These are competition (choice and by association freedom), atomisation (individualism/privatisation) and instrumentation (measures to ensure quality and control/accountability) (Clarke, 2012). These reinforce each other to ensure competition as opposed to collaboration operates in the school system. It is these logics, discussed in more detail below, that are examined in the FFHP text and discourse.
2.8c1a Competition

Competition in educational realms uses national benchmarks to compare school performance as the basis for "rewards and sanctions" for teaching practice and school leadership (Clarke, 2012: 180). These benchmarks are thought to allow "transparency and accountability" with the view of encouraging "innovation and excellence" in school programs, services and curricula design (Clarke, 2012: 180). They also said to provide parents, students and teachers "evidence for informed choices" (Clarke, 2012: 180). This ties in with merit based appointment and salary of teachers where labour unions and centralised bureaucracies are viewed as obstacles to a fully functioning consumer driven market (Clarke, 2012). The underlying logic in competition is that those schools that respond more successfully to parental appeal and demand will acquire a larger market share of consumers thus precluding the need for bureaucratic interference (Carusi, 2011). However, in reality, choice is restricted to those in a higher socio-economic bracket: those who can afford higher private school fees, transport expenses or relocation.

In effect, education systems (Clarke, 2012: 180) are "technologies of performativity" where competition through national testing enables governments to coerce the system. That is, it is government values and judgments (acceptable 'normative' knowledge) that are used in the creation of a competitive system that pits school against school.\(^84\)

2.8c1b Atomisation

Atomisation is "the ideology of individualism" (Wiley & Luke, 1996: 516). It focuses responsibility for the school on the individuals who access the school system – the parents, teachers and students. This, of course, results in a "downplaying of structural aspects of success and failure" (Clarke, 2012: 181).

Atomisation is apparent in parental responsibility to provide an education that gives their child the greatest 'market' advantage. When parents are able to use the transparency of competition between schools to achieve this advantage, this, of course, results in withdrawing children from

\(^84\) This is of course directly related to Foucault's (1977) view of the examination as a means to probe and review mentioned below.
and abandoning, usually, public schools in favour of private ones where the “resources follow students to non-government schools” (ABS, 2007). This consequently results in “the ongoing creation, not the mere reproduction, of educational inequalities and hierarchical categorisation and ordering of students” (Youdell, 2011: 14).

Since remote Indigenous caregivers do not have the resources to relocate their children to ‘better’ schools, resource deprivation does not occur as a consequence of this reason in their specific localities, but the effects are system wide. Remote school deprivation is endemic in the NT settler colonial context also as a consequence of postcolonial indifference. Remote Indigenous schools have often also been beset by inadequate resources, poor sanitary conditions and insufficient number of schools, qualified teachers and student places since enrolments are based not on actual student numbers, but on attendance (Appendix 1.2; AHRC, 2009; Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). Attempts to redress some of this inequity with Federal Government recommendations to redistribute funds from over-funded urban schools to underfunded remote schools were rebuffed in 2013 with the NT Government’s refusal to agree to (the Gonski) educational funding formula (Giles, 2013). In addition, the new funding formula for schools, although giving schools responsibility for their own funding, has effectively, Australian Education Union NT branch secretary Anita Johnsberg (in Dorsett, 2014) reports, halved remote school budgets leading to massive resource cuts.

Atomisation is also linked strongly to the concept of “language and social mobility … through individual ability and effort” (Wiley & Luke, 1996: 516). In terms of language policy and discourse, this manifests in arguments of individual culpability for lack of SAE language skills and academic achievement (Wiley & Luke, 1996: 516, 519). This logic contradicts the academic research that relates poor language and academic outcomes to subtractive language education (see bilingual education above) that include the lower status given to non-dominant language, culture and learners and the treatment they receive as a consequence.

As a result of neo-liberal atomisation, the poor and marginalised are “caught in a perpetual cycle of failure and blame” (Wiley & Luke, 1996: 517). This is particularly so for those whose languages or dialects are at some distance from the standard written text and schooled norm and so have lower literacy rates (Wiley & Luke, 1996). So, rather than change or reform the system, there are continuous attempts to assimilate by addressing individual linguistic lack or deficit (Wiley &

2.8c1c Instrumentation

To Foucault (1977) instrumentality, in the form of examination, was an instrument of surveillance, discipline and control. The examination, Foucault (1977) maintained:

...combines the technique of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalising judgment. It is a normalising gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them [Foucault, 1977: 184].

In terms of neo-liberalism, the normalising judgment in Instrumentation depends heavily on the metaphor of ‘the market’ and the rationale of “competitiveness in the global economy ... for education provision” (Clarke, 2012: 181). This social logic is tied to both accountability and social capital (Carusi, 2011). In this social logic, students are viewed as workers and education as the vehicles to “generate” the human capital necessary to exchange for jobs and wealth “in the marketplace of the global economy” (Clarke, 2012: 181). The way such capital is measured (judged) and valued is through various ‘testing’ instruments that include attendance, graduation rates, standardised tests and evaluative mechanisms to determine the worth of the school and its teachers (Carusi, 2011). Such an emphasis on instrumentality has had negative results in terms of narrowing educational vision and conceptualisation, Wolfe (2002) claimed. It ignores humanistic or critical elements of education. The use of standardised language testing to measure the marketability of students also presents a distorted view of the (Indigenous) cultural capital required for remote economic systems (see Guenther, 2013a; Ch5,6, 7 for more on this).

The next section outlines the historical interplay of globalisation, nation-state legitimacy and settler colonialism in Australia’s language education policy history that led to conditions where the FFHP arose and was considered ‘common sense’, ‘inevitable’ and responsible governance.
2.9 Language Education Policy History in Australia

Although Australia exhibits the typical manifestations of neo-liberal globalisation in its language policies, Australian language policy history diverges from other settler colonial counterparts in the influence of what, Lo Bianco (2001a: 14) has termed, “community activists” and “language professionals”. Lo Bianco (2001a: 16) stated that this is a consequence of compulsory voting and “more liberal citizenship laws” resulting in the “integration of minorities more quickly into the political and social fabric and electrical politics of Australia than in either the US or Britain”. This, in turn, is a consequence of identity politics becoming “prominent in Australian political discourse” which resulted in the emergence of multiculturalism and cultural pluralism as guiding principles for a “new vision of a diverse Australia” (Lo Bianco, 2001b: 43). In his treatise on Australia language policy history, Lo Bianco (2001b) outlined the historical interplay that these groups had with those in trade and diplomacy. With explicit policy came growing tension between these three groups, Lo Bianco (2001b: 16) explained. However, their interaction also brought “pluralistic and comprehensive planning for languages and indeed a kind of ‘citizen driven’ policy making” up until the 1990s when a “new interest emerged…[of] English literacy as human capital” (Lo Bianco, 2001b: 16). A brief overview of these developments is given below.

In the late 1960s, universities discarded the foreign language requirement for entry (1968) and language professionals grew to prominence in language policy issues (Lo Bianco, 2001b). Concurrently, Indigenous and ethnic language community groups also formed a coalition to advocate politically for explicit language rights and policy. Their advocacy resulted in the formation of the 1982-1984 Senate investigation into Australian languages and ultimately led to the 1987 National Policy on Languages (NPL) (Lo Bianco, 2001b). This policy espoused both “a language other than English for all”, in addition to advocating for cultural and linguistic diversity to enhance “cultural capital” and “intercultural communication” (Liddicoat, 2013: 34).

The NPL represented both an unusual policy for its time, given its national focus and a concerted, inclusive, positive and coherent attempt to address cultural diversity and language issues as the concern of ‘all’ as opposed to a concern of and with minority groups (Moore, 1996). It was also the first time the study of ILs was voiced in policy as a means by which the non-Indigenous can bridge the cultural divide (Lo Bianco, 1987; Moore, 1996). It, thereby, represented a continuation of the reformation policies of the Whitlam Government but with a focus on social
cohesion as opposed to rights, Moore (1996) contended. The NPL advocated the continuance of bilingual education with a strong development of L1 and the “positive affirmation of [Aboriginal children of non-English speaking background] linguistic and cultural background” (Lo Bianco, 1987: 73). These also became factors integral to teacher development and led to language policy changes in a broad range of sectors including education, public media and government services (Moore, 1996).

The fact that this policy espoused linguistic and cultural diversity meant, however, that the “NPL ran headlong into political processes that constructed pluralism as a problem” according to Moore (1996: 490). That is, the language and cultural rights of multicultural immigrants and Indigenous Australians over time became viewed as “ethnic particularism” and “special treatment” (Liddicoat, 2013: 34). This occurred in a period where a newly forged relationship in the 1980s between the Labor Federal Government, big business and unions effectively excluded all other parties from policy making (Moore, 1996). Multilanguage and cultural rights also contradicted the dominant view discussed earlier of diversity leading to national de-stability and the formation of groups that failed to uphold national interests (Liddicoat, 2013). The outright hostility expressed against the pluralism evident in the NPL led to language maintenance being “aligned with fanatical ‘ethnic’ groups (supposedly let out of control by Whitlam’s irresponsibility) and the spectre of ghettos and social collapse,” Moore (1996: 491) argued. Lo Bianco (1990: 2) acknowledged this policy also remained tied to the “labour market and the ways in which tackling adult illiteracy levels, extending English proficiency and teaching ‘trade languages’ would benefit Australia’s economic performance.”

Over the intervening decades, English language and literacy came to dominate as the solution to the ‘problem’ of multiculturalism and ethnic integration in addition to a way to enhance Australia’s national economic interests to the exclusion of other interests and groups (Liddicoat, 2013; Lo Bianco, 2001b). Later policy formations, delimited by considerations of economic regionalism, geopolitical interests (the languages of trade), ethnic integration and retraction from pluralism, included the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP) (1991-2005) (Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training, DEET, 1991), the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools Strategy (NALSAS) (1994-2002) (Council of
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85 While this tripartite alliance maintained social justice issues for a time, “by the late 1980s, the economic rationalist ethic had colonised social justice”, Moore (1996: 491) argued.
Australian Governments- COAG, 1994), the National Statement and Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools (2005-08) (MCEETYA, 2005) and the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Programs (NALSSP)(2009-12) (DEEWR, 2009, in Liddicoat, 2013: 33). In these policies, any benefits of language learning became increasingly demarcated by “national economic and international strategic intentions” (Truscott & Malcolm, 2010: 11, see also Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015). The focus thereby moved away from multilingualism to monolingualism in SAE and also the learning of useful ‘trade’ languages (after Britain joined the European Economic Community) and those of strategic military importance (in the post 9/11 world) (Liddicoat, 2013; Lo Bianco, 2001b; Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015; Truscott & Malcolm, 2010: 11). Indeed, Truscott and Malcolm (2010: 8) note the direct implication of SAE in “Australian identity, the carrying of Australian culture, the community and the workplace”. These policies thereby resulted in the collapse or restriction of non-SAE programs and “a decline in work on Aboriginal languages, permitted by the conflation of funding with ESL and literacy”, Moore (1996: 481) argued.

As neo-liberalism, monoethnicity and monolingualism came to increasingly dominate policy, the language interests of immigrant and Indigenous groups became progressively marginalised in and excluded from the policy process. These factors operated to the degree that language policy followed “a de facto policy of non-intervention” where IL development received no policy advocacy (Truscott & Malcolm, 2010: 11). Although proclaiming a place for Indigenous and other languages, the ALLP (DEET, 1991), for instance, made no mention of ILs in Indigenous education or bilingual education and affirmed English as the national language and “English for all” as the “number one priority” (Lo Bianco, 2001b: 64-65). ILs tuition for non-Indigenous people was dropped after the NPL (1987), although it received a short hiatus in the NSPLEAS (1991), and was soon only applied to ‘Aboriginal schools’. This limited its relevance to only local and remote contexts and was invariably tied to a transition to English and English literacy (Liddicoat, 2013; Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015).

Even when a specific IL policy came into operation, such as the National ILs Policy of 2009 (Macklin, 2009), it was not accompanied by an increase in funding (in fact, there was a reduction in real terms) and appeared to suffer the same fate of other language policies where there was a lack of practical support to preserve or revive ILs (HRSCATSIA, 2012; McKay, 2011). Indeed, as noted by McKay (2011: 305), the National ILs Policy text quickly devolved to a discussion of
English literacy, the “very focus that has undermined so much potential support for ILs over recent decades”. Although states began to create more policy devoted to ILs, this occurred largely in education policy and the funding of short-term projects (McKay, 2011). That is, the policy rhetoric on ILs education has not been followed through in any considerable measure (Truscott & Malcolm, 2010). This has occurred to the degree that there is now a violation of “democratic principles and personal rights”, Truscott and Malcolm (2010: 14) argue.

The result of all these developments has been an increasingly “state centred and directive style” of policy discourse that was orientated to marketisation and ‘language as a problem’ (the problem of multilingualism) as outlined by Ruiz (1984), as opposed to language as a resource and language as a right as advocated by the other two groups (Lo Bianco, 2001b). By the time of the Literacy for All policy in 1998, which influenced the NT Government’s announcement of the Schools Our Focus policy to halt all remote Indigenous bilingual education programs, the term ‘literacy’ was equated with English literacy at the exclusion of other languages and the primary sector was the only sector addressed (adult and community literacy were absent). This was largely a consequence of the increasing focus on national literacy standards, their assessment and measurement which were reflected in the policy (McKay, 2011; Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015). English literacy was thus constructed in the “national imagery” as “a homogenous norm for the population”, Lo Bianco (2001b: 18) admonished. Those with an ESL background were constructed as ‘at risk’ (Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015). The result has been the promulgation of English as a “key tool for integrating minorities or commercially traded in the delivery and accreditation of internationally oriented higher education” as well as being a “feature of modern science, technology and commerce” and “economic globalisation”, Lo Bianco (2008a: 343) asserts.

English acquisition, consequently, became the educational ‘standard’ for all Australian students (Liddicoat, 2013: 142). This translated into the 2008 National Partnership Agreement on Literacy (NPAL) (2008) that occurred between Australian States, Territories and the Commonwealth Government (Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015). One of the major elements in this partnership was the creation of the neo-liberal instrument NAPLAN tests. These tests (language conventions, writing and reading) have been administered to Years 3, 5, 7 and 9 students nationally since 2008. The assessment in reading is used as the measure of literacy and it is on this basis that funding is distributed to states and territories (Schalley, Guillemin & Eisenchlas, 2015).
2015: 168). The fact that reading, “the most basic skill” is used as the “proxy for literacy”, Schalley, Guillemin and Eisechlas (2015) maintain, “more solidly codifies the narrow understanding of literacy” that was evident in reports and policies prior to NAPLAN.

As a consequence of these developments, failure in English language and numeracy acquisition has become firmly constructed as “educational failure” in Aboriginal language and education policies, Liddicoat (2013: 142, 148) argues. ILS are viewed as not having a function in mainstream society, or indeed, “between Indigenous people and the dominant mainstream group” since the language of mediation is English (Liddicoat, 2013: 150). It appears, then, that historically, since the 1970s, there has been a trend of narrowing interests and objectives in language policy as well as scope of literacy and “the nation’s languages to just one, English”, as noted by Schalley, Guillemin and Eisechlas (2015). This seems to suggest a growing impact of neo-liberalism, settler colonialism and nation-state legitimacy on language policy through an increased focus on accountability and postcolonial subjectivities (of a colonial linguistic ideal and deficient ‘other’ language). The focus on English language and literacy skills in the FFHP indicates these trends and ideologies are also operating in that policy. As noted earlier, one of the aims of this study is to detail these influences of neo-liberalism, postcolonialism and nation-state legitimacy on the positionalities and subjectivities of ILS and Indigenous people in order to ascertain if, and to what extent, these ideologies prevail in the FFHP.

The next section examines the research conducted so far on the FFHP in this regard and how this particular treatise addresses the research ‘gaps’ of these studies in relation to national, economic and globalisation influences.

2.10 FFHP Research so far

While a significant amount of linguistic, educational, media and legal research and publications have been generated in relation to the FFHP (for example see Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009; Charles, 2010; Devlin, 2009a; Devlin, 2009b; Dickson, 2010; HRSCATSIA, 2012; Hughes & Huges, 2009; Waller, 2012), little critical policy research of the kind proposed here has been devoted to an examination of an ILS education policy discourse. One exception is Lo Bianco (1999) and his analysis of Hansards regarding the Schools Our Focus 1998 NT Government policy
that aimed to extinguish Indigenous bilingual schools (discussed in more detail in Ch4). Another is Waller (2012) who comes close in her analysis of media discourse in relation to bilingual education and the FFHP. However, the focus is not on CLPP, but rather the dynamics between media, research academics and politicians.

Generally, the research emphasis has not specifically addressed the FFHP or IL education policy but rather is related to the broader field of Indigenous education, such as the neo-liberal effects on Indigenous education (Fogarty, 2011; Kostogriz, 2011; Rudolph, 2011). Research has also been focused on postcolonial and critical race studies in Indigenous Education (McConaghy, 2000; Nakata, 1995, 2003; Nicholls, 2005; Rudolph, 2011; Schwab, 2012); (experiential) place based pedagogies and language as a resource (see Schwab, 1998; Fogarty, 2011; Fogarty & Schwab, 2012); as well as the effects of globalisation on vocational education and training and policy (Guenther, 2013c). There is thus a ‘gap’ in research in CLPP as it relates to postcolonial (and settler-colonial), globalisation and nation-state legitimacy studies in IL and bilingual education policy. It is the goal of this thesis to ‘close’ this ‘gap’.

2.10 Summary of Chapter 2

In this section, I have discussed the areas of research and literature findings that contextualised and informed the foundation of the literature search as well as showed key areas requiring further investigation in terms of IL policy in remote areas. A linguistic ecology at the commencement of the chapter reviewed the pastiche of traditional and newly emerged and emerging ILs in the NT that comprise the dominant or only languages used in remote Indigenous linguistic domains. From there, levels and measures of bilingualism were discussed as well as types of bilingual programs and how they reflect national language hierarchies. International and Australian research showed the benefits of positive (additive) and the detractions of negative (subtractive) bilingual education in terms of cognitive and academic, L1 and L2 acquisition and literacy, well-being, health and identity outcomes. That is, macro-political structures influence the implementation and success of bilingual programs in specific schools and this has a direct implication for bilingual education policy implementation.
LPP was defined and then discussed in terms of its role in language education policy and the group representations and hierarchies that consequently arose that led to the evolution of CLPP. CLPP was discussed in relation to critical studies on how the non-dominant are positioned, represented and maneuvered in language policy and planning and how this can manifest in institutions, discourse and social location. However, to date, with the exception of Lo Bianco (1999) and Liddicoat (2013), little attention in these areas has been devoted so far to Australian IL education policy. This thesis attempts to address this deficit in its close examination of the influence of colonisation, hegemony and ideology on the NT’s FFHP.

The next chapter presents an overview of the methodology applied in this study – the philosophy, research design, strategies and data collection an analysis – to examine the constructions and representations in policy text and discourse and interview data of participants.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

This chapter discusses the methodology applied in this research in terms of philosophy, research design and strategies, data collection methods and analysis as well as ethical issues and limitations. It begins by addressing the research question and how it is best answered through qualitative ethnographic and case study research strategies, CA and CDA. It then details the research design and philosophy, strategies of inquiry, data collection methods and data analysis methods. Finally, it examines the issues of validity and reliability associated with qualitative data analysis, ethical issues associated with interviewing Indigenous people and children and limitations of the research itself.

This thesis has analysed the FFHP discourse and the effects of the policy on the community and students at two Central Australian Indigenous communities in order to elucidate the beliefs and underlying ideologies inherent in an IL policy in addition to its effects. Its primary aim was to answer the following questions:

**What beliefs and attitudes underpin the First Four Hours of English policy?**

**What were its effects?**

This is then further broken down into three additional questions:

1. What ideologies are evident in the framing of this policy and in the political and media discourses about the policy?
2. How are they indicated by the construction and representation of languages, culture and people?
3. What were the consequences of this policy for two remote Indigenous communities which had, to that point, implemented bilingual education programs in their schools?

The investigation comprised dual lines of qualitative research – a focus on the policy and the discourse surrounding it (policy text and discourse) and its effects on those it was targeting.
(community interviews). Since the focus of examination was text, the primary analytical tools adopted were CA and CDA. CA categorises similar “discrete concepts” in text as a way to explore patterns in discourse (Ryan & Russell Bernard, 2003: 87) while CDA seeks to illuminate patterns in text by divulging its operating ideology and power relations (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). Given the distinctly different character of Indigenous thought from Western ontologies, CA was initially applied to community texts to ascertain the major beliefs and categorisations that appear in this discourse and this was then followed by CDA. As such, CDA was employed to analyse the policy texts and some selected community interview texts.

The field study to gain community interviews followed the research strategies (methodologies) of critical ethnography and case study. Critical ethnography represents an interpretivist inquiry which aims to understand human behaviour and cognition in terms of the social, historical and cultural context (Brown, 2008). In case study research, “the focus of the research is a bounded system or case” according to Brown (2008). With the inclusion of the views of the community, the research was in many respects exploratory but also employed a critical lens in order to explain socio-cultural phenomena as it related to FFHP. Such an approach entailed not just critique but, according to critical researchers Kincheloe, McLaren and Steinberg (2011: 169), the “insights from the margins of Western societies and the knowledge and ways of knowing of non-Western people”. The methodology thus also utilised participatory practice in order to ensure the centrality of highly marginalised voices.

The remainder of this chapter will explain how the methodologies and research instruments that underline this research were the appropriate choice to answer the research question. In the first part, I review the literature on methodology to support and justify methodological decisions made in this study. In the second part, I outline how the data were collected and analysed and discuss any ethical issues and limitations.

3.1 Research Type and Philosophy

The primary aim of this research was to discover how particular groups of people viewed a particular educational policy in a real world setting. This involved an inductive process in the uncovering of underlying themes and topics inherent in the data (Merriam, 2014). This primary
focus is enriched through contextual description from field notes (Merriam, 2014). In addition, the researcher in this study was “the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” which had the advantages of flexibility in and adaptability of immediate information processing as well as the ability to check with sources (Merriam, 2014: 15).

In describing qualitative inquiry both in relation to quantitative inquiry and in terms of its constituents, I largely refer to the definitions and classifications of qualitative researcher and adult education professor, Merriam (1998, 2014) who offers a concise and clear outline. As Merriam (2014: 8) notes, while quantitative or positivist researchers aim to measure an “observable...stable ... reality ‘out there’”:

Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences (Merriam, 2014: 5)

That is, qualitative researchers acknowledge that behaviour and experiences are context bound. They are situated in a socially constructed space that has its own distinctive rules and values that govern this behaviour and which is not evaluated against a socially dominant ‘norm’ in order to ascertain integrative dysfunction. Such an understanding of context bound behaviour was key in this research.

The one main criticism against such an instrument is its subjectivity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This was overcome to a degree with reflexivity – with monitoring any impact this may have had on data collection and interpretation which was done in Ch1 and in the present chapter. However, some researchers have disputed any such detraction. Pashkin (1988: 18 in Merriam, 2014: 15), for instance, maintained that the subjectivity of the researcher “can be seen as virtuous, for it is the basis of researchers making a distinctive contribution, one that results from the unique configuration of their personal qualities joined to the data they have collected”. Denzin and Lincoln (2011: 2) argue that criticism of this kind against qualitative research has a political function: “to legislate one version of truth over another”. This present research appears to be in line with Pashkin’s (1998 in Merriam, 2014) view, due to the proximity of the researcher to the lives of the research subjects, and Denzin and Lincoln’s (2011) position, since it sought to unveil a truth that differed from the mainstream.
3.1a Research Philosophy

The philosophy underlying this research is critical theory which is derived from interpretivist (or constructivist) philosophy, especially its principle that “reality is socially constructed” and that there is “no single, observable reality” (Merriam, 2014: 8). However, critical theory differs from its constructivist predecessor by having its roots in the theories of Marx, Freire’s emancipatory education and Habermas’ emancipatory knowledge. The critical researcher seeks to “frame research questions in terms of power – who has it, how it is negotiated, what structures in society reinforce the current distribution of power” (Merriam, 2014: 10). Indeed, critical theory asks who dominates in framing our current realities, what are the effects and how can we change or overcome their consequences? This is precisely what the current research seeks to find in relation to the FFHP.

Merriam (2014) also offers another category of research perspectives, that of postmodernism/poststructuralism. Postmodernism claims greater social complexity to the degree that grand narratives typical of the critical tradition cannot be applied (Fuchs & Sandoval, 2008). Rather, a more nuanced and complex analysis is warranted. The philosophy underpinning this perspective owes a large debt to Foucault (1980) and his notion of the influence of power on truth. Poststructuralism/postmodernism maintains multiple realities. This way to view reality denies absolute certainty or definable or attainable truth, instead regarding all truths as equally valid. This study, therefore, in fact, sits somewhere between critical and postmodern/poststructural analysis. This is seen in the attempt to allow participants to speak for themselves which affords a nuanced understanding of the implications of the policy. Regarding participant views as equally valid to any others, I have also engaged in some participatory practices (discussed in more detail below).

Having established the need for qualitative research to frame this research study, underpinned by both critical and postmodern philosophy, I will now discuss the research strategies of ethnography and case study that were employed.
3.2 Strategies of Inquiry - Methodologies

3.2a Case Study

The aim of investigating the impact of the FFHP in particular contexts has meant that this research has qualities of case study design. According to Merriam (2014: 43), such qualities include a bounded case or system which determines both what will and what will not be studied, and where data collection “focuses on holistic description and explanation” (as opposed to any particular methods). In addition, the case study inquiry involves initial theory development in the design phase, making this different from more phenomenological, grounded theory, or ethnographical approaches (Merriam, 2014; Yin, 2009). However, Yin (2009: 20), as a policy analyst, has added that apart from explanation and description, case studies can also explore an issue or event, including interventions (such as the FFHP).

The collection of data pertaining to descriptions about and explanations of the effects of the FFHP from school attenders, parents, ex-teachers and key personnel on the two communities means this research effectively involves multiple case studies of the FFHP intervention. This description is justified since there is a clear “demarcation” and “casing” of the multisite system as it pertains to two communities only and is related to a single common issue, the FFHP (Yin, 2009: 18). The research also sought to explore the consequences of this policy intervention in two communities in terms of ‘why’ it was created, the ideologies and power dynamics that drove the policy, and ‘how’ the FFHP has impacted on these communities. These are two questions types that Yin (2009: 18) has identified as the hallmarks of case study selection since they represent the study of a ‘real life’ issue inextricably linked to a context with “no clear set of outcomes”. Another factor that made this study fit case study methods was the collection of multiple sources of data (including ethnographic journaling and observations that influenced the interpretation of interviews). This created a highly detailed, contextual, complete and “in-depth” picture of the two communities (as advocated by Yin, 2009: 18).

Phenomenological approaches study the basic structures of lived experiences. Grounded theory approaches deal with the desire to create substantive, or everyday realisations of, theory. Ethnographical approaches involve the study of culture, cultural patterning and human society (Merriam, 2014; Yin, 2009).
There are advantages to case studies, particularly in the social sciences and humanities. Since there “cannot exist predictive theory in social science”, our best way of accruing knowledge of an event or process is through the case study (Flyvbjerg, 2011: 303). Hans Eysenck (1976: 9) has concurred and stated “sometimes we simply have to keep our eyes open and look carefully at individual cases – not in the hope of proving anything, but rather in the hope of learning something!” As such, being the first critical language policy study of this type in Australian Indigenous contexts, a case study in this research is thereby highly desirable, if not necessary. Having multiple case studies of two sites, Yin (2009: 61) observes, is even better due to the possibility of offering even greater and more powerful “analytical benefits” of theoretical replication and prediction (Yin, 2009).

However, case studies, due to their flexibility in design and their focus on particular contexts have also been criticised (Merriam, 2014; Yin, 2009). Yin (2009) notes that where there are a number of units of analysis, there is a danger that the focus can shift from the major unit of analysis to minor units and become a quite contrasting study that fails to answer the research question(s). To avoid this, it is necessary to maintain a focus on the main issue or to restructure the design and create a new research question (Yin, 2009). To overcome this in this research, I maintained a focus on the main issues of power and ideology in policy texts and the effects of the FFHP.

3.2b Ethnography

In some respects, this research is also ethnographic. Derived from anthropological field studies, ethnography, according to Riemer (2009: 204-205), involves the study of “a particular culture group or phenomenon”. It involves field studies and documentation of practices and beliefs in the field, typically with observations, interviews and documents (Naidu, 2012; Riemer, 2009). Its defining characteristic is that of cultural interpretation or “the ability to describe what the researcher has heard and seen within the framework of the social group’s view of reality”
Ethnography was appropriated by language education researchers in the 1960s and 1970s and led to the examinations of wider societal relations of power and economics that manifest in school contexts. This has occurred in the work of Norton (2000) in addition to Hornberger (1994), Watson-Gegeo (1997), Moll (2000) and Toohey (2000) (all in Toohey, 2008: 178-180). These scholars have studied how language learning, identities, resources and practices are inhibited or “enabled by wider societal processes” (Toohey, 2008: 178), approaches similar to those of the present research.

As such, this study has employed ethnography to examine how language learning is both hindered and helped by broader societal forces through the analysis of the impact of a language policy. It aimed to detail and analyse the lives of people in two particular communities as it related to the impact of the FFHP on the population and practices of the schools there. The research also aimed to detail the communities’ “views of reality” through observer participation, being a product of both time spent in the two communities, the long length of time spent in the Central Australian context and the implementation of participatory strategies (Fetterman, 1989: 28 in Riemer, 2009; see below). The research also used typical ethnographic data collection strategies of interviews, participant observation, journaling and reflection (but the latter three were only used to interpret interviews).

3.2c Critical Ethnography

This study has adopted a critical ethnography approach which provides both a reflexive and personal positioning of the researcher (Simon & Dippo, 1986). Critical discourse analysts, Wodak and Meyer (2009: 3), note that critical connotes critiquing text to discern power inequalities. In language education research, critical ethnography entails engaging:

---

87 Participant observation can involve participant observation, observer participation and complete observation (Naidu, 2012). While long periods of field work did not occur in this study, prior to this research there had been long engagement with remote communities and remote education systems as a consequence of my working life at Batchelor Institute as noted in Ch1.
... with the experiences of learners to understand how power operates locally and at more macro levels so as to investigate how social change might support minoritised peoples’ experiences in learning (Toohey, 2008: 183).

This study follows the pattern of critical ethnography in its positioning of the researcher and acknowledgment and articulation of their subjectivities in terms of biographical influence on personal opinion. There was also an outline of theoretical principles that are applied in this research (Ch2) as well as details on data (and participant) selection, collection and processing and research conclusion (later in this chapter) (as outlined by Molyneux, 2005; Simon & Dippo, 1986). For example, in this research, there was explicit explanation of research choices (Ch1) and findings as they related to the idea of “critical reflexivity” – a self-reflective process of the “intentions, choices, and processes” used in the research (Molyneux, 2005: 135). Simon and Dippo (1986: 200) contended, that this is a particularly important process, since it can reveal our own social situatedness and relatedness as well as the cultural structures in which we operate in the production of knowledge.

The combination of critical ethnography and CDA, Johnson (2011) argues, has particular application in language policy studies since it can:

provide a foundation for understanding how particular policies are recontextualised in particular contexts, how such recontextualisation is related to more widely circulating policy text and discourse, and what this means for language policy agents (Johnson, 2011: 267).

The combination of ethnography and CDA has also been used by Johnson (2011) in a very similar analysis of bilingual education in a language education policy environment that increasingly favoured English, but within the United States.

However, critical ethnography is not without its detractions or limitations which apply equally to this study. It suffers, Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 17) contended, from a “triple crisis of representation, legitimation, and praxis”. Representation involves the inability of critical ethnographers to “directly capture lived experience” since “Such experience ... is created in the social text written by the researcher” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 17). Legitimation involves how research is evaluated and interpreted since the traditional quantitative interpretations of the terms reliability, validity and generalisability do not apply (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 17). Praxis
arises because of the former two and the question for this element asked is, “Is it possible to effect change in the world if society is only and always a text?” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 17). Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 17) suggested that solutions to problems of representation and praxis are being offered by the “Epistemologies from previously silenced groups” which has resulted in greater participatory and political activist research. This was achieved in this study, as explored more fully in the next section, 

**Ethnography in Cross-cultural Research.** The crisis of legitimation can be resolved, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) noted, by qualitative definitions of validity and reliability. Such definitions apply also to this study and are explored in the Data Analysis section below. In this study they are additionally resolved by a triangulation of methods (CA and CDA). The crisis of praxis is thus remedied by addressing the former two dilemmas – the use of participatory research methods, Indigenous epistemologies, triangulation of methods and qualitative definitions of validity and reliability (which are explored more fully below). These elements combine to create a space in the Western academy for Indigenous voices and thus offer a means to resolve and change how Indigenous voices can influence public discourse.

### 3.2d Ethnography in Cross-Cultural Research

While ethnography claims to offer the worldview of the insider, that is the views of the group being studied, it has also been critiqued for its potential failure to accurately capture these perspectives. In Indigenous research, Denzin and Lincoln (2011) have identified this as a problem of Western dominated research. The non-dominant Indigene, occupying the periphery, have their views interpreted by the centre since research is judged by this central standard (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This is also related to Bourdieu’s (1991: 24) critique of academia and its purpose of “creating and sustaining inequalities” by legitimising the dominance of Western cultural capital and negatively discursively naming and positioning those who experience the least inculcation of it (Bourdieu, 1991). Academic researchers in cross-cultural environments are consequently always grappling with the issue of recognising difference while concurrently being mindful of how their own cultural values and norms influence how difference is viewed and interpreted. That is, the sociocultural and economic positioning of the researcher and the researched influences how data is collected, interpreted and presented since the research is “described/prescribed by members of the dominant way of knowing” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2011: 86).
Fairclough (2003: 41-42) has asserted that dominant bias can be overcome when discourse becomes replete with many voices and many meanings (through intertextuality) and when we orientate ourselves positively to difference. That is, if we imbue our research and discourse with positive orientations to difference (as in this research) our interpretations and findings will be less skewed by privileged dominance.

Dunbar (2008) has suggested that the main strategy to ensure researcher’s views and interpretations are more aligned with the Indigenous ‘other’ and that “prescriptive rules and canons” of dominant thought have less influence is to decolonise research methodology. Decolonising research is a phrase coined by Tuhiriwai Smith (1999, 2012) in her ground-breaking book and second edition of *Decolonising Methodologies Research and Indigenous Peoples*. This book and its second edition examined the intersection of Western research and disciplines of knowledge with Western imperialism where stereotypical discourses of the ‘other’ are used to legitimise domination and rule, to problematise and destroy Aboriginal culture and influence the perspectives of the researcher. While there is some dispute as to whether non-Indigenous researchers can in fact engage in decolonising research, the term generally refers to deconstructing “underlying texts” and transforming the problematised and silenced position of Indigenous subjects to that of highly respected and knowledgeable participants. In this way, decolonising research thereby gives voice to previously unarticulated and invariably unknown issues, concepts and concerns (Smith, 2012). This audibility of Indigenous voices is one of the main aims of this research.

Christie (2006b) maintains that to voice the perspectives of the ‘other’ requires *transdisciplinary* research where there is considerable compromise and contestation in an attempt to satisfy both Indigenous and academic research paradigms. It is most successful where the narratives of both are “collaboratively, contextually” communicated in order to reach “shared understandings” (Christie, 2006b: 82). It requires from the researcher an understanding that remoteness has particular “assets and benefits” and that justice “implies diversity, polyvocality and situated judgment” (Christie, 2006a: 29). When this is achieved, you break some of the ties that position Western knowledge in the *centre*, silencing the voices of the periphery, and you situate “language and identity ... at the heart of ... research and educational practice” (Christie, 2006a: 29). The dependence of successful research on contextual, situated, linguistic and narrative factors in Indigenous environments was also noted in Canada and the United States:
Places are geographies of social meaning and identity that naturalise situated ‘worlds of sense’ (Field & Basso, 1996: 8). Local language practices embody and transport those meanings across time and space (McCarty, Nicholas & Wyman, 2012: 51).

Australian Indigenous academic, Martin Nakata (2007), borrowed from feminist standpoint and critical postmodern theory to articulate such an Indigenous centric position that acknowledges power differentials, ongoing colonisation, hegemonic discourse and practice and incorporates Indigenous methodologies and place based knowledge. It is this approach that this study has taken in order to decolonise the research. Nakata (2007) views Indigenous Standpoint theory as:

...theorising knowledge from a particular and interested position, not to produce the “truth” of the Indigenous position or the awful “truth” of the “dominant” colonial groups but to better reveal the workings of knowledge and how understanding of Indigenous people is caught up and is implicated in its work (Nakata, 2007: 12).

Nakata (2007) explains that three principles underlie this approach. The first is the need to reflect on how we come to ‘know’. This relates to the functional role of language and how dominant signs and signifiers are internalised and form the corpus of our knowledge. This study attempts to discern this through CDA of media and government texts. The second principle is “what I can know from this constituted position” and affording “agency to people” (Nakata, 2007: 12, 13). The third principle is the awareness of everyday “tensions created between Indigenous and non-Indigenous dualities [that] ... limit not just the range but the diversity of responses from Indigenous people” (Nakata, 2007: 12).

This study has attempted to achieve the latter two principles through infusing the traditional data collection methods of group interviews, individual interviews, observations and ethnographic field notes with culturally relevant norms, behaviours, values and “Aboriginal ways of doing things”, in addition to a full and frank discussion of the issues surrounding FFHP. The data collection in terms of what can I know – or in fact find out – from this constituted position

---

88 I acknowledge and agree with Guenther, et al (2014: 4) that a “non-Indigenous researcher can never adopt Indigenous methodologies nor claim to operate from Indigenous standpoints. However, they can adopt positions that are congruent with the goals and needs of indigenous peoples in a “respectful way” and with “cultural sensitivity” (Guenther, et al, 2014: 4)
was also assisted in my case as a consequence of my position and history in the region. I am married to an Indigenous man with familial, ceremonial, political, social and/or traditional links to participants in both communities with some understanding of the protocols, ethics and issues effecting these remote centres. This was also facilitated by my long term relationship to BIITE, a well-known local Indigenous tertiary education provider with a strong presence in the region. By being able to place myself contextually and historically in relation to BIITE and my husband, his land and culture I was recognised as an ‘insider’ to a degree. This meant also that there was greater equality and relationships engendered between the participants and myself than would normally happen between two subjects of such power differentials. It also meant that I was familiar with social protocols, values, world views and perspectives. Indeed, my history and experience in the region has meant that I had already interrogated Western bias (both my own and those of others) and shared many of the perspectives and views of the participants. This resulted in greater participant agency and power to voice their views in the research (as shown in the transcripts), to not participate (which a number of prospective participants chose to do) or to withdraw from the study (which none chose to do).

In addition, I have also attempted to incorporate Indigenous agency through the use of aspects of community participatory research. As such, this research involves a number of principles as outlined by the Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal and Tropical Health (Henry, Dunbar, Arnott, Scrimgeour, Matthews, Muralakami-Gold & Chamberlain, 2002: 8) of:

- shared ownership of research projects
- community-based analysis of social problems; and
- an orientation towards community action

In effect, it is a combination, Henry, et al (2002: 9) declared, of “research, education and social action”. They also claimed that these principles should be underpinned by the following precepts:

1. Resistance and emancipation
2. Political integrity

Kumaravadivelu (2012: 461) defines the most common type of resistance as “systematic and sustained subversion” within existing social and power networks, as opposed to the more extreme “systemic social and discursive change”.

In this research, this involved ongoing negotiation and consultation with Indigenous organisations or representatives on the two communities (in this case, three to four representatives from each community on the Indigenous reference committee, local members of the Shire Council, a local media business and local and executive members of the Central Land Council – the latter two operating informally with contacts acquired in both organisations). It also involved the acknowledgement of knowledge ownership by the two communities and consequently (as part of Western ethics protocol and demands of community agencies) formal written permission for use of data in the thesis and for publication.

The community based analysis of the social problems, in effect, means that the community becomes a stakeholder in and owner of the research, that there is a reciprocity and “privileging of Indigenous voices” (Rigney 1999 in Henry, et al, 2008: 8). This can involve review, revision and the reaffirmation of an Indigenous perspective or even the use of more appropriate methodologies (Guenther, Osborne, Arnott, McRae-Williams & Disbray, 2014). In this study, this was achieved with snowball interviews (consulting with participants and key community members for possible further participants); regular debriefing and consultation with key community members (with knowledge and/or experience of FFHP in that context) while in the communities; data check by participants (where transcripts were personally given, read or sent to participants for them to review and change if necessary); a semi-structured interview technique to allow flexibility; a more culturally relevant methodology (face to face interviews); and a review of final findings and analysis with community members individually and at community meetings during subsequent visits. Health researchers, Sherwood and Kendall (2013: 87), note that such participatory measures are both “critical to the value/relevance of the research being undertaken and to the validity/rigour of the data being revealed” (see below). Unfortunately, due to the size of the study, the limited resources, the distance between the university and the two communities as well as the strictures of Western research ethics that were applied in this research, greater control over and participation by the communities in the research was not possible.

Another key ingredient of Indigenous research is also implicated in this study of “building relationships” in communities. During the research I regularly ‘dropped in’ on those who I had
previously interviewed and so continued these relationships. Of course, my status as a BIITE employee and wife of a local *gilpi* (old man/elder) meant that I automatically had a particular position that facilitated such relationships. In addition, these relationships will not cease with the research but will continue on beyond it. Ensuring all the above factors are operating, Guenther, et al (2014) argue, also ensures that data quality is enhanced in terms of validity, reliability and trustworthiness (see below).

### 3.3 Data Collection Methods

Having described the methodological framework and strategies of inquiry that I employed in the study, I now wish to explain how data collection was undertaken. I will first describe and justify the data collected and the type of collection methods employed.

As discussed, this study used multiple qualitative methods. The use of diverse strategies in this study includes;

- the collection of policy text and policy discourse documents such as
  - media and
  - government oral and written text
- field data through
  - individual interviews
  - group interviews
  - observations and
  - ethnographic field notes
  - Interviews with academic and language experts

Sadler (1985: 144) contended that such a diverse range of data is “not only legitimate and possible but necessary” in policy analysis, reasoning that the enactment of policy can have unintentional consequences that only diverse methodologies and strategies of data collection of ethnographic field work can elucidate. A table (Table 3.1, p. 104) in this section of the document reveals a summary of the data collection mechanisms that were employed in the study.
3.4 Documents for Analysis

Below is an outline of the data collected over the course of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>17 interviews in total</th>
<th>12 interviewees in total</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Area Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 linked to the school in the past</td>
<td>5 Community leaders</td>
<td>To gather information about the impact of the FFHP on the community and individuals within the school</td>
<td>Interview Questions Plain Language Statement Consent Form</td>
<td>Appendix 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 young adults who participated in the bilingual program</td>
<td>4 with past positions in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on the school board</td>
<td>2 young adults who participated in the bilingual program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 non-Indigenous</td>
<td>1 non-Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>12 interviewees in total</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Area Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Community leaders</td>
<td>To gather information about the impact of the FFHP on the community and individuals within the school</td>
<td>Interview Questions Plain Language Statement Consent Form</td>
<td>Appendix 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 with past positions in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 young adults who participated in the bilingual program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 non-Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Area Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Interviewees in total</td>
<td>To gather information about the history of bilingual education and the impact of English only instruction on communities and individuals working with the school</td>
<td>Interview Questions Plain Language Statement Consent Form</td>
<td>Appendix 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 with prior teaching experience in remote NT schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 language specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher journal</th>
<th>Attendance data</th>
<th>Discourse Analysis Texts Analysed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily entry on observations and discussions</td>
<td>Compare and contrast bilingual and non-bilingual school years and schools</td>
<td>To gather texts for CDA on the rationale of and ideology in the FFHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On MySchools website</td>
<td>Compulsory Teaching in English for the First Four Hours of each school day – policy and guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marian Scrymgour –The Language Gap- ABC News online opinion piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NT: Bilingual Education – House of Representatives Procedural Text, Petitions Response –Julia Gillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Barnes (Minister of Education) Interview (2010)– Four Corners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Text and Participant Data Collection

3.4a Policy Texts and Discourse

Texts acquired for analysis should be determined by the purpose of the study and policy implementation can be either “top down or bottom up”, Rizvi and Lingard (2010: 35) argue. Research associated with the latter occurs prior to policy implementation and deals with ways
to effect successful policy change by initially accounting for context, culture, structures and strategies which are mediated by professionals. Top down research deals with the effects of policy implementation that may fail to account for context and usually deals with deficiencies in policy and reasons for its failure. This is the focus of this study and so text selection is ‘after the fact’ of policy creation and enactment. Therefore, texts were selected for diversity of genre (from policy text to media articles, Hansard reports and television interviews) across two fields of action (lawmaking procedures as well as formation of public attitudes and opinions as in figure 3.1, p. 123 below), relevance to the FFHP; and the involvement of government officials who were instrumental in creating or enacting the policy.

The main texts subjected to CDA were the 2008 policy statements (policy and guidelines). These captured the basic concepts that inspired and underpinned the creation of the policy. The media text chosen for CDA was one that had actually been written by the office of the NT Education Minister involved in the creation of the FFHP. It consists of a response to articles criticising the implementation of the policy and, thereby, is an example text that can depict the government ideologies and framing used in creating and justifying the FFHP. Similarly, the Hansard transcript of a letter issued by then Federal Education Minister, Julia Gillard, also represents the actual voice and ideologies of government. This letter of support for the FFHP was a response to community criticism of the policy. In addition, there is also the transcript of a television interview conducted with Gary Barnes, a Minister involved in the FFHP creation and implementation, sitting at meetings with Marion Scrymgour at the time the FFHP came into effect. This interview centred on government views of bilingual education and preferred methods of literacy teaching, the circumstances, events, evidence and arguments that led to the FFHP, any support or resistance in the communities, and national or international implications of the policy.

3.4b Field Data

Field work was conducted in two Central Australian communities. One, Site 1, is a sizable community by Central Australian Standards (approximately 800). It has a strong IL and culture tradition and a long standing bilingual education program that was abruptly stopped when the FFHP came into effect but now has IL classes slowly increasing (Devlin, 2010; Dickson, 2010; Whitmont, 2009; Appendix 1.2). The other research site, Site 2, is of approximately 300 people,
also with a strong language and cultural tradition and a long standing bilingual education program (McDonald Shire Council, 2011). However, exceptional to the NT, its bilingual program unofficially continued and was sanctioned by the Department of Education after a case was made to the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission in 2010 (Williams, 2011; Appendix 1.2).

Site 1 and Site 2 were chosen, apart from their easy accessibility, for the very long and almost identical historical duration and continuity of their bilingual programs. This long and rich history of bilingual education on both communities meant there was a larger number of extant texts related to the history of bilingual education in these sites compared to other bilingual schools (Devlin, 1995; Disbray, 2014; Laughren, 2013; Appendix 1.2). However, the interruption of a bilingual program at Site 1 and the continuation of a bilingual program at Site 2 with the introduction of the FFHP in 2009 differentiated these sites.

In addition, both communities have outspoken and well-known linguistic and Indigenous educators of long service at the school, still connected to the school or residing within the community (Baarda, 2008a; Whitmont, 2009). Both communities were also keenly interested when I discussed the project with a number of members when I was working for BIITE. The communities thus identified represent ones that were keen to have a ‘voice’ in the bilingual debate and their differences afford points of comparison and contrast.

Given the cultural environment, it was deemed more ethically appropriate to conduct spoken interviews with participants since written questions and surveys are an ‘alien’ method of communication in these contexts and fail to engender trusting relationships. Research in the communities, therefore, comprised group and individual interviews with students (recruited through caregivers who were also participants), community leaders and Indigenous ex-teachers who had worked in bilingual education. There was the intention to interview Indigenous school staff and non-Indigenous teachers and principals but denial of ethics clearance from the NT Department of Education (NTDE) precluded this. The number of interviews conducted was inevitable due to the small size of the research project and saturation of data (where themes, topics and categories recurring in interview data signalled “comprehension and completeness” in data collection) (Elo, Kääriäinen, Kanste, Pölkki, Utriainen & Kyngäs, 2014: 5). In addition to interviews, there was a description of the community in the field as well as the ethnographic
method of journaling to enable a comprehensive and sophisticated appraisal of the effects of
the FFHP, but these sources of data were largely used for the socio-political contextualisation of
NT bilingual education history in Ch1, 2 and Appendix 1.2 and community interview analysis as
opposed to having a direct impact on the findings.

Research outside the communities involved interviews with educational and linguistic experts
in bilingual education in remote Indigenous contexts. Due to the large amount of data and the
need to focus directly on the effects of the FFHP on communities, data from expert interviews
were used to socio-historically contextualise NT bilingual education in chapters 1, 2 and
Appendix 1.2. The next subsection has a more detailed description of the type of data collection
mechanisms involved for each stage of the research.

3.4b1 Recruitment

Members of the local Shire Council office were asked to identify initial participants who were
prominent respected members of the community with experience in bilingual education. These
were predominantly ex-Indigenous teachers who had worked at the school or other community
participants with experience or some connection to education in the community (such as
members of the School Council). These members, in turn, suggested further participants.
Children were recruited by adult carer participants in consultation with the researcher. In this
way, those selected to participate in this study were effectively selected by the participants
themselves due to their experience and knowledge of remote Indigenous education. Again, this
complies with the principles appropriate to the participation of Indigenous people in the process
of Indigenous research (see below) and adds to the reliability and validity of the study since
selection is made with Indigenous knowledge and direction.
3.4b2 Interviews

The total number of interviewees is 17 adults and 12 children (10 primary school children and 2 post primary) at Site 1 and 12 adults and 12 primary school children at Site 2. These interviewees were identified by other members of the community (see recruitment above) since the latter knew potential participants well and because this procedure conforms to the requirements of Indigenous participation in the process of research (according to Cross-cultural Ethnography above and Recruitment and Ethical Considerations below). Sampling for the group and individual interviews was purposive (non-probability) as opposed to random since the participants were expected to meet particular criteria (experience as an educator, experience with bilingual education as a teacher/teaching assistant or on the school council or participation as a student at the school). According to Sadler (1985), random sampling can lead to errors in a study of this type since selection can occur of participants with non-typical qualities.

Each interview aimed to be no more than one hour long and, although the initial few were video-taped, the majority were audio taped due to superior audio quality and the analytical focus on meaning, discourse analysis and linguistic realisations as opposed conversational analysis (or “talk in interaction”, as described by Kvale, 2007: 111).

3.4b3 Success in Semi-Structured Interviews

Rapport has been identified as a necessary element for success in unstructured and semi-structured interviews (Fontana & Frey, 1994). This, in turn, brings a naturalness to the interview as well as offering something of oneself to the interviewee. As discussed above, I had existing rapport with interviewees because of my status as a regional (BIITE) lecturer, my relationship with my husband and my history in the region and so could offer this to interviewees as a way of establishing my knowledge ‘credentials’. In fact, a number of participants noted that they

---

90 The interview questions were semi-structured which had a number of advantages. They allowed; flexibility in exploring some topics in greater detail; greater control by and interactionality between the researcher and the participant; and the exploration of evolving topics, such as the effects of language education well-being, resilience and social functioning in this study, that might not have been anticipated prior to the study (Mason, 2002).
I knew me through knowing my husband. I also used the vernacular as a way of expressing ideas (Aboriginal English and some local IL language) and basically, sat in the dirt with the kids and the dogs – a place where interviewees and I felt most comfortable and at a time and place (invariably in the yard) convenient to them.

3.4b4 Individual Interviews

The majority of adult interviews in both communities were individual. This was partly due to the difficulty of getting an interpreter who knew English better than the participants to participate in group interviews and the logistics of getting a group together. It was also due to the fact that most preferred to be interviewed individually. This was possibly also a consequence of the previous research experience of individuals (such as interviews in meetings with government representatives, other researchers and at parliamentary committee hearings). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) note that individual interviews have particular advantages over group interviews. They emphasise both “the centrality of human interaction for knowledge production” and the “social situatedness of research” and so allow an interviewee to reveal their “interpretations of the world” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011: 409). Being slightly different from group interviews (discussed below), the individual interview “validates other methods” and thus enhances the triangulation of methods (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011: 411). In this research, I noted in my ethnographic journal the intensity of interaction and the expression of deeply held views that occurred with individual interviews as well as the growing rapport with participants (where some held my arm and one participant gave me a kiss goodbye!). These were positive and necessary elements in this research given the cultural emphasis on relationships (Sherwood & Kendall, 2013).

3.4b5 Group Interviews

Group interviews involve interaction between a group of participants as opposed to interaction with an individual interviewee and interviewer (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). In this way, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011: 436) note, they thus represent a “collective rather than an individual view”. This makes them also suitable for remote NT contexts since the culture in this environment focuses on “relationality, reciprocity ... and [is] community-based” (Biermann &
Townsend-Cross, 2008: 148). In this study, however, it was somewhat rare that I was able to achieve group interviews with adult community members (there was only one group interview involving four participants and a translator) due to the reasons outlined above. Most of the adult participants in this study were also highly confident and knowledgeable about the topic as well as of sufficient oral English language ability to be competent in and keen for individual interviews.

However, there were a number of group interviews with students (in pairs and in groups of four). This was largely due to the participation of caregivers (who would interpret) when interviewing students. This occurred on all occasions except one (with two group interviews of four) at Site 2. At Site 2, I knew the participants well. So, the children felt comfortable and the interviews were done outside in public view. In addition, the students at Site 2 had stronger English language skills which meant they were sufficiently competent for the purpose of the interview.

The adult group interview involved an interpreter and their extended family, some of whom had experience in bilingual education in the school. Others were highly placed elders (and thereby cultural educators) who regularly organised and attended traditional ceremonies. The group interview, thereby, provided a good opportunity to see how these participants viewed the interplay of language, culture and school in addition to what they perceived as the effects on communities with and without bilingual education.

**3.4b6 Interviews of Experts**

Community interviews were supplemented by six interviews with language experts. All had personal experience in bilingual education and so could relate to personal experience apart from their own academic or other expertise in the area. Questions directed at experts pertained to their history in bilingual education, their evaluation of Federal and Territory policy on IL education, their views on ‘ideal’ language policies, details on the training of bilingual staff and resources created and allocated to bilingual schools as well as greater community responses and reactions to the FFHP.
Each expert participant received and read a plain language statement and signed a consent form. The interviews ran from between 25 minutes to 1.5 hours. Again, ‘snowball’ interviews were used where NT experts in the field were initially identified and then asked to recommend others. Other interviews, which included some of those with teaching experience in bilingual education, were opportunistic. The number of interviews of this type were largely a product of the saturation of data but the researcher also had to be mindful of constraints in the size of the project. Given the small size of the project, it was later deemed more efficacious to not submit expert interviews to CA and CDA but include them as important primary sources in Chapter 1, 2 and Appendix 1.2.

3.4b7 Ethics and Interpretation/Translation

All participants signed a plain language statement (Appendices 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) and consent form (Appendices 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7) (including guardian consent where applicable) thus conforming to the requirements of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Central Australian Human Ethics Committee through which this research was required to have ethics clearance. None of the adult participants required assistance with these forms (these were read out and explained by the researcher) and adults interpreted the contents for children (for more information on ethics, see the Ethics section below).

As discussed above, a translator/interpreter was only used in one community and for a limited time which meant that a number of interviews in that community were conducted without a translator. However, as stated, the majority of the adults interviewed in both communities without a translator showed considerable strength and knowledge and good English language skills (often equivalent to a translator). Children, however, particularly at Site 1, appeared less grounded in English. Caregivers, present during the child interviews, acted as interpreters/translator. This meant that there was greater precision in terms of understanding a question but there was a tendency in a few cases for the caregiver to ‘direct’ the answers from the children (again, this happened at Site 1). While there was an effort to exclude such data from the student analysis, this factor needs to be considered in the analysis of children’s answers.
3.4b8 Transcription

As noted earlier, it was decided early on to use audio as opposed to video recording due to poor video sound quality. Kvale (2007: 93) notes that with such a large body of interviews and where the content of what is said represents the focus, videos are often “too cumbersome for the analysis of the interview content”. For two interviews, the respondents did not want audio recording and so the interview transcripts were rendered from notes. I decided to transcribe the tapes myself, since I understood the accents, syntax, grammar and lexis commonly used in Central Australia which can be foreign to those outside. Since the content of the transcription was the key focus in the interviews (as opposed to conversational analysis), pauses, sighs and other non-lexical expressions were not included in the transcription. However, repetitions, syntactical, grammatical and lexical nuances (which often reflected Aboriginal English) were transcribed in order to retain “the conviction of a good story”, the “rhetorical force” and to reflect the site context (Kvale, 2007: 34). In addition, interpretation of a text by an interpreter on site (as in the case of interviews at Site 2) was denoted by []. Replacement of key names that would reveal the identity of respondents and case study sites were enclosed in ().

3.4b9 Observations

The observation strategies used - journaling and community description - derive from critical ethnographic techniques that seek to address broad structural accounts of domination as well as socially negotiated meanings, “symbolic action” and individual social agency (Anderson, 1989: 251). Data were collected with this view in mind as well as the subjectivities of the researcher to create a reflexive account that contains “creativity and human agency” and details the dialectic operating between the structural and the social. In this study, observations detailed any changes that occurred due to the collapse of local community councils into large shires (where council work was now largely ‘off-site’ or involved non-Indigenous contractors from outside the community); the Intervention (where adult community independence and self-determination were compromised); the closure of or reduction in grade levels for high school (with increasing numbers of adolescents wandering the streets); and changes in the level of and support for L1 education at the local schools (with less community interaction with the school and the difficulty in sustaining L1 programs). That is, there was a desire to observe and reflect
on the larger structural constraints acting on the community that impacted on the daily
interactions of its members. These observations were used in this study to support socio-
historical analysis for Ch1, 2 and Appendix 1.2 as well as a nuanced interpretation of policy texts,
policy discourse and interviews.

After a brief introduction to general qualitative data analysis and how this relates to the data
analysis strategies, the next section describes the application of CA and the then CDA.

3.5 Data Analysis

3.5a Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis seeks to find patterns or themes (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011).91
There is no one correct method for qualitative analysis other than “fitness for purpose” (Cohen,
Manion & Morrison, 2011: 537). That is, the type of data analysis used will depend on both the
research question(s) and “what the researcher ... wants the data analysis to do” such as to
describe, to summarise, to disclose patterns or to engender themes (Cohen, Manion & Morrison,
2011: 529). The defining characteristic of all qualitative data analysis is for it to be an
interpretive, comparative and reflexive process in which data collection determines data
analysis and visa versa. Essentially, this requires “an open and emergent” process whereby
“predetermined hypothesis ... cannot be presumed” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011: 226).

This study was designed to adhere to the above characteristics in a reiterative process of data
collection, data comparison and data interpretation. Interpretation relied on both community
respondents and social and political elements embedded in bilingual, CLLP and Indigenous
research literature. Analysis was achieved using both CDA (for policy and key community
interview texts) and CA (to ascertain emerging categories in community interviews).

91 In this research, I follow Glaser and Strauss (1967) and use the term ‘categories’ to describe the phenomenon of
classifying concepts into abstract units that share similarities (Ryan & Russell Bernard, 2003: 87).
3.5a1 Content Analysis

CA dates back to 18th century Scandinavia and was used both as a quantitative (where text was statistically described) and qualitative method (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). From the 1990s, CA has largely been employed qualitatively in order to garner a firmer understanding and knowledge of text. It is a term that applies to a general method of text analysis that uses a process of coding and identifying themes in a text to obtain inferred or explicit categories of meaning (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

There are generally two approaches to CA – inductive (where categories evolve from data in an area where little is known or where there has been little research) or deductive (an a priori approach) in which:

... already previously agreed or professional definitions found in literature reviews; from local, common sense constructs; and from researchers’ values, theoretical orientations, and personal experiences (Bulmer, 1979; Strauss, 1987; Maxwell, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 41–47 in Ryan & Russell Bernard, 2003: 88).

Categories, as in this case, generally initially arise from the interview questions (informed by previous research, knowledge and even experience) and empirical data. The generation of categories derives from a process termed ‘open coding’ by grounded theorists and ‘qualitative analysis’ by classic content analysts (Ryan & Russell Bernard, 2003). In this particular study, this involved the analysis of data for repetitions, Indigenous cultural domains and similarities or differences (with the use of Glaser & Strauss, 1967, constant comparison method). In addition, it required examining data using a priori theorising which involved searching interview transcripts for evidence of views on social conflict or social control and respondent perspectives on “objects, processes, activities, events, and relationships that linked to prior theorising” (Ryan & Russell Bernard, 2003: 94). However, much of the foci of category creation remained inductive

---

92 In this study, the constant comparison method was achieved in a four staged process that follows, but differs from, Glaser’s (1965) in its inclusion of existing abstract theory and theory derived from the data. These phases were;
(1) comparing incidents applicable to each category,
(2) integrating categories and their properties,
(3) delimiting the theory, and
(4) creating or re-iterating the theory (Glaser, 1965: 439)
to ensure that lived experience became the location of knowledge production (Barnacle, 2004: 61). It was also used to ensure that new categories of analysis could emerge. This was particularly important given the fact that remote Indigenous community systems, according to Guenther (2015b), are invariably complex to outsiders given their difference from mainstream systems. It is vital, Guenther (2015b) argues, that community members are consulted in order to identify the elements that comprise these systems as well as how they interact. Categories that emerged from this study followed this process and were largely elements identified by respondents and other Indigenous research in the field.

Code names were derived both from research literature (constructed codes) as well as “taken from interviewees expressions (in vivo codes)” (Flick, 2006: 299). These codes were then made more abstract. Similar or related (descriptive) codes were combined into overarching (axial or analytical) categories and the relationships between categories and sub-categories established (Flick, 2006). Selective coding was then conducted to delimit data to two overarching categories (one, Language and Culture, actually subsumed within the other, Government authority/control) so that codes reflected a theory that accounted for “patterns in the data as well as the conditions under which these apply” (Flick, 2006: 302). The coding process was initially done on two interviews in each group of interviews (adult community members and students) and then extended to the remaining interviews for each group and refined. It also entailed a ‘cutting and sorting’ technique described in detail by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that involved identifying text extracts from interviews according to categories and sub-categories and putting them together in ‘piles’ or, as in this case, computer generated tables.

3.5a2 Manual Coding

CA data can be coded manually or coding can be computerised. The manual process has certain advantages such as “greater precision and consistency in the resulting concepts and theory development” (Putten & Nolen, 2010: 101), a product of the examination being continuous with a constant determination of patterns, conflicting evidence and explanations of these conflicts. As Putten and Nolen (2010: 107) explain, manual processing generates far more detailed contextualised categories and thereby greater “insights”. It is for these reasons that I chose to manually code data for this study.
CA allowed the patterns of experiences and views of Indigenous community members to be featured and then selected for CDA. The fewer policy texts meant that CDA was applied to all policy discourse (media and government). Although CA and CDA may be regarded by some as distinctly different, Hardy, Harley and Philips (2004: 20) maintained that they are “complementary in what they reveal”. CA has been described as positivist as a consequence of its association with quantitative statistical methods. As noted above, discourse analysis, in contrast, is underpinned by a social constructivist epistemology (Hardy, Harley & Philips, 2004: 20). However, Hardy, Harley and Philips (2004: 20) argued, there are qualitative varieties of CA that are more interpretive and these can be combined with discourse analysis. In addition, they reported, CA can “provide alternative perspectives on the role of language in social studies” (Hardy, Harley & Philips, 2004: 20).

Neuendorf (2004: 33) agreed and suggested that CA “is often quite rich, and offers the possibility of tapping complex, latent constructs”. Neuendorf (2004: 34) did concede, however, that the primary limitation of CA is its “focus on [decontextualised] messages.” However, he suggested the highly structured coding scheme of CA that enhances its reliability can complement the reliance on the “expertise and orientations of the researcher(s)” in CDA to create a triangulation of methods. Neuendorf (2004: 34) reminded us of the importance of the use of such multiple methods when he stated “When the findings agree, the conclusions of the researchers are strengthened multi-fold”. It is for this reason that I have combined CA and CDA, using CA to discern topics and themes in each community text and extracting the most representative and typical of these as well as those that do not conform to typical patterns (in order to explain these anomalies) for CDA analysis.

3.5b Critical Discourse Analysis

I have used Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001, 2009) framework for CDA (‘Historical Discourse Approach’ or HDA). HDA was used to analyse both the political text and discourse as well as key adult community texts. The adult community texts were selected for their typical framing of the effects of the FFHP as well as for the inter- and/or causative relationships between categories and sub-categories. Some, however, were selected for their lack of conformity in

---

93 This ‘version’ of CDA “views ‘discourse’ as structured forms of knowledge and the memory of social practices, whereas ‘text’ refers to concrete oral utterances or written documents” (Wodak & Meyer’s, 2009: 6).
order to explain anomalies. Adult texts were selected due to their complexity, which is absent in the student texts as a consequence of their more juvenile stage of cognition and reflection.

Wodak (2001b: 65) asserted that HDA draws on “a large quantity of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which discursive ‘events’ are embedded”. That is, the context pragmatically determines theory in order to examine “specific problems to be investigated” (Wodak, 2001b: 64). This means the conceptual tools chosen are on the basis of “utility” (Wodak, 2001b: 64). The historically-socially situated emphasis and use of theory makes Wodak’s interpretation of CDA eminently suitable for colonial settings. This is because in these environments, discourse about the Indigenous ‘other’ needs to be considered in political texts in relation to both colonial historical references and current socio-political contexts (as advocated by Moreton-Robinson, 2004). HDA also strongly highlights issues of power and exclusion in policy analysis (see Lawton, 2008) and is often used in conjunction with ethnographic studies (such as that of Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). This offers a particular confluence with this research. In addition, HDA also focuses on social actors and how they are portrayed (Wodak & Myers, 2009) which is also one feature of this study. Below, I will outline the main theoretical features, a brief history and the methodological elements of CDA and then describe HDA and outline how it was used in this study.

CDA relates to the concept of how discourse in spoken, written and multi-modal texts define and construct humans as social actors. As such, it differs from its descriptive predecessor, discourse analysis, by its concern with function and social, cultural and cognitive context (Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer, 2002; Lo Bianco, 2001a). It thus has extensive application in texts that relate to the fields of CLPP and postcolonialism. CDA allows an examination of Indigenous subjectivities and representations as well as dominant discursive practices in policy text and policy discourse and represents “the discursive reproduction of social cognition”, according to van Dijk (1990: 165). By divulging categorisations, stereotypes, social representations, group inter-relations and attributions it reveals the cognisance, information processing and memorisation of dominant “biased group schemas” that are used as the “basis of [processing] new, external information”, van Dijk (1990: 171) claimed.

Wodak (2001a: 1) explained that CDA has its genesis in “classical Rhetoric, Text Linguistics and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics” as well as the work of post-
positivists of the early twentieth century with Karl Popper’s 1930s critique of the physical sciences (the ‘falsification’ of evidence to support theory) and Wittgenstein’s (1950s) view of language as a system of signs that create a multiplicity of world views (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). One of the most important critical theorists includes Foucault (1977, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1991, 2000) who has had a monumental influence on discourse analysis, since these analyses are underpinned by Foucault’s conceptualisations (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). These conceptualisations are discursive constructions, or ‘regimes of truth’, which have already been dealt with in Ch2 (Foucault, 1980). It is enough to say here Foucault argued that knowledge is a discursive construction and that we are positioned by complex discourses but have little influence over their creation. Rather, power structures and strategies of power create ‘regimes of truth’ and ensure our compliance. These ‘regimes of truth’ refer to the rules of language for what can and cannot be stated, what is true and what is false and link to the dominant patterns of statements in particular discursive fields (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Since Fairclough’s 1989 publication, Language and Power, which analysed grammar (using Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics) to critically examine power hierarchies that are naturalised in text, CDA has become a dominant multidisciplinary analytical tool across the humanities (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui & O’Garro, 2005). It arose from critical linguistics at the Lancaster school of linguistics at which Fairclough played a dominant role. It now includes a broad range of practitioners and theorists, including Reisigl and Wodak (2001, 2009), Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), van Dijk (1982, 2009), Chilton (2004, 2006), Gee (2010) and others. These theorists and practitioners have varying interpretations and strategies that range from analysis that has a linguistic focus on text (such as those of Fairclough, Wodak and van Leeuwan which was further developed by Reyes, 2011) to those that have a social and cognitive focus (such as Gee and van Dijk) (Nielson, 2014).

Despite the heterogeneity of methodological and theoretical underpinnings, all CDA tends to share “an underlying commonality” (Locke, 2004: 25). This commonality includes the fact that values, thought and ideology are all mediated by power and through language, that the signifier and signified are in a dynamic relationship mediated by social relations and that these social relations are contextual, dialectic and unequal. As a consequence, there may be some privileging of some social groups over others and this privileging can be seen as natural, essential or inescapable (Wodak, 2001a). Finally, there is the defined purpose of CDA which is to make
this privileging and its consequences apparent and addressed (Locke, 2004; Wodak, 2001b). Wodak (2001a: 4) argued that it is predominantly the purpose of CDA to decipher discourses that are governed by power differentials. This is achieved, Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 32) claimed through a “complex concept of social critique” that entails:

1. **Text or discourse immanent critique** – that identifies contradictions, anomalies, fallacies, implications, argumentation and logical fallacies (see argumentation below) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 32);

2. **Sociodiagnostic critique** – that aims to demystify “persuasive, propagandist, populist, ‘manipulative’ character of discursive practices” and embed “the communicative or interactional structures of a discursive event in a wider frame of social and political relations” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 32-33); and

3. **Prospective critique** – which has an “ethico-practical dimension” that requires the analyst to utilise the critique in the service of social justice and enact positive change (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 32-33).

In the intervening decades since CDA was established, it has been accorded the status of being a field in its own right in the social sciences and humanities, as “an institutionalised discipline with its own paradigm, its own canon and conventionalised assumptions, and even its own power structures” (Breeze, 2011: 493). Historically, it has been subject to intense scrutiny and criticism in terms of its “inconsistencies”, epistemological and theoretical problems as well as subjective positioning (Breeze, 2011: 494). Despite the conceptual understandings of Foucault being integral in much CDA, there has also been a failure by CDA practitioners to acknowledge the relativism in Foucault’s discourse theory. This has led, critics observe, to the tendency to treat discourse as a much more normative and stable entity than Foucault anticipated (Breeze, 2011). CDA has also been critiqued (see Lo Bianco, 2009) for its failure to emancipate by the mere exposure of ideology without the creation of an alternative.

To be fair, CDA proponents have not put forward CDA as an objective positivist account of language use. They argue its underlying premise is critical, non-positivist and qualitative (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In addition, over time there is now greater consistency in theory and epistemology associated with CDA. This is largely a consequence of the considerable synergy between cognitive psychology and contemporary CDA as a result of the extensive work of social-
cognitive researchers such as van Dijk (2009), cognitive linguists such as Lakoff (1992) and cultural linguists such as Malcolm (1998). This research now suggests that there is a distinct link between experience and language elements (such as metaphor and metonymy) and cognition. That is, conceptual and image schemas, association chains and complex categories determine our semantic understanding of lexis across different domains (Chilton, 2006; Koller & Davidson, 2008).

Metaphors, for instance, can ‘map’ the qualities of a conceptually concrete source domain (grounded in experience) onto a conceptually abstract target domain (Johnson, 2005: 625). They thus represent the most efficient way of producing imagery – the basis by which we think. Johnson (2005: 628) notes the process of how metaphors influence and embed particular framings, views and semantic understandings “in our social conscious”:

The receiver of the metaphor implicitly deduces entailments by extrapolating all tangible qualities of the source domain. These entailments allow us to rationalise the cause and effect of a given situation. Entailing such information naturally, though, may also inhibit direct cognitive access to other points of view (Johnson, 2005: 628).

In addition, while there is certainly a diversity of discourses, some dominate, others obfuscate and still others eclipse reducing the number of contradictions that exist. Fairclough (2003) used Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, consensual domination as opposed to domination by force, to explain this process. Fairclough (2003: 45) noted that “The hegemonic struggle between political forces can be seen as partly a contention over the claims of their particular visions and representations of the world to having a universal status.” In this regard, his idea of discoursal hegemony is closely aligned to Foucault’s (1980: 131) “regimes of truth” or “general politics’ of truth”:

... the type of discourses which [a society] accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980: 131).94

94 Fairclough’s analytical method, thereby, could be regarded as the linguistic strategy by which to demonstrate a credible Foucauldian critique. Fairclough’s (2003) alignment to HDA, as such, makes HDA also a creditable expression of the Foucauldian analysis present in this study.
These factors of language elements and hegemony can account for the approximately ‘same’ interpretation of discourse between both analysts in the field of CDA and those outside of it as well as the reproduction of particular meanings from diverse groups (Chilton, 2006; Koller & Davidson, 2008). It can also account for both the construction and durability of biased popular opinions in relation to the “perceptions of the language-minority community” (Johnson, 2005: 628). This would, thereby, seem to justify a more ‘stable’ view of discourse.

In addition, although few case studies in CDA have presented an alternative discourse, it is the aim of this study to present an alternative mechanism of policy formation and enacting that will lead to a less hierarchical process of decision making.

Having established CDA as an appropriate data analysis method in this analysis, this choice is sensitive to the legitimate criticisms of this approach and thereby has taken the more advanced recent HDA form of Wodak and Reisigl (2001, 2009). The next section will describe and then address how HDA is used in this study.

3.5b1 Theoretical and Methodological underpinnings of HDA

As discussed above, Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001, 2009) CDA, HDA, is used in this study due to its linguistic focus, its methodological rigour and use of social and political theory making it highly applicable in colonial contexts. Its emphasis on power and exclusion also makes it suitable in critical policy analysis. Below, I will outline the main theoretical elements and methodological features of HDA that are used in this research.

Wodak (2001a: 66) defined ‘discourse’ as “a way of signifying a particular domain of social practice from a particular perspective” and maintains that there is a dialectical relationship between the “fields of action” (the situations, institutional frames and social structures) in which the discourse operates and the “discursive practices”. That is, fields of action both affect discourses and are affected by them. Texts can be conceived of as a “materially durable
products of linguistic actions” and genres are the “conventionalised, more or less schematically fixed use of language associated with a particular activity” (Wodak, 2001a: 66).

In league with Fairclough (2003), Reisigl and Wodak (2009) contend that discourses are open systems that can be intertextual, particularly in relation to macro-topics such as ‘unemployment’ which can in turn generate micro-topics such as “‘market’, ‘unions’, ‘social welfare’ ...” (Wodak, 2001a: 66). In fact, such topics can ‘travel’ through fields of action and genres. In addition, not only is discourse intertextual, individual texts can contain a number of topics, discourses and genres (forming hybrid genres).

Wodak (2001a: 68) depicted the relationship between these elements – fields of actions, genres and topics – in ‘political fields of action’ in the table below. This diagram shows how particular genres (bills, laws and speeches) are associated with particular fields of action (e.g. law-making) and how these genres can have one or multiple discourse topics. A number of these (law-making political procedure and formation of public opinion and self-presentation) are ‘fields of action’ that were examined in this study.

3.5b2 CDA and Text Analysis

Wodak (2009) claims that there are four levels of text analysis in HDA:

1. The immediate text or co-text
2. the *intertextual and interdiscursive relationships* between utterances, texts, genres and discourses;
3. the extra-linguistic social/sociological variables or institutional frames;
4. the socio-historical contexts in which utterances are embedded (Lawton, 2013: 106);

---

95 Laclau and Mouffe refer to this process as the dominant discourses fixing signs (basic units of language) to specific nodal points and thus reducing (excluding) the number of possibilities of meaning (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).
Political Fields of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law making political procedures</th>
<th>Field of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formation of public opinion and self-presentation</td>
<td>Political advertising, marketing and propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party internal development of an informed opinion</td>
<td>Political executive and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political executive and administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Genres

- Laws
- Bills
- Amendments
- Speeches and contributions of MPs
- Regulations
- Recommendations
- Prescriptions
- Guidelines
- Etc.
- Press releases
- Conferences
- Interviews
- Talk shows
- Lectures and contributions to conferences
- Articles, books
- Commemorative speeches
- Inaugural speeches
- etc.
- party programs, declarations, statements and speeches of principle
- speech on party conventions etc.
- election programs
- slogans, speeches in election campaigns
- announcements
- posters
- election brochure
- direct mailings
- fliers
- fliers
- etc.
- decisions (approval/rejection)
- inaugural speeches
- coalition papers, speeches of ministers/heads
- governmental answers to p.q.
- decisions (approval/rejection)
- inaugural speeches
- coalition papers, speeches of ministers/heads
- governmental answers to p.q.

Figure 3.1: Interdiscursive and intertextual relationships between discourses, discourse topics, genres and texts (Wodak, 2001b: 68).

Wodak (2009) contends that these levels of analysis can be achieved by examining discourse topics or themes, macrostrategies and linguistic means and forms of realisation. These levels of analysis are applied in this study and discussed below.
3.5b3 Content/Topics

This study approached discourse topics at a macro-level in order to ascertain the relationship between topics and ideologies (the ideational coherence). It was this relationship that formed the basis of discourse analysis in this research, in line with van Dijk’s (2009) suggestion that discourse topics should be approached at the semantic macrostructural level.

3.5b4 Strategies

After discourse topics, the next level of analysis focused on is strategies. These relate to the mechanisms of “discursive construction, perpetuation, transformation and dismantling” or “plans of action” according to de Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak, (1999: 160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimation/Delegitimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisation – legitimation through reference to an authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Evaluation – legitimation through reference to a value system (evaluative adjectives play a key role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalisation - legitimation by reference to a ‘truth’ in terms of Instrumentality (“purposefulness, usefulness, and effectiveness”) or theory (“the way things are”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythopoiesis – legitimation through story telling or moral or cautionary tales or the use of symbolic actions (van Leeuwen, 2008: 105-119)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation or misrepresentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This relates to withholding of information through denial, evasion and omissions. It can relate to grammatical structures, argument, metaphors, events, actors, spatial or temporal location from the perspective of a participant (deixis) (Lawton, 2013: 107)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This relates to the manipulation of hearers or readers through emotions or concepts. Lawton (2013: 107) claims that “To achieve coercion, political actors may select topics and position themselves and others in certain ways in order to set agendas”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Discursive Macrostrategies of HDA (derived from Lawton, 2008, 2013).

Wodak (2001a) denoted three levels of strategies – discursive macrostrategies (strategies of strategic function that “utterers use to manage their interests”) (Lawton, 2013: 107), discourse strategies (that include argumentation and function to create “the positive self and negative other presentation”) (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 72) and linguistic strategies/mechanisms (devices or use of signs) that make discursive strategies realisable in speech as important
elements of analysis. These elements will be discussed below beginning with macrostrategies, discursive strategies and linguistic mechanisms and then linguistic realisations.

Macrostrategies in this study are derived from van Leeuwen’s (2008) legitimation strategies and Chilton’s (2004) (see Lawton, 2008). They are categorised into three major groups as outlined and described in Table 3.2 (p.124) above and serve to manage communication strategies. They can provide a “manipulating and mystifying” function for the creation of the positive self and negative other presentation (Lawton, 2013: 107).

Wodak (2001b) has concentrated on five types of discourse strategies, or plans of action, since these are the principle ones involved in power differentials and the construction of positive self and negative other presentations. They act, she argues, to “achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic goal” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009: 94). Wodak (2001b) delineated the discourse strategies as follows: i) referential/nomination (construction of included – in – and excluded – out – or marginalised groups at a local semantic level); ii) predication – how social actors and their qualities are described or labelled, positively or negatively, iii) argumentation (how the text defends against refutation, that is justification); iv) perspectivation, framing and discourse representation (what is included and excluded explicitly or implicitly through such mechanisms as allusion, vagueness, presuppositions and implications to generate the speaker’s point of view); and v) intensification or mitigation (changing the force of utterances) (Wodak, 2001b). Many of these categories overlap since a political actor, in argumentation for instance, may enlist nomination to justify their arguments. These discourse strategies are examined for their linguistic strategies/mechanisms using the following questions.

96 Reisigl and Wodak (2001) have used both generic structure and rhetorical types to analyse political discourse genres – argument, description, problem-solution. It is this focus that has led to the type of strategies developed.
Table 3.3: Discursive Strategies (taken and adapted from Table 3.1 Discursive Strategies in Wodak and Meyer (2009: 73) and Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 93)

Specific linguistic realisations of linguistic strategies focused on in this study were;

1. Personal pronouns (lessen or enhance difference and social agency) (Lawton, 2008);
2. Tropes (such as metaphor and synecdoche organise and naturalise particular modes of thought) (Lawton, 2008);
3. Modality (constructs participant roles and “construe[s] the nature of reality”) (Bartlett, 2004: 69);
4. Grammatical structure (active or passive structures can elevate or diminish social agency; and nominalisation can emphasise the effect rather than the action or process and thus also diminish or absolve “the agent of responsibility”) (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83; Lawton, 2008);
5. Lexical choice (lexis can impart evaluations); and
6. Presuppositions (represent a window into firmly held beliefs and views) (Lawton, 2008).

The relationship of these elements are shown below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Topics/ Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Macrostrategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation / Delegitimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation / Misrepresentation Coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential/ Nominalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predication Argumentation Framing Intensification/Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Realisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Pronouns Tropes Modality Grammatical Structure Lexical Choice Presuppositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2: Levels of Analysis in the Historical Discourse Approach (adapted from figure 1.1 Lawton, 2013: 108)

### 3.5b5 Ideologies and Argumentation

In terms of discourse strategies, argumentation is one of the key strategies of discrimination identified by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) and the main discursive strategy exhibited in policy discourse and so was heavily scrutinised in this study. Wodak (2003: 134) detailed argumentative strategies such as “[S]cape-goating, blaming the victim, victim-perpetrator reversal, trivialisation, and denial” in her analysis of exclusion in political discourse. Arguments are intimately connected to ideologies so the next section will address the definition of ideologies, how they are related to argumentation and how argumentation can be analysed.

#### Ideologies

Ideologies, according to discourse analyst Gee (1996: ix), are the ‘theories’ (or “viewpoints”) that underpin beliefs, identities and relationships. They are socially situated and intimately connected to power. As discussed earlier, it is the ideologies of the powerful that flow most
often in discourse and overwhelm the ideologies inherent in other voices. It is their much greater occurrence that renders them “common sense” theories or “the conception of the world which is uncritically absorbed by the various social and cultural environments in which … the average [person] is developed” (Gramsci, 1971: 333). It is their presence in a wide range of fields sustained by institutional state power and symbolic strategies that conceal other realities and make them normative to the degree that their “semantic structures” become the “language of everyday life” (Corson, 1993: 169).

**Analysing arguments**

In order to analyse ideological constructions in discourse, Fairclough (2003: 99) suggested the need to investigate reasoning within discourse. In order to investigate rationality, Corson (1993) recommended utilising Habermas (1970, 1985 in Corson, 1993: 169) “ideal speech situation”. These situations he has defined as locutionary (description or fact), illocutionary (an order, action or question) and prelocutionary speech acts (audience manipulation by the speaker) (Habermas, 1984). How Habermas’ ideal speech intersects with Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001) analysis in this study will be discussed below.

Habermas connects discourse of speech acts with ethics in order to ascertain the validity of claims (a key aim of this FFHP research). The maintenance of certain ethical principles which are adhered to in speech acts ensures communication is “meaningful, true, justified and sincere” (Corson, 1993: 169). The maintenance of these principles in addition to using “logical reasoned argument” to “reach consensus” constitutes an ideal speech act (Corson, 1993: 170). Similarly, Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 71) use the traditions of rhetoric to analyse discourse. In their analysis, Reisigl and Wodak (2001) enlisted the two German lexis and meanings of persuade - ‘Urberzeugen’ or rational persuasion under “widely symmetrical, power free communication” which they equate with ‘reasonableness’ and Habermas’ ideal speech situation; and ‘Uberreden’ or “restricted consent under conditions of suspended rationality” where non-argumentative elements (“emotionalisation, suggestion, demagogy, propaganda, brainwashing, threatening and so on”) that repress logic and rationality are successfully used to “force or compel” an agreement with an argument (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 70).
To ascertain the reasonableness of an argument, Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 71) used ten ethical rules of argumentation, stating that these rules for argumentation “should form the basis of a discourse ethics” on which to critique democratic “discursive political exchange” (found in Appendix 3.8). These authors also use rhetoric and argumentative theory to describe the violations (referred to as fallacies) of these rules (see Appendix 3.9 for the ones they deem most common). Both the ethical rules and violations were used in the analysis of policy discourse in this thesis.

### 3.5c Summary of HDA

The principles and strategies of HDA allow deep analysis of policy discourse in terms of policy aims, underlying representations, how the issue is viewed by policy creators and enactors, the validity of claims and how all these factors are realised linguistically and hegemonically. By using the concepts of discourse theorists and analysts such as Foucault and Habermas, the principles of rhetoric and argument, and placing a focus on cognitive linguistics, Reisigl and Wodak (2001) have produced a highly systematic analysis that allows for a precise examination of such discourse. HDA, thereby, allows a thorough and accurate investigation into the power dynamics and ideologies that operate in policy texts.

Both CA and HDA, however, suffer from the same weaknesses pertaining to all qualitative methods. These are the crisis in legitimation and crisis of representation discussed briefly above (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) which brings into question the validity and reliability of analytical qualitative results as well as how representative these results are of the views and life experiences of those involved in the study. The next section thereby discusses how validity and reliability of HDA and CA was achieved in this study. I outline how ethical guidelines were achieved to ensure a portrayal aligned with Indigenous community member views and experiences. The final section on ‘Limitations’ reviews some of these issues in relation to this research.

---

97 I will use Reisigl and Wodak’s (2001: 69) definition of persuasion here, “the means of intentionally influencing a person so that she or he adopts, fixes or changes her or his ways of perception, attitudes to and views on persons, objects and ideas, and dispositions to behave or act in a specific way”. 

---
3.6 Validity and Reliability

3.6a Validity

Although there should be a focus on validity and reliability in qualitative research, strict positivist notions of validity (as truth) and reliability (repeatability of results) are inappropriate in a qualitative study (Gibbs, 2007). Guba and Lincoln (1994: 114) suggest that reliability and validity are in fact related to “trustworthiness” and that trustworthiness had four elements – transferability (that parallels quantitative external validity or “generalisability”), dependability (which parallels reliability or “stability” of findings), credibility (that parallels internal validity or “isomorphism of findings with reality”) and confirmability (that parallels objectivity or “distanced and neutral observer”). These elements are discussed in detail below.

3.6b Transferability

Transferability of qualitative data can be defined as the generalisability of findings. This generalisability in qualitative research, however, does not equate to quantitative research ‘repeatability’ (Delmar, 2010). Critical theorists have argued for generalisability in qualitative research to be viewed as similarity (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Delmar (2010: 125) notes that if we retain generalisability as evidence of quality in qualitative research, then, generalisability needs to be construed in terms of recognisability. That is, the recognisability of “communalities, similarities and differences in situations and human beings” as well as in patterns of data and the confirmation and acceptance by others (Delmar, 2010: 125). Also essential are rich descriptions of the context in which the research was carried out since there is an acknowledgement that contexts differ and may not have relevance to another context in all aspects (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

In this research, these principles were achieved by peer and participant checks. That is, the consultations of findings and analysis with participants occurred at three levels. Participants were initially asked to review their transcripts to ensure they complied with their intent and understandings. Community members also participated on a reference group to review the evolving and overall findings. Participants were then later individually consulted in the field to
ensure that the categories and subcategories and interpretations reflected their views. Peer checking was implemented through panel member and supervisory researchers, as well as other academics aligned with Central Australian research and Melbourne University. In addition, each community was described in detail in field notes and in Appendix 1.2, with similarities and differences duly noted so that any comparisons being made were done so with these aspects at the fore. Also, the methodology embraced purposeful sampling so that rich detail about events could be garnered from participant interviews. Detail was also gathered in ethnographic notes during the period of field work which were then used to interpret interview data and fed into socio-historical descriptions of the NT and the two sites that appeared in the first two chapters and Appendix 1.2. I will now address the issue of dependability.

3.6c Dependability (stability of findings)

Dependability in qualitative research relates both to ‘validity’ of methods as well as the quality of knowledge claims (Kvale, 2002). Kvale (2002) notes that validity is related to both checking methodology and analysis as well as theorising about findings and certainty of knowledge statements.

Prolonged and repeated examination of policy text can resolve issues of consistency and accuracy (Wodak, 2006). I began applying HDA analysis on policy texts and discourse during my first year of PhD study and this continued into my fourth year in order to ensure the accuracy of the arguments, framing and representations that emerged. In addition, application of both HDA analysis and CA was an ongoing process, starting with the first data collection and continuing through the analysis in order to refine categories and check all data.

Consistency and accuracy can also be confirmed with recurring patterns of data (Golafshani, 2003). This is related to data collection and having sufficient quantities of data to ensure patterns emerge. In the present research, extensive interviewing, analysis and coding that began at the data collection stage meant that patterns began to emerge relatively early. As discussed above, repetition of categories and sub-categories arising from the data signalled that sufficient data had been collected. When this was coupled with continued informal and formal clarification and review of data with participants and interested others on each successive community visit, confidence in the reliability of the dataset was enhanced. Regular constructive
and supportive meetings with supervisors and presentations at a number of conferences both inside and outside of the university allowed for a number of opportunities for peer briefing and suggestions on methods and interpretations that furthered the study’s reliability. The triangulation of methods with the use of CA and CDA also fostered the dependability of findings. The following examines how confirmability was addressed in this study.

3.6d Confirmability and ‘Auditing’

In critical qualitative research, confirmability also cannot be understood with positivist notions of “objectivity (distanced and neutral observer)” but, rather, must acknowledge the economic, political, social, cultural and ethnic context in which this research is conducted (Guba & Lincoln, 1994: 114). As such, quality in this criterion is attributed to “texts that are ... open about their social and cultural positions” or positionality. This requires the researcher to identify their position, their epistemology, preconceptions, power relations in the field between the researcher, participants and others on the research team. It also involves leaving an audit trail of the documentation and reflection on data, decisions and methods.

This study achieves this in a number of ways. There were field notes, personal notes, emails, forms, raw data such as video and audio recordings and their transcripts, findings, analysis and conclusions. These, in turn, have been extensively reviewed and audited by supervisors, panel members and others. There is also extensive text in this thesis that relates to interview instruments, intentions of the study, findings and conclusions, methodologies, theories and my position. For example, the introduction commences with a narrative regarding the personal impact of Indigenous policy decisions in the NT. There is also a discussion of my relationship to those in the field, my experiences in Central Australia and my epistemological stance. In the methodology, details are given of why various data collection and data analysis decisions were made as well as their consequences.

In addition, reflections on data and what they represented, as well as methodology used to collect data, were consistently critiqued and explored in supervisory meetings. Supervisor questioning and desire for explication ensured that I was made to thoroughly plan and examine each step of the data collection process, what the data represented and any further investigation. This, in addition to concerns of decolonising methodology and ensuring a
powerful ‘voice’ for Indigenous people, allowed the focus of data collection and analysis to move from the broad to particular. It also allowed opportunistic examinations of emerging patterns in data. For example, there was a concern of parents and community members about the behaviour of students in one of the communities (with destruction of property) and the school (in terms of ‘strong’ academic students bullying weaker ones) that has occurred with the increasing loss of Indigenous culture and values and increasing use of English in the classroom. This led me to look more closely at the well-being benefits of bilingualism as well as the health and well-being issues that can arise with monolingual education and loss of culture. Such responses to the data demonstrated an engagement with the context as well as the confirmability of the data.

3.6e Credibility

Credibility closely relates to validity since it deals with the degree to which the realities of the researcher converge with or mirror those of respondents (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). It can be achieved through prolonged engagement at a site, persistent observations, case analysis, triangulation and peer debriefing.

In terms of prolonged engagement and persistent observation in this study, I began to contact communities one year before commencing the research. This was an attempt to develop a long term relationship with the issues and respondents, as it related to the research question and in their context. In addition, while the research period was quite short (five weeks in both communities), I extended this over a period of more than 3 months to prolong the reflection with and of the communities. I then returned to the two community sites to deliver the analysis. I was also very familiar with the region having living in Central Australia for more than 10 years. Additionally, I engaged NT peers to review my research.

Credibility in data analysis is conferred where there is “consistent and accurate” comparisons as well as noting “differences and variations” in terms of “cases, settings and events” (Gibbs, 2007: 96). In this study, this was achieved by identifying incongruous cases that do not ‘fit’ categories and patterns; identifying contradictions given by respondents and seeking alternative explanations for these; as well as ensuring context was explicit in rich description (Lincoln, 2002). Credibility can also be conferred through triangulation (the use of several methods of data
collection and/or analysis) since this offers greater precision and robustness (Gibbs, 2007). In this study, this was achieved through the triangulation of methods of analysis applied to distinct sets of “samples and datasets” (Westbrook, 1994: 247). There were geographically distinct data sets procured from two communities through the careful recording and transcription of interview data and detailed reflexive and reflective field notes. As discussed, the interviews were analysed using CA and CDA while descriptions and fields notes functioned to carry “initial codes and memos” as outlined by Westbrook (1994: 247) and inform the sociodiagnostic critique. In addition, there was data (media and government texts) related to policy discourse that were analysed using CDA.

In conclusion, I have attempted to set up a number of strategies that have ensured qualitative interpretations of ‘trustworthiness’ in terms of methodology, data collection and analysis and applied these consistently through this study. These factors – transferability, dependability, confirmability and credibility – have been achieved through peer and respondent debriefing, participatory strategies, observation, description, data patterning and methodological instruments and strategies. Many of these elements relate not only to decolonising methodology but have a firm foundation in ethics since research ethics, in Indigenous contexts in particular, represent a response to past exploitation in Western research. The next section will thereby look closely at the ethics involved in this research and how it was fulfilled.

3.7 Ethical Issues

Ethics can be regarded as guidelines of practice that heighten both analytical accuracy and responsibility. The following outlines what is meant by ‘ethics’ and how it was realised in this study in order to overcome the dilemma of a crisis of representation.

There are a number of agreed guidelines that have evolved in the twentieth century that researchers need to follow throughout the research process to ensure participant protection in terms of participation and data accuracy. These guidelines are so well-established, Sachs (2011) claims, that they can now be regarded as canons. The principles include informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality, respect for people’s rights and dignity, justice, beneficence, non-
maleficence as well as honesty and integrity (American Psychological Association, APA, 2013; Miller & Brewer, 2003).

The fact that this research aimed to ascertain participant topics, concepts and issues of importance means that data were generated devoid of manipulation by the researcher (Hatch, 2002). Also, research methods were not experimental, or scientifically based, were non-intrusive and non-deceptive and so were non-maleficent. Anonymity and confidentiality were preserved by allocating codes and pseudonyms to participants. Also, while communities were identified to interested parties during the research (such as the NHMRC Central Australian Human Ethics Committee and Melbourne University Ethics Committees), they remained unidentified in the research findings and participants were not required to give their true name or address. However, despite these precautions, given the size of the communities and the relationships that exist within them, complete anonymity cannot be achieved and this was discussed with participants.

Although video and audio recordings were used for individual and group interviews, they were kept in a safe place, according to legal requirements. Informed consent was achieved with a simple letter and consent form (see appendices 3.2 to 3.7) which were discussed at length with participants’ guardians or parents and participants themselves. They also conformed to the four principles outlined by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007: 52) of competence, voluntarism, full information and comprehension and the right to withdraw at any time during the research. It also conformed to the ethical principles outlined by NHMRC (which concord with and were accepted by University of Melbourne ethics), undergoing a rigorous ethics application and approval process.

In addition to these ethical principles, there were additional issues which I addressed in terms of ethics since the participants were largely Indigenous and some were children.

3.7a Ethical Issues in Indigenous Research

As a consequence of previous unethical practices in research, Flicker and Worthington (2012) propose that it is vital to develop a relationship of trust and understanding with a community,
negotiate consent between the community and the researcher and have the community guide the researcher as to what is ‘right’. This issue of trust in addition to values and recognition of knowledgeable others have been developed into guidelines by the NHMRC (2003) through which this research sought ethical approval.  

A number of models to achieve reconciliation between these aims and values of the researcher and the community have been outlined by the NHMRC (2003: 5). These include; the use of a participatory research process; institutional arrangements; ongoing involvement of the community in the research process; legal agreements; and community control over the research process with the project being led by Aboriginal people. As discussed above, in this research project, there was a focus on participatory research and community involvement in the research process as a consequence of strong affiliations formed with the community as well as legal agreements for publications (see Appendices 3.10 and 3.11). Indigenous guardians acted as interpreters and I reported back any transcripts and analysis to the communities with emails and on-site visits. The communities also determined any further reciprocity demands from me as a consequence of participation in the research (which has so far required monitoring poor housing issues, writing a letter to then Prime Minister Tony Abbott regarding language and culture and making the research available to the executive of Central Land Council). In addition, in accordance with Melbourne University and NHMRC ethics requirements, the study also involved an ethics reference group, apart from the Advisory Committee, composed of University of Melbourne academic researchers with Indigenous research experience and one member from each research site. Throughout the research process, community participants were also recognised as co-owners of the research which led to their views and opinions forming the foundation of research guidance.

3.7b Working with Children

Birbeck and Drummond (2007) note that children are significantly more open to suggestion than adults and that this can affect research outcomes. Birbeck and Drummond (2007: 25) argue this susceptibility is a consequence of two factors: the significant power differential between a participant child and a researcher and the cognitive “abilities of children”. However, the level
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98 A detailed analysis of how this project conforms to these NHMRC principles is outlined in an ethics application to the NHMRC Central Australian Human Research Ethics Committee.
of susceptibility can be minimised in a number of ways – through unambiguous questioning, avoiding repetition (paraphrasing if necessary) and detailed responses (these can lead to incorrect answers because the child perceives they have done something wrong) and ensuring the methodologies used support the cognitive and social abilities and culture of the children. It also requires children determining central and peripheral events or thoughts as opposed to the researcher. The research strategies and instruments demonstrate that this was the case for this project and these were further developed in consultation with community members as the research proceeded.

The protection of children in this research from psychological and physical harm, informed consent, the use of children as research subjects and the research methods as well as the participation of Indigenous people in research are all elements that are addressed in the University of Melbourne’s and the NHMRC guidelines and publications as well as NHMRC Central Australian Human Research Ethics Committee ethics application forms (on which University of Melbourne ethics was approved). I also required a research permit from the Central Land Council that was contingent on the success of a Central Australian Human Research Ethics Committee application. The amount of gatekeeping in this context helped ensure that ethical principles were met. Even so, there were still limitations attached to this research and the following section discusses how these limitations were addressed.

### 3.8 Limitations

The limitations of qualitative research outlined above, legitimation, representation and praxis, are largely issues of selectivity, subjectivity and interpretation that plague case study data processes generally (Brown, 2008). This is due to the need to; select a case to begin with; use selective sampling; take a particular researcher perspective (which in this instance was “observer as participant”); and select data collection and analysis strategies (which can be “highly” intuitive) all of which can yield to subjective bias and a lack of analytical insight and theorising (Brown, 2008: 3-4; Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Again, although the very nature of case studies entails interpretation, the use of many ‘voices’ and participatory practices ensured that the theoretical framework and values reflected those
of the participants and context of the issue. Even though the research only entailed two case studies, in combination with other ethnographic studies of this type they contribute immeasurably to “the robustness of the pattern of findings across a wide range of sociolinguistic and socio-political contexts” (Cummins, 2000: 216).

Another limitation issue was the use of English in interviews which was a second, if not third or fourth, language for many young respondents. However, the presence of carers and their interpretation both enhanced but, in some cases, possibly hindered results. While carers could readily interpret the major concepts in the questions and this was extremely helpful in ensuring a strong understanding for the children, a carer in one case, in an attempt to ‘scaffold’ a question and provide a range of choices to a child, inadvertently directed a child to give a particular answer. Even though this brings authenticity of responses into question, and it was excluded as a consequence, it did provide an opportunity to hear the adult community and carer view of language learning.

An additional limitation was the lack of access to the school in order to recruit Indigenous and non-Indigenous teachers and students. However, the enthusiastic participation of community interviewees and their willingness to recruit others, in fact, ensured a much louder Indigenous voice that lent greater authenticity and strength to the research.

3.9 Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter has defined, justified, explicated and described the issues faced in the methodological development of this research. I have described and justified the methodology and philosophy that underpins this research, that of critical postmodern qualitative research. This was done in relation to its ability to answer the research questions concerning the beliefs and attitudes that underpinned the FFHP and its effects. In addition, I have detailed the largely qualitative data collection and data analysis methods that were used through the study – those of critical ethnographic case studies, HDA and CA. Also, I have accounted for research validity, ethics and the cross-cultural colonial context in which data collection and analysis occurred by outlining the triangulation of data analysis methods as well as the use of multiple sources and perspectives.
The following chapters represent the results of this data analysis. Chapter 4 deals with the CDA of the policy texts and policy discourse, applying the socio-historical HDA strategies developed by Reisigl and Wodak (2001). The two chapters that follow (5 and 6) report on the analysis of community interviews through the tools of CA and CDA (again using HDA).

These findings in these chapters are then included in a conclusion/discussion chapter that seeks to examine the implications of the research and suggest recommendations based on these findings.
Chapter 4 – Boss Talk – weapon of choice

This chapter presents the discourse analysis on the four policy texts and discourses described in Ch3. As outlined by van Dijk (1997: 40):

... discourse reflects the underlying cognitive structures and strategies, for example, mental models, attitudes and processes (such as categorisation and polarisation) and their societal function (such as persuasion and legitimization for discrimination (van Dijk, 1997: 40).

As such, CDA itself seeks to divulge discursive construction of power in texts that define a particular reality. It, thereby, provides a mechanism for social analysis (van Dijk, 1997). In this research it will allow a social analysis of FFHP texts and community interviews by examining the representations, constructions, ideologies, privileging and silencing that denote underlying power structures and world views.

The focus of the analysis of this chapter relates to the examination of policy text and discourse that may contain contemporary representations of an Indigenous ‘Other’ that are both intertextual and influenced by historical representations. The analysis will seek to answer the following sub-questions introduced in the first chapter in order to ascertain if and how these representations, evaluations and ideologies have manifested in the framing of the policy text and discourse.

1. What ideologies are evident in the framing of this policy and in the political and media discourses about the policy?
2. How are they indicated by the construction and representation of languages, culture and people?
3. What were the consequences of this policy for two remote Indigenous communities which had, to that point, implemented bilingual education programs in their schools?

These representations, evaluations and ideologies are found through an examination of communication macrostrategies, discursive strategies (of nomination, predication, argumentation, framing, intensification and mitigation) and their linguistic strategies and
realisations (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Linguistic realisation (metaphors, lexis and specific grammar) reveal gender, cultural and class subjectivities and relations of power in addition to the naturalisation of such hierarchies (discussed below) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009).

The four government texts examined – the FFHP text, an article written by Marion Scrymgour, a television interview with Gary Burgess (the Education Minister who succeeded Scrymgour) and a letter by Julia Gillard – are situated in critical contexts and junctures of the FFHP debate in the year after its introduction. All were selected for their quality of government ‘authorship’. Their importance lies in the fact that they can illuminate both NT and Federal Government thinking and ideational systems at critical times and can reliably depict the ideologies underpinning the FFHP decision.

The first text (Appendix 4.1) represents an initial working of the FFHP discourse in its ‘raw’ declarative state that reflects the unadulterated and prevailing ideology. The next text is the letter to the editor by then NT Minister for Education Marion Scrymgour (Appendix 4.2) responding to criticisms of the FFHP by the Human Rights Commissioner Tom Calma (see Ch1 for relevant UN Human Rights legislation). Although harbouring many of the same neo-liberal and postcolonial ideologies as well as coercions and assumptions, this text shows arguments that are more clearly directed at bilingual education and more clearly influenced by counterarguments. The following text is a transcript of an interview on the Four Corners current affairs program, ‘Going back to Lajamanu’ featuring Gary Barnes (Appendix 4.3), the successor to Marion Scrymgour in the NT Education department. Although this text shows an attempt to mitigate the tensions between communities, experts and the government that remained high one year after the FFHP implementation, in effect it reinforces and intensifies prior claims evident in the other texts. The final text, written by the Minister for Education, Julia Gillard (Appendix 4.4), is constitutionally exceptional because it is a product of clear Federal Government intervention into sovereign state affairs. The letter addresses the issue from a more national and international perspective, introducing additional argumentative claims in an attempt to mitigate the conflict between the policy and Australia’s international agreements.

Each text represents the state of political discourse at pivotal and decisive moments in the life of the FFHP demonstrating the wide range of government responses related to both criticism and justification of this policy. These texts range from public texts, or “official documentation”
of policy, to public discourses or the “debates, discussions and arguments on issues of languages” that represent a reaffirmation, extension or change to the original policies or plans as a consequence of changes wrought by performative action (how the policy is realised in practice with language use), as discussed by Lo Bianco (2009: 103-104.)

Chapter 5 and 6 report community adult interviews using both CA and critical discourse techniques (CDA) and report on the community student interviews using CA. Mulderrig (2011) argues that this approach enhances the validity and reliability of findings since it represents a triangulation of methodologies. The aim of the analysis is to ascertain the topics that adult community members believe characterise the FFHP and its effects. The analysis also allows comparison of ideologies and discourse construction, macrostrategies and discursive strategies and their linguistic realisations with the aim of revealing how languages, people and the FFHP are represented by diverse groups and how beliefs are expressed.

4.1 Methodology

As discussed in Ch3, the analysis uses the Historical Discourse Approach (HDA) outlined by Reisigl and Wodak (2001, 2009) which captures power dynamics and ideologies in socio-political contexts. HDA allows flexibility in methodology, background information and theories as well as empirical observation in order to address specific problems (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Wodak (2009) states that there are four levels of analysis involved in HDA.99

1. Discourse topics
2. Discursive macrostrategies
3. Discourse strategies, and
4. Linguistic strategies and realisations

Within the first level, there are a number of discourse topics or themes. The main topics identified in this research are IL and culture (education), Indigenous people, English (education) and the State (NT or the nation). These are analysed in terms of macrostrategies derived from van Leeuwen’s (2008) legitimation strategies and Chilton’s (2004) communication strategies and
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99 A deeper discussion of this methodology occurs in Ch3.
entail legitimation/delegitimation, representation/misrepresentation and coercion (Lawton, 2013; van Leeuwen, 2008).

Macrostrategies are analysed in terms of discursive strategies of framing, argumentation, topoi, reporting, narration, description and quotation in addition to intensification and mitigation of utterances (as outlined by Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Discursive strategies are examined through linguistic strategies such as narration, description and negative or positive, implicit or explicit traits. These, in turn, are examined for their linguistic realisation, particularly in terms of the use of pronouns, tropes, modality, grammar and lexical choice in addition to presuppositions as discussed by Bartlett (2004), Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) and Lawton (2008).

The four analysed texts are reproduced in unedited form in appendices while extracts are included in this chapter as the focus of analysis. The analysis of each text is reported under subheadings that directly relate to constructions of language, culture, people and ideologies evident in the text (e.g. Indigenous deficit, English as the panacea, Competition and Atomisation). Within each sub-heading the discourse strategies of argumentation, framing, predication, referencing/ nomination, intensification and mitigation and their linguistic realisations in grammar, lexis, modality, pronouns, tropes and presupposition (as outlined by Lawton, 2008, 2013; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) are discussed in detail.

4.2 Transcript 1: The First Four Hours Policy Text and Guidelines (Appendix 4.1)

The FFHP policy first appeared on the (NT) Education website in 2008 as an announcement intended for schools. It consists of two documents (a policy and a guideline). The policy consisted of 800 words in six sections with subheadings of policy, business need (justification for the policy), Responsibilities (of principals, school managers, general managers of teaching, learning and standards and executive directors), Definition (a statement defining the policy as “Teaching and Learning programs in English”) and Related policies. The guide consisted of one page of approximately 300 words divided into two sections of Introduction (which restates claims) and Scope (which outlines the possible need for English translation in remote contexts,
the need to program for ESL and document literacy and numeracy targets, programs and resources in department accountability instruments).

**4.2a English as the Panacea for improving Literacy and Numeracy and Indigenous Deficits**

**Extract 4.0**

Teaching and learning programs in NT schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day, in order to improve literacy and numeracy results, particularly for Indigenous students.

**Extract 4.1**

The provision of an environment at school where English is used regularly in a variety of ways will support the development of proficiency in English literacy and enhance numeracy skills. Students in remote and very remote communities need increased opportunities to learn and practice their English literacy skills. Four hours of instruction in English each school day will give them these opportunities.

Extracts 4.0 and 4.1 represent the first paragraphs of the FFHP policy and the guideline. Extract 4.0 declares the policy while extract 4.1 begins with a ‘common sense’ claim, a deficit discourse and a closing of the topic. Both extracts are typical of this genre in their normalising of English as a panacea for solving SAE literacy and numeracy; problems in remote contexts and their absence of ILs.

The superiority of English is construed through a number of linguistic strategies. According to the argument rules, topos and fallacies as outlined by Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 69-74) and Tindale (2007), the excerpts above use the topos of advantage or usefulness as well as a topos of consequence (cause and effect) to support a legitimising strategy of instrumentality or ‘usefulness’ and ‘truth’ for an English only policy. In extract 4.0 this is visible in, “Teaching and learning programs in NT schools are to be conducted in English ... in order to improve literacy and numeracy results” (where ‘in order to’ acts as the topos of consequence). In extract 4.1 this is achieved with “The provision of an environment at school where English is used regularly in a
variety of ways will support the development of proficiency in English literacy and enhance numeracy skills”. The use of the modal ‘will’ denotes certainty in the future (Bartlett, 2004; Gee, 2011).

This strategy is enhanced with the simple present (indicating complete commitment to the statement by the writer and a “knowledge-claim as true and incontrovertible”) (Bartlett, 2004; Gee, 2011; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 84). Nominalisation (in extract 4.1 with “The provision of an environment”) and passivity (in extract 4.0 “Teaching and learning programs in NT schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day”) obscure the agent(s) responsible for enforcing the policy and convey in the policy “that present social arrangements [the implementation of and need for the policy] are objective, unchangeable things... rather than the contingent results of human actions” (Locke, 2004: 786). These strategies all lend credence to the ideologies underpinning the FFHP as ‘matter of fact’, ‘normal’, ‘true’ and an objectivist reflection of reality.

4.2b Deficit Discourse

Visible in the text above is a critique of remote schools. The implication in the extract 4.1 above (“The provision of .... English is used regularly in a variety of ways”) is that, in remote schools prior to the FFHP, English was used ‘irregularly’ and in ‘limited ways’. This is repeated in the extract with “Students in remote and very remote communities need increased opportunities to learn and practise their English literacy skills” which insinuates there was insufficient exposure to SAE in remote schools prior to the FFHP and students in remote regions have ‘little’ opportunity. This indicates macrostrategies of representation (of limited English in very remote schools will be resolved with the FFHP) and legitimation (through instrumentality or usefulness) are operating here that are accompanied by negative predication (discussed immediately below).

Considering that 76 remote schools in the NT out of a total of 85 were monolingual English language schools (Lee, et al, 2014), the allegation that Indigenous community schools do not
provide opportunities to learn and practise English could be alluding to a number of deficits. It could be alluding to a deficit in the communities themselves for not being capable of providing opportunities to learn and practise in English. It could be alluding to a deficiency in the schools and teaching staff in not providing sufficient English language (this is contradicted later with “genuine effort” by department staff in extract 4.2 below). Or it could be particularly targeted at Indigenous bilingual schools.

4.2c Atomisation and Destructive ‘Choice’

Extract 4.2

Despite substantial investment by the NT and Australian governments in supporting the improvement of literacy and numeracy skills for students, and the genuine effort of Department of Education and Training (DET) staff over many years to improve results, there has been no significant improvement in NT students’ literacy and numeracy outcomes.

However, the lexical selection in extract 4.2, “Despite substantial investment .... And the genuine effort of Department .... Staff .... no significant improvement in NT literacy and numeracy outcomes”, implies blame is apportioned to Indigenous people and bilingual education. This is suggested by the fact there has been no change in outcomes for Indigenous students (inferring cultural deficits) and, given the fact that the vast majority of remote and very remote Indigenous schools are already English language schools and the guide recommends the use of existing English literacy and numeracy programs in extract 4.3 below (with one exception of Walking Talking Texts), English programs are not being critiqued. That is, ‘despite substantial investment’ shows the utilisation of a topos of uselessness in regards to previous (bilingual) policy and appears to apportion blame and responsibility of failure on individual students and Indigenous communities suggesting atomisation (“language and social mobility ... through individual ability and effort”, Wiley & Luke, 1996: 516) is at work here, particularly since “genuine effort” has still
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100 Note here that Lee et (2014) show nine bilingual schools rather than the NTDE 10 bilingual schools quoted earlier which is a consequence of the imprecision associated with NTDE bilingual education and bilingual school definitions. The total number of public primary schools in the NT is approximately 125.
not resolved the problem of school achievement (and overcome the issue of Indigenous poor ‘choice’).

Extract 4.3

The currently endorsed and supported literacy approaches include Accelerated Literacy, First Steps and Stepping Out, Quick Smart Literacy and Walking Talking Texts. Endorsed and supported numeracy approaches include Quick Smart Numeracy and Count Me in Too.\(^{101}\)

This construal implies Indigenous cultural deficits which, in turn, imply Indigenous deficits and this seems to suggest a relationship to historical constructions of Indigeneity as incapable, primitive and uncivilised (Macoun, 2011; Watson, 2011). It also seems to imply a relationship to Ahmed’s (2012) postcolonial ‘wilful child’ metaphor that results in “individual destructive choices” and blame claims that are classically associated with the settler colonial ‘Aboriginal problem’ (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 363).

4.2d Instrumentation – competition and cost effectiveness

The use of the preposition ‘despite’ and the noun phrase ‘substantial investment’ in extract 4.2 above also shows evidence of the topos of cost or finance (of bilingual or IL education). The lexis ‘investment’, intensified with ‘substantial’, in fact, links measured performance outcomes (instrumentality) to economic criteria (Dean, 2009). The historical link between NAPLAN results and the FFHP and the link between the FFHP and accountability instruments in general (indicated by ‘results’ in extracts 4.0, 4.2 and 4.7 and ‘outcomes’ in extract 4.2) as well as the linking of English literacy and numeracy targets to the Accountability and Performance Improvement Framework (APIF) (in extract 4.4 below) also shows a relationship in the text between the performance ‘outcomes’ from testing instruments, government coercion and the commanding role of dominant authoritative knowledge in curriculum and pedagogy. This, in turn, indicates global panopticism (and the global eye) (Lingard, Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2003)

\(^{101}\) Although Accelerated Literacy was adopted by the NT Department of Education, Employment and Training (NTDEET) in 2004 as a strategy to improve the literacy and numeracy of Indigenous students, in a study, it was found only to accelerate rates of literacy development in remote non-Indigenous students (Tyler, Robinson & Bartlett, 2008).
and the standardisation and national surveillance that this entails operating across all Australian education policy platforms, including Indigenous education ones.

**Extract 4.4**

This policy is in addition to the existing requirements for schools to ...
- identify literacy and numeracy targets and the programs and resources that will be used to meet these targets in the short and longer term in their Annual Operational Plans and their four-year Strategic Improvement Plans, under the Accountability and Performance Improvement Framework (APIF)

**4.2e Assimilation is the Key**

The deprecation strategies in operation in extract 4.2 also demonstrate the policy is underpinned by the policy orientation of ‘language as a problem’ (Ruiz, 1984, 2010) that can be amended with assimilative remedies of more English. Not only does this rationale have no basis in fact or evidence to support it (see Ch2) making it invalid (a fallacy)\(^\text{102}\), it also appears to confirm arguments by Ellis (2002: 515) that much of Australia’s direction in terms of ESL teaching is “supported by behaviourist psycholinguistic theories prevalent in education in the 1940s” where increased exposure to an L2 will result in higher L2 language and literacy levels and where L1 was thought to be “best avoided in the learning process” in order to “develop much better proficiency in the second language”.

**4.2f FFHP will Normalise Indigenous People**

The assimilation remedy in the FFHP with the instruction in extract 4.0 to teach in “English for the first four hours of each school day, in order to improve literacy and numeracy results” also suggests the policy is underpinned by Howard strategies of ‘normalising’ and ‘mainstreaming’ to overcome deficit (Howard-Wagner, 2007; Piller & Takahashi, 2011; Watson, 2011; Macoun, 2011). Continued Indigenous failure, indicated by ‘despite’ further in the text (extract 4.2), also strongly suggests an association with the Howard Intervention account of Indigenous deficiency

\(^\text{102}\) This refers to the notion of an unreasonable argument that violates the ten ethical rules of argumentation (in Appendix 3.8).
as a failure to adapt and the crisis this generates (Howard-Wagner, 2007; Macoun, 2011; Piller & Takahashi, 2011). That is, the FFHP appears to represent another demand for Indigenous students to be exposed to the mainstream and ‘normalised’ to overcome their inherent and cultural deficiencies.

### 4.2g The Normativity of English and English as the Language of the Nation-State

**Extract 4.5**

The ability to read and write and to be numerate is the foundation for all school learning. Good literacy and numeracy skills are critical if young people are to complete their schooling successfully. These skills are also required if they are to participate fully in the economic and social development of the NT and the nation.

In conjunction with IL deficit discourse, evident in these extracts is a normativity conferred on SAE regardless of the sociological and linguistic context. This is most notable in statements on literacy and numeracy that fail to name the language they are referring to, as in extract 4.7 (“improvements in literacy and numeracy for all NT students”) and extract 4.5 (“The ability to read and write is the foundation for all school learning”) above. Normativity of SAE and Western culture is also evident in the absence of IL and culture in the discourse of the policy and guidelines. This normativity recurs in a representation of a [nation-state] crisis created by a lack of SAE literacy and numeracy, denoted by ‘critical’ (as in “Good literacy and numeracy skills are critical” in extract 4.5). This normativity of SAE is reinforced with a conditional clause when English is framed as essential for participation in the life of the territory and the nation in extract 4.5 with “These skills are also required if they are to participate fully in the economic and social development of the NT and the nation.”

Normativity of SAE and culture is also apparent in the first sentence of extract 4.5, “The ability to read and write and to be numerate is the foundation for all school learning”, where there is the use of the building metaphor (‘foundation’) in relation to English and learning. This metaphor strengthens the topos of advantage and usefulness for monolingual SAE education which is intensified with the adjective ‘all’ in relation to students. Corson (1993: 169) argues the
use of ‘all’ signifies a distortion of ideology since it is a representation of sectional interests as being universal. The simple present grammatical construction and lack of modality again discursively constructs the association of all these elements as a ‘fact’, ‘truth’, ‘the way things are’ suggesting a rationalisation legitimisation strategy at work (as outlined by Lawton, 2013; Reyes, 2011).

4.2h Competition and Atomisation - Survival of the Individual and Nation

Competition and atomisation are also obvious in extract 4.5 above in; “These [SAE literacy and numeracy] skills are required if they [students and potential workers] are to participate fully in the economic and social development of the NT and the nation”. Key verb (“participate fully”) and noun phrases (“economic and social development of the NT and the nation”) in this excerpt connote individual responsibility for the nation and cultural capital associated with market worth. Implied in this sentence is the idea of national social and economic prosperity being underpinned by congruous SAE literacy and numeracy (with ‘skills’) and tied together by the metaphor of the market (“participate fully in the economic and social development”). The use of the adjective ‘social’ is, in fact, associated with one of the major tenets of neo-liberalism, that of ‘social mobility’ (Collins, 1989).

4.2i Misrepresentation of IL and Indigenous Culture

What is also evident in these extracts is the implication that ILs or L1s do not provide a means to acquire a dominant colonial language and literacy, even though this is supported by both international (Baker, 2008; Cummins, 2000; May, 2008) and empirical NT evidence (Gaglioti, 1999; Gale, et al, 1981; Lasorsa, 1990; McConvell & Theiberger, 2001; Murtagh, 1982; Ch2; Appendix 1.2). Studies in Laija-Rodriguez, Ochoa and Parker (2006) and Baker (2011), in fact, document high L1 language proficiency resulting in higher readings skills, academic achievement, quicker L2 literacy transfer and higher L2 readings skills. This indicates a macrostrategy of (mis)representation is operating here both in terms of bilingual education and the importance of ILs and culture in schools. This misrepresentation of monolingual dominant education leading to higher SAE literacy and numeracy rates is also evident in the causation idiomatic phrase, ‘in order to’ (Extract 4.0) and the topos of usefulness or advantage (of SAE
monolingual education) in “identified need ... to make improvements” (Extract 4.7). This misrepresentation is made even more evident when the policy excludes Languages Other Than English (LOTE) from the directive (in extract 4.6 below), even though LOTE is also highly “marginalised” in all language education sectors (Molyneux, 2009: 98).

Extract 4.6

1 Policy

- The requirement is subject to a common sense interpretation to allow for the timetabling of morning classes for Languages Other than English (LOTE) in secondary schools and colleges.

4.2j Deficit Discourse, Danger to the Nation-State and Equity as Sameness

Extract 4.7

This decision was made in response to an identified need to make improvements in literacy and numeracy for all NT students, in particular the results being achieved by Indigenous students.

Although the policy extract 4.7 above (from the Business Need section of the FFHP) professes that the directive is aimed at “all NT students”, there is an implied focus of the FFHP as a remedy for Indigenous student deficiencies with “in particular the results being achieved by Indigenous students” which is also evident in extract 4.0 with “particularlly for Indigenous students”. Indigenous students are also construed as having an “identified need to make improvements” (extract 4.7) and “need[ing] increased opportunities to learn and practise their English literacy skills” in extract 4.1. These statements, with the use of ‘need to’ and ‘need’, express obligation and essential repair (Bartlett, 2004). They thereby denote a legitimation strategy of moral obligation (van Leeuwan, 2008) and imply cultural deficits (where the Indigenous community cannot provide sufficient SAE thus resulting in a ‘need’). The use of ‘for’ in “for all NT students” in extract 4.7 also indicates a topos of humanitarianism and an argument of moral obligation to introduce the FFHP is operating here (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Glenn & Goldthwaite, 2008).
The use of ‘need’ and ‘need to’ also appear to allude to the divisive danger of non-dominant languages and groups to the nation-state, given the threat to a “full understanding of key .... political concepts” that non-dominant languages present (Lo Bianco, 2001a: 205). This ‘need’ for congruity in SAE language and culture also implies both assimilative policy as a remedy for ‘lack’ in the colonised other (and a link to fantasmatic logic, Clarke, 2012) as well as the mechanism for accruing ‘market’ cultural capital and thereby ‘market’ sameness and equity. This relates to the neo-liberal construction of same and equal rights and freedoms as opposed to differentiated group rights to attain equality (Howard-Wagner, 2007: 3).

This equity as sameness motif is also evident in the direction to use mainstream literacy and numeracy programs in the guideline (extract 4.3) with the one exception of Walking, Talking Texts (Murray, 1995).

4.2k Postcolonial Invisibility of ILs

The framing of the language problem as one of insufficient English in the guide Extract 4.1, “The provision of an environment at school where English is used regularly in a variety of ways will support the development of proficiency in English literacy and enhance numeracy skills” implies a failure to recognise that English is sociologically and educationally a L2 (ESL) or additional language in remote and very remote schools. Indeed, this is also evident in extracts 4.0, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.7 where IL and cultures are absent in any reference to educational contexts. The implication here is one of postcolonial ‘invisibility’ of ILs and culture in the policy (Sellwood & Angelo, 2013). This seems to be supported by the fact that, as mentioned above, although the policy guide directs staff to use existing ESL department policies, only one program recommended for use with the policy (Walking, Talking Texts, Murray, 1995) was actually designed for Indigenous contexts (but originally created in an urban Alice Springs setting) for Standard English as an Additional Dialect/ ESL students. It appears, then, that language teaching is “subsumed entirely under an overarching category of (English) literacy” as stated by Sellwood and Angelo (2013: 251). The referral to migrant ESL policies also seems to suggest the

---

103 This interestingly contrasts with the interpretation offered by a community member at Site 1, of ‘same’ rights and educational privileges when taught in a L1 (see Ch5).
positioning of Indigenous people “as an ethnic minority along with other non-Anglo immigrants” (Walter & Butler, 2013: 399) but without the same resources allocated.

4.2| Passivity and Invisibility of Indigenous People

Invisibility also applies to Indigenous subjects. Despite the policy being aimed at Indigenous teachers and non-Indigenous teachers in remote and very remote schools, Indigenous teachers are not directly referred to in the policy text until the second page under ‘Responsibilities’ (in extract 4.8 below) and only then in relation to their management.

**Extract 4.8**

Ensuring teachers, Assistant Teachers and other support staff have access to appropriate training or professional development to enable them to operate effectively in ‘English only’ classrooms.

Apart from this, the grammatical construction in the text is largely passive, with only schools, school councils, NT Government, Australian Government Minister for Education and Training, and students explicitly being named. Schools and school councils, however, only appear in the subject position with directives as in extract 4.9 below (the third paragraph in the policy text).

**Extract 4.9**

Each school, in conjunction with its school council, will ensure that its school timetable addresses this requirement.

Students only appear in prepositional/adverbial phrases (as in “for all NT students, in particular .... Indigenous students” and “particularly for Indigenous students” in extracts 4.7 and 4.0) in the policy, or as objects (as in “to assist students’ understanding” from extract 4.10 below) in the guide or are omitted altogether in passive constructions (such as in extract 4.1, “The provision of an environment at school where English is used regularly in a variety of ways will support the development of proficiency in English literacy”). Alternatively, they appear in the subordinate conditional clause (such as in the policy Extract 4.5 “Good literacy and numeracy skills are critical
if young people are to complete their schooling successfully”) that acts to construe a topos of consequence, advantage and moral obligation\textsuperscript{104} for monolingual SAE education (discussed above).

That is, Indigenous subjects tend to be passive or lack agency. Van Dijk (2000: 40) claims that this is a typical strategy for depicting minorities as having “things ... being decided or done, for or against them”. The exception, which is not evident here (but is in the following policy discourse text), occurs when minorities are the responsible “agents of negative actions, such as illegal entry, crime, violence or drug abuse” (van Dijk, 2000: 40).

\textbf{Extract 4.10}

2 SCOPE

It may be necessary for schools to provide some translation of terms and concepts required to assist students’ understandings, particularly in the early years of schooling, in areas where English is not the L1 of students.

4.3 Transcript 2: Media article (opinion) by Marion Scrymgour – The Language Gap (Appendix 4.2)

The \textit{Language Gap} is an opinion news article issued by Marion Scrymgour that first appeared on ABC Unleashed (an online ABC media site), Tuesday 23 December 2008. It consists of one document comprised of approximately 1200 words and 23 paragraphs. It was largely a response to a 2008 article written for ABC by Indigenous education and human rights specialist, Tom Calma. Calma (2008) was then ATSI Social Justice Commissioner at the AHRC (from 2004 to 2010).\textsuperscript{105} The Calma article proposed that school success in remote contexts required bicultural bilingual education with a focus on Indigenous literacy education in the early years.

\textsuperscript{104} The conditional clauses, “if young people are to complete their schooling” and “If they are to participate fully...” represents a typical legitimation and coercive strategy in political discourse of a hypothetical future that “requires our imminent action in the present” (Reyes, 2011: 786). This shows a moral evaluation legitimation strategy and moral obligation (a topos of humanitarianism) is framing the argument for the FFHP.

\textsuperscript{105} This article can be found at the ABC website, at \url{http://www.abc.net.au/news/2008-12-18/38228} as of 7 August 2014.
Calma cited international meta-analyses that conclusively showed bilingual education is "consistently superior to all-English approaches" and leads to higher academic and dominant language literacy and numeracy outcomes. He also stated close community co-operation was a sign of good school performance which the FFHP undermined. These elements relate intimately to those proposed by Cummins (2000) for additive bilingual education and the APA (1997) Psychological Principles for Successful Learning. In addition, Calma referred to two articles from Human Rights covenants – Article 29.1 and Article 14.1 – which argued for the need to develop “respect for the child’s parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values” in addition to the right of Indigenous people to “establish and control their educational systems and institutions, providing education in their own language” (in Calma, 2008). The complete Scrymgour opinion article transcript appears in Appendix 4.2.

4.3a No difference between Indigenous and English Language Education except Costs

The dominant arguments in the Scrymgour letter largely involve refutations of Tom Calma’s critical analysis of the FFHP. This occurs in the following:

**Extract 4.11**

Mr Calma knows (or if he doesn’t he ought to) that the division of remote NT Schools into ‘bilingual’ and ‘English only’ schools is spurious. The reality is that in the many areas where a particular regional language is spoken by most or all students then that language is used as a vehicle for teaching English and learning areas, whether the school is a designated "bilingual" school or not.

Evident in this extract is the (mis) representation of the FFHP as resulting in no difference to IL bilingual schools. This is achieved through an association fallacy where one quality (of using an IL in classroom instruction) is used to support a claim of ‘no difference’ between the two schooling systems. This framing is also supported by a fallacy of argumentum ad hominem or an attack on a person’s credibility and knowledge, in “Mr Calma knows (or if he doesn’t, he

---

106 This type of comparison undermines the distinct differences between these two education systems, where an IL is only used as oral translation by assistant teachers in monolingual English education but constitutes the development focus in students of both oral and written receptive and productive skills in bilingual education.
ought to)” as opposed to refuting the arguments. This attack is intensified through explicit derogative predicates, evaluative frames, perspectivation as well as emotive and intensifying lexis (‘grossly’, ‘spurious’, ‘the reality is’, and the modality of obligation, ‘ought to’) which imply Calma as incompetent or unknowledgeable. These linguistic strategies negatively position and mitigate Mr Calma’s arguments of support for bilingual education. The emotive lexis (‘grossly’ and ‘spurious’) also suggest the macro-strategy of coercion is operating to cast Mr Calma’s arguments (which support Indigenous control of education as well as higher academic and English language literacy and numeracy outcomes as a consequence of bilingual education) in a poor light despite the extensive evidential data that support his claims (as noted above and in Ch2).

Supporting the macro-strategy of legitimation are the topos of reality or truth (“the reality is”) and the topos of uselessness (“...the division of remote NT Schools into ‘bilingual’ and ‘English only’ schools is spurious”). These create a rationale that bilingual systems and monolingual systems are effectively the same and that bilingual systems do not lead to higher academic outcomes and so should be abandoned. The topos of uselessness is later connected to the topos of costs, when Ms Scrymgour states:

**Extract 4.12**

What sets the designated “bilingual” schools apart is that they receive 20% more funding and a range of [bilingual] models, for example step, or 50-50 ... Aboriginal language and culture programs may be taught in the afternoon ... There is nothing wrong with the bilingual teaching model in principle, but nowhere in the Territory is that model viably and effectively implemented, despite the additional funding allocated to the ‘bilingual’ schools.

The use of ‘despite’ in extract 4.12 aims to diminish the culpability of government and allocate blame for Indigenous education failure to students, teachers or the communities. This claim also appears to be using all three macrostrategies of legitimation through instrumentality in

---

107 The clause “Mr Calma’s article ... is grossly misleading” was in relation to his treatment of the nine bilingual schools as one entity and the reporting of higher attendance levels at bilingual schools which Ms Scrymgour disputed in regards to Maningrida school. Maningrida school had a 49% attendance rate in 2008, 39% in 2009, 38% in 2010, 46% in 2011, 53% in 2012 and 51% in 2013 which indicates that attendance dropped initially 10% when the FFHP was brought in but rose again with greater department support for Indigenous language education in that school (ACARA, 2014).
terms of usefulness, misrepresentation of bilingual education as unsuccessful and coercion and intensification with the adverbs “viably and effectively”.

The relativity fallacy in extract 4.12 of “nowhere in the Territory is that model [of bilingual education] viably and effectively implemented” may represent, not just a direct attack against very remote bilingual schools, but another instance of an allusion to the classic neo-liberal signifier of individual (destructive) choice to not achieve and the Aboriginal ‘postcolonial’ problem (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999; Wiley & Luke, 1996). This is substantiated to a degree by the fact that NAPLAN results have been used to underpin these comments. And, as argued by Lingard, Creagh and Vass (2012: 328), NAPLAN results represent “the achievement of ‘white’ students” where the failure to achieve these standards “enables ‘blame’ to be directed towards Indigenous students”.

4.3b Inferiority of ILs and English as the Panacea and Normative

IL and culture are also represented as inferior when Ms Scrymgour writes;

Extract 4.13

The policy that the NT Government is introducing seeks to increase and improve the exposure of students to standard Australian English from the very beginning of their schooling and to require that the morning classes in each school day will be devoted to core subjects.

The parataxis (equal) relationship between clauses to do with ‘core subjects’ and SAE in the sentence, “devoted to ‘core’ subjects”, implies that only English is authoritative, and not ILs, and so can only be used to teach core subjects despite evidence to the contrary.108 The use of ‘core’ suggests the use of the centre-periphery schema which has links to the container metaphor of

108 Other evidence shows the curriculum was often integrated and L1s were used to teach core curriculum elements (see Graham, 1999; Oldfield, 2011; Purdon, 2010).
inside and outside, ‘self’ and ‘other’ (Chilton, 2006), thus positioning IL and culture on the postcolonial periphery.

Again, as in the policy text, there is also the implication in extract 4.13 with “seeks to increase and improve the exposure of students to [SAE]” that there was both insufficient and poor quality exposure to SAE in remote schools prior to the FFHP. As with the previous text, this representation strategy indicates a critique of remote area schools in general or a critique of bilingual schools in addition to the failure to recognise the ESL status of remote schools and the teaching techniques that require a high use of oral ILs. As such, the representation strategy appears to represent an example of postcolonial ‘invisibility’ of IL and culture (Sellwood & Angelo, 2013: 251). As stated earlier, this is evidence of the policy functioning with IL as a problem which contrasts markedly with the advocacy for the use of ILs in human rights documents.

There is also here a recurring claim that greater exposure to SAE will result in higher SAE literacy levels with “increase and improve the exposure” which indicates, as with the policy text, the operation in the policy discourse of behaviourist theory (Ellis, 2002). As in the policy text, there is the use of a rationalising legitimation strategy (with present simple grammar) and the topos of consequence (“seeks to increase”) to support the claim. However, since the claim is not borne out by evidence, this indicates it is a fallacy (of Argumentum ad populum or popular opinion) and so is actually a macro-strategy of delegitimation.

The need to “increase and improve” English through the FFHP also suggests not only links to postcolonial theory with fantasmatic logic (the colonial ideal) and the construal of Indigenous deficiency or lack (in SAE) that is amended through assimilation (Clarke, 2012), but the neo-liberal tenant of equity as sameness (and the SAE cultural capital required by the market). This implies a punishment of bilingual schools in the removal or reduction of their IL programs for their failure to ‘normalise’ and equalise its student population (see Foucault, 1977 on schooling and punishment).

ILs are also represented using a metaphor of ‘travel’ (denoted by ‘vehicle’) to frame the normative view of English as the ‘goal’ of all education when Ms Scrymgour writes, “the
particular vernacular regional language ... is used as a vehicle for teaching English and learning areas” in extract 4.11. Such a representation also suggests the use of a human capital frame for monolingual English teaching despite the much poorer socio-economic outcomes associated with the loss of ILs (Ch2). There is also here again a glaring omission of ILs as being a learning area.

This ‘travel’ metaphor is later repeated in the final paragraph:

**Extract 4.14**

The destination we want to reach is one where the job of teaching the class is undertaken effectively and comprehensively by one teacher – preferably a local Aboriginal person fluent in both SAE and the relevant regional Aboriginal language.

This travel metaphor (“destination we want to reach”) has particular associations with the pathway and procession metaphor (related to front/back, leader/follower and inferior/superior) described by Chilton (2006: 64) that is commonly used in policy and planning to connote an ‘ideal. Thus, the travel metaphor in this instance repeats the connotation of English as the ideal (even only) language that will lead to educational success and only those competent in English know about education and can teach.

**Extract 4.15**

A subordinate representation of ILs is repeated when Ms Scrymgour writes;

It is understood and accepted by the NT Government that it will take time for the teaching of core subjects in the morning to be conducted only in English, and the role of Aboriginal teachers and teacher assistants will continue to be valued as an important tool for teaching students the core curriculum subjects (in particular English) which they need to master to progress to secondary and then tertiary education.

Evident in this extract is the fact that the new policy requires both English language and core subjects be taught in the first four hours of each day. This again implies that ILs cannot be used
for the teaching of core subjects and that Indigenous curriculum elements are categorised as not core elements and are thereby superfluous. Referring to non-Indigenous elements and English language as ‘core’ also adds to the representation of these elements as normative. This framing and representation of English language as the goal, the repeated stipulation that English (and not an IL) must be used for core subjects and the consequent implication of ILs and culture as having no relevance to the teaching of core curriculum subjects shows another association of the text with postcolonial ‘invisibility’ (terra nullus) of ILs and culture and the need to ‘fill up’ students with Western language and knowledge (Sellwood & Angelo, 2013). The linking of English language and ‘core’ curriculum subjects to educational progress also demonstrates another strong connection to the settler colonial neo-liberal discourse of competition where, despite evidence to contrary (as discussed earlier), the language of the dominant is construed as the cultural capital for the market, as the key to educational and socio-economic mobility and success and national advancement.

Given the fact that SAE is equated with the formation of dominant authoritative knowledge (in “teaching students the core curriculum subjects (in particular English)”), SAE becomes the measure of performability and accountability. This extract, therefore, also appears to link to neo-liberal globalisation instrumentality.

This representation is intensified with the adjective ‘particular’, the verbs ‘master’ and ‘progress’ and the modal of (individual) obligation ‘need to’ in “teaching students the core curriculum subjects (in particular English) which they need to master to progress to secondary and then tertiary education.” The use of the modal ‘need to’ reinforces (teaching English as) an obligation and an essential requirement (Bartlett, 2004: 75) making this an argument of moral obligation. As with the policy text, this appears to also allude to the divisive danger of non-dominant languages (Lo Bianco, 2001a) and SAE as an assimilative (and fantasmatic) remedy (for this lack, Clarke, 2012). The use of ‘progress’, Chilton (2006) argues, relates to the ‘front back’ schema or metaphor (a procession or ordering with leaders and followers). The use of ‘master’ relates to the master-apprentice metaphor and so links with the building metaphor (“foundation”) in the FFHP.
4.3c Indigenous Staff as Inferior

In terms of exclusion and inclusion and the creation of ‘in’ and ‘out’ groups, as with the FFHP, Indigenous staff are generally construed in the text as subservient, incapable and even absent from the school context. Absence is evident in passive grammatical constructions in extract 4.11, for instance, with “where a particular regional language is spoken by most or all students then that language is used as a vehicle for teaching English” and the modal passive in extract 4.12, “Aboriginal language and culture programs may be taught in the afternoon”. Invisibility of Indigenous people is accompanied by allusions to the incapability and deficiency of Indigenous teaching staff in extract 4.12 with “nowhere in the Territory is that model (bilingual education) viably and effectively implemented”.

When Indigenous subjects are active, they are represented stereotypically as ‘assistants’ to white teaching staff despite the prominent role of many as fully qualified teachers and the IL planning, delivery and assessment role of assistant teachers in bilingual schools (see Appendix 1.2). This is evident in the second paragraph of the text with:

**Extract 4.16**

Although there is a small number of fully qualified Aboriginal teachers (spread out amongst the ‘bilingual’ and ‘English only’ schools), for the most part when the class is addressed in an Aboriginal language it is by Aboriginal teacher assistants.

The implication here with the use of ‘small number’ and a stereotypical portrayal of Indigenous teachers as ‘Aboriginal teacher assistants’ is the failure of Indigenous people to gain qualifications to teach. This signifies an implication operating here of Indigenous deficit and incapability.

This construction is intensified when Ms Scrymgour stated that “teacher assistants will continue to be valued as an important tool” in extract 4.15. Not only is the term ‘tool’ aligned with the master-apprentice metaphor (“core subjects ... [students] need to master” in extract 4.15) and so connotes hierarchy, it equivocates Indigenous teachers to inanimate objects (tools). That is,
they are depersonalised and their position rendered subservient and secondary to non-Indigenous teachers. The construction of Indigenous staff as non-prominent, unacknowledged, unknowledgeable and even omitted is almost a classist, socio-economic categorisation (Walter & Butler, 2013) but with strong postcolonial undertones of ‘denial’ of Indigenous agency, history and visibility.

This inferior representation and incapacity is amplified in the following extract:

**Extract 4.17**

A focus and emphasis on such transition of Aboriginal teaching assistants into qualified teachers is another aspect of ‘Transforming Indigenous Education’. The reality is that while most Aboriginal teacher assistants are fluent in their own regional Aboriginal language, their capacity to assist the classroom teacher across all learning areas (including English), even if using their own language as a tool, is limited.

When Ms Scrymgour makes the statement, Aboriginal teaching assistants “confirmed interest in and enthusiasm for” a career path, this was interpreted as ‘conventional [Western] teaching qualifications’.109 There is thereby a failure to acknowledge the cultural and linguistic skills that local teachers and assistant teachers can bring to the classroom. It is also again suggestive of the invisibility of Indigenous people and culture (Sellwood & Angelo, 2013). The stereotypical perspectivation, “The reality is...their capacity to assist...is limited” overtly constructs Indigenous teachers as incapable (with the adjective ‘limited’) underpinned by a topos of reality and a rationalisation legitimisation strategy (indicated by ‘the reality is’).

---

109 The NT Government has consistently ‘interpreted’ the request for an Aboriginal Language Worker career path as a demand for mainstream further tertiary education to attain a teaching degree. However, this request relates to the proposal of a tiered Aboriginal Language Worker professional structure that includes both Vocational Education and Training qualifications as well as specific Indigenous language education degrees (on par in status with mainstream teacher education degrees) that recognise and develop existing Indigenous language skills and cultural knowledge.
4.3d Burrarra Oppression

The only time where Indigenous subjects are presented as active is in the narrative regarding the (negative) representation of the domination of Burrarra language and people at the Maningrida School.

The extract begins with:

**Extract 4.18**

… the adoption of one particular language as a language of instruction in the school is profoundly political and often contentious at the local level … Maningrida is a Western Arnhem Land town which was developed as a Government ‘settlement’ in the mid-20th Century, resulting in the coalescing there of a number of different language groups. Under Aboriginal protocol they were and continue to be visitors on the land of the traditional owners, whose language is Ndjebbana. … Over the years, many Burrara people have moved into Maningrida to live. There are also many people from other language groups in Maningrida, including a significant contingent of Kunwinjku speakers.

For many years the only Aboriginal language taught at the Maningrida school was Burrarra. A Ndjebbana program has commenced only in the very recent past.

When I was last in Maningrida I spoke at length to Aboriginal teaching staff and to parents of school aged children. One of the most senior traditional owners told me that he regarded the bilingual program at the school to be Burrarra-dominated, and that he would continue to refuse to send his children there unless they were to be taught in English (as he was taught himself when attending school).

The domination of Burrara, evidenced in the text by “many Burrarra people have moved into Maningrida … For many years the only Aboriginal language taught at the Maningrida school was Burrara … the bilingual program at the school to be Burrarra dominated”, is used to bolster the claim of traditional owner preference for SAE education.

In this excerpt, Ms Scrymgour renders an active subjectivity for (invasive and dominating) non-traditional owner groups infiltrating and overwhelming Maningrida. As discussed in the policy
text analysis, active subjectivity is the strategy utilised to construct minorities as “agents of negative actions ... crime, violence or drug abuse” (van Dijk, 2000: 40) and, in this case, invasion.

Scrymgour also used a Ndjebbana speaker telling the story of Burrarra domination as a mechanism for negatively framing ‘out’ groups (the negative ‘others’) to support dominant language education and so has enlisted mythopoesis (or legitimation through story-telling) and authorisation (or legitimation by ‘elder’ authority). The use of these macrostrategies are significant since, Gasper (1996: 9) explained, narratives are an excellent way to transmit “a framework of meanings” as they integrate arguments and evidence as well as infuse the text with definitions, goals, values and problems.

In this extract, Scrymgour denotes values and problems by invoking negative lexicalisation as well as the “violation of norms and values of [a] normative group” (as outlined by van Dijk, 1995b: 144) which, in this case, is the failure to use Ndjebbana language. However, as May (2012: 153) notes, the use of such internal disparities in group opinion to negate “the legitimacy of minority language claims” represents “a reduction ad absurdum”.

To support the claim of bilingual education as being problematic in multilingual contexts, Ms Scrymgour has enlisted a number of discursive strategies (principally of nomination, predication and framing) that involve metaphor, personal pronouns and lexis. For example, she enlists the container metaphor (inside/outside) in her description of the site of linguistic contention, the Maningrida School, when she writes that non-traditional owners, dominated by the Burrarra language group, have ‘moved in’. Ms Scrymgour also uses the lexicalpredications of ‘visitors’ to describe the Indigenous ‘out’ group at the school and ‘traditional owners’ to describe the ‘in’ group, even using their language name to describe the location of the school, in ‘Ndjebbana country’. She uses the prestigious nomination “most senior traditional owners” to introduce

---

110 This scenario which Scrymgour exploits in her letter to the editor is related to the phenomenon described by Lo Bianco and Rhdywen (2001) in Ch2 of lifestyle change (particularly lifestyle associated with less traditional country visits and traditional cultural activities) resulting in the decreasing use of a traditional IL and an increasing use of a different dominant IL. However, decisions on which dialect or language to use in a school is a community-wide decision. So, while some individual members may be dissatisfied with the IL taught in a school, the vast majority have agreed to this decision.

111 Scrymgour’s claim also appears to be contradicted by other reports that suggested community members prefer the use of a related IL and bilingual education rather than English only (see Graham, 1999; Maningrida Community, 1999; Nambara Schools Council, 1999; non-Indigenous ex-teacher, pi, 13 November 2013).
a narrative that describes the elder’s contention about the domination of Burrarra at the school and his ‘refusal’ to send his children there until English was used as the medium of instruction.

In relation to this extract, Ms Scrymgour is also presented as one of the (primary) agents, as in “When I was last in Maningrida I spoke” and “One of the most senior traditional owners told me...”. The rendering of the narrative in such a way invokes two typical legitimation strategies of public speakers and politicians according van Leeuwan and Wodak (1999). The first, the concordance with the wishes of a traditional owner, implies altruism (doing something of benefit for a particular group or serving the interests of a sector of the population) and is a typical coercive mechanism of politicians (van Leeuwan & Wodak 1999). The other (denoted by ‘told me’) is rationalisation which is invoked in the text with the implication that there was consultation, evaluation and “thoughtful procedures” (van Leeuwan & Wodak, 1999: 786, 800).

4.3e Indigenous Behavioural Deficits

Finally, Indigenous deficits in terms of the failure to meet educational outcomes are presented as an ‘attendance’ problem which has a behavioural, as opposed to socio-economic or health, basis. In this extract, Ms Scrymgour writes:

Extract 4.19

"Transforming Indigenous Education" policy which the NT Government is introducing involves a range of targeted measures, emphasis on SAE is only one of them. In regard to attendance, it is proposed the existing truancy powers and processes under the NT Education Act be enhanced so that effective action in relation to non-attendance can be taken at all remote communities, including Maningrida.

The fact that attendance is linked to “targeted measures” associates this statement with a ‘war’ metaphor of an assault, presumably, against literacy failure and truants and their community cohorts in a bid to increase school effectiveness and academic achievements. The use of a war metaphor, Lakoff (1992) asserts, is a particularly powerful framing device and denotes a moral

112 This contradicts evidence that bilingual education in remote Indigenous areas enhances attendance (see for example Devlin, 2010, Dickson, 2010 and Appendix 1.2).
imperative in a metaphor that he has termed ‘The Fairy Tale of the Just War’. Its use, thereby, is suggesting the government, the hero, has a moral obligation to intervene and call the villains – the child, the parents or the school – to account in their fight against poor attendance. This, thus, indicates the rendering of a moral evaluation legitimation strategy. Again, there are postcolonial and neoliberal implications here since those who fail to attend school and achieve educationally are engaging in an “individual destructive choice” (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 363) and are ‘not pulling their weight’ for the nation (denoting individualism and individual responsibility for the economy as outlined by Davies & Bansel, 2007; Clarke, 2012).

However, construing attendance as an exclusively behavioural issue contrasts with what researchers have argued is often the result of inappropriate teaching methods or medical and socio-economic problems. As previously noted, Cowey, Harper, Dunn and Wolgemuth (2009), demonstrate there is no direct causative relationship between attendance and academic outcomes for Indigenous students in their analysis of data sets from two literacy programs (National Accelerated Literacy Program and Abracadabra) but rather the correlation exists between engagement (influenced by curriculum and pedagogy) and academic outcomes (Cowey, et al, 2009). In this regard, they noted that productively engaging students in literacy learning in addition to the “nature of the program used to teach it” were the primary elements responsible for academic outcomes and literacy acquisition (Cowey, et al, 2009: 14).

This issue is also canvassed in the findings of Behrendt and Causland (2008: 27) who found disengagement from school was due to “a lack of identification with educational values and expectations”, “a failure of the school ethos to respect and validate cultural and self-identity and to supply experiences that are relevant to life’s circumstances”. Behrendt and Causland, (2008: 28) explain that the many truants had “ear disease and hearing loss”, poor nutrition and high morbidity largely as a consequence of socio-economic conditions that remain invisible in

---

113 After a study of media reports on the Gulf War, Lakoff (1992) concluded that the war metaphor is associated with morality and justness. In this metaphor, Lakoff (1992) identified a protagonist or villain, an innocent victim and a hero who rescues the innocent victim from the villain.

114 This links with Munns, Martin and Craven’s (2008) work on Indigenous engagement with tasks being a product of ‘engaging pedagogies’ that “encourage high cognitive, affective and procedural responses” from students in addition to the development of a classroom learning community. These engaging pedagogies arise when teachers interrogate ‘discourses of power’ that are operating in their classroom and ensure there is cultural inclusivity, role modelling, peer support, culturally appropriate curricular, pedagogy and extra-curricular activities in addition to a whole school approach where “Indigenous students feel valued, supported and catered for across involvement, emotional and cognitive levels” (Munns, Martin & Craven, 2008: 100).
quantifiable attendance statistics and can also contribute to low self-esteem and lack of performance. Lack of attendance has also been attributed to the absence from a community as a consequence of the disruption to family life that results from incarceration or from hospitalisation of family members which, again, represent socio-economic factors related to institutional and structural inequality (Wendy Baarda in HRSCATSIA, 2012: 45).

4.3f Failure of Bilingual Indigenous Schools and Indigenous Deficiency

Scrymgour frequently frames the introduction of the FFHP as a response to the failed policy of bilingual education despite the fact that this can be refuted by substantial NT research (see Appendix 1.2; Ch2). This was noted in extract 4.12 with “nowhere in the Territory is that [bilingual] model viably and effectively implemented”. It is also evident in the negative predication of Indigenous teachers (discussed in Indigenous staff as Inferior), the failure of schools to expose students to sufficient SAE (in Inferiority of ILs and English as the panacea and normative) and the lack of non-Indigenous staff to teach ILs (which suggests bilingual education does not meet an economic efficiency criteria) in:

Extract 4.20

...There are virtually no non-Aboriginal teachers who speak the relevant regional language with sufficient fluency to be able to teach in it. Most can barely speak the language at all, and this includes non-Aboriginal teachers at ‘bilingual’ schools.

To support this framing, Ms Scrymgour attempted legitimation by direct quotation from authoritative evidence using the government’s own report of 1999 (Collins, 1999), in addition to a (mis)representation macro-strategy in relation to the failure of bilingual education.

---

115 Wendy Baarda (in HRSCATSIA, 2012), a teacher linguist at Yuendumu, in fact noted studies that showed attendance figures of 50-60% actually translated to attendance that was greater than 90% in some communities if attendance was based on the presence of children in the community (and does not include those who have temporarily gone to other communities or towns largely as a consequence of family member death, hospitalisation or incarceration).
Extract 4.21

In the 1999 Learning Lessons report commissioned by the Northern Territory Government it was noted that the reality in Northern Territory “bilingual” classrooms was that “the proportions of languages used, and the quality of instruction delivered, zigzag widely from year to year depending on the experience and skills of the teachers available at any one time, and the school leadership support for bilingual education”.

The representation involved the use of a coercive predication (a zipper metaphor, ‘zigzag’) to describe the inconsistency in languages and quality instruction in bilingual schools. However, the legitimisation strategy fails to support Ms Scrymgour’s claim of poorer educational outcomes when the evidence she presents contradicts her own assertion in:

Extract 4.22

Historical assessment data reviewed by the authors of Learning Lessons indicated that at that time “bilingual” schools, or some of them, were achieving positive outcomes in comparison with benchmark non-bilingual schools. The most recent data shows that that situation has changed.

To counter this, Ms Scrymgour uses a representation macro-strategy supported by a topos of numbers (with quantitative data) in, “The most recent data shows that that situation has changed”. However, this is not elaborated in the text. Rather, due to previous media coverage, the inference here is that the poor NT NAPLAN results represent the evidence. As mentioned above, NAPLAN outcomes are viewed by many as questionable in very remote Indigenous contexts where there has been a consistent failure to differentiate the results of schools that have part-time IL and bilingual programs and the fact that NAPLAN cannot account for the linguistic repertoire or the context of multilinguals (see Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). Apart from this, however, criticisms by linguist Brian Devlin (2009b: 8) have also been levelled at the quality of the NAPLAN evidence provided to the legislative assembly to support FFHP which he noted “concealed half of the data and what it did include was too selective, invalid and unreliable to be taken seriously”. Scrymgour’s statement also fails to account for institutional change where resources were dramatically reduced following the introduction of the Schools Our Focus policy in 1998 (an attempt to remove all bilingual programs) and the Collins (1999) report which resulted in bilingual programs becoming increasingly subtractive.
Another bilingual school (mis)representational macro-strategy of interest to note is in the following:

**Extract 4.23**

While some "bilingual" schools retain linguists who assist with the production of literacy materials, there are virtually no non-Aboriginal teachers who speak the relevant regional language with sufficient fluency to be able to teach in it.

Here the use of verb ‘retain’ implies that it was a school’s choice to terminate the employment of their linguists as opposed to any structural changes and consequential job losses that arose from the FFHP. This statement thus deflects government responsibility for the lack of qualified IL teaching support staff at some remote schools that resulted from policy changes (such as the FFHP) and so creates a misrepresentation of events.

The use of metonymies according to de Cillia, Wodak and Reisigl (1999: 165) allow “speakers to dissolve individuals, and hence volitions and responsibilities, or to keep them in the semantic background.” The use of the metonymy ‘bilingual schools’ in this instance appears to keep the actions backgrounded of parents, teachers and community social actors who diverted school budgets to keep linguists employed, who used outside funds for this purpose, who campaigned for the retention of linguists (as in the two communities in this study) or who brought a human rights case against the NT Government to retain bilingual status. Indigenous teachers are also omitted in this text which involves the implicit predication of a ‘lack’ in professional skills for Indigenous subjects.

**4.4 Transcript 3: Four Corners Interview with Gary Barnes (Appendix 4.3)**

The transcript of the Four Corners Interview with Gary Barnes, Marion Scrymgour’s successor to the Ministry of Education portfolio, was derived from unedited video footage of an interview with Mr Barnes and ABC reporter Debbie Whitmont that appeared on the ABC documentary website, ‘Going back to Lajamanu’. The documentary, broadcast in September 2009, examined
the FFHP one year after its introduction and featured the opinions of politicians, linguists and community elders. The Barnes video interview was transcribed on 10 December 2013 and comprised approximately 2000 words.

Barnes stayed in this portfolio from 2009 to 2013 whereupon he was assigned as Chief Executive in the Chief Minister’s Department. Prior to this, Mr Barnes was the Deputy Chief Executive of the Queensland Public Service Commission, and held various senior department positions in education departments of the Queensland government.

Analysis of Text

The following represents an analysis of the interview extracts that contain the majority of Mr Barnes’ argumentative claims within the interview. During the interview, Barnes is questioned by a Four Corners’ journalist on the goals of the FFHP, how it should be realised in the classroom, how it is realised in a particular context (Lajamanu) and problems associated with bilingual education in justification of its withdrawal.

4.4a Normativity of English and English as Panacea for Literacy and Numeracy

Extract 4.24

What that policy means is that there’ll be an explicit focus in the first instance on teaching in English and that we’ll have our assistant teachers who know the local language, support those teachers in delivering those concepts to the kids... I guess it’s the explicitness that makes the difference. We absolutely want our young Indigenous people to become proficient in the use of English language. Um, that’s fundamentally important. It’s the language of learning. It’s the language of living. And, it’s the language of the, of the, ah, the main culture in Australia. Um, so it’s being explicit around the importance of that. It’s making sure that students have both their own language and culture.
What is noted most in this extract is the intensity of the implicitness of mainstream English language education superiority and the normativity of dominant (English) language. Both these elements, van Dijk (1995a) reports, are common framing and predication (what he refers to as ‘perspectivation’) strategies and are evident, as previously noted, in the other policy texts. The implicitness is obvious from the beginning where Mr Barnes’s repeats Marion Scrymgour’s assertion that the policy means there will “be an explicit focus on English” implying that there was not one before (a presupposition). Again, in making the claim, it appears to both hark back to behaviourist views on second language acquisition (Ellis, 2002) and present us with a fallacy of definition of Indigenous bilingual education as largely Indigenous monolingual education.116

4.4b The FFHP is a Solution to the Literacy and Numeracy Problems

Mr Barnes in extract 4.24 also frames the FFHP as a solution to literacy and numeracy issues. Heavy government involvement in the issue and intensification is suggested by the adverb ‘absolutely’ and the adjective ‘fundamentally’ in, “We absolutely want our young Indigenous people to become proficient in the use of English language. Um, that’s fundamentally important.” Both these linguistic devices, in addition to the use of ‘we’ and ‘want’ (which is later repeated as “We want our students” and “We want what the community wants”) frame the issue of the FFHP as imperative and the motive of the department in introducing it as one of affectionate desire, good intentions and democratic governance (Bartlett, 2004: 81). If we examine the binary opposite of this frame, this of course implies that Indigenous bilingual education will not lead to a proficiency in English, is not what the communities want and is not good governance. As already stated, this not only contradicts the tenets of international human rights articles (discussed earlier) but an array of research and meta-analyses (discussed earlier and as outlined by Ball, 2010; Balarac & Bialystok, 2012; Cummins, 2000; Devlin, 1995; Lee, 1996; Rolstad, Mahoney & Glass, 2005; Ch2) as well as the desires of remote communities (Dickson, 2010; Appendix 1.2) making this implication a fallacy and misrepresentation.

116 Interestingly, the department did reduce its Indigenous staffing considerably and had English only classes with no translation in some cases for a few years which could account for their meaning of “explicit focus on English” (Frank Baarda, pers. interv. 2014).
4.4c English is the Language of Life

The normativity of English in this text, as in previous texts, is also linked to nation-state legitimacy and neoliberal assumptions when Mr Barnes states in extract 4.24, “It's [English language] the language of learning. It’s the language of living. And, it’s the language of the, of the, ah, the main culture in Australia”. ‘English’ in the active subject position is personified, rendering it into a metaphor. Education in ‘English’ as “the language of living” (with the underling topos of usefulness with links to the market metaphor) and “as a currency for learning” (in extract 4.25 below) is construed here as a way to be marketable and tradeable. English as the language of “the main culture of Australia” confers it as normal or the ‘native’ language of the nation (May, 2012). Its elevated status in text, according to Lingard, Martino and Rezai-Rashi (2013), indicates links to neoliberal texts across multiple fields that portray English, particularly in settler-colonial contexts (the “main-culture”), as the ‘normative’ standard language.

Extract 4.25

And, certainly, I think, ah, as I’ve said, ah, this is not an either or debate. This is um, and I think it could have been painted as that, this is about um, ah, quality outcomes in, um, ah, preparing kids to use standard English as a currency for learning and at the same time, and preserving, growing, Indigenous culture. The Northern Territory is the first um, state, to offer ILs as a dedicated senior secondary subject. NSW is just thinking about doing it now. The Northern Territory are ahead of the game in this space.

The hierarchy given to English in the extract immediately above, as in “quality outcomes in, um, ah, preparing kids to use Standard English”, thus, implies that ILs don’t provide such ‘quality outcomes’. As discussed previously, this normativity is associated with social capital, social mobility, economic development and national cohesion in neoliberal discourse but lacks evidential support (Clarke, 2012; Lingard, Martino & Rezai-Rashi, 2013).
4.4d English as Social Capital

As in the previous texts, the discursive connection to the market and thereby social mobility and social capital also positions the teaching of dominant English as social justice and IL education as of no use and therefore a disadvantage. This is intensified with the connection between English and “preserving, growing Indigenous culture” in extract 4.25, thus implying ILs are not needed for Indigenous culture. This contradicts both human rights articles as well as research on the relationship between languages, cognition and culture that indicate language is implicated in “higher order cognition” and thinking practices and that there is semantic specificity in a language (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2011: 125). In this way, Dahmardeh, Memar and Memar (2014) argue, language cannot be separated from culture:

Culture to language is analogous with soul to body, respectively; we cannot separate soul from body unless the body is dead. The same might go for culture to language. We cannot regard any language without culture unless the language is dead. (Dahmardeh, Memar & Memar, 2014: 18)

There is thereby a denial of the role of language in knowledge operating here. This, in turn, suggests both an invisibility of IL and culture and the settler colonial authoritativeness of English in all domains, including those most intimately and exclusively associated with ILs.

There is also here the implicit postcolonial assumption that ILs are not normal, that they are not the “language of learning ... the language of living” in extract 4.24. So, there is a need to transplant the colonising culture and language to assuage this deficiency. The repetition, apparent in the sentence “It is the language of ... ”, intensifies the need for Indigenous students to learn English, as opposed to any IL. That is, ILs are being predicated here as both lacking and ‘nullus’. There also appears to be a fallacy of presumption operating here since the “language of learning” and “language of living” is an IL in remote Indigenous contexts.

Interestingly, Mr Barnes uses another metaphor of ‘competition’ also common in neoliberal discourse when he argues that the use of a student’s language and culture construes the territory as “ahead of the game” in extract 4.25. Although this is mitigated with “I think”, it is then later refuted completely in:
...probably the rest of the country’s got it right and we should get on board with that and it is the strategy that most of our schools have been using. And, that’s to teach in English but to have that teaching supported in the other language. Certainly, there’s no evidence to suggest um that the Two Way bilingual Step Program delivers any better results than the approaches that I’ve described.

This refutation involves another reference to the normativity of English using a less aggressive (ship) journey metaphor (related to a pathway metaphor denoting ‘procession’ according to Chilton, 2006). The territory presumably doesn’t ‘want to miss the boat’ in “… probably the rest of the country’s got it right and we should get on board with that and it is the strategy that most of our schools have been using. And, that’s to teach in English but to have that teaching supported in the other language.” The use of ‘right’ in “got it right” suggests typical and normal, according to Gee (2011). Here Mr Barnes is also using the topos of quantity or numbers (“most of our schools have been using”). However, very few schools nationally are in EFL contexts like the remote Indigenous schools he is discussing, which makes the topos and comparison problematic, if not invalid. In addition, the statement “there’s no evidence to suggest um that the Two Way bilingual Step Program delivers any better results than the approaches that I’ve described,” represents another fallacy given the evidence discussed above and in Ch2 and Appendix 1.2 to support higher gains from NT bilingual education even in subtractive environments.

4.4e No Difference between Indigenous and English Language Education

In this interview there is also the other commonly occurring claim that the FFHP represents no change to the existing status and use of ILs in schools. This is achieved with a mythopoesis (story telling) legitimation strategy where Barnes reports on events at Lajamanu school to bolster his arguments, evidence and evaluative frames (Gasper, 1996). The claim of ‘no change’, however, contradicts the original statement of Marion Scrymgour at the time of the FFHP announcement, “I’ve made it very clear to those schools that we are saying that language and culture is not part of the school.” (ABC, 2008).
I’d have to say from the outset that teaching in the First Four Hours of English categorically does not mean that the home language of the community won’t also be used in that first four hours because good teaching is about making sure you build from where the kids are at. So, if kids have got language and they’ve got culture, that needs to be a feature of how we go about delivering in those first four hours...

It’s making sure that students have both their own language and culture. At this school in Lajamanu, every afternoon, they do Warlpari language and culture... It’s not an either, or. We want what the community wants and that’s to have kids proficient at language, that is English language, Standard English and at their own language...

I think there was some confusion and, ah the approach being painted as either bilingual or English, this is another form of bilingual and as soon as people understand that this is something that supports home language and culture being taught in the school and being used as the basis for teaching in English I think the heat will go out of the debate.

The ‘no change’ claim is linked to an argument that monolingual dominant education is the same as Indigenous bilingual education. In extract 4.27, this is first mentioned as, “the First Four Hours of English categorically does not mean that the home language of the community won’t also be used”, where ‘categorically’ acts to intensify the statement, indicating coercion. Mr Barnes then states that the policy also involves “making sure that students have both their own language and culture”. The lexical selection (with the phrasal verb of determine, ‘making sure’, and the exclusive plural possessive pronoun phrase “their own language and culture”) in this statement diminishes the notion that there is any change (from bilingual to monolingual education). It consequently, represents another example of a macro-strategy of misrepresentation which appears to be used as a way to ensure, “the injustices perpetrated against Aboriginal people are down-played and dismissed” (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 360).

In support of the ‘no change’ claim, Mr Barnes, relates the use of local language and culture in the classroom to the Vygotskian (1994) principle of cognitive learning involving building knowledge and skills from “where the kids are at”. He thus uses an authority to buttress (legitimise) his claim that the FFHP involves no change in the teaching of IL and culture. However, this is a fallacy of relevance since the optimum Vygotskian (1994) approach would be...
to use the students’ IL and culture in literacy acquisition which is contradictory to the tenets of the FFHP.

The ‘no change’ claim is also supported in the extract above by the report that Warlpari language and culture at Lajamanu continued after the implementation of the FFHP. This is later given more emphasis in the narrative of the language and culture week planned for the school in:

**Extract 4.28**

... with the new senior teacher which is a new position that’s been created in the school, they’re planning for a big event in week 7. They do that every term where language and culture is taken onto country. So, community members are in this school. It’s not either, or.

The use and repetition of the adjective ‘new’ and the use of the verb ‘created’ in this text suggests even greater investment in schools with the FFHP which contradicts reports that the “new senior teacher” actually replaced the ‘old’ teacher linguist who assisted with IL education (Dickson, 2010; Frank Baarda, pers. Interv. 2014; Robson, 2011). The noun phrase “big event” intensifies the idea that language and culture programs are still dominant in the school and there is cultural continuity. However, this disagrees with other reports that maintain cultural continuity has declined since there is less interaction and planning between Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff and the community (see Dickson, 2010; Robson, 2011). Cultural continuity and ‘business as usual’ is also emphasised with the adjective of frequency, ‘every’ in “every term” and the fact that “community members are in this school”. However, these same community members are in dwindling numbers which makes this a misrepresentation (Dickson, 2010; Robson, 2011). The statement “It’s not either, or” intensifies the framing of the issue as black or white or on or off which contrasts with, and perhaps undermines, the framing of the debate over the FFHP by community members as a gradual erosion of community participation and language and cultural studies (Dickson, 2010; Robson, 2011).

In relation to the Lajamanu ‘report’, there is also a claim of concordance with community desires in the sentence “We want what the community wants” in extract 4.27. However, this contradicts reports of Indigenous community opposition to the reduction in IL and culture (as mentioned in Dickson, 2010, Ch2 and Appendix 1.2) as a consequence of the FFHP. Here again
can be seen the two strategies of altruism (doing something that benefits a group or population sector) and consultation, evaluation and “thoughtful procedure” (typical political strategies outlined by van Leeuwan & Wodak, 1999: 786, 800) to construe a misrepresentation of politicians abiding by the ‘public will’. The ‘we’ in this sentence “We want what the community wants” appears to refer to the NT Government and so represents a speaker-inclusive but addressee-exclusive ‘we’ (see de Cillia, Reisigl & Wodak, 1999). Even so, the use of the inclusive plural personal pronoun ‘we’ does personalise the claim, intensifying the sincerity and concordance.

Finally, in extract 4.27, Mr Barnes explicitly gives a definition fallacy to diminish government culpability for injustice against Indigenous people when he states that the FFHP represents “another form of bilingual and as soon as people understand that this is something that supports home language and culture being taught in the school and being used as the basis for teaching in English, I think the heat will go out of the debate.”

4.4f Inferiority of ILs and the Indigenous Problem

Mr Barnes portrays Indigenous bilingual education as deficient using a number of devices in addition to an allusion to the ‘Indigenous problem’ in the following extract.

Extract 4.29

Look, what I say is that um, the step approach to doing things is a high risk strategy. Um, it’s high risk for a couple of reasons. Number 1, um, you need to ensure that there’s continuity of staff within our schools. That’s a big problem in the territory. Number 2, you need to make sure that the students are attending on a regular basis. Across the territory, our attendance is not as it could be. Um, number 3, we need to make sure that there’s strong leadership in the community and community engagement.

In this extract, Indigenous bilingual education is described using a gambling metaphor (“high risk”) where the odds for success are presented as lower than monolingual education. Mr Barnes, in this instance is thus using the topos of numbers but there is little evidence to substantiate that bilingual education leads to lower outcomes (Simpson, Caffery & McConvell,
2009; Devlin, 2009a, 2009b; Ch2; Appendix 1.2) thus suggesting a fallacy of relevance. Following this, Mr Barnes lists a number of (inferred) reasons for the problems associated with bilingual education programs such as the lack of continuity of school staff, poor student attendance, lack of strong leadership and lack of community engagement. In contrast, a number of authors have claimed that all of these factors to some degree are the products of government policy subsequent to bilingual education, including the FFHP. This suggests a macro-strategy of misrepresentation and Petirio principia (fallacy of presumption) since there is the presumption that the argument against bilingual education has already been proved but, as discussed above, there is no evidence to substantiate this.

A number of linguistic strategies are used to achieve this misrepresentation. For example, the government is de-emphasised and detached in the text with the use of pronouns and modalities of obligation that signify, according to Bartlett (2004: 75), a list of instructions and “essential repair” in “you need to ensure”, “you need to make sure”, “we need to make sure” (where ‘we’ could be the government or a collective universal ‘we’). We generally are therefore left in some doubt as to who exactly is responsible for ensuring the conditions are met for bilingual education to be successful, thus helping to construe the success of bilingual education in schools as speculative. However, the problems presented in the Barnes text are consistently portrayed as a product of poor community leadership as well as Indigenous ‘lack’ (evidenced by high staff turnover and low attendance) that is not evident in other states or territories (indicated by “the rest of the country’s got it right”). These problems are thus construed as ones of cultural deficit with the implication that “mediated solutions” are “pointless” and there is, therefore, a need for overt interventions such as the NTER and FFHP (as outlined by Simmons & Lecouteru, 2008: 668).

Later in the text, teacher turnover is directly linked to bilingual programs, in;

117 Baarda (2008a, 2008b) and Brown and Brown (2007) claim that these policies include the decreasing training and hiring of local teachers who would remain in the schools; the increasing dominance of a non-Indigenous curriculum which is one factor that contributes to poorer student attendance and a lack of local adult participation in the school; the lack of Indigenous control in the school which influences child attendance and community engagement; and the undermining of local authority and participation with such policies as the Intervention.
Extract 4.30

...if teacher’s were truly engaged and believed in these sort of programs as being the answer to delivering fantastic outcomes in those young Indigenous people’s lives then they probably would stay longer.

Here, Mr Barnes is using a topos of uselessness or lack of utility (of bilingual education) in the statement which is intensified with the adverb ‘truly’. The parataxical relationship between the first two clauses in the statement ensures that teacher engagement is a product of their pedagogical beliefs as opposed to any other (structural or cultural) influences (such as the poor community and school conditions as well as cultural difference and/or shock) (Fairclough, 2003). Although the active grammatical structures and lack of nominalisation suggests a ‘truth’ and commitment by the speaker, researchers suggest that this claim cannot be numerically substantiated since only a maximum 20% of students in very remote schools were in Two Way programs and so statistically Two Way schools could not account for the high staff turnover and low attendance in all remote Indigenous schools (Devlin, 2009b). In addition, others claim these factors have become a problem with the erosion of bilingual education that began in 1976 but increased from 1999 (Dickson, 2010; Disbray, 2014; Nicholls, 2005; Simpson, 2010; Watt, 1993). This, thereby, indicates a macro-strategy of misrepresentation is operating.

The use of ‘fantastic outcomes’ in this extract appears to belie a particular expectation of bilingual education that cannot immediately be achieved by any program – that of ensuring remote Indigenous parity in English literacy and numeracy with the dominant group. Such parity is only possible with the consistent implementation of a bilingual program through both primary and secondary schooling due to the nature of L1 and L2 and literacy acquisition (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000). However, there has not been any secondary bilingual programs in existence in any NT Indigenous schools. Even so, in its heyday, as discussed in Appendix 1.2, bilingual education in the NT did achieve “statistically significant academic growth in English and Maths” despite the fact that children in bilingual schools experienced half the temporal exposure to English of those in monolingual English schools (Harris & Jones, 1991: 32). This was accompanied by higher attendance rates (Harris & Jones, 1991). These are two elements that Australian governments view as signs of school success (Guenther, 2015d).
The use of ‘fantastic’ also appears to be associated with Clarke’s (2012) fantasmatic logic which links to Lacanian psychoanalytic theory and the positive symbolic fantasy of colonial “completeness and harmony” (Clarke, 2012: 179). The failure of bilingual programs, thereby, could be perceived as a failure to assimilate or “whiten black people” (McConaghy, 2000: 156). It thereby represents a failure in the transformation of the Indigenous subject into the colonial ideal – a transformation that can never occur once “the subject enters the symbolic order” (Clarke, 2012: 179).

4.4g Indigenous Staff are Inferior

As with the other texts, the inferiority of Indigenous teaching staff appears to be expressed through a number of strategies. Passivity, for instance, is evident in the opening remark in extract 4.24 with, “...we’ll have our assistant teachers” where the department is in the subject position and not the Indigenous staff. In extract 4.27 Indigenous teaching staff are absent altogether despite much of the extract principally pertaining to their role. Such a lack of agency can denote, van Leeuw (2008: 30) explains, “something not to be further examined or contested”. In this instance, this lack of examination or contestation appears to be associated with the subservient role of Indigenous staff. This lack of agency is also similar to that found by van Leeuwen (2008: 74) in his examination of media texts on immigration. In these texts, as with the Indigenous subjects in this text, van Leeuwen (2008: 74) notes, “the immigrants themselves are never represented as reacting, and their actions are mostly nontransactive and objectivated.” That is, as in previous texts, there is a dehumanising tendency operating here. Interestingly, ‘our’ in extract 4.24 makes the statement inclusive but this is the only time in the text that Indigenous teachers could be regarded as ‘in’ and it appears to be used to intensify the ‘active’ role of the department as opposed to emphasising the value of Indigenous teachers. Contrastingly, the use of ‘our’ could indicate possessive paternalism that suggests both Indigenous incapacity and the need to be rescued (McConaghy, 2000) (presumably from the ineffective bilingual practices of the past).

118 This construction contrasts with those that claim bilingual success. Both Harris and Jones (1991) and Watt (1993) noted that while academic and English literacy and numeracy outcomes were also valued by community members, there were additional valuable outcomes that arose. These included jobs, professional status and independence for local Indigenous people, Indigenous control of schools, language and cultural maintenance and the recognition in and value of IL, culture and skills in Indigenous staff.
The subservience of Indigenous teachers is also expressed lexically, similar to previous texts, in “assistant teachers who know the local language support those teachers in delivering those concepts”. As noted in earlier texts, Indigenous staff are never referred to as non-support teachers or Principals despite the fact that there have been quite a number in the department. Their role is to ‘support’ as opposed to take a more professional and hierarchical role in the classroom or school (despite the fact that they invariably do with language and culture lessons and activities). Local staff are also always presented ethnically (as in ‘Indigenous’). In addition, the use of a relative clause (above in relation to “assistant teachers”), Reisigl and Wodak (2001) note, can also be a mechanism of detachment and distance.

4.4h The Community is to Blame

Interestingly in the Barnes Interview, communities are enlisted quite frequently as the ones responsible for poor implementation of the FFHP. An example of this occurs in the following:

**Extract 4.31**

There was confusion around, ah, whether, ah, the community based people that worked in our schools could speak their home language. Of course they can, not only ah, can they but we want them to during that first four hours as they support the learning that’s taking place.

Here, ‘community based people’ appear excluded from ‘our schools’ given that they are consistently referred to with exclusive plural possessives and pronouns, ‘their’, ‘they’ while non-community subjects are referred to with inclusive plural pronouns ‘our’ and ‘we’. This appears to absolve the non-community school staff and operations of blame for the poor FFHP interpretation while the passive construction (“There was confusion around…”) ensures a level of ambiguity in terms of responsibility (for both the ‘confusion’ and accusations against ‘community based people’ for being confused) but sufficient detail to do “some delicate rhetorical work” (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 363). In this case, the ‘confusion’ which arose in the interpretation of the FFHP that caused considerable problems for schools is indirectly inferred as the fault of “the community based people that worked in the school”. This is despite school authority for implementing the FFHP largely residing with (white) school principals. This community ‘fault’ also infers a deficiency of understanding in these Indigenous
members which links to postcolonial lack or deficits. This deficiency or fault in understanding is intensified with the adverb and the modality in the following statement “Of course they can” in reference to using L1 in class. The next clause, “we want them to” then implies altruism, a typical political strategy as discussed above (see van Leeuwan & Wodak, 1999 for an extended discussion). However, again a fallacy of relevance appears to be operating here, indicating a macro-strategy of misrepresentation since the policy directly contradicts Mr Barnes’ assertion that community confusion, as opposed to the FFHP policy text itself, was the reason for failing to use an L1 in ESL or EFL classrooms with the implementation of the FFHP.\(^{119}\) Presenting NT communities as at fault in their interpretation of the FFHP also deflects department blame for the problems experienced in remote schools with its introduction.

In the following extract, the use of plural exclusive pronouns ‘they’ and ‘them’ in relation to good FFHP planning by Lajamanu implies that poor planning by communities will lead to poor FFHP outcomes.

**Extract 4.32**

If you have a look at this community here at Lajamanu, they started their planning in November last year and they’ve come up with something that works for them.

So again, there is evidence of community blame for destructive choices (as outlined by Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999). There is also the inference here that the Lajamanu community has control over its school which contradicts reports at that time (Dickson, 2010).

In extract 4.33, the metaphor of flight is used to frame the list of elements that need to be done to ensure FFHP success in Lajamanu school.

\(^{119}\) The wording in the policy text that contradicts this claim appears under 4 *Definition* on page 2, “Teaching and learning programs are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day, and may encompass instruction in a range of learning areas.”
Um, if they keep this in place, if we can keep teachers here longer because keeping teachers in Lajamanu has been an issue. If you have a look, um, at the staffing profile here, in a staff of about 12 or 13 um teachers, we’ve got six of them that are recent arrivals. Now, that’s where I need to focus my energy on. Get the programs bedded down, um, get the community on board, get the teachers wanting to stay, and get um, um commitment and we can fly in the territory.

In this instance, the community of Lajamanu appears to be predicated as responsible for department programs, teacher tenancy and success of the school. This insinuates the operation of postcolonial deficit (if things don’t succeed) and poor choices. It also frames the community of Lajamanu as accountable and responsible for solving problems associated with a policy that they had no influence over in either its creation or implementation. It is thereby not substantiated by evidence or experience.

Despite the inclusive plural pronoun ‘we’ in “if we can keep”, “we’ve got”, the nomination and passivity in the text ensures sufficient ambiguity to infer Lajamanu, rather than the Department of Education, is responsible for the high turnover of staff. This contradicts other findings that indicate education department recruitment and professional development processes do not ensure sufficient cross-cultural awareness for higher teacher retention and proficiency in cross-cultural contexts (see de Plevitz, 2007). It also ignores the fact that staff turnover would slow considerably with greater recruitment and training of local Indigenous teachers. Of interest also is Mr Barnes focus on “new staff”. As opposed to building relationships with the community, Mr Barnes views his role as focused on the newly recruited (white) teachers which signifies a postcolonial hierarchy of concern. Furthermore, his additional roles of getting the “community on board” and “commitment” implies a community laxity in engagement and responsibility and thereby a possible connection to recurrent historical constructions of Aboriginal people as aimless, not motivated and lazy (see O’Conor, 2010; Harrison, 2012; Metherell, 2013; Moreton-Robinson, 2011).
Transcript 4 consists of a letter written by the then Federal Minister for Education, Julia Gillard, in response to a petition submitted by a Mrs Julia Irwin on behalf of 18 citizens. The petition expressed concern at the closure of the 10 remaining bilingual programs in remote Indigenous schools with the announcement of the FFHP. The reasons given for this concern included: the fact that the FFHP contradicted evidence on bilingual education; the FFHP was “demoralising for Indigenous communities” who invested 30 years of development in bilingual teaching and resources; it represented a threat to the survival of ILs; and the fact that the policy contravenes UN rights of “Indigenous people to provide education in their own languages” (Irwin, 2009: 4148).

The reply letter to the petition appeared in the official parliamentary transcripts (Hansards) as a Procedural Text on page 8738, 7 September 2009. It comprised 11 paragraphs and approximately 450 words. This letter exhibits the same political discourse qualities of neoliberal ideology and claims of altruism as the previous texts.

**Analysis of Text**

The following represents an analysis of the reply letter to the petition against the FFHP. In the letter, Ms Gillard responds with claims of her government’s commitment to IL education through policy and funding, justification for the FFHP, the Federal Government’s provision of policy and funding for Indigenous literacy and numeracy education, *Closing the Gap* and the 2008 *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* that require schools to work closely with communities to enhance Indigenous student outcomes.

Transcript 4 differs from the previous texts in relation to its emphasis on Federal Government initiatives.
**Extract 4.34**

The Australian Government is committed to maximising the learning opportunities and life chances of Indigenous Australians. The Government is committed to languages education in Australian schools and recognises the important role Indigenous language learning plays in some schools. In recognition of this commitment, Australia formally endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on 3 April 2009.

### 4.5a English as Social Capital and Government serving Indigenous Interests

The confluence of Federal Government initiatives above supports the macrostrategies of representation of government responsibility and legitimation through mythopoesis which is framed through neoliberalism. The macro-strategy of legitimation (moral evaluation) can be seen with the invocation of liberal-egalitarian principles using the predicates of “maximising the learning opportunities” and “life chances”. The lexical choice of “life chances” both denotes the neoliberal signifier ‘competition’ and alludes to the neoliberal notion that social mobility occurs with English literacy education noted also in the previous texts. This lexical choice serves to create topoi of humanitarianism and advantage.

The fact that this text is in response to criticism of the FFHP suggests a link between these Federal Government initiatives and the FFHP. As noted earlier, Augoustinos, Tuffin and Rapley (1999: 363) contend that vague constructions are problematic to subvert but also provide just enough information to warrant “a particular inference”. Since there is government “commitment” to UN declarations with “Australia formally endors[ing] the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous people” and “maximising the learning opportunities” and “life chances” through education programs, the inference that appears to be operating in this case is that the FFHP conforms to national and international human rights agreements. This is despite the evident contradiction of the FFHP to such international human rights tenets (particularly in its exclusion of parental influence on a child’s education) in addition to a number of negative reports from Indigenous communities (Dickson, 2010) and human rights organisations (Amnesty International, 2010; UN Human Rights Committee, 2009). This altruistic framing of government is assisted with verbal constructions such as ‘is being provided’, ‘is

4.5b I Care

Ms Gillard also uses a number of mechanisms to denote her involvement (in terms of beliefs, interest and engagement) in the (government’s) commitment to Indigenous education as in the following extract.

Extract 4.35

As indicated in other related correspondence, I recognise the importance of Indigenous languages and I am pleased to advise that my Department will be working with the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts to develop an Indigenous Languages Action Strategy.

In this extract, ‘I’ is also used a number of times through the text, such as in “I recognise” and “I am pleased”. This involvement is again linked to Federal Government IL initiatives that have had no direct relationship to supporting Indigenous bilingual education and “the important role IL learning plays in some schools” that is outlined in the second paragraph. As in the previous extracts, the statements in the text are intensified and predicated with adjectives, verbs and nominalisations describing the federal government role in sustaining IL education such as ‘committed’, ‘recognises’ ‘to assist’, ‘formally endorsed’, ‘ensuring’, ‘in recognition of this commitment’ in addition to the phrase, “As indicated in other related correspondence”. However, the fact that the FFHP is supported by Ms Gillard also appears to undermine any claims of government recognition of and support for Indigenous bilingual or language education.

The final paragraph regarding the issue of the FFHP represents another representational macro-strategy when it states:
The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, agreed to by all Australian Education Ministers in December 2008, commits Australian schools to work in partnership with local communities to promote learning outcomes for Indigenous students.

Restating the agreement here to work with local communities implies that this condition is being met and that the FFHP evolved as a consequence of community consultation which contradicts other reports (see Robson, 2011; Marich, 2009; Appendix 1.2). This use of the verb ‘commit’ again predicates Australian governments as altruistic and the adjective ‘all’ suggests a universal, including territory, agreement.

The framing of the FFHP in this way, as serving the Indigenous sector, is supported in a number of paragraphs with adjectives and noun repetitions (see van Leeuwan & Wodak, 1999) that include ‘significant funding’ and ‘additional funding’ as in “Significant funding for languages education in government schools”. The fact that the major programs relate to SAE literacy and numeracy acquisition (such as “additional $56.4 million over four years through the Indigenous Education (Targeted Assistance) Act”), however, indicates no relationship to bilingual or IL education funding but strong links to neoliberal notions of equality (as sameness). There is also an allusion to the perceived ‘gap’ and deficiency in (English literacy and numeracy) achievements between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students which is stated overtly at the near conclusion of the letter with:

Finally, through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) processes, all Australian Governments have committed to halving the gap in the reading, writing and numeracy achievements between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students within a decade.

4.5c English and the Nation-state

The text also shows the establishment of a strong relationship between English and national normativity.
The Northern Territory Government’s policy that programs in its schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day is about ensuring that Indigenous children have the opportunity to be taught and learn English. The learning of English is a fundamental skill that all Australians, including Indigenous Australians, must have to successfully progress through school and participate in life beyond their schooling years.

English in the subject position in “The learning of English” in the second sentence of this extract is personified and is predicated with “fundamental” to intensify its importance. As discussed above, the elevation of English as a subject in the text, common in neoliberal texts across multiple fields, renders English as the ‘normative’ standard language. The repetition of ‘Australians’ in this discourse acts as a cohesive device that links ‘The learning of English’ to the normativity of the nation in terms of settler colonial ‘Australian’ standards. However, the addition of the anthroponym ‘Indigenous’ also ensures that ‘Indigenous Australians’ are regarded as different (from Witkowska, Krzyżanowski & Buchowski, 2012). There is also the use of ‘all’ that distorts sectional interests as universal, and the inclusion of Indigenous Australians in the phrase “all Australians, including Indigenous Australians” that again denotes the neoliberal construal of equality as ‘sameness’ (Corson, 1993: 169; Dean, 2009 for extended discussion).

4.5d Indigenous Teachers and Languages as Deficient

In Extract 4.38, there is a direct reference to the FFHP (“The Northern Territory Government’s policy that programs in its schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day”) and a repetition of presuppositions that, without the FFHP, Indigenous students will continue to get insufficient opportunities to learn English (“is about ensuring that Indigenous children have the opportunity to be taught and learn English”).

As with the previous policy texts and discourse, there is the inference that there was insufficient English learning and exposure in remote (bilingual) schools prior to the FFHP and this implies that ILs and the work of Indigenous educators cannot lead to English language acquisition despite the evidence that shows these elements do indeed result in higher L1 and L2 literacy,
numeracy, attendance and engagement outcomes (Collins, 1999; Disbray, 2014; Harris, 1999; Harris & Jones, 1991; Hoogenraad, 2001; Malcolm, 2003; Ch2: Appendix 1.2). It also implies, as with earlier texts, that IL learning occurs as a monolingual program as opposed to bilingual which contradicts NT language education policy or extant texts on the issue throughout the history of bilingual education (Appendix 1.2). The topos of humanitarianism in the previous paragraph is linked to this paragraph through intensifying and predicating lexis and phrases of ‘ensuring’, ‘opportunity’ and ‘participate in life’. It is interesting to note the use of the present continuous (“is about ensuring”) instead of a future modal tense of ‘will ensure’ that intensifies and discursively constructs the statement as ‘a fact’ (see Reyes, 2011 on this strategy).

4.5e Invisible Indigenous Australians

As with the other texts, Indigenous Australians are passive, rather than active agents, and often invisible appearing in passive or dependent clauses or prepositional phrases (e.g. “have committed to halving the gap”, “between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students”, “is about ensuring that Indigenous children have the opportunity” that could be operating to create a negative ‘other’ representation (van Dijk, 2000). However, in this case, it could also be a product of the representation macro-strategy of altruism where government(s) and ministers (e.g. I) are the dominant agents.

4.5f Moral Duty to Teach English

The use of the modal ‘must’ in Extract 4.38 in terms of the need to learn English indicates that there is again the use of a moral imperative or ‘moral’ or ‘cautionary tale’ operating here of “bad things will happen if we don’t” (Fairclough, 2003: 91) teach in English (of educational, social and economic exclusion). This implies a strategy of legitimation through moral evaluation is operating. This is framed neoliberal in the same paragraph with predications such as “successfully progress” and “participate in life” – the predications indicating intertextual neoliberal signifiers of economic progress and work life (which contradicts evidence of higher economic participation with IL and culture as outlined by Biddle, 2012b; Daly & Smith, 2003; Dockery, 2010, 2013; Ch7). These strategies give rise to the inevitability of the need to learn English, and, consequently, the inevitability of the policy.
4.6 Summary of Chapter 4

This chapter has examined the CDA of the policy text (Appendix 4.1), the letter to the editor by then Minister for Education Marion Scrymgour (Appendix 4.3), a transcript of the Four Corners interview, ‘Going back to Lajamanu’ (Appendix 4.4) with Gary Barnes, the successor to Marion Scrymgour in the NT Education department and the response letter written by the then Minister for Education, Julia Gillard (Appendix 4.3).

It outlined the analytical tool of HDA (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) that aims to reveal ideologies, privileging and silencing and its applicability in the context of this research. It then outlined the results of this analysis in terms of macrostrategies, discursive strategies and linguistic realisations (predominantly the use of pronouns, tropes, modality, grammatical structure and lexical choice). Given the importance of the major trends found in this analysis and some of their implications in terms of IL policy and planning, a summary of these trends appears below.

Summary of Common Trends

Language

Justification for the FFHP was related intimately to the status of SAE and the language hierarchy that operates. SAE was invariably presented as normative, superior and the only language capable of authoritative knowledge with the implication of ILs as abnormal. The normativity of English in all texts implies the ideology that it is the ‘native’ language of the nation, despite the existence of 250 Indigenous ‘native’ languages prior to white settlement (Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). This is reinforced with Garry Barnes remarks, “It is the language of learning. It’s the language of living and it’s the language of the main culture of Australia”. This description of English demonstrates how English is formulated in the text in terms of a settler colonial standard and a prime symbol of national belonging, national normativity and nation-state legitimacy. Contrastingly, ILs are implicated as ‘abnormal’ and unconnected to both social capital and mobility and economic wealth implying that they pose a covert threat to social unity and the survival of dominant culture (as discussed by Davies & Bansel, 2007). Their continued use in education, thereby, represents a ‘problem’ for the state and national economy.
The fact that this is not supported by international or NT bilingual research (Ch2, Appendix 1.2) or the research in the two communities in this study indicates the propagation of the symbolic power and status of English is operating as a result of the hegemony and the cultural capital of English in the national context (Bourdieu, 1991; Gramsci, 1999; Liddicoat, 2013). This representation of ILs was similar to the Federal Government IL policy discourse analysis findings of Liddicoat (2013: 149) who notes that ILs were seen as subordinate to English, as not having a “function in broader relationships and interactions in Australia” with qualities of “backwardness and non-modernity” (Liddicoat, 2013: 149) that are reminiscent of recurrent historical representations of Indigenous people as primitive, savage, “ignoble” and “a place which humans have left behind in order to assume ‘civilisation’” (Attwood, 1992: 4; Macoun, 2011; Watson, 2011). In addition, the elevation of English and the exclusion of ILs in the FFHP texts appear to be in line with the Howard response of solving the high risk ‘Aboriginal problem’ by overcoming Indigenous ‘lack’ through assimilation and ‘mainstreaming’ (Macoun, 2011). In doing so, it thus seems to demonstrate the reproduction of the Australian settler colonial signification of the ‘other’ that is apparent in the NTER texts.

Although this predication is not explicitly evident in the FFHP policy text and discourse, there is consistent reference to Indigenous deficiencies and lack of progress as well as ILs being construed as superfluous and retarding L2 acquisition, academic, social and economic achievement suggesting the ideological dichotomy remains. This is despite the importance of ILs in language socialisation, cognition, well-being and socio-economic outcomes for Indigenous people (Biddle, 2012a, 2012b; Malcolm, 1998). This predication is also connected intimately to notions of neoliberal globalisation with SAE representing the language of national economic and social development (discussed below) and progress (procession).

This almost exclusive focus on English in policy text and discourse indicates a linguistic and cultural terra nullus is operating where ILs and cultures appear ‘invisible’ in education policy. This at times seems to preclude the consideration of the EFL status of remote and very remote schools. Liddicoat (2013) argues there is an increasing invisibility of ILs in Indigenous education Federal policy texts with no explicit reference to ILs in the recent ATSI Education Action Plan (2010-2014). In terms of the FFHP, this ‘invisibility’ of ILs and culture has manifested in the assertion by NT Education Minister Gary Barnes and Federal Education Minister Julia Gillard that the FFHP represented ‘no change’ to bilingual education. This (mis)representation of bilingual
education as monolingual English education suggests that the issue is being framed to “down-play” or “dismiss” the degree of injustice “perpetuated against Indigenous people” in the enactment of the FFHP (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 360).

This attempt to thwart the creation of a dichotomy between bilingual and monolingual English education also appears to operate as a strategy to support ILs being subsumed in English literacy. Lo Bianco (1999) reported the misrepresentation of bilingual education as monolingual education in the NT as early as 1998 in a study of a December 10 1998 federal government parliamentary question time response related to NT policy that attempted to abolish bilingual education. In the analysis (Lo Bianco, 1999: 43) he noted the pivotal moments when bilingual education became construed as “a kind of (English) literacy teaching method for linguistic minorities”. This same construction is apparent in the policy discourse when Gary Barnes distorts the purpose and intention of the FFHP monolingual education policy when he states:

... this is another form of bilingual and as soon as people understand that this is something that supports home language and culture being taught in the school and being used as the basis for teaching in English I think the heat will go out of the debate.

Lo Bianco (1999: 43) argued this construction meant that “its continued funding becomes dependent on its demonstrating gains in English literacy greater than alternative programs would produce”. In fact, the expectation of bilingual education and the delivery of ‘fantastic outcomes’ in Gary Barnes interview appears to allude to this demonstration of the need for bilingual education to have “English literacy greater than alternative programs” and a requirement for bilingual programs to result in English literacy parity between very remote Indigenous students in bilingual education and native SAE speakers. This, however, is a result that cannot immediately be achieved with any program and such unrealistic high expectations suggests a complete failure to understand L2 acquisition but one shared by those in power in other colonial contexts (Chimbutane, 2009). This use of ‘fantastic’ could also be associated with Clarke’s (2012) fantasmatic logic which links to Lacanian psychoanalytic theory and the positive symbolic fantasy of colonial “completeness and harmony” (Clarke, 2012: 179). Bilingual

---

120 However, due to the lack of bilingual education into high school years (with the absence of high schools), these higher gains cannot be realised.
programs, thereby, are perceived as deficient programs due to their failure to transform the Indigenous subject into the ‘white’ impossible and fantasmatic colonial ideal (Clarke, 2012: 179).

English superiority and normativity also shows an orientation of Indigenous language policy as ‘language as a problem’ (Ruiz, 1984, 2010). This has resulted in greater state directed policy practice, exclusion of knowledge and evidence from Indigenous groups and language specialists (Lo Bianco, 2001b) but an increase in remote community responsibility and accountability for policy implementation (see Ch7 for more on this).

People

The texts do not exhibit overt racist slurs (termed “inegalitarian racism” by Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 9). However, difference, depersonalisation and inequality are presented by alternative means such as through passivity, nomination, lack of agency, metaphor and exclusion of Indigenous subjects and Indigenous spaces (regions of high Indigenous populations). Indeed, with considerable frequency, failure of Indigenous subjects to reach parity with the mainstream socially, economically and linguistically is constructed as a ‘wilful’ and ‘destructive’ individual choice (as explained by Ahmed, 2012; Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 363) and the consequence of Indigenous deficits as opposed to the outcomes of structural and institutional inequalities. Marion Scrymgour in her letter, for instance, constructs the cause of literacy and numeracy failure in terms of deficient Indigenous behaviour (lack of attendance). In her letter, Marion Scrymgour makes a direct link between educational achievement and attendance which became the focus of later Federal Labor and Liberal Indigenous education policies.121 Despite the weak correlation between Indigenous student attendance and performance (as shown by Cowey, et al, 2009) and the indications that engagement with tasks, which can be affected by both pedagogy and health status, is the major factor involved in student performance (as discussed by Behrendt & Causland, 2008),122 Guenther (2014a: 11) argues that the issue of attendance is often associated with human capital and “the importance of investment in

---

121 This legislation, part of the Stronger Futures in the Northern Territory Package, the successor to the NTER was named ‘Improving School Enrolment & Attendance Reform Measure’, and was initially introduced 1 July 2012 by the then Federal Labor Government (Justman & Peyton, 2014).

122 Cowey et al (2009: 13), in fact, concluded in their study that the relationship created between attendance and performance is an example of a ‘folk theory’ created to accommodate explanation of problems through ‘othering’ but whose “categories and maxims … are rarely put to the test”.
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education” by “non-locals” in remote areas (Guenther, 2014a: 11). The link between education and attendance could thereby constitute another neoliberal ‘fantasy’.

Indigenous teaching staff are consistently represented as translators and assistants despite frequently engaging in planning, teaching and assessment, with some acting as the primary or sole teacher in schools (particularly at outstations) supported by regional principals or other school teaching staff. This is consistent with comments in this study from community members themselves.  

The hierarchy of languages and people discussed above is often achieved through the ‘container’ metaphor in the FFHP texts. Chilton (2006: 65) states that the container metaphor represents an integral “component of political thinking and action”. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) argue that it is the most common metaphor employed in racist political discourse. Chestman (2009) believes, not only was this metaphor applied in the case of the NTER, but its use opened the way for other Australian policies, such as the FFHP, to use such a metaphor against the same group.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberal logics are also common in all texts. They are used to construct; English speakers as having market worth; schools as technologies of performability; bilingual education as ‘non-competitive’ and cost ineffective; Indigenous student failure, as previously mentioned, as a product of wilful desire (‘choice’) or a product of their innate (postcolonial) Indigenous failings. English is frequently framed in the texts as cultural capital and a market language and necessity leading to academic success as well as individual, state and national economic and social (in terms of social mobility) development (Collins, 1989; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996) despite a lack of evidence that substantiates this rationale applying to Indigenous people in remote areas (because of structural and institional inequality, Ch2; Ch7).

123 One complained that in a public community meeting to discuss the FFHP, Marion Scrymgour failed to recognise Indigenous teacher skills, roles and qualifications (Ch6). Others commented that Indigenous teaching staff had taken a lesser role in the running of schools and classes as a consequence of losing professional status and authority (Ch5; Ch6).
English’s market value also helps construe English language standardisation and sameness as the hallmark of economically “responsible governments” and common good, even aligned with International Human Rights agreements which it clearly contravenes (see Davies & Bansel, 2007: 251). This allows the over-riding of ethical and moral dimensions of human rights with economic concerns (increased productivity of the individual, state and nation) and the concept of social inclusion as educational equality in terms of the same teaching staff and language of instruction (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999; Clarke, 2012; 182 Wiley & Luke, 1996). Moreover, the framing of English, through present simple, modals of obligation and the future, is a ‘given’ implying ‘the way things must be’ indicating hegemony at work (Corson, 2001: 24).

Quality education in the FFHP texts, as such, is construed through neoliberalism to be equated with (English language) accountability and “opacity” (NAPLAN and APIF) (both indications of instrumentality) as well as atomisation and (individual destructive) choice (not only in terms of poorer academic and behavioural outcomes but the decision to live in a remote Indigenous community problematised by ILs). These perspectives of quality education and outcomes of monolingual dominant language education that dominates in the policy texts, given the fact that they are contrary to the findings on bilingual education of higher academic, behavioural, social and economic outcomes (see Ch2 & Appendix 1.2), both substantiate and demonstrate Lo Bianco’s (2008a: 350) claim that the “independent professional voice on language education policy” has been greatly denuded. That is, the confluence of neoliberal and nation-state concerns in language education policy has resulted in little incorporation or consideration of language education policy research in language education policy decision-making.

The use of state accountability frameworks such as NAPLAN also represent a means of global panopticism (Lingard, Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2013) to ensure uniformity through standardised education and testing. The subsequent dependence on NAPLAN by many NT and other schools to monitor their performance also indicates a growing ‘performance’ approach to education that focuses on assessment, diagnosis and individual abilities (and defects) as opposed to the social situatedness and linguistic context of teaching (Bourne, 2008). Not only does such a focus negatively impact on school activities (which, by concentrating on teaching to the ‘test’, become less cognitively challenging) (Bourne, 2008), it indicates a ‘fractional’ view of multilingualism (as opposed to considering a ‘holistic’ unique language profile in multilingual speakers) (Baker, 2011). This could account for the failure to consider the ESL contexts of remote and very remote
Indigenous community schools, apart from the academic failure in most of these schools (Bourne, 2008: 44). These findings, thereby, go some way to substantiating Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor’s (2005) application of Bourdieu’s theorising of social fields to analyse the effects on education policy of economic globalisation through neoliberalism that is nuanced by local relationships and increasingly subsumed within economic policy fields.

The following chapters will now examine the effects of these ideologies and constructions on Indigenous communities and schools.
Chapter 5 - Analysis at Site 1

My language has always been in my heart. It’s been there for 40 to 60,000 years. It’s always been there...the language and the culture, the ceremony, the cultural activities...country visit, teach the young ones, country visit like land groups, the land, the animals, the birds, flora and fauna, you know. That’s why I was taught by my parents. Language has always been in my life. I prefer the language better [Site 1 respondent on language].

5.1 Introduction to Research Results Chapters

The following two chapters represent the analysis of data collected at two remote Indigenous communities that reflect the notions in the argument above – language as land, belonging, kinship, identity and power. Initially, this chapter reviews the history of bilingual education at Site 1 and then addresses the data as it relates to adult interviews. It then reviews student interview data analysis. This process is repeated in Chapter 6 for Site 2.

As outlined in Appendix 1.2, Site 1 has had a long history of bilingual education dating from 1975 (Disbray, 2014) comprising the ‘step’ or ‘staircase’ model (NTDEET, 2005). The model relied on community interaction with the school both in terms of employment of local staff and voluntary participation of locals in school activities (Oldfield, 2011). However, as with other bilingual schools, there was an erosion of the program as a consequence of the 1998 NT Government attempt to eradicate bilingual schools that led to the subtractive Two Way bilingual program. The bilingual education program was subsequently extinguished entirely in 2008 after the introduction of the FFHP (although there remained a limited amount of IL education) but has recently (2015) been re-established in some classes.

This chapter attempts to capture the consequences of the historical reduction in bilingual education through the data analysis of interviews at Site 1.
5.1a Interview Topics

The 17 adult community semi-structured interviews that were conducted at Site 1 involved respected ex-teachers and assistant teachers, parents and grandparents of children currently at the school, adults on the school council and young adults who had participated in the bilingual program at Site 1. The main topics of discussion in the interviews are shown below:

- Community interaction with the school before and after FFHP
- Benefits or problems with bilingual education
- Benefits or problems with changes after the FFHP was introduced
- Changes in school practice before and after the FFHP
- Community reaction to the FFHP
- Effects on students and young people of the FFHP
- Effects on literacy workers and teachers after the FFHP
- Reasons for the importance of speaking and learning in your own language
- Resources created as a consequence of bilingual education and what happened to the resources
- Teacher and other training in each community

As noted earlier, the adult semi-structured interviews are of particular importance since they contain the seldom heard views of highly marginalised remote adult community members. These data therefore offer a valuable alternative perspective of bilingual education, Indigenous identity, the social and academic success of remote Indigenous children and governance. This is augmented with the quantitative and qualitative analysis of responses from 12 students to a semi-structured interview (in English).

Adult data were analysed initially using CA with, as discussed in Ch3, categories and sub-categories arising both from the data and from prior research on bilingual and Indigenous education and policy. Categories and sub-categories that arose from the data were then compared to and modified according to a treatise on IL1 culture created by members of a community culturally and geographically close to Site 1 (Pawu-Kurlpurlurnu, Holmes & Box, 2008).
A quantitative overview of the frequency of categories and sub-categories is initially given for each set of responses and an explanation of how they are represented by the respondents is then undertaken. Given the more unstructured nature (open-ended questions) of the interviews with adults and their length and complexity, key adult responses that reflected the inter- and causative relationships between themes and topics and how the policy and its effects were typically framed as well as those responses that did not fit typical patterns were then analysed using CDA to further triangulate the methods (as discussed by Neuendorf, 2004). The rationale is that where findings agree, research conclusions are strengthened (Neuendorf, 2004). This process also garnered a deeper understanding of remote adult community perspectives.

In contrast, questions directed at students were closed in order to deduce how language of instruction impacts on this group in relation to findings on bilingual education (such as those in Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000; May, 2008). So the categories that emerged generally came directly from the initial research. The nature of these questions and responses as well as the L2 ability of students (who in the majority of questions and responses required caregivers to translate) also meant that CDA was not used to analyse student responses. The topics of student discussion that arose from student interview questions were

- The language environment in which they live
- Their language preferences for learning
- Their perception of how language affects their self-esteem and learning
- Their perception of the parental importance of ILs, and
- The impact of the FFHP

The same data analysis process (adult CA and CDA analysis and student data CA) is repeated for Site 2 in the next chapter. Both the adult and the student data give a rounded appraisal of how Indigenous community members view the social and academic outcomes of a reduced IL environment in their community school as a consequence of the FFHP. This could then form the basis for further research and policy appraisal.
5.2 Adult Data Collection

Details of the Site 1 semi-structured adult interviews are shown below. Interviews at Site 1 were conducted in English due to the good English language skills of respondents and the difficulty of locating interpreters of higher English language abilities than the respondents themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>17 interviews in total</td>
<td>To gather information about the impact of the FFHP on the community and individuals within the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 linked to the school in the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 young adults who participated in the bilingual program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 on the school board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Non-Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Interview Respondents at Site 1

This meant that perhaps less information was given in relation to traditional Indigenous topics of concern to participants given the fact that language harbours “the ideas of a people, their philosophies, and the experience of its speakers” (Schmidt, 1990: 27) which cannot necessarily translate across languages. However, this facilitated the use of CDA. That is, community responses often demonstrated the same discernible sophisticated European or English language metaphors, intensification, predication, argumentation and nominalisation strategies as evident in the political texts and discourse. CDA thus provided a consistent means of analysing both policy text and discourse and community respondent interviews in addition to providing a triangulation of methodology and subsequently reinforcing research findings (Cheng, 2013).

5.3 Content Analysis

As discussed in Ch3, data gathering involved both ethnographic and collaborative social research approaches. Participants were also given feedback on the data gathered (transcripts of their interviews). Some later participated in a reflective panel or public meeting to analyse and discuss the results. The questions asked of each participant (see Appendix 3.1) varied depending on their history and level of experience with bilingual education.
While there were specific questions about the FFHP, these often elicited generalised answers that related to the impact of Western influence and government policy. The CA topics (categories and sub-categories) that emerged are described below. Some of these topics and themes reflect the world views or Ngurra-kurlu (five key elements of culture – land, law, language, ceremony and skin, Pawu-Kurlpurlurnu, Holmes & Box, 2008) since these elements dominated in discussions of FFHP. Others emerged from the data at both communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Department Response</td>
<td>Interaction with community</td>
<td>This category relates to practices at the school – relationships of staff to staff, staff to children, children to children, education that has evolved as a consequence of types of language instruction and school, department policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on students</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>This category relates to academic, well-being, behavioural, social and economic outcomes for students as a consequence of monolingual English or bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss - Government authority/control</td>
<td>Management (Governance)</td>
<td>This category relates to how government authority is wielded in the community and school in terms of policy such as the FFHP, assistance to the community and effects on community members. Management relates to the types of policies and actions of government. Outcomes are the social, economic and physical effects on the community in terms of dependency, deficit discourse, resourcing, emotional impacts and freedoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Language and culture</td>
<td>Belonging - Relationships,</td>
<td>This category relates to how community members view the importance of language generally and as a language of instruction, what it does for them, how it relates to cultural knowledge and practices and how it effects well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worldviews, values Language</td>
<td>Indigenous world views, in terms of inter-relationships, belonging and co-operative and collective values are also here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights Root Knowledge</td>
<td>This is a subset of language and culture that relates to the influence of Western values and norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and cultural</td>
<td>This code influences student outcome behaviour, attendance and motivation and leads to resistance or conformity (as according to Cummins, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Categories, Subcategories and their Definitions

The major categories and concepts that emerged related to the influence of government management (governance) and government language education policy on school practice in terms of how much the community interacted with the school, the language education, professional status of Indigenous teachers and the professional conduct of the teachers at the school. These broad political governmental forces tended to modify the impact of both Western culture and ILs and culture on these school practices, according to participants. The resulting school practices and language and cultural influences, in turn, determined the academic and
behavioural outcomes of students. This had repercussions for the positive or negative (including resilience) outcomes for the community.

Each major category was examined individually both quantitatively and then qualitatively. The quantitative scores were derived from counting the number of coded responses in each sub-category and then evaluating these against the total number in the category to calculate the corresponding percentage. The qualitative responses presented are the most common in that sub-category and/or show causal relationships between categories and sub-categories or are atypical. This analysis is then followed by CDA conducted on selected responses that show a typicality in terms of framing the FFHP and the factors it influences and is influenced by as well as those responses that did not conform to typical patterns (in order to ascertain why these anomalies occurred).

The aim of the analysis was to portray the complexity in interviewee responses through the inter-relationship between categories. While the inter-relationships of categories and sub-categories are complex, particular sub-categories tended to have distinctive links to others permitting a number of clear relationships between different categories and sub-categories to emerge and dominate. These relationships are depicted pictorially on the next page.

5.4 Critical Discourse Analysis

The excerpts selected for CDA analysis, as detailed earlier, were drawn from the CA and were those that reflected the typical relationship between categories and subcategories or how the policy and its effects were generally framed in addition to those that failed to conform to typical patterns.

CDA is frequently used to identify and expose the hegemony, power and ideology operating in text (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). Although not generally used on non-dominant texts, it is used here to uncover the discourse, linguistic or argumentative strategies that were used in community texts. This helped determine the validity of the CA analysis results of community responses (as outlined by Jick, 1979; Neuman, 2003) and compare them to those of the policy
text and discourse. In so doing, this garnered a deeper understanding of perspectives of the policy implementation and its effects.

Figure 5.1: Categories and Subcategories and how they are related (how they influence each other)
As discussed in Ch3 and Ch4, the CDA used was Historical Discourse Approach (HDA). The elements of analysis in this type of CDA feature below. While this figure is similar to that found in Ch3, the topics vary as a consequence of categories and subcategories that arose with the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Topics/ Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/ School Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss- Government Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Levels of analysis in the Discourse Historical Approach (taken and adapted from Lawton, 2013: 108)

The discursive strategies examined in this research (referential/nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivation/framing) are detailed in Ch3. They relate to the use of metaphors, metonymies, categorisations, stereotypes, comparisons, topoi, fallacies, the use of narratives and descriptions in addition to mitigating or intensifying the force of an utterance (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009: 93).

The following represents the findings from CA (on all responses) and CDA analysis (on selected responses).

5.5 Findings

Figure 5.2 below depicts the total number of responses in each CA category given by the 17 adult respondents in semi-structured interviews at Site 1. The figure shows 48% of responses related to department or school practices, 28% to language and culture and 24% to Government.
Department/school practices were associated with how education language policy influenced language education, school or department interaction with the community and the professional status and conduct of teachers at the school (both Indigenous and non-Indigenous). Figure 5.3 below shows that language education dominates in the number of responses for this category while the responses for professionalism and professional conduct were roughly equal to those for the interaction of the school with the community. This difference in responses reflects the pivotal role language education had in community interaction with the school and the employment and professional status of Indigenous staff at the school.
5.5a1 Language Education

Language and cultural education at Site 1 was regarded as the conduit through which professionalism and employment of Indigenous teachers, the professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff, in addition to the academic and behavioural outcomes of students, were mediated. When the sub-category of language education was examined more closely (figure 5.4 below), the following relationships emerged;
Figure 5.4: The relationship of language education to other categories and sub-categories.

The graph above shows that respondents viewed language education as having the most profound impacts on academic/cognitive outcomes for students (41%), followed by professionalism and employment of Indigenous teachers and the professional conduct of non-Indigenous teachers (31%). Language education also had a large impact on the behavioural outcomes of students (26%), the interaction of the school with the community (24%) and language and culture (16%) (in terms of identity, well-being, relationships and Root Knowledge). This means that bilingual education was construed as having positive results and monolingual education negative. The effects on students are discussed in more detail below while professionalism and professional conduct are discussed in the next section given its close relationship to interaction with the community in many responses.

5.5a2 Bilingual is Good for You

The academic outcomes that respondents identified (41% or responses) related to both perceived learning and academic (including literacy) outcomes.
Extract 5.1

Bilingual education is not about speaking but about understanding and learning to think. If there is no comprehension there, education will not contribute to life skills at all.

Extract 5.2

We want kids to have both, just to have that Two Way. English is a foreign language for our kids, they have to have their own language first and then English.

Extract 5.3

Well, in normal society, white society, kids are taught to learn to read and write properly. We want our kids to do that as well.

Extract 5.1, the response from one school council member, iterates the importance of the need to understand the teacher in order to learn.

The response in extract 5.2 denotes a desire to have children learn both languages, particularly given the fact that SAE represented an alien language to children in the community. That is, the respondent did not perceive the issue as an ‘either/or’ but, rather, valued a more inclusive plurality in language education.

The 5.3 response was articulated by an older respondent on the school board, who identified learning literacy exclusively in a foreign language, although common in remote Indigenous contexts, as not equal to and considerably different from the practices in dominant mainstream schools (a discourse analysis is conducted on this extract below).

5.5a2a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.3

Interestingly, this respondent in extract 5.3 uses the term ‘normal’ to characterise dominant society which implies that the respondent is ‘abnormal’. However, in later discussion, the same respondent stated that they used this term to emphasise the ‘abnormality’ of schooling in a foreign language. This relates to the language gap between the Indigenous student and non-
Indigenous teacher which is rarely acknowledged but has a considerable impact on communication and understanding (partly due to diverse and non-interacting cultural schemas or theories of understanding), teaching effectiveness and Indigenous school achievement (Gardner & Mushin, 2013; Malcolm & Königsberg, 2007; Malcolm & Sharifian, 2002; Ch2).

In addition, the notion of ‘sameness’ as equality to support learning in an IL1 appears to frame the argument in neoliberal terms that, also interestingly, contradicts the contemporary mainstream Australian expression of neoliberalism.\textsuperscript{124} This use of ‘sameness’ is also suggestive of topoi of advantage and usefulness in addition to justice being used to argue for Indigenous bilingual education. The idiom “as well” (implying equality), the adjective “normal” (alluding to the normative, dominant population) and the evaluative intensifying adverb “properly” (correctly) which is equated with “normal society”, act to support the argument for the ‘same’, L1 type of education. The adjective “proper” is typically used in Central Australian Aboriginal English to denote correct protocol and practice. The statement that “proper” reading and writing methods are stated to occur in “normal society” implies that this it is not occurring in remote communities with monolingual English education. “We want our kids to do that” reinforces this implicit argument. The inclusive pronoun “we” frames the argument as one of community agreement and concern. The use of “want to” signifies a desire and wish of the whole community to be the “same” as “normal” society by having bilingual education and so be able to “to read and write properly”. It is thus alluding to the cognitive, academic, well-being and social advantages of bilingual education evidenced in a plethora of research literature (already discussed in Ch2). The text, as with the majority of community interviews, policy discourse and policy texts, is largely in the present simple, framing this argument as a fact.

5.5a3 IL is the Key

In the analysis of these responses, it was found that participants viewed Indigenous bilingual language as presenting the most efficient and effective means of achieving academic learning and English language proficiency.

\textsuperscript{124} That is, that a monolingual national identity is essential to individual and national social and economic success (Lo Bianco, 2001b).
Extract 5.4

If you have (IL1) and English, you have radically different world views. My son grew up in (site 1) and went to school here and learnt (IL1) and he claims that having the two languages and different world views helped him solve computer and software problems which he does now. I’m a product of a bilingual education and I know it has given me cognitive advantages.

Extract 5.5

The only good way for our kids to learn is from our first language. They need to read English through the first language first. Language is the key. You need to think and understand in [IL1] and you need to transfer and translate in English. They caused a lot of damage and want to make it secret.

The non-Indigenous respondent in extract 5.4 spoke of the cognitive advantages of bilingual education in relation to the learning of pluralist conceptualisations and classifications (as outlined by Malcolm, 1998, in Ch2), particularly in Western fields of technology.

In contrast, extract 5.5, the response of an ex-student, relates the adverse effects of exclusively using a foreign language (SAE) in classroom instruction in terms of arresting academic development. This contrasts with bilingual education which leads to the development of both an IL and English. This extract also implies that the practice of monolingual foreign language education and its negative effects, although well-known in the community, were thought to have been kept hidden from mainstream society.

5.5a4 Monolingual Standard English Education and can't speak Standard English

Respondents also referred to how the reduction in bilingual education and the eventual introduction of the FFHP had resulted in a change in the heritage language in children.

Extract 5.6

But most of our Aboriginal schools all around the Territory only have a few hours to teach. And, we know that um, that’s where our kids are breaking down the language. When I’m up at (another community), I’ve got my - I’ve
got my granddaughter’s kids up there and I can just listen to the language that they speak, you know (IL1)-English mix. Down here, we still got kids that talk strongly but sometimes, somewhere along the line, they change and little by little I can hear them speaking a little bit of English and (IL) together. We don’t want that to, it’s ... we want to be able to have kids speaking their language strongly, not that half and half thing – English and (IL1) together.\textsuperscript{125}

This school council member respondent in the above extract is reporting the emergence of a mixed or hybrid language comprised of English and the heritage language, rather than acquisition of SAE which is in agreement with other research on monolingual dominant education for Indigenous students (de la Sablonnière, et al, 2011; Ch2).

5.5a5 Monolingual English made Me go to Sleep

Figure 5.4 (p.207) indicates that participants viewed the language of instruction as having a strong influence on student behaviour (26%). Reflecting on his own school experience, one respondent discussed his inability to attend to classroom tasks and his exhaustion in a monolingual SAE class.

Extract 5.7

Well, from my experience, students really want to go to a classroom where there’s (IL1) spoken, a personal (IL1) being taught. From my experience when I used to be young, I never used to understand English one bit, so that was foreign to me. The teacher in my times used to make us go to sleep in the afternoons, right, but do the lessons in the morning. That was one thing that I noted during those times. They used to get us go to sleep. That’s from being boring.

He also remarked on the effect of monolingual foreign language instruction on classroom engagement and tasks.

Extract 5.8

Even when I was at the Mission House, here, we’d be going for breakfast and just a bit of touring on the paper and pencil and colouring and that’s all we

\textsuperscript{125} In fact, language mixing was remarked on as a problem by another respondent in the years prior to bilingual education when there was only monolingual English education.
could do. But they’d see us and once you’re doing something, you could see and you could draw, you known, they know that you are telling someone, yes, he knows what he’s doing. But speaking language, it wasn’t there. We couldn’t even understand.

Here the respondent is referring to the diminution of the curriculum due to the failure to understand the foreign language of instruction and hence the inability to apply oneself to more advanced cognitive tasks. This is in agreement with findings of Baker (2008, 2011), Collier (1989) and Cummins (2000) in Ch2.

5.5a6 Kids don’t want to go to School

Another respondent commented on the effect on school attendance of the FFHP.

Extract 5.9

They’re getting rid of the value of language and culture. They don’t realise that it’s important. Kids would go to school because they wanted to but now they go because the government makes them. Kids are kids.

This respondent, an ex-school teacher, is reporting the lack of student enthusiasm for attending school after the FFHP introduction. Their response shows they thought this was a consequence of the fact that the language of instruction changed exclusively to monolingual English, the curriculum became ‘white’ and there was a consistent failure to acknowledge the value of the students’ own culture and knowledge. Again, these are all elements that have been evidenced and acknowledged by others in research on monolingual and monocultural education on non-dominant students (in Ch2).

5.5a7 Monolingual English and Bad Things

Some community members viewed the lack of an IL at school as having even more dire behavioural (criminal) consequences.
Extract 5.10

(changes in the community with change in education) I think stealing ... Bad things they do with that .... Sometime when they take our kids away, they won’t learn a thing, like (IL1). Only learn English. They get into more trouble.

This respondent, a grandparent, believed that not all children successfully pursued academic goals away from their communities. This response seems to indicate that learning away from community often resulted in social dysfunction and this agrees with research on how dominant L2 education impinges on a child’s socialisation in their L1 which can then undermine their “cognitive self-regulatory mechanisms” and lead to destructive behaviour (Ochs & Shieffelin, 1996; Wilkins, 2008; Ch2).

5.5a8 No Respect

The following response relates to the effect language has on intergenerational relationships.

Extract 5.11

We’d like to see team teaching in both languages come back. If you’re not team teaching, my kids (in class) would not respect me. Without bilingual education, kids won’t respect the elders.

This comment reveals the respondent’s belief that a failure to provide IL and cultural instruction in remote schools has undermined respect for elders and, consequently, elder authority. This indicates that dominant monolingual English education is leading to intergenerational rupture which could have negative effects on identity formation (and thereby social interaction and resilience), as outlined by Schmidt (1990) and Nicholls (2005) in Ch2.

5.5b Interaction with the Community and Staff Professionalism

These two subcategories are treated together because respondents viewed their relationship as intimately connected. Their relationship to other categories and sub-categories are shown in the graph (figure 5.5) below.
From figure 5.5 above, it can be seen that respondents viewed the interaction of the school with the community (14%) as being predominantly mediated by the language of instruction (34% of responses). This, in turn, influenced the employment and professional status of Indigenous staff and the professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff (including collegiality, classroom management and community interaction). It also influenced the professional knowledge of non-Indigenous staff (where cross-cultural knowledge was rated highly since it impacted directly on student outcomes) (29% of responses). This interaction had a direct bearing on the academic (4%) and behavioural outcomes of students (7%) (both of which are discussed above). It also affected the relationship of younger members with elders as well as the identity and well-being of community members in general (6%) (discussed in more detail below in Language and Culture). Both the professionalism and professional conduct of teachers as well as the interaction of the community with the school, were viewed by respondents to be a product of government intervention and language education policy. Government interventions are discussed in more detail in governance below.
5.5b1 We had Control

Some respondents recalled earlier days of bilingual education.

Extract 5.12

After the second year of teacher training, I went into the bilingual program in the schools which was run by [Indigenous] people. We had control. [Non-Indigenous] were just helping the program. [Indigenous] people are good teachers. Now I don’t go into the classroom much. I don’t know what’s going on. Up until 2000, there were lots of [Indigenous] teachers.

This extract from an ex-teacher substantiates the historical accounts of bilingual education in the NT (Dispray, 2014; Hoogenraad, 2001; Watt, 1993; Appendix 1.2) that reported greater control of schools by Indigenous people as well as the ownership of, vested interest in, empowerment and community development through education and its institutions.

5.5b1a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.12

This authority of Indigenous people in the school system can be seen in the extract above with the noun “control” in the sentence, “We had control”, the verb “helping” and the intensifying adverb “just” in “[Non-Indigenous] were just helping the program” that work to denote the Indigenous dominance operating in the school program prior to monolingual education. This is contrasted with “Now...I don’t know what’s going on” which connotes a lack of consultation by the school with the community, in addition to a lack of interaction.

The verbal phrase “turn-back” in “They wanted to turn back to English” is related to the procession and travel metaphor, suggesting a reversal of progress that was achieved under bilingual education with the implementation of monolingual education. The verbal phrase “turn-back” (or reversal of gains made) also suggests a topos of uselessness is operating in relation to monolingual education. It is unclear, however, who “they” are in the sentence but it seems likely that “they” refers to a nebulous and remote government as it does in other responses. This is particularly so given the fact that participants viewed the government as distant and disparate from themselves but having considerable control over their daily lives.
In the next sentence, “I didn’t like it, everyone didn’t like it” again conveys the lack of consultation and overt control of government. The emotive “didn’t like” and collective pronoun “everyone” intensifies the statement and suggests universal agreement (Benford, 1997). Generally, with all sentences active and clauses independent, community agency is emphasised as is the “truth” of the assertion (Gee, 2011: 66). The exception is in the sentence “There was one principal and four teachers and then it stopped.” Rather than a suppression or demotion of the subject (presumably government) to mitigate any blame for an action, the use of the passive here could be a product of social decorum (where outright criticisms are avoided). It could also be related to the fact that the subject could be inferred from the previous text (see Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002; Lawton, 2008).

5.5b2 We made Books, Dictionaries and did Research

The following extract, a quote from an ex-teacher, reiterates the positive effect of bilingual education on the school and community.

Extract 5.13

(The school) It was good. The Principal supported the program back then. There was a strong presence of bilingual at the school in (Site 1). A lot of local people working, making books, dictionaries and research. People come from Melbourne, David Nash, the late Ken Hale, he was a linguist from Boston Massachusetts. So, bilingual was really strong back then. Yes, it was um, (Indigenous people) was really, they worked at the school as professional, you know. They were recognised by the education department and they went to become teachers and at the same time the linguists worked at the school. Yeah. That was a time of team teaching and working together. It was um …the Principal really supported it and the Deputy Principal. The teachers, they acknowledged that bilingual was for the community…it made the school in a way more stronger … Bilingual and the non-Indigenous staff working together, there was no … there wasn’t a rift. It was working together and [Site 1] was one of the strong schools back then.

From this statement we can see how bilingual education placed a far higher value on IL and culture, resulted in far greater job opportunities for locals and career prospects for youth, greater collegiality between non-Indigenous and Indigenous teachers and a flurry of Indigenous literacy and curriculum activity – all elements reported on in the history of NT bilingual
Indigenous bilingual education (Appendix 1.2). It also represented a time of tangible strength in school activities and outcomes that impacted on the community as a whole with high student attendance, attention to and engagement with tasks and positive student behaviour – all elements listed as outcomes of culturally responsive pedagogy in Ch2.

5.5b3 We had Careers and We made Leaders

These same views are expressed by an ex-teacher.

Extract 5.14

They (students) were happy to go to school and some of those children who go to school back then are now leaders, you know, in the community. That happened at (Site 1, another community, another community) and some of those people are leaders now working really hard through the bilingual program working with the Education Department back in the late 70s to the 80s.

Apart from the factors listed under extract 5.13, this extract suggests that bilingual education also resulted in the development of strong community leaders which agrees with historical accounts of NT bilingual education (Devlin, 1995; Disbray, 2014; Appendix 1.2) but directly contradicts the inference of NT Minister for Education Garry Barnes in the previous chapter that bilingual education was a failed program partly due to a lack of strong leadership.

5.5b4 I was Trained and learnt on the Job

Interestingly, many community members who taught at the school during the early period of bilingual education had achieved their education in a monolingual English language environment. They had poor literacy and English language skills. However, this improved with employment in later years at the bilingual school, training with BIITE and training with linguists in bible translation. One ex-teacher recalled:

Extract 5.15
I went to Kormilda College and Batchelor Institute where I was two years trained. But I’m still not good at writing and spelling. I can write easy in my language but I didn’t have the bilingual program. I learnt from professors from America when writing and reading the [IL1] bible. We just got it straight away, in two weeks. I went to school in the 1960s and 1970s and finished in 1973 in Year 7 and then I just worked part time myself in the school as an assistant teacher. We used to get a little bit of English from the government. I learnt more English teaching kids in a class than with a white teacher. Kids in the 1960s and 1970s didn’t learn much oral English.

5.5b5 I became a Master of Ceremonies

One ex-teacher recollected other benefits of working in a bilingual school.

Extract 5.16

I used to teach (non-Indigenous) teachers as well. I even made tapes and books and papers at home, doing a (IL1) course in town at IAD, I got all the tapes and got everything for a (IL1) speaker to take over. I spoke both languages at that time. I was interpreting my English to (IL1) and (IL1) visa versa. Yes, it was a bit hard because I didn’t know much English. The only English I started to learn was because, doing these jobs, working alongside a white person has been very helpful for my English. Then I started doing more of these courses that really brought my confidence to speak English. I started learning to be...a what do they call it, at the school... the teachers let me be a Master of Ceremony you know doing explanation, having a meeting in public. That’s how I got to understand you can’t be (IL) all the time, you gotta be someone else as well. It was all because of me being with white people working and working closely. That’s how I got my English.

This extract supports the discussion in Ch1 and Appendix 1.2 of the elevation of Indigenous staff to important teaching and school representative roles as a consequence of prioritising cultural and language exchange between Indigenous and non-Indigenous teaching staff. This extract also reveals the positive and productive cross-cultural (IL and English) identities for local community leaders that evolved from this elevated role of IL language and culture (also a noted impact with Site 2 students in Ch6).
5.5b6 Community run School Activities

With bilingual education, participants related that there was also a much stronger Indigenous cultural curriculum.

Extract 5.17

We used to have one week of schooling out of the community at an outstation. Most of the teachers were all Aboriginal people. White teachers would come out; they were observers like. They'd look after us with food and funding and all that. More of the teaching was done by Aboriginal people. Like that's how we got to teach our young kids to speak stronger L1, the L1 that was used long before ...like the hard English. You've got to learn to speak from the university professionals. We were more or less the professionals out there. And that’s how we got to keep our L1 strong.

The extract above relates the fact that the bilingual program in schools resulted in far greater community involvement in the school, school activities and excursions outside of the school, higher levels of L1 language teaching and a positive and strong Indigenous identity and IL for students.

5.5b7 Parents helped with Homework

Bilingual education also appeared to enhance parental participation in a child’s school work both at home and at school.

Extract 5.18

Kids could come home and show their work they’d done, a book, to their parents and their parents could understand and teachers could come home with them. Teachers used to go to people’s houses to meet parents. Now, I don’t know the teachers but the Principal knows most people. We were free to walk around the school.
This extract suggests that there was more intergenerational interaction and participation when the school had a bilingual program as a consequence of a shared language between home and school in addition to a more extensive interaction of parents with their child’s teacher. That is, there was considerable positive serial impact of bilingual instruction.

5.5b8 I haven't met any Teachers

The same participant had views on the outcomes of monolingual dominant language education that contrasted considerably from those of bilingual education above.

Extract 5.19

I haven’t met any teachers except the Principal. But before we would see the teachers and they would talk to us about kids’ behaviour or their work at school. They used to use the school bus to bring around permission slips and so we could talk to the teacher. Now the kids bring them home.

The extract above implies the professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff, in terms of interaction with caregivers and classroom management, has been compromised since the introduction of monolingual English education in terms of teaching strategies, engagement with caregivers and cross-cultural understanding.126

5.5b9 Classroom Management Difficulties

Other participants noted the negative effect of monolingual dominant language and cultural education on classroom management.

Extract 5.20

126 The responses appear to indicate that participants view the changes in educational practice over the past two decades from bilingual to monolingual education as leading to a failure by non-Indigenous teachers to meet the following Australian Professional Standards for Teachers: 1.4 Strategies for teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students; 1.5 Differentiate teaching to meet the specific learning needs of students across the full range of abilities; 2.4 Understand and respect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to promote reconciliation between Indigenous and nonindigenous Australians; 3.7 Engage parents/carers in the educative process; 4.4 Maintain student safety; and 7.3 Engage with the parents/carers (ATSIL, 2011).
When there is no Aboriginal teacher in a class, kids can get away with saying anything. They can insult the teacher and there can be lots of verbal bullying of the girls. It is really shocking. Aboriginal adults don’t let them get away with it. If you allow this kind of behaviour, the boys end up in jail and the girls murdered. These kids need the voice of sense and reason.

**Extract 5.21**

Some kids don’t go to school because of the behaviour towards children by their teachers. You need to use a proper approach to kids who get into mischief. Kids get bullied by teachers. With Indigenous teachers, they approach with caution, what you say, how you say it. How you treat them can also get the parents riled up. I think there should be cross-cultural seminars held for two weeks before new teachers go out into communities.

Extract 5.20 shows the view that a lack of cross-cultural understanding and interaction has led to increased bullying between students when an Aboriginal teacher is absent.

Extract 5.21 indicates a belief that a lack of interaction with the community and reduced cross-cultural understanding has contributed to difficulties in teacher-student interaction and student attendance for some teachers which are also elements outlined in Ch2 and Appendix 1.2.

**5.5b9a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.21**

When CDA is used to analyse extract 5.21, it shows teacher behaviour is framed as the cause of a lack of student attendance at school both in terms of their behaviour to children (with the verb “bullied”) as well as the response of parents (with the phrasal verb ‘riled up’). However, the use of the passive in this sentence results in the actions of teachers, and not the qualities of the teachers themselves, being censured. It is interesting that the respondent does not ‘other’ or use any adjectives except for “new” to describe non-Indigenous teachers (using “teachers” and “new teachers”). This implies that they are the “norm”, particularly when Indigenous teachers are described as “Indigenous teachers” as opposed to “local” or “experienced”. This could indicate that ‘regimes of truth’ and complicity of the dominated are in operation here and/or the school is recognised as a domain of Western domination. The phrase “You need to use a proper [correct] approach” has a modality that indicates “essential repair” (Bartlett, 2004: 75;
see also Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) and so is intensifying the argument for change in teacher classroom management.

Of interest also is the implication that these problems are occurring not because of some deficient quality in the teachers arriving in remote Indigenous communities but rather because some non-Indigenous teachers are ignorant. This is achieved with the sentence, “I think there should be cross-cultural seminars held for two weeks”. Here, the connotation is that non-Indigenous teachers are not directly to blame for their behaviour, but rather their lack of cross-cultural education and preparedness. That is, the fault is stated to lie with the lack of resources allocated to remote Indigenous education as opposed to any inherent Western negative trait, indicating an expression of the “relationality”, “reciprocity” and collectivist values inherent in Indigenous cultures (Biermann & Townsend-Cross, 2008: 148). Here, the participant is presenting a solution or remedy to a problem (“cross-cultural seminars”) using a topos of usefulness and perhaps even danger (if a solution is not found). This is indicated by the use, in the previous sentence, of “need to” (as outlined by Bartlett, 2004). The lack of modal adjuncts shows a strong commitment from the speaker and this construes the text as fact, suggesting a rationalisation macro-strategy is also at work (Reyes, 2011; van Leeuwan, 2008).

5.5b10 A Bad Attitude of White People

Respondents also related the effects of government interventions on interactions in remote schools.

Extract 5.22

With the allegations of child abuse, there is often a bad attitude of white people towards locals coming into communities – new teachers, government workers, all the new white people in communities. They see the kids in a different light which is not good. Some don’t get over the attitude, don’t change it, because they leave before they’ve found out it’s not true. They think the traditional culture has a terrible flaw. They develop a bad attitude to the culture and feel justified in changing it. It’s just assimilationist. However, their attitude couldn’t be further from the truth.
This respondent perceived professional compromise occurring as a consequence of the governance of Indigenous people that has been engendered in the past few decades (Lovell, 2012; Simmons & Lecouteru, 2008). As noted in Ch2, this found its most forceful expression in the NTER with its allegations of child abuse on remote Indigenous communities (Lovell, 2012; Macoun, 2011; Watson, 2011). The abolition of bilingual education in remote schools appeared to respondents to also influence non-Indigenous workers in the community. This non-Indigenous respondent viewed this influence as resulting not only in the rejection by white outsiders of Indigenous culture, language and people (also noted in governance outcomes) despite the effect this has on professional conduct, but a lack of recognition of Indigenous teacher’s skills.

Extract 5.23

There is no recognition of local teachers’ skills. They are by far the most suitable people to teach community children. With local people, there are no behaviour management problems.

5.5c Language and Culture

Language and culture represented the main concern of respondents. Subcategories dominating in this discussion appear in figure 5.6 below. They include belonging (the worldview, relationships and values) embodied in language, the effect of Western society and language on the community, how language intersects with identity and well-being as well as the relationship between language and student behaviour.

Most responses occurred in the sub-category of belonging (15%). This was closely followed by the impact language has on identity and well-being (14%). However, I initially discuss language use since it helps define the language ecology of Site 1. I then discuss the relationships between language and belonging (world views, relationships and values) and finally language, identity and well-being. Incorporated into these two subcategories are the elements of Western influence (15%) and Root Knowledge (11%) and so they are not dealt with separately to prevent repetition. A discussion on student behaviour (13%) appeared above and so this too is not repeated. Governance (7%) is dealt with in a separate section and so does not appear here.
Within governance and governance outcomes, language rights feature prominently and so are dealt with in that section.

Figure 5.6: Language and Culture responses and how they relate to other categories and subcategories (note responses below 6% were not included above)

5.5c1 Language Use

The language use sub-category relates to the language used within the community. Participants overwhelmingly agreed that the local IL was the dominating language and the vehicle through which both knowledge and English can be acquired. That is, there was a recognition of the importance of sufficient IL1 acquisition for both cognitive and behavioural development and the acquisition of a L2 (Ch2).
5.5c2 English only used by Institutions of Power

Participant interviews revealed that English was used in limited domains, those of institutions of power within and outside the community (schools, the judicial and health systems, outsourced job seeking centres and government departments).

Extract 5.24

Yes, language helps with jobs. If a person doesn’t know English, he can talk to one of his friends or to his supervisor who is Indigenous and knows English and can help with the language. It’s valuable to talk good English, so they mix English and language.

However, even with employment, this extract suggests English is not regarded as essential. If someone does not have English skills, they expect to rely on others as a consequence of obligations of reciprocity and of belonging to a closely linked group.

5.5c3 Belonging - Relationships, World Views and Values

Figure 5.6 above shows the largest number of responses for a sub-category in language and culture was belonging (15%) and Western influence (15% – which is dealt with below).

5.5c4 Land and Language is Life

In responses on belonging, participants viewed language as the integral element since it acted as a repository of the spiritual relationships between an individual, the land and their extended family – a link which ceased to operate with a loss of language. Hence, the strong desire for bilingual education and more IL learning.

Extract 5.25

It’s so important to have that because it’s your grandfather’s language, your father’s language, your mother’s language but it’s also comes with the land, and your spirit and your heart because that is very important.
Extract 5.25 shows the belief that the key to Indigenous life was the link between language, the land, family, the soul and spirituality.

The connection between language, culture and the land was also deemed inseparable from life itself by participants.

**Extract 5.26**

[language is culture and land] It’s part of the land and us. We are the land; the land is us. It’s the connection to everything else inside the culture. It’s all to do with the land, the life.

### 5.5c5 Without Language you’re Lost

The caretaking role of land and language was regarded by respondents as the most crucial element in Indigenous identity and well-being. The following extract encapsulates the importance of language to land, ceremony and identity.

**Extract 5.27**

Language is a thing given to us and we see it with the country, you know, how it is important to us. It’s not there just to play around, it’s there. We’re connected into that. There’s about 8 or 16 groups of people who carry that. If they’re not doing that, where are they? They’re lost. So we come in some of us to get them back with their ceremony, dancing and all that and the language is part of that. It’s really important.

These sentiments resonate with the findings of Guenther (2014a) who notes in his study of 31 very remote Indigenous Australian schools (with Indigenous populations of more than 80%) that remote Indigenous families regarded the development of Indigenous cultural capital in school—in terms of teacher social competency in the community and classroom as well as student IL and cultural development—as of prime importance. Community members at Site 1 during a research review meeting on this project also argued in this regard. They maintained that IL and culture practices should be encouraged and recognised in the education sector and not be seen as ‘lost time’.
This pre-eminence of language is evident in the CDA of this extract. Language, here, is linked to the metaphor of a ‘gift’ ("given to us"), implying a valuable element that requires care. It is difficult to ascertain who the gift is from exactly – the land? Ancestral beings? Ancestors? God? It is described as “important” and “not ...just to play around” – the latter phrase indicates the special powers of language to direct and create material, mental and behavioural effects (Ch2).

The use of the verb “see” to describe language, even though language is auditory, intensifies the sense of interconnection between song and story and visual aspects of the land. In addition, when the 8 or 16 groups of people (Skin groups) are said to “carry” the language and the knowledge it contains, this links language to the metaphor of a ‘load’ that implies a burden or responsibility (see Diegnan, 1999 on the meaning of ‘carry’).

The use of collective inclusive pronouns, “we” and “us” describes the ‘in’ group. That is, the group with culture and language. The use of the inclusive plural personal pronoun “we” also personalises the argument, thus intensifying the universality and sincerity of the claim. In contrast, those without language and culture are denoted with “they” and described as “lost” and directionless. This lexis shows the employment of the pathway or procession metaphor to indicate no “future planning” or “moving forward” (see Chilton, 2006: 64).

Again, with no modal adjuncts in this text in addition to the use of the present simple, there is the indication of a rationalisation macro-strategy (and a commitment of the speaker to the statements) (Reyes, 2011; van Leeuwan, 2008). The use of pronouns “we”, “us” and “they” and the predication of the ‘out’ group as “lost”, however, indicates a coercive macro-strategy is also possibly operating. The lack of nominalisation and active tense in these clauses also enhances the processes, actions and agency of Indigenous people in these statements as opposed to mitigating or obscuring them (as according to Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83; Lawton, 2008), suggesting an agented struggle with the effects of colonisation on language and cultural loss.
5.5c6 Languages are good for You

In this study, a knowledge of other languages was also regarded by participants as essential to ensure an understanding and harmonious relationship with others.

Extract 5.28

Um, it’s good for us to learn [IL] and English and it’s good for you guys to learn in [IL] and understand our language, yeah. Especially the older people, they love to talk in [IL] to the white people. They just only speak [IL] to the white people, you know... And you’ve got different communities. They have their own languages and you have to learn the language so that you can understand the people, what kids are asking you. I think it’s good for the children and it’s good for [non-Indigenous] people as well to understand kids in class, rather than speaking English. They’re speaking [IL] and they need a translator there too.

It appears from the above that members at Site 1 viewed multilingualism as a cultural-cognitive and communicative enterprise, an idea attune to the community’s relational and integrated world view (Pawu-Kurlpurlurnu, Holmes & Box, 2008) and one that resonates strongly with those presented in extract 5.4 that express the cognitive advantages of cross-cultural bilingual and multilingual education (Martin-Rhee & Bialystok, 2008; Carlson & Meltzoff, 2008; Lee, 1996; Lo Bianco, 2008a; Ch2).

5.5c7 Language lets you talk to Ancestors

ILs also ensure the maintenance of knowledge and culture. As one respondent noted:

Extract 5.29

If you end up at a sacred site, you have to talk to our ancestors first. Say something like, ‘Can I enter this country?’ It’s part of me and part of my family, the country. You can enter but you say it in English they can’t identify you by that.

The importance of uniting belonging and Root Knowledge (deep knowledge and culture) through language and cultural practices common on traditional land is a recurring theme.
You’re born with [it] language. If you go out visiting countries, you have to talk to your ancestors or else you get sick.

These extracts above show the respondents’ view of language being a prime factor in spiritual and physical well-being.

5.5c8 Identity and Well-being

The next strongest number of responses in the language and culture sub-categories related to Western influence (15%). This was followed by identity and well-being (14%) and then student behaviour (13%). These elements were inter-related with respondents viewing a loss of language as a consequence of Western influence. The Western influence and loss of language were viewed as directly impacting on identity, well-being and behavioural issues for youth. These issues occurred as a consequence of the lack of moral direction (in terms of embedded elements of belonging and Root Knowledge) where moral direction, values and norms were no longer accessed through the traditional Indigenous language (with change and/or disuse) or arbitrated through IL speaking elders (who no longer had authority through language).

5.5c9 No language, No Confidence, No Direction

Concomitant with heritage language loss, research participants spoke of a loss of confidence, values and morals as well as respect for elders and a deterioration in the moral fabric of the community itself. This mirrors the Canadian findings of de la Sablonnière, et al (2011: 303) in Ch2 who note that colonisation has resulted in “the worst possible situation” where former norms no longer exist but “have not been replaced by new norms, leaving the Inuit communities in a state of social dysfunction”. In relation to this loss at Site1, one participant stated:

We want our children to take this bilingual program. Young people don’t know about meaning of words, they have less direction and confidence and culture.
5.5c10 Not so much Language, on the Wrong Road

Respondents viewed this lack of values and morals through language loss as manifesting in a lack of resilience, a lack of aspirations in general, alcohol abuse and a diminution in the social fabric of the community. This view reflects the international findings of Hallett, Chandler and Lalonde (2007) as well as Schmidt (1990: 27), who noted that an IL “is the lynchpin in self-esteem, cultural respect and social identification”. This loss of language was narrated in the following:

Extract 5.32

You weren’t allowed to speak in your own language when I went to school through the missionaries. And now not as much language and everyone doing their own thing and their own way and some are on the wrong road. They don’t want to work or do nothing. In Alice they’re living in the creek with nothing.

5.5c10a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.32

As previously noted by Gasper (1996), narratives concisely integrate problems, solutions, arguments and evidence and so are often used by policy makers and implementers as well. Here, the use of a narrative succinctly illustrates the complex effects of language and culture loss and implies that with greater IL and culture at school, the destructive behavioural problems discussed above would not occur (in agreement with research literature in Ch2).

In this text excerpt, the argument and framing in the narrative is intensified with the inclusive plural pronoun “everyone” in “everyone doing their own thing”, where “their own” indicates morals and values not related to (or outside) the community. It thus alludes to the container metaphor (Chilton, 2006). A moral evaluation is also given in addition to the mythopoesis macro-strategy with the metaphor of travel, as in “wrong road” and a predication “They don’t want to work or do nothing” that acts to frame the destructive behavioural consequences of a lack of IL and culture. The adjective “wrong” and its implied moral evaluation, shows a topos of law or right is operating here as well. The final statement, “they’re living in the creek with nothing” appears to be a predication that functions to absolve those on the “wrong road” of
blame or wrong doing. Rather, the fact that they have not gained from this behaviour ("with nothing") frames them as victims thus construing a powerful story of despair and destruction.

5.5c11 Languages Mixed Up and Marriages wrong Skins

Social and moral dysfunction, in fact, was frequently attributed to the loss of ILs.

Extract 5.33

In this new generation now, there’s the languages being mixed up, there’s the marriage of wrong skins, bringing up the children but we deal with that. We know straight away. They’re kids and they belong to the community. They love at first sight. The old days are gone. Like the promises and right skin marriage. It’s gone. Today there’s kids in wrong skin marriages. Today, young people know what they want these days. It’s not your mother’s and father’s choice of marriage anymore. It’s their choice of marriage. It’s just Yoo-hoo for the young ones. I can go and marry who I want now. And, what was the upbringing in those days, we had to obey the laws that the old people used to say.

This extract demonstrates the belief that a prime ‘litmus test’ of morality for Site 1 participants is commonly embodied in marriage where an intricate and strict web of inter and intra-relationships (the ‘Skin’ relationships) has been developed. This intricate web of relationships is to ensure no intra-breeding in families. It also allows for a rigid allocation of specific responsibilities for the land and to particular community members as well as a strict adherence to community laws (Pawu-Kurlpurlurnu, Holmes & Box, 2008). When these relationships are ignored, older community members take it as a sign that traditional community values, morals and laws related to belonging and Root Knowledge are no longer adhered to as a consequence of the loss of the heritage language.

5.5c12 Exclusive Western education and the Breakdown of Law and Culture, No Jobs

Participants generally viewed the loss of language, the loss of culture and the diminution in respect for elders as the result of an almost exclusively Western education. They also viewed
this loss as occurring from the lack of employment of community workers at the school which, in turn, as previously discussed, was a consequence of government interventions.

Extract 5.34

When they’re walking around the community, boring, nothing to do. You know, they do this and that and ... where does it all come from. I think it’s a breakdown of families. This new generation now. It’s starting now. And, I think it’s also a breakdown of some of the young fellas not being interested in going back to the law and culture thing, all that. And, it may be somewhere down the track they’ll be new agreements, no bilingual in the school. You gotta learn to speak English. You gotta read and write in English. Some young people want to get their mind on being somebody and they lose track of family, culture, language, you know.

As noted above, the loss of heritage language, culture and education was occurring slowly prior to the FFHP but accelerated with its introduction. The FFHP, as well as policies that encouraged high school students to study away from home, were thus viewed as contributing to the undermining of traditional elder authority (also discussed in governance outcomes), heritage language, culture and law. These elements, in turn, were generally being replaced by Western influence, Western education and English language. However, as mentioned in some detail above, rather than contributing to positive social or economic outcomes, including job opportunities or job readiness for the community, Western influence and Indigenous language loss resulted in an increase in alcohol abuse as well as massive social dislocation, disconnection and other problems. Some dislocated members chose to move to Alice Springs, contributing to social problems there. Others who stayed exhibited anti-social behaviour. As one respondent noted:

Extract 5.35

Some kids now go to school in cities and come back and do nothing... no jobs just drinking and gunga. They were carting grog from town. That stopped. People are now going to town to drink and more people live in town camps and send kids to Yeperinya and Yirara [schools in Alice Springs].

127 At a meeting with key respondents in 2014, those with educational experience noted that some students who attended distant boarding schools did well. However, not all succeeded or could cope with the distance from family and place.
The lack of a relationship between Western education and economic engagement (common in human capital arguments for education) in responses from remote Indigenous community members is also noted by Guenther (2014a) in his study of 31 very remote schools. He (p. 11) presumes that this was a consequence of the school being viewed as “an end in itself”, the preoccupation “with what happens in school” as opposed to beyond it, or the “focus on primary aged education” as opposed to further schooling, training or education, if indeed there is any readily available.

5.5c13 Language is Identity

The next strongest relationship was that between language and identity where your language literally identified who you are and represented the intergenerational transfer of knowledge, culture and social skills.

Extract 5.36

Languages are connected to identity. For example, [Site 1] people will say that people at [another community], many of whom don’t speak much [IL1], are not [IL1people] anymore, they’re English. The [IL2] used to be spoken at [another community 2] but they people speak [IL1] now so they’re [IL1people] and not [IL 2 people]. ILs are the language of their mothers who love them and care for them. How can any other language have such an emotional attachment whereas English is taught by people of a different culture and colour. There is an emotional bond with the mother’s language. Kids of [IL1] speaking mums still speak [IL1].

The speaker here is creating a strong link between language, identity and well-being through the use of a ‘mother tongue’, which has positive constructions of Indigenous identity and active Indigenous agency, in “their mother who loves and cares for them”. This is in agreement with the international research discussed in Ch2 (and Hallett, Chandler & Lalonde, 2007; Schmidt, 1990) that outlined the positive effect of heritage language on Indigenous identity creation and self-esteem. It also relates to the Australian research discussed in the literature review that links Indigenous identity, well-being and socio-economic enhancement to IL and culture (Beresford & Gray, 2006; Biddle, 2012a, 2012b; Collins, 1999; Martin, 2006; Maughan, 2012).
5.5d Boss - Types of Government Authority/Control

This category is divided into two sub-categories of Governance and Governance Outcomes. The division of responses into these subcategories was as follows:

![Bar graph showing responses for Governance and Governance Outcomes](image)

Figure 5.7: Responses related for Governance and Governance Outcomes

5.5d1 Management - Governance

The theme of governance dealt directly with how participants viewed the FFHP and government consultation with the community as well as how they viewed the rationale of government in policy making. All participants in this research at Site 1, except one (a non-Indigenous participant), disagreed with the FFHP. All commented on the poor consultation with the community regarding the FFHP.

When the sub-category of governance was analysed in more detail, the following relationships emerged.
The graph above indicates that the majority (21%) of responses related to the qualities of governance (the consultation and rational exhibited by consecutive governments). The greatest impact governance had on other categories was with language and culture (18%), predominantly relating to language rights (6%) (also discussed below), and the well-being of community members as a consequence of government policy (7%) (discussed in governance outcomes). This was followed by governance outcomes (12%) which was closely linked to behavioural (12%) and academic (10%) outcomes of students, the interaction with the community and professionalism/professional conduct of teachers (10%) (most of which is discussed in governance outcomes).

5.5d2 Regimes of Truth

Although the vast majority of community members advocated the benefits of bilingual education, a non-Indigenous participant viewed bilingual education negatively.
Extract 5.37

Self-determination is what ruined it. It was too much too soon. To be plucked from something from hunting and gathering food to one where they relied on sugar and tea was a mistake. That’s the problem with bilingual education—too much too soon. [IL1 Site 1] as a culture were so slow to develop.

Interestingly, these views reiterated the same dominant NTER perspectives of both the Howard and subsequent Labor governments outlined by Lovell (2012: 200, of “Aboriginal culture as maladapted to modern ways of life”) and Altman (2013: 88, of self-determination as a failed experiment whereby “the state must paternalistically enforce discipline and development on indigenous subjects”). This indicates the possible workings of ‘regimes of truth’ in this extract that is “ideological and divorced from reality” (Altman, 2013: 88).

Wipe out

Generally, participants viewed a number of government intervention and programs negatively, even destructive. This included the non-Indigenous respondent from above:

Extract 5.38

Having grown up here, every program that has been a success, they get rid of it or change it. I always think they’re trying to wipe [Site 1 people] out or [Site 1 people] will wipe themselves out through what whitefellas are giving them.

5.5d2a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.39

In the above extract, there appears to be evidence of a topos of danger or threat (dangerous consequences) and a topos of humanitarianism in an argument of government oppression. This is indicated by the clause “they’re trying to wipe [Site 1 people] out” which connotes genocidal tendencies (with the use of the phrasal verb “wipe out”) of an amorphous and distant government “they”. The use of “wipe out” is interesting since it derives from an action to clean or erase and means destruction or annihilation. It, thereby, appears to link to settler colonial “exclusivism … that demands that settler sovereignty entirely replace Indigenous ones” as
outlined by Veracini (2007). The use of “wipe out” consequently results in the portrayal of these Site 1 people as victims both directly (“wipe [Site 1 people] out”) and indirectly through what they are allowed access to (as in “wipe themselves out”). The excerpt “every program that has been a success, they get rid of it or change it” shows evidence of coercion and representation (oppressive government) macrostrategies and victimisation framing. The adjective “every” and adverb “always” universalises and intensifies the argument as does the phrasal verb “get rid of” (to discard or eliminate). The use of “success” in this sentence implies government failure to enact or sustain beneficial policies and programs (criticisms also levelled at Indigenous policy in general by the Productivity Commission, 2013) while the present continuous and future modal “will” acts to show that the process of oppression is ongoing with negative repercussions for the future.

5.5d3 Terra Nullus and Smashing the Mirror

Such acts of oppression are explained in nuanced postcolonial terms by another speaker. This articulate non-Indigenous participant viewed this oppression as emanating from a fear of the “other” in relation to the analysis of the Western self. They also perceived this destruction as a product of settler colonial ideology (also outlined in Ch2 by Sellwood & Angelo, 2013; Veracini, 2007; Walter & Butler, 2013).

Extract 5.39

Aboriginal society by its very difference holds up a mirror to white society and they want to smash it. It threatens the comfortable way they feel about their own society. It makes you question whether this going to work and paying off a mortgage is the best idea. White society demands consumption, there has to be some economic growth and all the time the environment is getting worse and all of a sudden a bunch of people here don’t believe in that and that is threatening to people. ... Lots of people, teachers, principals and departments, feel powerless when confronted by bilingual education. They feel out of control. We pretend there is only whitefella history here, as if Aboriginal people were never here before. It’s like white people don’t like to be reminded of the English destruction and their English descent.

This extract comprehensively outlines both Indigenous invisibility and *terra nullus* (“We pretend there is only whitefella history here”) and the ‘threat’ posed by *difference* to the integrity of the
nation-state (“They feel out of control”). This extract also considers the divergent world views between Aboriginal (collectivism and relational) and settler colonial societies (atomistic) that has led governments to consistently apply policies with narrow settler colonial and ethnocentric development trajectories (of individual home and business ownership, in “engaging with the mainstream economy” and “work each day”) as opposed to collective goals (Lovell, 2012: 213-214). Interestingly, it also deals with the settler colonial ‘denial’ of imperial roots and colonial violence (“white people don’t like to be reminded of the English destruction and their English descent”) as noted by Barker (2012) and Veracini (2007 in Ch2).

5.5d4 It’s offensive

For respondents, governance and interaction with the community was the dominant relationship that appeared between governance and other categories.

Extract 5.40

They don’t ask, especially on bilingual education, they don’t ask many local people on what their opinion is on bilingual teaching and English. They just only go to the school and ask the teachers there.

Extract 5.41

Neglect, there was no consultation with [Il1 people] ... The policy was four hours of English in the morning. To me, that’s arrogant. It offended me too.

In these extracts, participants related the consistent failure generally of government to consult the local population in terms of policy creation and enactment, including that of the FFHP, and related this to the tyranny of government.

Another participant noted the long history of consultation neglect and how this has resulted in erratic policy outcomes.
We all know that these rules are made in parliament without any deep consultancy with the Aboriginal people. It’s been happening right through. During that time, other stuff was brought in. We needn’t go into details; we know exactly what we’re talking about. And, there’s a lack of consultation. In some areas it was good and some areas it was bad.

### 5.5d5 It’s a Joke

When government did consult, it was often with those not perceived to have community hierarchy, knowledge or authority. Apart from the abject failure of governments to consult at all, community members discussed the belief that leadership in the community was totally bypassed as well as how government consultants paid ‘lip service’ to the consultation process, using meeting attendance sheets as evidence of consultation at meetings where there was no discussion and submissions were ignored:

### Extract 5.43

The higher ups use your submissions as a way to defeat you on their agenda. At government meetings, a meeting clipboard goes around and you sign it to say you are present at the meeting. The government uses this as proof of consultation and that you’ve agreed with a decision they’ve made. With the Stronger Futures legislation, the ‘consultation’ discussion meetings they had in communities was simply a presentation of a discussion paper. There was no discussion and what was said at the meetings or things in the 700 submissions was not taken on board. It became legislation even before the parliamentary inquiry put in a report. It’s a joke.

### 5.5d6 They’re Not Boss of our Body

This view of failure to consult communities was often linked to neglect of community desires and manifested in statements regarding the participants’ human rights being compromised.

Many research participants framed the FFHP as a transgression against their rights to heritage language education which is not denied to other groups.
Extract 5.44

It’s not fair. You’ve got minority group, Greek, Italian...they’ve got their language class but poor [IL1 and other language groups], left out.

Some related this denial to a lack of respect for the First Australians in tandem with technologies of government control.

Extract 5.45

We are born with this language just like the Chinese, Africans and English are born with theirs. We’re the first Australians here, it is really wrong that they’re telling us what to do. They’re not boss of our body. We can’t go to Alice Springs and go to their classroom and teach [Non-Indigenous people]. They wouldn’t understand what I’m saying.

5.5d6a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 5.49

The CDA of this extract indicates a number of interesting strategies that reveal both global and local processes related to colonial resistance. For instance, there appears to be a reference to the body metaphor possibly used in much the same way as Foucault (1977). That is, as a “political technology” of the state where the body is directed, regulated and controlled as a means of redemption. However, the negative “not” works to present the colonised as agented and resisting in “They’re not the boss of our body”.

The “boss” in this sentence is also a striking term. According to Musharbash (2001), ‘boss’ is used in Aboriginal English to describe “a perceived or real lack of autonomy in the workplace”.

---

128 Given that Foucault developed many of his theories and concepts as a consequence of experiencing French colonisation in Algeria, the fact that the ‘body’ metaphor occurs in Indigenous colonised respondents is probably not unusual (Fendler, 2010).

129 Duveen (2001: 269) notes that resistance is where “an identity refuses to accept what is proposed by a communicative act, that is, it refuses to accept an attempt to influence”.

130 It derives from traditional owner and caretaker roles of the country of ‘boss’ or ‘owner’ and ‘worker’ or ‘policeman’ (Musharbash, 2001). This is related to the obligation of personal relationships derived from traditional roles of kirda for some places and kurdungurlu for others. Kirda becomes reinterpreted as ‘boss’ or ‘owner’ and Kurdungurlu as ‘worker’ or policeman. With the position of Kirda comes a responsibility for looking after workers. Musharbash (2001) explains this as “showing acceptance of and tolerance for cultural obligations of workers (like absences for ‘sorry business’), offering seats to workers first when driving to town, assisting with bureaucratic matters, allowing access to office and private resources such as the telephones, and generally ‘caring’ for workers.”
Its use here suggests a reference to the attrition in self-determination of Indigenous people in communities due to government policies (such as the NTER, the collapse of the Indigenous community councils into ‘white’ Shires and the FFHP).

Also, IL rights are intertwined with moral evaluation (used as a legitimation, justification strategy) in “it is really wrong that they’re telling us what to do”. This is intensified by the adverb “really” and indicated by the noun “wrong”. There is also evidence of a procession metaphor in “First Australians here” to denote the (neglected and unacknowledged) hierarchy of Indigenous people.

5.5d7 The Indigenous Language and Cultural Rights that Indigenous People can’t have

The rights associated with one’s own language and culture were often directly associated with a knowledge of UN covenants.

Extract 5.46

I think, the community feel really angry, upset. They were really angry because what they were taking away was their right. And every people in the whole world has the right to be taught their own language, their L1, so they can learn English quickly, their L2.

This respondent above showed both an understanding of these UN covenants in relation education of Indigenous people as well as the need for a strong acquisition of a L1 to adequately acquire a second.

The lack of IL rights was also framed by research participants as a product of paternalism, power, control and the spoils of war for the dominant. A non-Indigenous respondent, for instance, noted:
Extract 5.47

The ideal is to give the community and family real choices. No one has a right to force a choice on to other people. Not everyone can be the same. They haven’t got the same opportunity. Just because [monolingual English and/or mainstream] education has worked for some, it doesn’t mean it will work for everyone. It’s saying I know what’s best for everyone. You don’t have the rights over other people’s children. In the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People it does say Indigenous people have the right to educate their children in the language they want. It’s part of the rights of parents. If Japan won WWII, we would all speak Japanese and they would over-ride our rights in the same way.

In the extract above, these elements were tied to the use of the neoliberal signifier of ‘competition’ in relation to choice.

5.5e Management (Governance) Outcomes

This subcategory relates to the outcomes on the community and students as a consequence of the type of governance and policy enacted. It relates to how governance and policy has affected the degree of informed consent, dependence, caregiver authority, choice and resources within the community and the degree of deficit views and assimilation tendencies of non-Indigenous people that impact on the community. These were all concerns expressed by community members. As can be seen in figure 5.9 below, respondents viewed governance outcomes as having the most profound effect on student behaviour (24%) and community member identity and well-being (22%), closely followed by professionalism and professional conduct (13%) and student academic outcomes (11%).
5.5e1 We were stressed out

In terms of community well-being, a number of respondents commented on the serious emotional distress associated with the introduction of the FFHP.

**Extract 5.48**

Yes, [the community] were angry. It was really frustrating because it was coming from an Indigenous person who stopped and brought that idea in. My mum and the older ones were all stressing out. This change in four hours English really hit them hard and they felt so sad because our language and culture was always being attacked.

5.5e2 Elder Power and Social Harmony

The most profound effects of governance outcomes were on the behaviour of youth. However, prior to increasing government intervention in the 1990s and 2000s, respondents reported a quite different situation. For instance, during the period of bilingual education and greater levels of self-determination, attendance at school and positive social behaviour was high (as discussed above).
Our elders. There’s not much elders at this community now because the more elders we had the more power they had. They made everything. In the welfare days, if they had a problem here, like a man’s killed a person, they’d all get together and they’d settle that, not by sending them to jail. But punishment. And the punishment was not to kill but to make them [in] pain, that pain will remind him I won’t do any more of this.

This extract shows views on high positive social behaviour being a product of the more effective community management of social problems by elder groups who had cultural authority.

5.5e3 We don’t get to do Mediation

This is contrasted with the contemporary exacerbation of social problems as a consequence of the inability of community members to intervene in these issues due to their lack of authority and consultation that is arising from the growing influence of ‘white’ institutions.

This government oppression is alluded to with “We don’t get to do the mediation in a way that we want to”, implying those in power are prohibiting community leaders to act. This is linked to rights in the proceeding sentence where there is an attempt at the passive in “It’s [They have] taken away the rights of all this which they [those in power] haven’t got”. The use of “all” universalises the statement, thus intensifying it (see Gee, 1996) and the passive indicates both a detachment from the subject but also mitigation of the criticism of the subject while the use

131 There exists a growing authority of white institutions and institutional members such as the police, government departments and the school at the expense of the authority of community members.
of plural inclusive pronouns, “our people” and “we” denote the consensus of the in-group (the community) and exclusive “they” to indicate dominant authority.

Mitigation is also seen in the sentence “They’re things that aren’t really taught by our people”. The rationale here is that “stealing motor cars” is a skill taught by those outside the community suggesting the use of a container metaphor to emphasise the destructive role of outside authoritarianism and influence.

As such this extract uses a topos of burden (threats from outside) and a topos of justice (rights) to create an argument of outside influences causing social problems in addition to the lack of rights to address these problems.

5.5e4 Whitefella Voice and Violence

Respondents consistently reported that student behaviour deteriorated with this decrease in traditional power as a consequence of growing Western authority through government intervention and the threat of incarceration to caregivers (who attempted to curb poor child behaviour). Added to this is the increasing threat of the removal of children from the community (as described to me on a visit in 2015. See also Gibson, 2013, 2015).

This undermining of community authority has had community wide repercussions.

Extract 5.52

Government, a couple of years ago, back they say stop, um, they put too much, they stick their nose into Aboriginal things. Sorry to say that but… The promises and all that go for generation for generation until the 90s. Somewhere around there, the government realised that the young girls were not meant to be living with the elderly man. They stopped that marriage. When something, you know, up in the [another community] side

---

132 Here, “really” usually used to intensify, is linked with “not” which is lessening the force of the utterance (see Reisigl & Wodak, 2001).

133 Again, there is an absence of modality and use of the present tense suggesting commitment by the speaker and ‘truth’ from the speaker’s perspective.
or might be up further north. They stopped the traditional ways. Even the payback thing. It was the time they stopped everything, government.\footnote{The participant was making reference to a community disturbance in 2010 that erupted when a law was introduced that prevented traditional ‘payback’, or controlled retribution by victims, for criminal activities such as murder from being served. This resulted in “spiralling inter-family violence” according to local web site, Alice Online (2010) and the incarceration of 9 people from Site 1.}

This research participant is describing the role of government in undermining community authority to enforce moral laws or rules such as promised marriages (that had previously stopped marriage between close family members) or payback (traditional Indigenous justice such as spearing that ensured disputes were resolved). The inability for community authorities to act traditionally resulted in extreme community violence at Site 1 in addition to close intra-family marriages that may have genetic repercussions in the future.

### 5.5e5 Intervention mucked it all up

Some respondents directly blamed the Howard Government’s NTER of 2007 for both the inability of adults to modify the behaviour of children and for the high unemployment on Indigenous communities.

**Extract 5.53**

Intervention mucked it all up. When they first came they started talking about kids first, kids first when they interrupted this community. Remember in this first meeting at the council office. At that time, they came in with all those interruptions.

**Extract 5.54**

The intervention has gone about it the wrong way and disempowered hundreds of community members who have lost their jobs. The white people do all the work now and the locals are left with little.
5.5e6 Keeping Aboriginal People marginal

Many participants viewed the major outcomes of the FFHP and the NTER as both having major repercussions on identity and well-being as a consequence of engendering in non-Indigenous people views of Indigenous economic dependency and negative IL and culture evaluations (also noted in other categories above). This has been facilitated, as discussed above and in Ch1 and Ch2, by decreasing amounts of professional training for Indigenous community members, the undermining of their traditional authority and the huge loss of employment as a consequence of re-allocating Indigenous work to non-Indigenous outsiders, including those at the school. In this way, respondents viewed the FFHP as part of the on-going process of Indigenous marginalisation and disempowerment that was prevalent in Indigenous politics throughout the 1990s and 2000s.

Extract 5.54

During the period of self-determination, us whitefellas, we came here with the belief that we would work ourselves out of a job but here they are deliberately keeping Aboriginal people dependent. The welfare money keeps coming to the Northern Territory government. The government is using Aboriginal people to keep bringing money to the state. It’s to do with growing the economy. Why are bureaucrats so against bilingual education, which I prefer to call teaching in the vernacular, when the benefits are a no-brainer?

This respondent viewed this process of disempowerment, marginalisation and failure to support bilingual education in schools as a means of securing federal government social security revenue for the NT and thereby wealth for the state without conferring any tangible benefits on Indigenous people.

5.6 Summary of CA and CDA

In summary, the themes and topics that emerged from the interviews show the diminution of community authority and employment and the erosion of tradition, language and self-determination through poor, oppressive and erratic governance. Although other policies, especially the NTER, were felt to play a major role in the deterioration of community resilience
and safety, participants viewed the loss of bilingual education as the most intrusive manifestation of government authority and control over the past few decades that has undermined Indigenous culture and communities through the erosion of cultural traditions, language and participation and was characterised by poor consultation and negative outcomes for the community as a whole. The FFHP and related policies appear to have had consequences of not only encouraging the loss of a heritage language and the emergence of a language mix but also academic and behavioural problems in children. Policies have also led to longer term social community dislocation and dysfunction and higher unemployment. These findings are in agreement with international and Australian literature that links Indigenous bilingual education with higher well-being and socio-economic outcomes and monolingual dominant education with self-destructive behaviours and social dysfunction (Biddle, 2012a, 2012b; Dockery, 2010; Hallett, Chandler & Lalonde, 2007; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2005 and Ch2).

Perhaps the most profound result of the community CDA analysis was the fact that it substantiated both the CA results and theoretical framework (in Ch2) used to analyse texts. That is, the frames of equal opportunity, human rights and hegemonic injustice and oppression, the topoi of burden, danger, uselessness and usefulness as well as the metaphors of procession and container were used to characterise overt and often tyrannical governance derived from settler colonial denial of colonial violence, Indigenous history, rights and claims.

Interestingly, in general, many of the strategies of the respondents in this study were similar to those seen in the political discourse in the earlier chapter. That is, the frames and topoi above that were used in relation to monolingual English or bilingual Indigenous education and their effects and governance were the same or similar to those of the policy text and discourse. Respondents also had a tendency to use similar metaphors (such as container and procession) and universalise their case: strategies that were also evident in the political texts. However, this universalisation may not necessarily be exaggerated or in error given the degree of community consultation and decision making that occurs in remote Indigenous communities in addition to the overwhelmingly similar responses in all community interviews in this research. In addition, while the respondents used the same metaphors, frames and topoi as those in the political texts, their strong ideational connection to ‘place’ meant this use was inverted with the community at the centre, as opposed to the periphery, and Indigenous people, culture and language high in the hierarchy. Also, they had an additional metaphor of ‘gift’ to describe
language that denoted the high regard these community members had for pluralism and pluralism which was absent in the political texts. In fact, political texts presented non-dominant languages as a burden. Both these responses to languages reflect the cultural perspectives and ideational proclivities of each group (of collectivism and relationships in the Indigenous community versus atomisation and the influence of neoliberalism in Western governments).

Those responses that did not fit the patterning of the other texts were all discourses created by non-Indigenous respondents. The CDA of these texts revealed some of the same logics of neoliberalism (competition) and settler colonialism (of Aboriginal culture as “maladapted to modern ways of life”, Lovell, 2012: 200) that indicate the intertextuality of institutional discourse and how they are capable of travelling across genres and fields of action (as noted in Ch3) as a consequence of discoursal hegemony (Fairclough, 2003) and ‘regimes of truth’ (Foucault, 1980).

Although both the political discourse and the community responses used equal opportunity and rights frames, community members used these frames in a distinctive way, as hegemonic injustice frames, typical of anti-establishment (or in this case, anti-colonial) resistance (as outlined in Benford, 1997). In addition, both community members and political texts used the ‘other world’ frame which “enables us to feel good about our way of life by contrasting” with the other (Bishop, 2007: 12). That is, the political texts and community responses represented an inversion of each other.

The most common legitimation strategies for both types of texts were moral evaluation, storytelling and rationalisation. However, political texts often referred to an authority to substantiate their claims. Given the direct experience of policy effects by community members, community macrostrategies, in contrast, relied on their own ‘story’ and personal experience to substantiate theirs.

What was most noticeable about the Indigenous participants’ responses and their difference from the political texts was the use of *uberzeugen* (or rational persuasion) and the lack of *uberreden* (or repressed logic and rationality that “force or compel” consent). That is, *uberreden* are logical fallacies or violations of ethical rules on argumentation that give rise to irrationality and unreasonableness (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Ch3).
although strategies of coercion were at times used, they were not accompanied by anomalies, contradictions or manipulation or overt persuasion that had little basis in evidence or fact. Indeed, all claims by the community were substantiated by extensive research internationally and nationally. In addition, there was a lack of allusion to the tenants of globalisation in non-Indigenous respondents. There was also a distinct lack of ‘othering’ in the Indigenous community texts. In fact, the Indigenous community texts did not appear to have any of the (even reversed) social, political or fantasmatic logics as discussed by Clarke (2012), hence their absence in the analysis.

Despite covert and overt denigrations of IL, culture and people in the policy texts, criticisms of governance in the Indigenous community texts were consistently mitigated and there was no overt or covert negative predication of dominant groups. Rather, these texts refer to negative ‘actions’ as opposed to actor qualities. In addition, community responses exhibited an explanatory logic that had complex causes of problems embedded within it. This differed from the, at times, superficial, anomalous and simplified causes which were often evident in the political texts (such as that underpinning the rationale to increase school attendance through punitive measures). Again, this is not surprising given that the problems experienced by community people are lived on a daily basis, and, as such, are well-known and well-evaluated. What is surprising, however, is the fact that little, if any, of these community evaluations appear in or are referred to in the policy texts indicating the overwhelming influence of neoliberalism, nation-state legitimacy and settler colonialism on institutional discourse.

The next section will examine student responses but in terms of content only, since respondents’ ages precluded a complex rationalisation of the FFHP and its effects.

5.7 Site 1 Students

Below is an analysis of the responses from the 12 students interviewed at Site 1. Details of these interviews are below.
| Children | 12 interviewees in total  
Grades ranged from 1-9 | To gather information about the impact of the FFHP on students within the school. To gather information about language context, preferences and effects of language self-esteem and cognition. |

Table 5.4: Children Interview Respondents at Site 1

The data gathering device used was semi-structured interviews done with groups (3 pairs and 1 group of 3) and individual students (3) opportunistically since direct access to students at the school was not possible. A caregiver was present to translate the questions and answers during the interviews.

Although the small sample size of students must be taken into account when evaluating the analysis, there were some trends in language instruction that reflected trends in the school as a whole. For example, of interest in the interviews was the consistent contemporary use of oral IL1 and English throughout the schools. This was a product of the fact that at least one IL1 assistant teacher was in each class, with two in the lower grades, all of whom translated English orally to IL1. Of interest also was the emergence of stronger personal literacy skills in English (as opposed to IL1) in the middle and upper grades because IL1 literacy classes were stopped (in the upper grades) or heavily reduced (in the lower grades) after the FFHP. The topics that emerged from the interviews included:

- The linguistic environment in which they live
- Their language preferences for learning
- How language affects their self-esteem and cognition
- Parental importance of ILs and,
- The impact of the FFHP.

5.7a Language Use

The results from questions relating to language use detailed the language ecology of the community in terms of language contexts which linked to adult responses on the same issue.
An analysis of the responses (figure 5.10, below) revealed that while students spoke either two (75%) or three languages (25%), only one, IL1, was spoken in all contexts and only English was spoken at the school.

![Figure 5.10: Where languages are spoken at Site 1 (note that NI refers to non-Indigenous)](image)

This appears to coincide with the adult responses noted in the previous section that IL1 was the dominant language spoken and English was reserved for institutions of power and contexts of non-Indigenous control (Simpson, 2013 also discusses this), though, even here IL1 was still present in this context. This would, thus, seem to reveal that the language of the classroom was generally unrelated to the life of students inside and outside of the school and restricted to the domain of Western pedagogy and education.
5.7b Language Preferences

Figure 5.11 above shows that the vast majority of students desired to learn both more English and IL1. When asked the reasons, most students responded that they were important for communication, thus agreeing with the adult responses that knowledge of many languages was necessary to ensure understanding and harmony. It also linked into the expectations of some families in terms of language preferences (IL1, IL2 and English and IL1 and English).

In terms of IL1, apart from communication, students viewed its importance as a mechanism to grasp, learn and practise Indigenous culture and knowledge (‘painting, the land’) and to have a larger lexical repertoire and proficiency in L1, such as in the following:

Extract 5.55

To talk very well in IL1 and you get to learn different words that the old people used to use that we don’t use nowadays.

As with adult responses, some linked this desire directly to Indigenous well-being:

Extract 5.56

Keep it in our mind and good for [IL1 Site 1] people.
While the preference to learn English was also a desire to communicate with others, it was largely associated with work, school education (“It’s good to learn, I can go to secondary class”) and literacy activities, particularly writing. Given the fact that IL1 literacy was no longer taught in the higher grades, English literacy was seen as the only vehicle by which education and literacy occurred and was, naturally, the literacy where students had the most proficiency (as opposed to an IL1 literacy which was barely known).

When asked which language they found easiest to learn in and what language they understood and learnt more in, the vast majority of respondents replied IL1. Those who replied both and one who replied English were all in classes with local Indigenous assistant teachers who translated classroom English to IL1. It appeared from other responses by these participants that they may have interpreted the question as a preference to learn more English since their replies related to future schooling and work (“I want to go to secondary school” and “Learning for when we get bigger”). The one other participant who responded that they learnt best in English had another IL as a L1, which, interestingly, they regarded negatively.

Even though all students, except one, regarded English positively, figure 5.11 above shows that students felt a much higher sense of well-being using IL1. The higher well-being associated with an IL is in agreement with both international and national research (Ch2) that shows ILs enhance social, emotional and spiritual well-being as well as resilience (Funnell, 2013; Kelly, et al, 2009; Malcolm, 1998; Marmion, Obata & Troy, 2014; May, 2012; Ch2).
The results for the preference of English-only speaking teachers, IL1 speakers or having one of each in the class indicated the students’ far greater preference for both. Students generally stated that there were no differences between the two types of teachers but that oral English was ‘hard’ while English writing was easy. Some students liked the fact that additional assistance was given in the classroom with two teachers. A number made the point that they had ‘good [non-Indigenous] teachers’ who they really liked. When IL1 speakers were absent from the classroom, however, students did report minor ‘teasing’ between other students.\(^{136}\)

The one negative comment against English-only speakers appeared to also indicate cross-cultural and perhaps even gender issues, since the respondent was a Year 6 male – the only male interviewed at this site.\(^{137}\) The interpreter stated:

\(^{136}\) This comment agreed with adult comments earlier on cross-cultural and other problems that arise from a lack of L1 language and culture in relation to non-Indigenous teachers.

\(^{137}\) A young male student at this age or older may have gone through an initiation ceremony to become a ‘man’ which they would perceive as necessarily changing the status and dynamics operating between them and a female teacher, giving the male student greater authority. If this is not observed, and the teacher-student authority dynamics are maintained, this is regarded as highly insulting and disrespectful. Authoritarianism in individuals is, however, generally regarded as disrespectful and socially flawed regardless of gender.
They don’t understand. They’re not comfortable with them (non-Indigenous teacher).

Sometimes when they muck around and run around the teachers growl at them. IL1 ones have respect for them.

When by themselves with (non-Indigenous teachers), they muck around and don’t listen to them [but] talk in lingo.

Implied in this comment is the importance of Indigenous Education Workers (IEW) in this context. IEWs cultural knowledge is highly contextualised and ensures that cross-cultural issues are not problematised in the classroom, such as in the above (this phenomenon in Indigenous contexts was also noted by Funnell, 2013).

5.7d Impact of FFHP

Participants in grades lower than Year 6 had no experience of the FFHP. Of the remaining six, only three were old enough to recall the change, noting longer hours devoted to learning in English but stated that there was no difference between the teaching pre- and post-FFHP. However, they did state that after the FFHP introduction there were no longer any local Indigenous teachers in classes, except the afternoon hour-long IL1 class. When asked if this consequence of the FFHP affected classroom dynamics in terms of ‘teasing’, they stated that teasing occurred but it wasn’t ‘too bad’ and eventually the non-Indigenous teachers came to understand the ‘teasing’ IL1 language being spoken and could intervene. When asked if their learning changed with the change from bilingual to monolingual English education (more or less, faster or slower learning), they failed to understand the question adequately and answered that they learnt more in English and were already fluent in IL1.

In summary, the linguistic environment in which the students lived was predominantly in IL1. This was so even at the school where, although English represented the language of Western learning, literacy (writing) and the classroom, an IL1 assistant teacher was invariably present to interpret. Students viewed English as the language necessary for their future work and learning and IL1 as the family preference and necessary for well-being and culture. Students, however,
regarded both languages as important for communication and preferred to learn both which may be a product of the high use of oral IL1 in the classroom as well as a high interest in learning languages generally given the high cultural values associated with communication and multilingualism and the multilingual setting in which they lived. Students expressed a similar preference for teachers, preferring both IL1 and non-Indigenous teachers in the classroom as opposed to one or the other. The one student who preferred to have Indigenous teachers perceived non-Indigenous teachers as unable to manage student behaviour or to respect students in the classroom, indicating this may be related to a lack of cultural awareness or intelligence. Very few of the students recalled the FFHP or the change that occurred after it was introduced due to their age and could not cognise with any complexity on its consequences in terms of their own learning.

5.8 Summary of Chapter 5

Generally, adult responses at Site 1 indicated that change in the bilingual education program at the school mirrored changes in national and NT language policy over the past few decades, where the impact of the FFHP had the most profound effects in this location. Participants linked these changes to the erosion of language, culture, traditional elder and carer authority, morality and value systems, professional status and employment and interaction of the community with the school that have had dire consequences on the community as a whole. They related a complex system of causes and effects, framing their arguments of decreasing bilingual education and IL use and increasing social problems with container and procession metaphor as well as frames of justice, equality and hegemony which largely represented an inversion of those in the policy texts.

Interestingly, as opposed to the policy texts and discourse, arguments of Indigenous respondents appeared to contain no logical fallacies (or Uberreden, the repressed logic and rationality that “force or compel” consent – see Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). There is also no evidence of the vilification of others but rather a deep concern for the welfare of youth in their community and the resilience of the community as a whole. In addition, unlike policy claims, Indigenous community arguments have been overwhelmingly substantiated by national and international research in other similar Indigenous contexts (Devlin, 1995; Disbray, 2014; Gale, et al, 1981).
Student responses, while showing a deep regard for their classroom teachers, a preference to be bilingual and bicultural, and a high cross-cultural tolerance possibly as a consequence of the amount of spoken L1 used at the school, also demonstrated a heavy reliance on the interpreting skills of IEWs and teachers. This was largely a reflection of the linguistic and cultural context where IL1 was the major language spoken at Site 1 but where the literacy language of the school and of the non-Indigenous teachers was SAE. The literacy skills of students were consequently restricted to a dominant language in which they had extremely limited oral proficiency in comparison to mainstream students, and hence accounts for their poorer performance on standardised tests. Research predicts that the failure to develop adequate oracy and literacy in L1 will undermine the development of CALP in the L1 which, in turn, will undermine or even arrest CALP development in SAE (Ball, 2010: 13; Cummins, 2003; Magga, et al, 2005).

The next chapter will detail the results of interviews at Site 2 with adults and students and outline differences between Site 1 and Site 2.
Chapter 6 - Analysis at Site 2

It hurt. We was real sad. And we said, oh, we wanted bilingual...We still fight for language.

Respondent grandmother from Site 2 on the FFHP introduction.

6.1 Introduction to Analysis at Site 2

As discussed in Ch1 and Appendix 1.2, Site 2 has had a long history of bilingual education beginning in 1973 (McGrath, 1974). As with Site 1, Site 2 implemented a ‘step’ or ‘staircase’ model of bilingual education but with a later exit. Consequently, there was greater class time and duration allocated to L1 oracy and literacy development (NTDEET, 2005). This was characterised by considerable community interaction with the school through local staff and community participation in school activities (McGrath, 1974; ex-assistant teacher, pi, 11 March 2014). However, as with Site 1, an erosion of the program as a consequence of the initial 1998 Schools Our Focus policy and then the 2008 FFHP led to a reduction in human and material resources for bilingual programs (NTDEET, 2005). Unlike Site 1, however, Site 2 managed to retain its bilingual program after the FFHP following a successful resolution of an official 2011 Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) complaint.

This chapter analyses the consequences of these historical developments through analysis of 12 adult semi-structured and 12 student interviews. The interview topics and methods of analysis for both adults and students were identical to those at Site 1 and so are not reiterated here. While an overview of the data analysis elements (CA and CDA) is provided, it is a truncation of that presented in Ch5. A detailed description of CA, CDA and student analysis findings is then presented.

The adult semi-structured interviews are of particular importance since they not only contain the rarely heard voice of highly marginalised remote adult community members but provide a comparison to another site with slightly different history. These data, thereby, afford much needed alternative comparative viewpoints on governance, bilingual education in remote
communities and its social and academic effects on children that could positively influence future policy direction. The views of 12 students extracted from semi-structured interviews enhance the adult data and provide a rounded picture of language education as it operates in a remote Indigenous community with uninterrupted bilingual education.

6.2 Adult Data Collection and Analysis

Data were gathered from 12 adults interviewed (one non-Indigenous and 11 Indigenous – details appear in Table 6.1 below) and analysed with CA (Ch3), the results of which are discussed in detail below. Interviews were conducted largely in English but the availability of an interpreter also allowed a group interview in the local language. As with Site 1, in general, respondents expressed themselves with a sophisticated use of macro- and discursive strategies and rhetoric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 interviews in total</td>
<td>To gather information about the impact of the FFHP on the community and individuals within the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 with past positions in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 young adults who participated in the bilingual program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 non-Indigenous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Adult Interview Respondents at Site 2

6.3 Content Analysis

As discussed in Ch3 and Ch5, the data gathering and analysis entailed both collaborative social research and ethnography (from interviews and field notes). This involved participants being given feedback on the data acquired (interview transcripts) and its analysis in person and/or at a public meeting. The questions actually asked varied according to the experience, history and position of the participants within the community but typically covered the same interview topics described in Ch5 for Site 1.

Similar to Site 1, even though the questions specifically addressed the FFHP, this often resulted in more generalised answers that related to the impact of governance and Western (Australian settler colonial) culture. The major categories and sub-categories that emerged from the CA (governance, language and culture and school practices) and their descriptions and the
relationship between governance, language policy, IL and cultural education are the same as at Site 1 since they evolved to encompass the two sites and are outlined in the previous chapter.

6.4 Critical Discourse Analysis

As noted in Ch3 and Ch5, CDA is generally applied to texts to examine power, ideology and hegemony (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). While not commonly used to analyse non-dominant text, it is used here as a means to triangulate methods, confirm data analysis conclusion and so enhance the validity of results (see Jick, 1979; Neuendorf, 2004; Neuman, 2003). This examination of perspectives should, thereby, yield a more in-depth understanding of policy effects.

As with the previous chapter, the adult responses chosen for CDA analysis represented those that exhibited a typical framing of the FFHP or its consequences and those that showed inter- and/or causative relationships between categories and sub-categories as well as those that failed to fit the pattern of the other texts (in an effort to explain anomalies). Those excerpts chosen for this analysis were drawn from those that had also undergone CA, the CDA analysis appearing directly under each extract. Only adult responses were considered for this analysis due to the more unstructured (open-ended) questions that gave rise to cognitively mature complex responses.

The next section begins with how the responses are divided into major CA categories. A pie graph (figure 6.1 below) shows the frequency of responses in each major category in relation to the total number of responses. A graphical depiction of responses in each category and subcategory is used to initially outline numerical values of participant views. This is followed by a discussion of the contents of the responses and the CDA of selected responses.

---

138 Given that a detailed explanation of HDA was given in the previous chapter and Ch3, an explanation of HDA will not be given here.
6.5 Findings

When the responses from the 12 adult community semi-structured interviewees at Site 2 were analysed quantitatively, they showed the numerical relationship in figure 6.2 – 54% were about NTDE or school practices, 25% related to governance of the community and 21% related to language and culture both in terms of its importance and the effect of its loss. These results were similar to those at Site 1 but with a greater percentage of responses relating to NT Department of Education and school practice and somewhat fewer language and culture responses, possibly as a consequence of retaining a strong language and culture program at the school. How the content of responses relates to the categories and subcategories will be further detailed below.

![Percentage of Total Responses](image)

**Figure 6.1: Percentage of responses for the three major themes – Department/School Practice, language and culture and governance**

6.5a Department/School Practices

This category entailed how government policy (in terms of language education) influenced the practices of the school and/or NTDE in relation to their interaction with the community, professional status of Indigenous staff, professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff and how these impacted on student academic and behavioural outcomes. These sub-categories were analysed quantitatively.
The distribution of responses in the graph above (figure 6.2 above) exhibits a similar pattern to that at Site 1. This suggests that Site 2 participants also regarded language education as having a decisive role in the interaction of the school with the community and the employment and status of Indigenous staff and conduct of non-Indigenous staff. Indeed, this relationship is evident in the analysis of these responses (below). Initially, Language Education at Site 2 is examined which is then followed by an analysis of the professionalism of Indigenous staff and professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff as well as the interaction of the school with the community.

### 6.5a1 Language Education

As with Site 1, language and cultural education at Site 2 was regarded as the conduit through which professionalism and employment of Indigenous teachers, the professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff, in addition to the academic and behavioural outcomes of students, were mediated. When the sub-category of language education was examined more closely (figure 6.3 below), the following relationships emerged:
Figure 6.3 above shows that Site 2 respondents also perceived language education as having a major impact on academic and cognitive outcomes (33% of responses) and behavioural outcomes of students (35% of responses). Respondents in this sub-category perceived increased academic and social outcomes in children with bilingual education at Site 2 in addition to long term economic success. They also expressed distress in regards to the negative influences of a monolingual English education on the cognition and behaviour of children. Both these elements mirrored the views of Site 1 participants.
Respondents at both sites also reported a similar concern for the impact of language education on IL and culture (25% at Site 2 versus 16% of responses at Site 1). This last category will be discussed in more detail in a section below and so will only be briefly dealt with in terms of children’s behaviour.

Site 2 respondents also viewed language education as having a marked impact on professionalism of Indigenous staff, professional conduct of non-Indigenous staff (35% at Site 2) and the interaction of the school with the community (35%). These concerns were similar at both sites and involved a diminution in the interaction of the community with the school and the decrease in local employment at the school in addition to the reduced status, training and activities of Indigenous staff within the school. This analysis is dealt with in more detail below, following responses on the academic and behavioural outcomes of students.
6.5a2 Behavioural and Academic Outcomes for Students

Community members were highly concerned regarding the academic and behavioural outcomes of students. They viewed bilingual education as; the means to achieving much needed expertise in both English and IL2; a way to accelerate first and second literacy acquisition; a program that ensures cultural tolerance and thereby a desire to learn English; a program that enhances resilience and the socio-economic outcomes of students; and a program that leads to higher academic learning and success due to higher student understanding of the classroom language – all factors cited in research in Ch2. Contrastingly, monolingual English education was regarded as detrimental to student cognition, behaviour and morality, ultimately leading to social dysfunction, as a consequence of Indigenous de-culturation (also documented by de la Sablonnière, et al, 2011 in Ch2).

6.5a3 Two Ways is Good for You

Some respondents, as in Site 1, viewed bilingual education as having a major impact on the behaviour and academic success as well as well-being of students. One respected elder argued:

**Extract 6.1**

They should have Both Ways. It right there. It’s good. English is good it can help many people. Grandmother and grandfather have rights to their grandchildren – to teach.

This elder is noting both the importance of English and Site 2 language and how this was connected to the traditional rights of teaching for grandmothers and grandfathers that ensured intergeneration relationships and the generational transfer of knowledge, values and morals (see also Nicholls, 2005).
6.5a4 Because I’ve learned my Language, that’s why I want to earn English

The success associated with bilingual education both in terms of well-being and academic skills was corroborated by a number of other respondents. One parent (whose own parent was an IL teacher at the local school) with children at Site 2 school, also stated that he acquired both L1 and L2 literacy very quickly. He, in fact, jumped a grade upon arrival at Yirara (an Indigenous boarding school in Alice Springs) after attending the bilingual primary school at Site 2. He then received the highest academic marks in every consecutive year after that. His sister did similarly well. Asked why this achievement occurred and why they remained happy at Yirara (and didn’t run away), he replied:

Extract 6.2

Because I’ve learned my language, that’s why I want to learn English so I can have good education and I can have a good job and can find easy work doing a job, having all the skills.

This confirms McGrath’s (1974) and Dhaykamalu’s (1999) observations of higher academic outcomes where bilingual programs operate.

6.5a5 Learning English in Bilingual is easy

Respondents believed that where IL education was valued as in a bilingual system, the academic outcomes for literacy in both languages can be great. An ex-assistant teacher at Site 2 school from the 1990s related the effect of L2 literacy acquisition in a bilingual system.

Extract 6.3

Interviewer: Now, with students learning in their L1, do you think it makes it easier or harder for them in school?
Respondent: Easy
Interviewer: Easy? Why’s that?
Respondent They learn alphabet sounds and letters
Interviewer: So it becomes quick?
Respondent: And sometimes they make up song in [IL2] with the letters like...una metta una u u u [I going, going ggg]. And they sing it.

This teacher, in fact, was reporting the transfer of L1 phonetic skills, phonetic classes of sounds, their enunciation and symbol-sound association to a L2. In addition, collaborative song creation allows the development of creativity (in terms of a novel application of skills and knowledge to create “something new”) and, in turn, cognition (Batchelor & Blintz, 2013: 3). However, this is a task only possible with a particular level of L1 linguistic knowledge which is not achievable in contexts of very early L2 monolingual education (Cummins, 2000).

In fact, higher academic and language achievements have translated into quite a number of students successfully attending high schools in South Australia courtesy of the Conway Kids Foundation (a not-for-profit charity that funds boarding school attendance for remote Central Australian children). One father, himself multilingual and educated at Yirara, discussed both the multilingualism of his daughters (who because of grandparents and parents can speak and/or understand four ILs) and the achievement of his eldest in a South Australian school who is soon to attend university.

Extract 6.4

She’s very successful. She’s her grades like. When they brought that thing down brother. You know the graph... you know the lines that go above expectation and below expectation and all that shit. In English...mostly in English, it’s way up here. It’s above expectation and that’s not [Site 2] that’s Australian standard.

This respondent, in fact, is describing an often studied phenomenon of additive bilingual education programs leading to high levels of academic and conversational L2 proficiency with the sufficient development of an L1 (Cummins, 2000; Ch2).

6.5a6 Two Ways – they can get a job and learn more

Additional benefits of bilingual education in terms of socio-economic outcomes were reiterated by others in the community.
**Extract 6.5**

Kids learn Two Ways from [IL2] to English. They can then get a job and learn more. Learning [IL2] first, they can understand what they are learning and learn English better.

This ex-assistant teacher at the school in the 1970s was describing both the higher job prospects of bilingual students as well as the higher understanding of and engagement in school tasks that comes with initially learning in a L1.

**6.5a7 Bilingual makes Kids stronger**

Respondents also observed the economic benefits of bilingual education. In terms of socio-economic and well-being outcomes, a grandmother, who was also an IL teacher at Site 2 school in the past, observed:

**Extract 6.6**

My son has had many jobs – the mines, telegraph station as a ranger...he was always able to work. (Bilingualism) It makes kids stronger. My grandson can read (Site 2 language) at home with his parents. It makes them happier, they like to learn.

This respondent is associating academic and language achievements with resilience and socio-economic benefits, and attributing these outcomes to a bilingual education program – a relationship also described by Biddle (2012b), Dockery (2010, 2013) and ABS (2011). She is also relating the greater participation that parents have in a child’s school homework with a bilingual program where there is a shared language and understanding. In addition, this extract also confirms the results of Guenther (2015d) in a study that found attendance and academic outcomes highly dependant on a high ratio of Indigenous teaching staff to non-Indigenous teaching staff (79% compared to 68%) since they have the pivotal position of acting as cultural role models in academic environments. It reminded him, Guenther (2015d) notes, of the Nulungu Research Institute report *You Can’t Be What You Can’t See* (Kinnane, et al, 2014 in Guenther, 2015d) that detailed the success of Indigenous transition from high school to the higher education sector as being dependent on community and family involvement.
In extract 6.6, this positive framing of bilingual education is achieved using the norms and values of the normative group. The mention of jobs, literacy and parental involvement in the school could be influenced by what the speaker perceives are the addressee’s beliefs, interests and knowledge. However, it could also be a consequence of the speaker’s own perspectives that reflect the same norms and values. Here, the argument of the socio-economic benefits of bilingual education is again framed using narrative and description (mythopoesis). The other discursive strategies that support this macro-strategy include the use of a topos of advantage and usefulness, positive predication and intensification. This is achieved linguistically with explicit and specific positive lexicalisations such as the adjective ‘happier’. It is also achieved with verb phrases ‘like to learn’ and ‘able to work’ to indicate positive goal-oriented behaviour and intentional agency (see, van Leeuwen 2008: 127 on these strategies). This positivity is further intensified with temporal adverbs (such as ‘always’).

Statements are also intensified with repetition which emphasises and amplifies the positive argument for bilingual education (as in “My son has had many jobs – the mines, telegraph station as a ranger”) (see Cataldi, 2001 on repetition). The allocation of bilingual education to the subject position in ‘It makes them happier’ also promotes its importance. The general absence of modality and metaphors as well as the use of active tense and a lack of nominalisation and embedded clauses again here ensures the active positive agency of Indigenous subjects and ‘truth’ of the statements (see Gee, 2011; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83; Lawton, 2008 on these devices). Interestingly, however, the one modal used in “was able to work” relates to past realised possibility (see Bartlett, 2004: 75 on this strategy). This phrase and the use of the present perfect in “has had many jobs” could be alluding to the lack of ability to get local work currently because of structural changes as a consequence of the FFHP and the NTER as well as the collapse of local councils.

**6.5a8 Well-being and IL**

Enhanced well-being when IL education is accompanied by the participation of community members in the school is both substantiated by NT and international research (Anderson & Wild,
2007; Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; de la Sablonnière, et al, 2011; Harris, 1990; Maughan, 2012; Ch2) and the views of other respondents. One ex-assistant teacher from the 1990s, for instance, noted:

**Extract 6.7**

They feel happy when they see local people coming in the classroom teaching them culture. Sometimes taking out, them out, to teach them bush tuckers.

This extract also appears to again confirm the important role model function that local community members play in the school system (Guenther, 2015d).

**6.5a9 English Way sends you Rama**

One mother, who also attended Site 2 primary school, however, was concerned that children were being overwhelmed by too much English in the early grades and that this was effecting their learning. Two other respondents, a respected elder and his nephew from a nearby community, while they espoused a bilingual approach to education, also warned of the dangers of dominant English instruction on the behaviour of children.

**Extract 6.8**

Elder: Bilingual and English. Both Ways. Making the *chichi* [Children] rama [crazy] *Chichi* rama English way. They be rama, they be robbing anything teach English [you know like motor cars and money]

Nephew: And forget about losing their language. They’re not going to listen if they don’t learn their own language.

The interpreter at this site said to me this comment was related to how Aboriginal people believe ‘white people’ are fundamentally ‘robbers’ and white culture, consequently, has had deleterious consequences on their youth. Colonisation in the nineteenth century was accompanied by Christian proselytising where Christian beliefs, values and ethics became absorbed into the local Indigenous worldview. Local people now view contemporary Western culture as largely secular and divorced from Christian ethos, containing values, ethics and morals that are antithetical to their own. In addition, they also seemed to be relating the same concerns as other respondents at Site 1 which agree with findings in de la Sablonnière, et al (2011), of colonisation and...
Indigenous de-culturation leading to social dysfunction and not to the acquisition of positive dominant norms, values or standard language. Interestingly, though, other respondents observed that IL skills were still ‘good’ amongst students and that behaviour had not deteriorated despite this slight increase in English education.

6.5b Interaction with the Community and Professionalism

These two subcategories are treated together given the intimate relationship they have in participant responses. Interestingly, language education was given slightly more prominence in its relationships to these two subcategories at Site 2 (95% of responses) compared to Site 1 (86%)
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In terms of community interaction with the school and Indigenous professionalism and non-Indigenous professional conduct, as with Site 1, respondents reported that the FFHP (and to a lesser degree its predecessor, Two Way learning) was associated with; a reduction in the participation of elders for cultural activities and excursions; a decline in the employment and
professional status of community members at the school; the closure of literacy centres at other sites; a reduction in Site 2 literacy centre activity; and decreased on-site teacher and assistant teacher training. There was also apathy of community members to participate at the school. This has been engendered, presumably, as a consequence of the effects of Indigenous policy decisions (particularly the FFHP, the Two Way policy and the NTER) over the past few decades as described in detail in Appendix 1.2. A comprehensive description of these responses occurs below.

6.5b1 We took the Elders

Although the bilingual program was maintained as a Two Way Learning Program, there was still a decline in IL and literacy learning for all grades with Two Way learning that accelerated after the FFHP. The majority of responses that related to community interaction with the school indicated this decline in IL and literacy education also resulted in a decline in interaction between the school and community members, including caregivers.

A female assistant teacher from the 1970s and 1980s, for instance, recalled:

Extract 6.9

We took the kids for bush trips for honey ants and camp out and culture dance and kids would write a story and we would check words, saying that one’s not right and telling kids how to spell them. Two times a week. Sometimes we did big excursions out bush. We went to Ernabella dance and culture and took elders and family to Ali Curang. We took the elders too and kids danced in the bush at night time, sometimes we go out bush in the morning.

Now different. Still some dancing in the morning. Still take kids out at night and show seven sisters with tourists from Melbourne and kids dance at the school. Less culture at the school.

6.5b2 They were powerful

As with Site 1, this decline in interaction with the community was coupled with a decline in the professional status and employment of Indigenous people at the school. Where there was once
local Indigenous headmasters, a number of Indigenous teachers, two full-time teaching assistants, three Indigenous tutors and two Indigenous literacy workers in addition to a number of community members caretaking and cleaning the grounds as well as teaching and working in the literacy centre part time, at the time of the data collection for this research, and in line with the neoliberal onus on ‘efficiency’ (which translates into job reductions), there was one qualified Indigenous teacher working as a teacher at the school, two Indigenous assistant teachers and one part time tutor. A few elders also assisted in the literacy centre and at the school but there were no full-time workers in the literacy centre.

One respondent, a respected male elder from Site 2, narrated a positive history of bilingual education ([ ] denotes English interpretation):

**Extract 6.10**

Remember your old uncle, they were inside. They were the priests and headmaster and they could read the bible [They were powerful, they were educated and already had literacy in their language in the form of the bible and handbook and the influence of the Lutheran missionary. More people back then living at [Site 2] and in the school. The education was given over to the school. All buildings at [Site 2] were full once. Every classroom. Whole communal ownership of education.]

**6.5b2a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 6.10**

In the text above, the speaker and interpreter are using mythopoesis (narrative and description) to frame this positive history. As discussed previously, this is a successful device for both integrating arguments and evidence, defining problems or constraints and nominating self and others (Gasper, 1996: 9). The absence of modality and consistent use of the active past tense, the lack of nomination and the few embedded clauses (used only in description of attributes) conveys the active agency of Indigenous subjects in addition to a ‘truth’ that is no longer occurring (see Gee, 2011; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83; Lawton, 2008).

Using narrative also means that a topos of history is being implemented (where particular actions have particular consequences) to support an argument for greater community control of the school and L1 literacy. This is reinforced with explicit evaluations of the past and implicit
evaluations of the present. For instance, “they were inside. They were the priests and headmaster. They were powerful, they were educated” implies, given the past simple of these statements, that the opposite is true of community people and the school today. Framing of the issue in this way is reinforced with the container metaphor (‘inside’ institutions of power in the past as opposed to ‘outside’ as in the present) (Chilton, 2006). These statements are also intensified with repetition and positions of authority in the past (of “priests” and “headmaster”). Also, “could read the bible” is emphasised with the adjectives “powerful” and “educated” in addition to the determiner “the” and the repetition of lexis in “already had literacy in their language in the form of the bible”. This intensification, typical in some ILs, in this case, is probably an instrument of emphasis and amplification to enhance the status of the subject so as to make it more ‘grand’ (see Cataldi, 2001 on this type of Indigenous rhetoric).

In the above case, an elder is talking to the interpreter who is related to him. Hence, there is an immediate familial nomination of “your old uncle”. This is also an important intensifying device given the domination of relationships within the community. Intensification is also possibly achieved with periodos (Cataldi, 2001). This is a rhetorical device that entails a “close-packed and uninterrupted group of words embracing a complete thought” (Cataldi, 2001: 183). This is typically used in a conclusion as it is used here in the final phrase of “Whole communal ownership of education.”

A more positive past is also explicitly referred to when the speaker states, “More people back then living in Site 2 and in the school”. This implies an active community with high communal participation in the school in addition to high student attendance. This is intensified with the adjectives “all” and “every” in “All buildings at Site 2 were full once. Every classroom.” This is further emphasised with the use of a gift metaphor in relation to the education of community children by the school in “The education was given over to the school.” The use of this metaphor in relation to the past implies a trust the community had in the school to adequately educate their children and a willingness to send their children there. However, it also implies that there is a current lack of trust by the community and an unwillingness to interact with the school. The control the community had over the school in the past is reinforced with the powerful conclusive phrase of “Whole communal ownership of education” to create a picture of full community engagement in the past and current disenfranchisement and marginalisation of the community in the present.
6.5b3 I finished my Training

One ex-assistant teacher who was at the school from the 1970s and 1980s also noted differences with the past in terms of the professional status of assistant teachers who were effectively IL teachers.

**Extract 6.11**

I finished my training at stage 2 (second year of a three year teaching degree) at Batchelor. [Another assistant teacher] reached stage 3. We would sometimes go to Batchelor campus at Katherine and sometimes do work at [another community]. Batchelor people would sometimes come to [Site 2] too.

As with Site 1, these assistant teachers had received training from BIITE, planned lessons and developed resources for their class. Some were assisted by linguists in this. This ex-assistant teacher was recalling a much higher degree of on-site training (which is absent now), in addition to collaboration with teachers from other schools in the training.

6.5b4 We collected Stories

Another ex-assistant teacher from the 1990s recalled the activities of literacy centres.

**Extract 6.12**

(The literacy centre was) for the whole community. [Site 2] and [another site] used to work together. Like they used to collect story from old people there, and send it here to get published or to check and we collected stories like [you give, I give] working together you know.

This respondent was noting collaboration of literacy centres at different sites, the publication of elder stories and a newsletter all of which no longer occur or, in the case of stories, occur to a much lesser degree.
6.5b5 No community Support

The current lack of interaction with the community and lack of Indigenous employment at the school led one non-Indigenous middle-aged female community resident to remark on the community interaction with the school as follows:

Extract 6.13

... they’ve found it difficult to get anybody to support them. This community couldn’t be more apathetic when it comes to work and becoming involved in that sort of thing and I don’t think they’re getting very many people over there helping to support that. And I know that you need that support to make that program work.

Discursive settler colonial ‘other’ formations or deficits rather than structural changes at the school and in the department (and consequential disempowerment of Indigenous people) appear evident in this response. Interestingly, this was reversed in a later comment about the effects of the Intervention (NTER) (see governance outcomes below).

6.5c Language and Culture

Language and culture, as in the Site 1 analysis, largely relates to the impact language has on students in terms of their identity, well-being, Root Knowledge (deep cultural knowledge and practices) and relationships, worldview and values. In addition, it links to the influence of Western culture. As can be seen from figure 6.6 (below), the categories and sub-categories that dominated in discussions on language and culture related to language education (50%), identity and well-being (55%), student behaviour (50%), relationships, worldviews and values (35%) and Root Knowledge (25%). This differed slightly from responses at Site 1 which, while also exhibiting prominence for responses relating to identity, well-being and student behaviour, focused more strongly on relationships and Western influence. This difference may be a consequence of the greater Western influence that appears to be operating at Site 1. This, in turn, may partly be a product of the language education at Site 1 but also the greater Western governance (the greater government interaction) that has negatively affected community
coherence, self-governance, well-being and resilience (as outlined by governance responses in the previous chapter).

The remainder of this section examines respondent remarks in terms of; IL use (typically framed as the language of relationships, interaction with others, religion and culture as well as knowledge); identity and well-being (where although Site 2 children were regarded as strong in language and well-being, there were some signs of Western cultural incursion); and belonging and Root Knowledge (where, as with Site 1, respondents remarked on the impossibility of English capturing cultural practices and Indigenous knowledge).

6.5c1 Language Use

Similar to Site 1, Site 2 participants regarded the use of English, although important for interaction with the greater society outside of Site 2, as peripheral to community life and only needed for interactions with the few non-IL speakers at the council, shop and clinic. ILs, however, were regarded as essential. One ex-assistant teacher from the 1990s, for instance, commented:
Extract 6.14

Interviewee: Language is like ... in all the [Site 2 - IL2] communities, everything is in language. I’m talking about the church you know, singing, liturgy, prayer and like you have all in language.

Interviewer: And talking to people down the street?

Interviewee: Yeah

Interviewer: And anything outside the school and shire office? Is it all in language?

Interviewee: All in language, yes. You see people sitting around. They’re all talking in language.

6.5c2 Identity and Well-being

Identity and well-being represented the greatest number of responses in this category apart from language education and student behaviour (which have been dealt with above). It was common for respondents to talk of being ‘proud’ and strong when having the ability to speak one or a number of ILs. A parent of a number of children at Site 2 school, for example, stated:

6.5c3 I feel proud

Extract 6.15

I feel really proud you know. I feel happy. It’s something that I got ‘cause my father’s (from Site 1) and my mum’s (from Site 2). I speak two languages and I speak (another language) as well. So, I’ve know three languages living here in (Site 2).

Contrastingly, an ex-assistant teacher from the 1990s explained that, although language was still strong, Western influences were having some impact on language and culture for younger people.

Extract 6.16

Indigenous people are losing their culture and trying to get back their culture...When our grandchildren, when they’re in trouble with the police or want to talk to us. Someone non-indigenous, they ask me or the younger people nowadays rely on other people, older people, to talk up for them because they’re too shy to speak English and they get others to speak up for
them. And that’s why we got interpreters in town. Someone has to come in the middle and talk to them.

As with many respondents at Site 1, this respondent at Site 2 believed the Western impact on language and culture was affecting young people’s resilience, strength and capacity to interact with confidence when relating to those outside the community. The growing domination of Western culture and the breakdown of some families was also negatively affecting the interaction of children with adults. She argued:

Extract 6.17

No respect for ...Some children like when you tell them off, they talk back you know. And that’s not respecting older people you know.

6.5c4 Language is Culture, Language is Land, Language is Life

Largely, however, discussion of language and cultural loss related to those outside the community who did not have bilingual education and were more heavily influenced by Western technology, much of which was absent at Site 2 because of the lack of Internet and mobile phone access. An ex-assistant teacher, for example, discussed the failing morality of youth from other communities who were incorrectly and inappropriately interacting with skin groups when using mobile phones and Facebook. Many noted, as in Site1, how ‘lost’ people were who did not have language and how language linked in with Root Knowledge, relationships to people, the land and ‘survival’.

A father of a child currently at Site2 school, for instance, argued that an IL:

Extract 6.18

Interviewee: Keeps ah...well, um. Keeps who you are, your culture too much, pretty much up and alive really. An important one, I think, I believe is to keep you know language...is one of the most important things that are in communities, in [Site 2] values is language and the land and ah culture. So if you take one away ... Interviewer: So, what happens if you don’t have the culture? Interviewee: Well, that’s what I was ...If you take one of them away you’re fucked. It doesn’t work.
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Interviewer: So, what happens?
Interviewee: You’re nobody...You’ve got no identity. You don’t say I’m an (Site 2) man from Central Australia. If you can’t have language, language is culture which is land and all that you know ... You can’t have one missing. Our language is just as important as having land and land is just as important as having language. You can’t pull one out cause it’s the fucking end of the world if you do you know.

This belief of language and identity being intimately intertwined relates to the concept of identity outlined by May (2012: 44) who states that ethnic groups define and are defined by “cultural attitudes and symbols, language, kinship and historical memory”. These principally function as ‘belonging’, providing a basis for “identity and meaning” as opposed to Western standards of ‘belonging’ associated with, invariably economic, “accomplishments” (May, 2012: 44). Of relevance here is the notion of relationships that give rise to particular patterns of social interaction (May, 2012). That is, an absence of language is an absence of interaction and thereby of ‘belonging’ which means you have no place and cannot know how to behave – a recognition by Site 2 participants of the importance of IL socialisation in a child’s personal and cognitive development as outlined by Wilkins (2008).

6.5c4a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 6.18

This framing of ILs as ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’ is achieved in this extract through rationalisation and moral evaluation. These macrostrategies involve discursive strategies that are arguing for the importance of language in both identity development and well-being. This is intensified at a number of points with coercive emotive linguistic realisations such as “So, If you take one away ... you’re fucked” and “You can’t pull one out cause it’s the fucking end of the world if you do you know” (see Reyes, 2011 and Lawton, 2013 for an extensive discussion). In this way, a causal relationship is tied to a hypothetical future, indicating a topos of danger and threat that supports the argument for IL education, suggesting “cautionary tales” or “deviant activities that lead to unhappy endings”, as outlined by van Leeuwen (2008: 118) and is also reminiscent of the “slippage between description and prediction” that Fairclough (2003: 99) discusses as being common in policy. That is, the respondent is using both rational legitimation and strong coercion when arguing for Indigenous bilingual education. The warning or threat of a negative hypothetical future if ILs are lost is reinforced with explicit negative lexicalisations that relate to culture and identity such as “It doesn’t work”, “You’re nobody” and “You’ve got no identity”.
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The modality used, “cannot”, construes impossibility and inability and so supports the topos of danger and threat. This is coupled with the extensive use of the second person inclusive plural pronoun “you” in the subject position which intensifies the statement and the hearer’s involvement.

In contrast, when ‘language’ is in the subject position, inferred or explicit, there is a definitive positive lexical choice, such as in “Keeps who you are, your culture too much, pretty much up and alive really”. While there is some complexity in clause relationships, these appear to have a descriptive role such as in “Keeps who you are alive”. 139

6.5c5 You can’t sing Corroboree in English

Belonging, relationships and values in addition to Root Knowledge (deep land and cultural knowledge) represented the next major sub-categories of language and culture that respondents discussed. These two categories often overlapped with identity and well-being (such as above and in Site 1). As with Site 1, Site 2 IL was intimately connected to cultural practice and could not be conducted without it. For instance, a father of children at the school commented:

Extract 6.19

Two Way learning, it’s better for the kids so they can understand growing up and learning about the animals, and their totems, like um ceremonies and all these things happen. It’s very important for the kids to learn.

This was reiterated by a respected elder at Site 2:

Extract 6.20

If the kids just learn English, how are they going to sing and corroboree and all that? Think they can’t sing that one in English? The kids want their own

139 Again, the active present and future tense and lack of passivity and nominalisation maintain active subjectivity or actions thus reinforcing the commitment of the speaker and ‘truth’ of their statements (see Gee, 2011; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002: 83; Lawton, 2008 for an extensive discussion).
language, you know, the children. They can carry on culture, you know. You can’t sing the corroboree in English (laugh). That’s the main thing you know.

As with Site 1, these comments appear to relate directly to the concepts of Malcolm (1998) and Schmidt (1990) in their discussion on language and cognition in relation to verbal imagery, metonymy, metaphor and other image schemas that are specific to languages and that cannot be translated across languages. It also relates to language function and use in specific contexts and domains (Baker, 2011). That is, how language use is patterned according to the domain in which it is being used and hence you cannot “sing corroboree in English” given the restriction of SAE use to non-Indigenous domains.

6.5c5a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 6.20

This argument appears to be largely underpinned by a legitimisation macro-strategy of rationalisation (specifically instrumentality that indicates “purposefulness, usefulness” and one derived from “utilitarianism and pragmatism” philosophical traditions) (see van Leeuwan, 2008: 105-114). This is indicated by the topos of uselessness and disadvantage in relation to monolingual English education that dominates in the argument. For instance, it can be seen in the mitigating adverb ‘just’ as in “just learn English” and in the (goal oriented) infinitive verb in “how are they going to sing and corroboree and all that?” (Bartlett, 2004: 114). This is emphasised and amplified with a repetition of this statement in addition to the use of the modal ‘can’t’ that denotes impossibility and incapability in “Think they can’t sing that one in English” and “You can’t sing corroboree in English” (see Bartlett, 2004: 75 on modals). It is intensified again with adjective ‘main’ to indicate language as a principal concern in cultural practise in “That’s the main thing you know” (Cataldi, 2001). These linguistic realisations and strategies appear to operate to create the argument that monolingual English education is not adequate for the education of remote Indigenous children, given its unsuitability in specific IL domains and due to its lack of appropriate tropes, verbal imagery, concepts and ideologies necessary for student comprehension (Malcolm, 1998; Schmidt, 1990; Ch2).
6.5d Boss - Types of Government Authority/Control

As described in the previous chapter, boss-governance deals with issues of governance (how participants perceived the FFHP and government consultation with the community as well as how they viewed the government ideology and conceptualisation in policy making) and governance outcomes (the effects of governance and policy on the community in terms of informed consent, dependence, caregiver authority, choice and resources within the community and the degree of deficit views). How government authority/control is divided into the subcategories of governance and governance outcomes is shown in figure 6.7 below.

![Figure 6.7: Responses related for Governance and Governance Outcomes](image)

Interestingly, the division of responses into governance and governance outcomes was very similar to Site 1, suggesting a similar concern in terms of government consultation with the community and government-community agreements. When responses were analysed, these were indeed the major concerns for adult respondents at Site 2.

6.5d1 Management - Governance

Governance deals with community views of the FFHP and subsequent policy, government consultation with the community and the reasoning associated with policy making.
When governance responses were examined more closely, there were a greater number of responses relating to governance outcomes (than governance) at Site 2 in comparison to Site 1. This could be a consequence of the fact that bilingual education was retained at Site 2 after negotiation with the government (albeit under the threat of Human Rights Commission actions). Thereby, there were a lower number of, but equally intense, responses related to negative government consultations.

The relationship to other categories and sub-categories was similar at Site 2 to those at Site 1 with language and culture (in terms of well-being and identity) being the most pronounced. This suggests that community members in both communities viewed governance as being instrumental in the deterioration of language, culture, well-being and identity. This was borne out by the responses related to governance outcomes below (figure 6.8 below).

![Figure 6.8: Governance responses and how they relate to other categories and subcategories](image)

As with Site1, community members generally at Site 2 framed governance in terms of poor government consultation in addition to experiencing erratic policy change. However, there was a firm belief at Site 2, which was not apparent at Site 1, that despite attempts by government to undermine language rights, these were inviolate and so could not be eroded, which is possibly a consequence of the successful human rights commission outcome for that community.
6.5d2 We took all the Ladies and Kids to the Council Lawns

At Site 2, all respondents disagreed with the FFHP and agreed with bilingual education. An ex-assistant teacher from the 1970s recalled the action that occurred when the FFHP was initially announced:

Extract 6.21

We took all the ladies and elders and kids to the council lawns in Alice Springs and then went to the education office and said we want bilingual. We came back here (Site 2) and drew a painting on the school wall ‘learning together’.

Not only is the lack of support for the FFHP evident here, but the advocation for Both Ways (see glossary of terms) and the intercultural and non-hierarchical discourse this implies.

A young male parent with children at the school thought the FFHP was an example of seriously flawed governance.

Extract 6.22

These people don’t know about policies, that they shut it down and all that when they shut it ...

This respondent was, in fact, with the phrase “don’t know about policies”, implying government incompetence and that the FFHP was an example of government ineptitude.

6.5d3 She was Saying but not Listening

Some respondents commented on the poor consultation with the community regarding the FFHP, a disregard for their wishes in addition to the disempowering effects it had on the community. The education minister at the time, Marion Scrymgour, was the subject of particular criticism in relation to a meeting she had with the [Site 2] community regarding the FFHP.
Extract 6.23

She was saying but not listening. She came here to talk, not listen. It was all, gonna be like this... Really rude hey. She came across very rude. You think being [Aboriginal] ... you know if we went to the top end well you sort of get that it’s not my country to come and scream and tell these people how their school should be run.

6.5d4 This is the Last Leaf on the Tree

The community interviews were conducted at the time of the Wilson (2014a) draft review of Indigenous education in the NT which recommended the dismantling of all bilingual education in NT schools. A number of respondents relayed their fear of losing bilingual education at the school. An ex-primary student and now parent of children at the school referred to the school as “changing” with the belief that the government was “putting on English in the school instead of our language” against the wishes of the community. This was corroborated by an ex-assistant teacher from the school who stated:

Extract 6.24

Interviewee: Docker River is now English. All that top end, they took it away.
Interviewer: Do you think they’ll do it here?
Interviewee: This one is the last one. It’s on the last branch, the last leaf.

This firm belief in the imminent implementation of a monolingual English education policy at the school against the desires of the community and the AHRC is both indicative of the perceived vagaries of government policy-making operating in the NT as well as a prescient analysis given the absence of IL education (for more than one year) after data collection for this research was complete.\(^{140}\)

\(^{140}\) On an additional visit in September 2015, I was told by respondents that the NTDE had failed to employ a teacher linguist at Site 2 since mid-2014 and the one qualified local teacher (who taught IL) had retired as a consequence of age and ill-health. She had not yet been replaced and, since there had been no training by NTDE of younger candidates in the community up until that time, IL classes had ceased. It was also reported that classroom behaviour had deteriorated markedly. The failure to ensure training seems to confirm the criticism of the historical lack of professional training for local NT Indigenous people in Appendix 1.2.
Such government oppression, in terms of education programs and policies in this excerpt, is achieved with a representation macro-strategy. This is realised with the predication phrasal verb “took away” that suggests both oppression and Indigenous victimisation with the removal of bilingual education from most remote contexts.

Argumentation and intensification are also employed to realise this representation. For example, a topos of danger or threat (dangerous consequences) and urgency is implied with “This one is the last one. It’s on the last branch, the last leaf.” Here a tree metaphor is engaged to link IL to knowledge and life. However, it is a precarious situation since the bilingual program at Site 2 is the “last one”, “the last leaf” with every possibility it will fall given the current political climate and recommendations of the Wilson (2014a) report.

The repetition of the adjective “last” both emphasises and amplifies this precariousness, intensifying the statement of oppression and victimisation. The use of “all” in “All that top end” universalises this oppression to create a picture of extensive symbolic violence by government authority.

6.5d5 Language Rights

Governance was also strongly associated with language rights and IL was framed as a right of Site 2 people.

Extract 6.25

We still have our language. Nobody can take it away from us. Not even the government can take it away. It’s our mother tongue.

Interestingly, this advocacy of language as a right was not stated as frequently as in Site 1 and was not couched in the same way in terms of government failure to impose its will on Indigenous people. As noted earlier, this is likely a consequence of the successful Site 2 racial discrimination complaint that was used successfully to overturn the FFHP at this site. This meant that some of
the issues discussed at Site 1 were not relevant to Site 2 and when rights were discussed, it was in relation to the success of this action.

6.5d6 Governance Outcomes

As in Ch5, governance outcomes relate to the impact of government policy and governance on the community and how this influences the authority of caregivers, choice, allocation of resources to the community, economic dependency of community members and the degree of deficit views. When responses on governance outcomes were examined more closely, the following relationships emerged (figure 6.9 below).

![Figure 6.9: Governance responses and how they relate to other categories and subcategories](image)

The dominant responses that emerged at Site 2 related to governance and the derogative effects of policy, followed by the impact on language and culture (including well-being and identity) and language education. In this regard, community residents stated; how emotionally wrought they were by policy decisions such as the FFHP in addition to the failure of government to ‘care’ about Indigenous youth sufficiently to ensure sufficient resources so that they can attend a high school within their own community. Respondents at Site 2 also discussed how the FFHP policy...
discourse framed them in terms of deficits. Analogous to Site 1, participants also complained how their authority as caregivers was being undermined by governance in addition to the rise in unemployment and social welfare as a consequence of government intervention in the community and the re-allocation of resources to outside agencies and departments.

6.5d7 We were sad, angry

Respondents reported the despondency they felt when the FFHP was initially announced. A mother of children in the school noted that the entire community felt “bad” with the FFHP announcement. Another parent (previously discussed) related the “anger” of the community in relation to Marion Scrymgour’s community consultation regarding the FFHP. An ex-assistant teacher from the 1990s discussed the feelings of the community in addition to the failure of the government to listen or acknowledge the aspirations of the community.

Extract 6.26

Interviewee: Yeah, it hurt. We was real sad. And we said, oh, we wanted bilingual.
Interviewer: You said that to the department?
Interviewee: Together. Not want English. They could hear everything, ask and learn.

6.5d8 They won’t think anything about Blackfellas

A well-respected elder at Site 2 stated the FFHP showed a lack of ‘care’:

Extract 6.27

That’s why government trying to take over these young people now and give them some English, they won’t think anything about blackfellas, you know.

This response appears to frame the FFHP and the attempt to eradicate bilingual education as not motivated by any concern for Indigenous people but rather a need to control or even symbolically eradicate (indicated by ‘take over’) them, demonstrating the respondent’s understanding of the goal of mainstreaming policies, such as the FFHP, to remove the risk that
Indigenous people pose to nation-state legitimacy and rule (as discussed by Altman & Hinkson, 2010, in Ch1).

6.5d9 No High School for Older Kids

Community members believe that this lack of ‘care’ has also translated into reduced educational resources. Some commented on the fact that secondary education at the Site 2 school has been abandoned leading to a number of young high school students wandering the streets in the community. Some of this is associated with the inability of some youth at Site 2 to adjust to boarding schools remote from home. This failure to adjust at school may not only be associated with a feeling of ‘loss’ because of separation from friends and family but is probably also related to an inability to enact “reflexive thinking” or situated learning in foreign domains with foreign social, physical and political ecologies (as outlined by Hopkins, 2012: 236 and Ch2). Truanting from remote schools was also seen as the result of ‘teasing’. An ex-language teacher at the school, for instance, stated:

Extract 6.28

Some of the kids might be but some keep running away from school because teasing. They don’t like bush people, bush kids in town.

This seems to indicate that the hierarchy of languages (and cultures) that is evident in language policies such as the FFHP is negatively influencing the greater community, including this negative attitude of some students at Yirara High School in Alice Springs to remote IL speakers. The failure to attend school, at times, is also a consequence of the lack of places available at Yirara for bush kids. During my stay at Site 2, one of the students in the upper primary class was actually a Year 7 but was still waiting for a place at Yirara three months after school had commenced for the year. This led the nephew of a prominent elder at Site 2 to criticise the very poor government resourcing common in Indigenous schools:

Extract 6.29

All them mob saying no more high school for [people] in the bush but only 500 kids can go to Yirara. There’s 10,000 kids need school. They’re only
taking 500. There’s 10,000 kids in the bush and they’re only getting high school in Yirara and there’s only place for 500 kids. And they got 10,000 *chi chi* [children] outside. All them other kids are missing out on school.

6.5d10 Us People are constantly Trainees

A parent of a child at the local school recalled the deficit discourse expressed by Marion Scrymgour when she came to the community to discuss the FFHP. This deficit discourse was largely articulated in reference to Indigenous staff at the school.

**Extract 6.30**

She said, ‘Oh you know, we’re going to bring in English and have proper school teachers teaching kids’. And all I can remember was, the moral of the story was, she was saying we’re going to have proper school teachers rather than have teacher’s assistants and then you know you can ... pointing at [Indigenous teacher at the school]. She’s a fucking qualified school teacher. She’s got whatever it is you know. She’s qualified. And she gets up and she says, “I’m not a teacher’s assistant right. I’m a qualified teacher. You don’t know me.” She upped her. ‘Because I’m (from Site 2) and I’m standing in the pack and you think I’m a teacher’s assistant.’ So, she, wrong way you know...that she’s just a teacher’s assistant and getting all uptight about it. ...Us (Site 2 people) are constantly trainees.

This respondent was largely relating a narrative about the inferior status (as ‘trainees’) that Indigenous staff were given which links to the child-like positioning Indigenous people are frequently constructed with (Ahmed, 2012). This, in turn, relates to the container (inside, outside) metaphor common in postcolonial contexts (Chilton, 2006).

6.5d11 Because of Government, you can’t touch Kids

A number of community members at Site 2 expressed the concern about their lack of authority over youth in the community as a consequence of government intervention where control by parents and caregivers was removed. A male elder at Site 2 remarked:

**Extract 6.31**

Interviewee: Today, you can’t hit anybody, the kids, everything changed.
Interviewer: So, you can’t get in to see the kids now?
Interviewee: Yeah. Parents used to go to school. [Site 2 people] used to run the school and proper qualified teachers they were. Kids now answer back to mother and father. They used to hit them to make them running to school. No hitting now. They used to hit them you know for not listening. Mother father answer back. They used to hit them and make them run to school. You can’t do that now.
Interviewer: In the past, parents used to make kids go to school but parents don’t bother now?
Interviewee: No because of these rules changing, not to hit children.
Interviewer: So, do parents not make kids go to school now?
Interviewee: Nothing. Because of this government, you can’t touch kids now. Change.

Leaving the cross-cultural and UN human rights issues of corporal punishment aside, the implications for community adult members is their perception of being withheld from acting responsibly in regards to the behaviour of their children. This is accompanied by the knowledge that their children’s behaviour, despite these limitations in metering out punishment, reflects on their parenting skills. This has the potential to result in the loss of their children to the state and subsequent social trauma for the community.

6.5d11a Critical Discourse Analysis Extract 6.31

This framing of government as disempowering and authoritative is largely achieved in this text through mythopoesis (story telling) and representation (through a description of past events compared to the present). The repetitive use of “used to” (to emphasise the actions of the past) refers to parental involvement in the school (“Parents used to go to school”) and ability to discipline their children (“They used to hit them …for not listening”). The professional status and employment of community members at the school is also discussed and emphasised by the adjectival phrase (that intensifies the statement) “proper qualified” in “[Site 2 people] used to run the school and proper qualified teachers they were”. This is interjected with negative lexicalisation and the temporal adverb “now” (repeated for intensity) to indicate how these actions have been curtailed. The negative repercussions of this history are evident in “Kids now answer back” and the modal “can’t” to suggest impossibility and incapability in “You can’t do that now” to render a picture of poor social behaviour of children as a consequence of the high government restraint in parental control.
6.5d12 No Accountability

Another non-Indigenous resident related the failure in and lack of accountability of government administration of Indigenous community assets, such as the pool and housing.

Extract 6.32

Before we arrived, apparently there was a lot of council works going on in Site 2. A lot of the men worked. They were driving graders and they were driving the trucks and they were getting on with doing quite a bit of work around the place. And then the shire took the grader away and took the trucks away. They all went over to (another larger community) never to be seen again. And now these men that are out here actually don’t want to work. They don’t want to pick up rubbish, they want to be out there building and doing things. I mean they said themselves, we’re bored. The one thing that they were really good at has been taken away from them.

Originally bought and maintained by Indigenous organisations, the assets she described (trucks and graders) had been surrendered to government authorities with the collapse of institutions such as ATSIC and the local community council. The withdrawal of resources from small communities, such as Site 2, as a consequence of the Intervention and the collapse of community councils has, as previously mentioned, led to a dramatic decline in both (meaningful) work (since many community councils operated their own businesses) and population. This speaker was relating how this lack of accountability and erratic management of community assets posed grave concerns for remote community members, greatly increasing their stress and reducing their well-being.141

6.5e Summary of CA and CDA

The descriptions that emerged from Site 2 are remarkably similar to those of Site 1, detailing a positive past with a high level of self-determination and self-governance but a negative present as a consequence of the actions and outcomes of oppressive and non-consultative successive

141 Indeed, a recent report by The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2015) has indicated that the vast majority of health issues for Indigenous Australians are a consequence of socio-economic factors. This suggest that the interventions discussed in this study are, in their suppression of local employment, contributing to the far worse morbidity and mortality rates of remote Indigenous Australians.
federal and territory governments, painting a picture of governance that progressively led to highly denuded resources and undermined self-determination, economic independence, employment and community authority and participation.

Authoritarian governance has had an impact on traditional authority, language and culture, although this was reduced compared to Site 1. Respondents also perceived the influence of Western values and morals as negative and contributing to social dysfunction. Community members without language were also described as ‘lost’. This was in line with the Canadian findings of de la Sablonnière, et al (2011) as well as the research of Ochs and Schieffelin (1996) and Wilkins (2008) that detailed the negative effect of language loss on socialisation and cognition. However, in contrast to Site 1, respondents at Site 2 perceived these negative elements as being mitigated by the retention of bilingual education at the school and the presence of far less Western technology and media (such as mobile phones and Internet). That is, they perceived this process as predominantly happening outside of their community.

In this regard, respondents also noted high academic, behavioural, well-being and identity outcomes (including attendance) of students and community resilience as a consequence of less Western influence and a strong bilingual program at the school (which is in agreement with studies by Biddle, 2012b; Dockery, 2010; Hallett, Chandler & Lalonde, 2007; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2005). This outcome was perceived to occur to a high degree despite the negative impact on self-governance as well as the reduced community interaction and employment at the school as a consequence of government interventions such as the NTER and the FFHP.

This outcome aligns with additive bilingual education findings of Baker (2011), Collier (1998) and Cummins (2000) where positive formation and representation of a L1 identity results in not only high academic and L2 outcomes but a greater willingness of students to embrace a L2 and culture. In contrast to Site 1, there were no reports of destructive behaviour of youth at Site 2, suggesting the higher L2, academic and behavioural outcomes may also be a product of achieving sufficient levels of L1 language socialisation which has resulted in the growth of “cognitive self-regulatory mechanisms” that inhibit destructive and high risk behaviour and lead to the higher development of working memory (as discussed by Wilkins, 2008).
As with Site 1, many of the discursive strategies employed by respondents at Site 2, the metaphors (such as container), the topoi (uselessness and disadvantage or usefulness and advantage), the grammatical and lexical choices, were similar to the political texts but inverted to denote the communities as at the centre and outside agencies (such as the NTDE) as at the periphery and oppressive. The use of personal narrative and the lack of dependence on an outside authority (since it was a lived experience) in macrostrategies were common in interview texts from both research sites but largely absent in political texts. As with Site 1, the only texts that aligned with government accounts were those of non-Indigenous respondents. In the case of Site 2, they exhibited typical manifestations of settler colonial ideology (of a deficient other) suggesting (as with Site 1) the influence of government hegemonic discourse and ‘regimes of truth’ on public discourse.

Similar to Site 1, there was a higher degree of metaphor employed at Site 2 than in the political texts. This was likely due to an increased need for metaphor to understand alien Western knowledge systems in community discourse (Goddard, 2004). Some metaphors have added an emotive eloquence (such as “the last branch, the last leaf”) that exposes the pain of language and cultural loss and intensifies the argument for bilingual education. An additional difference from policy texts was the use of the ‘gift’ metaphor in discourse at the two community sites to describe L1/and or multilingualism – a recognition of the importance of diverse and deep cognizance that occurs with bi- or multi-lingualism (as outlined by Wilkins, 2008). The next section deals with the results of the student analysis which reinforces the claims of adult respondents’ discourse.

6.5f Site 2 Students

Below is an analysis of the responses from the 12 students interviewed at Site 2. Information regarding these interviews are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td>12 interviewees in total Grades ranged from Year 3 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To gather information about language context, preferences and effects of language on self-esteem and cognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Children Interview Respondents at Site 2
Students were interviewed using semi-structured interview questions, individually (2 interviews), in pairs (1) and in groups (2 groups). As with Site 1, the variation in the number of interviewees at each site was a consequence of the opportunistic nature of the interviews since it was not possible to gain direct access to students at the school. In all but the group interviews, caregivers were present and available to recruit respondents, translate questions and answers. However, the students interviewed at this site required little (if any) such assistance. They were, as shown in the graph below (figure 6.10), also more multilingual than students at Site 1.

The size of the sample (12 of the 36 students at the school) meant that there were distinct trends that emerged from the data which reflected both the community context and the bilingual status of the school. The greater ability of students to participate in English in the interviews at Site 2 is an example of this in addition to the bi-literacy of students. However, there were also noticeable similarities with Site 1 results, such as the multilingualism of some students as well as better comprehension and learning achieved through an Indigenous L1 for most students.

The topics that emerged from the interviews remain the same as in Ch5 and so will not be dealt with here except for that fact that the impact of the FFHP on language education was not examined due the continuous history of bilingual education at Site 2.

6.5f1 Language Use

Language use relates to the language environment and language contexts in which students live. Analysis of responses for this topic (figure 6.10 below) revealed that, as with Site 1, there was predominantly productive bilingualism in the community (with a few multi-lingual families).\(^{142}\) In addition, the language context was similar in both sites where the entire community was IL speaking and there were only a few domains where English was spoken. Like Site 1, English was spoken in areas of non-Indigenous power and control (Simpson, 2013). For children at both sites, this was largely the school and the shop. However, since an IL was spoken everywhere, this also meant that an IL was spoken in these contexts as well. The fact that the Site 2 school is strongly bilingual (with 30-40% of instruction in IL2) meant that, for quite a substantial amount

---

\(^{142}\) While community members at both sites understood a range of languages, they may not speak them. Rather, they would converse with outsiders or when travelling in their own language.
of time during the school day an IL of instruction was an integral element of student life. Even so, this was not indicated by student responses. Rather, English was shown to be spoken at school by all students at Site 2 whereas English at Site 1 was the language spoken at school by 80% of the students. This may indicate that some Site 1 students did not speak English at all in school, or at least perceived themselves not to.

Of interest also were the additional domains that Site 2 students spoke English (shop, office, pool and clinic) which did not appear in Site 1 responses (where IL1 and not English was spoken at the shop and English was not spoken, at least regularly, by student participants in any other domain but the school). These results could suggest that bilingual education (because of reduced or absent power differential between L1 and SAE) encourages bilingual communication where English only education does not.

Figure 6.10: Where languages are spoken at Site 2

6.5f2 Language Preferences

Figure 6.11 below shows there are quite a lot of similarities in language preference responses at both sites. In both communities, a considerable number of students wanted to learn both the local IL and English with fewer numbers wanting to learn the local IL or English exclusively. In addition, unfamiliar or non-local ILs were the languages disliked by students in both
communities. In both communities, the family language preference was also dominantly the local IL.

Despite these similarities, there are some important differences. For instance, while the majority of learners at both sites had a higher understanding of and learnt more in the local IL, this result was more pronounced at Site 2. This could be a consequence of the fact that the main task of IL assistant teachers at Site 1 was translation and classroom management. Consequently, some Site 1 students may have perceived they were learning in English when in fact they were learning in an IL translated from English (given the translative function of English that the IL teachers performed). These students also appeared to have interpreted the question as a preference to learn English for future study and work (see Ch5). However, no such confusion or inference existed at Site 2. That is, Site 2 responses showed an awareness of the difference between learning in a L1 and L2. These Site 2 student responses could indicate higher metalinguistic awareness in these students, or at least a greater awareness of language boundaries. This analysis of higher metalinguistic skills in Site 2 students was supported to a degree by adults in both communities. Some Site 1 adults, for instance, noted an increase in an IL1/English mix in the everyday speech of youth but adults at Site 2 consistently reported IL2 as ‘good’ and unchanged. In addition, the students at Site 2 also appeared to have much deeper oral English language reception and production skills than those at Site 1 since they rarely lapsed into IL2 or needed interpreting assistance, despite the fact that their tuition in English at school
was 50% less (the indications of which are in agreement with Alidou, et al, 2006; Malcolm, 2003; May, 2008).

Another difference in the data was the language or languages associated with well-being. While at Site 1, the language associated with well-being was overwhelming IL1, at Site 2, it was a combination of IL2 and English. This could indicate that the greater use of the students’ first IL (in addition to English) across the curriculum both orally and with literacy tasks is producing a more ‘additive’ type or education. That is, there is “collaborative relations of power” (Cummins, 2000: 43) operating in Site 2 classrooms as opposed to coercive ones as a consequence of the higher status given to the local IL within the school. Consequently, students have a positive identity in either language.

The other difference was family preference. Site 1 nominated a number of languages, including English, as the family preferred language(s) while students at Site 2 predominantly nominated IL2. This could be a consequence of the fact that IL2 at Site 2 has higher cultural capital than IL1 at Site 1 (due to the greater prestige of the IL2 as a consequence of the bilingual status of the school).

In terms of language preferences, students at Site 2 also regarded learning English as essential for school work. English for instance was used to “learn to read, write, do mathematics and science” stated one Year 7 student who also had future employment ambitions to work in the shop. Unlike Site 1, however, the local IL at Site 2 was also regarded as the language of both Western and local cultural learning and a language where there was greater comprehension for school work. According to a Year 3, a Year 4, a Year 6 and a Year 7 student, IL2 was necessarily for “listening” “talking to friends” and “reading”, apart from its necessity in traditional knowledge, stories and culture. These same students also reported learning in an IL made them feel “excellent” (in agreement with findings by Anders-Baer, et al, 2008; Cummins, 2000; Marmion, Obata & Troy, 2014; Ch2) while a Year 4 and Year 6 student reported that learning in the local IL was easier “because it makes sense”. This ties into research by Lakoff (1992), Malcolm (1998), Chilton (2006) and others in Ch2 that demonstrate student understanding is enhanced with L1 because, apart from lexical understanding, the image schemas, association chains, metonymy and metaphor are known and familiar.
In addition, one Year 3 student, when asked what can they do in IL2 as opposed to English, replied “writing”. Although this perhaps was a product of how the local IL and English is used and introduced in the school (where there is a focus on oral English and IL literacy in the earlier grades with English literacy not being introduced until middle primary), it is also indicative of earlier and more complex literacy abilities in these bilingual students (which includes writing their own stories, also in agreement with research in Ch2).

6.5f3 Teacher Preference

Teacher preference refers to whether a student prefers, as their classroom teacher, a non-Indigenous English speaking teacher, an IL speaking teacher or both. Below, as with Site 1, the preference was for both due to comprehension issues. A Year 7 student, for instance, noted “Sometimes don’t understand white teachers. Good to have (Site 2) teachers.”

What did differ, however, from Site 1 was the preference for non-Indigenous English speaking teachers. At Site 1, there was a slight preference for IL1 speaking teachers (8%). However, at Site 2, there was no preference for an IL2 speaking teacher. Also, while there was no preference for an English speaking teacher at Site 1, there was a preference at Site 2 (27%). Again, this preference for and positive perceptions of non-Indigenous teachers could be a consequence of the greater self-esteem and confidence that Site 2 students felt due to the prestige of the local
In the school which, in turn, has resulted in a strong Indigenous and non-Indigenous (linguistic) identity, greater cross-cultural tolerance, respect and understanding (elements noted by Cummins, 2000: Ch2).

In conclusion, the linguistic environment of students at Site 2 was similar to Site 1 where English was used at sites of colonial domination and control. However, the use of English by the students appeared to be more frequent and in more domains (the shop, the shire office, the clinic and the pool) than at Site 1 (the school only). This could indicate that bilingual education encourages the greater use of English. Of difference also was the language of pedagogy and literacy at Site 1 (exclusively English) and Site 2 (where both languages were considered important for school learning and literacy). While this result may be expected given the monolingual and bilingual status of the schools at each site, what is perhaps unexpected is the higher desire for English language teachers at Site 2 and earlier literacy abilities. As discussed above, this could be a consequence of higher academic ability, positive identity and well-being engendered through the use of a L1 that in turn results in greater dominant language use, higher resilience and inter-cultural acceptance (Cummins, 2000).

6.6 Summary of Chapter 6

This chapter reports on the analysis of a large amount of data collected at Site 2. Interestingly, the categories and discursive strategies that emerged at Site 2 from the analysis of semi-structured interviews, while the same as those at Site 1 differed in their focus as a consequence of the retention, strength and consistency of bilingual education at Site 2 school. Although respondents related similar concerns regarding a lack of government consultation as well as oppressive and marginalising policies, the impact of these policies were reduced seemingly as a consequence of the retention of a strong bilingual education program at the school and less Western influence and intervention from governments. Site 2 respondents regarded the retention of their bilingual education as a major factor contributing to community resilience. They also related its valuable contribution to superior student behaviour and academic outcomes which have had profound positive socio-economic effects in the community. This finding is in agreement with NT, national and international research (Baker, 2011; Biddle, 2012a, 2012b; Cummins, 2000; Daly & Smith, 2003; Devlin, 1995; Disbray, 2014; Gale, et al, 1981; Ch2).
There were many similarities between students at both sites but also important differences. Students at Site 1 and Site 2 lived in similar linguistic environments, with perhaps more multilingualism at Site 2. However, the language of learning was perceived by Site 1 students as English-only but both English and the local IL at Site 2. Less predictable was the higher English comprehension skills of students at Site 2 during interviews and the greater desire for English language teachers. As discussed previously, this may be the result of higher academic and L2 ability as well as positive Indigenous identity and well-being engendered through the use of a bilingual program in English and a L1 that, in turn, resulted in higher cross-cultural tolerance and desire to learn and use English in Site 2 students.

The final chapter will discuss the implications of these results from the two communities as well as the analysis of the policy texts and discourse and will outline some recommendations in relation to language education in remote Indigenous schools and policy development.
I am not an Aboriginal, or indeed indigenous, I am ... (a) first nation’s person. A sovereign person from this country. I speak my language, and I practise my cultural essence of me. Don’t try and suppress me, and don’t call me a problem, I am not the problem (Rose Kunoth Monks quoted in News Ltd, 2014).

Poisoned damper has long ceased to be a weapon of ethnocide and forced assimilation. Semantics and euphemisms are now the weapon of choice (Frank Baarda, pc, 21 May 2015).

This chapter concludes a thesis which explored the rationale and ideologies that underpinned the 2008 monolingual English language policy, the FFHP, but which also investigated the effects of this policy on two remote Indigenous NT non-English speaking communities. On this research journey, I have examined the micro-policy expressed in the paragraphs above, as indicative of how Indigenous people are positioned and manoeuvred.

7.1 Summary of Study

The aim of this study was to illuminate the context and motives of the FFHP policy and disclose the rationale and community impact of a policy which many argued constituted a disregard for key Indigenous UN Human Rights tenets. The policy targeted remote and outer regional Indigenous community members who are often multilingual IL speakers in contexts where English is a second or, more commonly, foreign Language (Simpson, 2013; Koch & Nordlinger, 2014; Ch2). These communities are usually situated in areas some distance from major urban centres with few mainstream services and resources in environments of deficient government educational systems that lack educational levels above Year 6 and have insufficient places for the number of children in a community (Kronemann, 2007: 6). In addition, members of these communities have been the target of successive Federal Australian and NT policy that has disempowered and marginalised them to a high degree (Brown & Brown, 2007; Paradies, Harris & Anderson, 2008). As a consequence of historical oppression, these communities are now generally characterised by extreme poverty, high mortality and morbidity, suicide, violence, unemployment and underemployment and poor housing (Brown & Brown, 2007; Paradies, Harris & Anderson, 2008; Ch2).
In relation to the decision to enact a language policy that fails to account for a unique socio-linguistic and socio-political context and contravenes educational and IL rights, the then Federal Minister for Education, Julia Gillard stated at the opening of an e-learning centre at BIITE in 2008:

For indigenous Australia, English is the language of further learning and English is the language of work (Gillard in Sydney Morning Herald, 2008).

This thesis explored the assumptions contained in this statement. It interrogated the concept of the role of English as the language of the nation and the ‘market’ and explored the power dynamics between the dominant socio-political group and marginalised Indigenous groups. It examined how attributions and directives ascribed to such groups impacted on two remote communities and critiqued the assimilative tendencies that appear in the Gillard text above and in the original policy text and discourse that surrounded its proclamation and subsequent life.

To explore these issues, the research examined the following questions and subquestions:

**What beliefs and attitudes underpin the First Four Hours of English policy?**

**What were its effects?**

1. What ideologies are evident in the framing of this policy and in the political and media discourses about the policy?
2. How are they indicated by the construction and representation of languages, culture and people?
3. What were the consequences of this policy for two remote Indigenous communities which had, to that point, implemented bilingual education programs in their schools?

This chapter initially reiterates the methodology used to investigate these questions and then summarises the disciplinary fields of bilingual education and CLPP relevant to the study. It then summarises and details the major findings in relation to CA and CDA applied in this research (both of which are detailed in Ch3).
7.1a Methodology

The methodology employed to answer these questions was qualitative and used the strategies of participatory research (through consultation and involvement of research participants in the study), critical cross-cultural ethnography (a reflexive inquiry that aims to understand behaviour and cognition through social, political and historical structures) and case study (research on a particular case or bounded system) (Brown, 2008). The data collection method used involved the collection of policy, media and parliamentary texts – the FFHP text, an opinion article issued by Marion Scrymgour, a television interview with Gary Burgess (the NT Education Minister who succeeded Scrymgour) and a letter issued by then Federal Minister for Education Julia Gillard. It also entailed the collection of individual and group adult and child community interviews, ethnographic notes, observations and interview responses of language and education experts.

The data analysis strategies used CA to capture categories of meaning in community interviews through a coding process and CDA, which was applied to policy texts and discourse in addition to selected community texts and involved the study of grammatical and language patterns as well as lexical choice to divulge views and ideologies (refer to Ch3). The particular type of CDA employed in this research is that developed by Reisigl and Wodak (2009), Historical Discourse Analysis (HDA) to examine political discourse in particular. This involved the examination of typical elements of political texts – the macrostrategies of legitimation, representation and coercion; the discourse strategies of nominalisation, predication, argumentation (topoi and argumentative fallacies) as well as framing and intensification or mitigation (as outlined in Ch3). It also included the linguistic realisations of these strategies (such as personal pronouns, tropes, grammatical structures, lexical choice and presuppositions) (Bartlett, 2004; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002; Lawton, 2013; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, 2009; Ch3).

7.1b Disciplinary Fields

This study is positioned within the fields of bilingual education and CLPP. Bilingual education and the language ecology of the NT are addressed first.
Australian Indigenous languages comprise both traditional (those existing prior to white settlement) and new language groups (of English/Indigenous mixed languages, creoles and English varieties such as Aboriginal English; Ch2) that arose as a consequence of colonisation. The NT, given its late colonial history, has most of the only remaining traditional Indigenous languages spoken on a daily basis by both adults and children (Koch & Nordlinger, 2014). Infused in these languages is identification with land, spirituality and law as well a family and clan (Ch2). Remote speakers of Indigenous languages in the NT invariably are multilingual. However, English domain encroachment, particularly as a consequence of monolingual schooling in dominant SAE, has resulted in the accelerated loss of traditional Indigenous languages and accompanying multilingualism and accelerated evolvement of mixed languages and creoles (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001; Ch2). The lack of recurrent funding and erratic support for maintenance and revival programs have facilitated these accelerations (Evans, 2010; Ch2).

Bilingual programs are frequently situated within these remote Indigenous language sites and were introduced by the Whitlam Government in the 1970s in recognition of the learning, cognitive, identity formation and well-being gains that they can confer. Such gains include enhanced metacognitive awareness, analytical reasoning, divergent thinking, creativity, rule generation and symbolic and abstract thinking that can lead to higher academic outcomes and higher L2 acquisition (Ch2). However, such gains can only occur in additive bilingual environments where a minority L1 is regarded as an asset and is not subtracted or devalued in the learning process and its speakers are afforded equal status (as opposed to an environment where there are unequal relations of power and the L1, regarded as a problem, is replaced by an L2) (Cummins, 2000; Ch2). Additive programs include maintenance or revitalisation, dual, multi- or bilingual programs while subtractive programs include mainstreaming or submersion (in an L2 with or without withdrawal ESL classes) and transitional bilingual programs, such as the Step program in the NT (Ch2; Appendix 1.2). Additive programs have been shown to accelerate L2 acquisition and academic achievement but only with sufficient L1 achievement and L2 academic language development (as opposed to conversational or superficial English attainment). Indeed, the longer the duration of education in an L1, the more proficient both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students become in both academic and conversational L2 (Ch2). Bilingualism and bilingual education is also accompanied by well-being gains such as resilience, higher socio-economic outcomes, lower or non-existent levels of suicide, substance abuse and social dysfunction. These outcomes are a consequence of the development of cognitive self-
regulation mechanisms and community socialisation and intergenerational cultural transmission associated with L1 development (which does not occur with a dominant L2 in remote Indigenous contexts). It is also a result of the retention of classroom learning that allows students to experience achievement often not possible in an L2 (Ch2). As such, there are a considerable number of reports of very positive L2, academic and well-being outcomes associated with bilingual programs across the NT, including qualitative findings in this research, despite their often subtractive status (see Ch2, Appendix 1.2).

This study is also positioned within the field of CLPP. Critical policy analysts examine language policy to unveil the beliefs, values, judgments, assumptions, ideologies, hierarchies and desires implicit and explicit in policy text and discourse. This process ‘illuminates’ why a particular policy is produced and implemented (Liddicoat, 2013; Ricento, 2006; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Ch2,3). Theorists and researchers in CLPP for a number of decades have discursively analysed and evaluated language policy largely using the critical works of or works derived from those of Foucault (1977, 1980), Bourdieu (1983, 1986, 1991, 1998), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) and Gramsci (1999). They have interrogated policy text and discourse to reveal common sense political and social views (the ideologies and relations of power) which help explain why particular policies are issued and the hegemony of such texts (Cohen, 2010; Fairclough, 2003).

In recent decades, as outlined in Ch2, these theories have been used to examine a number of major ideological frameworks that have emerged or re-emerged in relation to Indigenous policy and language education policy. These include the legitimacy of the nation-state (denoted by cultural and linguistic congruity), neoliberal globalisation (implementation of business models and practices in traditionally non-business areas such as education) and postcolonialism (the continuing colonising practices and ideologies that are particularly common in settler colonial states). In Indigenous policy in general, this has resulted in a deficit discourse of Indigenous individuals, culture and community to account for the difference in Indigenous and non-Indigenous dominant language and numeracy standardised testing outcomes (now conventionally referred to as ‘gaps’ in achievement between Indigenous bi- or multilingual and non-Indigenous dominant monolingual students) (Ch2).

It has also resulted in ‘mainstreaming’ of Indigenous services and agencies, greatly reduced Indigenous governance, service provision, business enterprises, some essential services to
remote communities and even reductions in human rights and much needed welfare payments as well as greatly reduced employment, including that at remote schools (Altman, 2009; Altman & Hinkson, 2010; Altman & Russell, 2012; AHRC, 2010: XIV; Brown & Brown, 2007; Shaw, 2013; Ch1,2; Appendix 1.2). This study investigated the presence and impact of these or other ideologies in the framing of the Indigenous ‘problem’ in the FFHP as a lack of parity in English language numeracy and literacy between non-Indigenous and remote Indigenous students.

7.2 Summary and Discussion of Findings

Data analysis exposed the deep and recurring language and cultural hierarchy in the policy texts and their legitimating discourse. These same texts were found to contain mostly negative and deficient Indigenous representations and constructions. This hierarchy and the negative constructions can be explained by the ideological postcolonial practice of ‘othering’ and neoliberal globalisation that underpin the legitimacy and symbolism of the Australian nation-state (explained in more detail below).

In terms of the second question, the effects were unanimously experienced by Indigenous respondents as wholly negative. The introduction of the FFHP resulted in entrenching alienation of Indigenous communities from the school system and negative behavioural and academic outcomes for students and their estrangement from traditional authority. This was more pronounced in the community that dramatically reduced its IL program in accordance with the FFHP policy. In contrast, the community that resisted and preserved a higher level of IL programming within a bilingual program was able to sustain higher academic, behavioural and socio-economic outcomes of students in line with national and international research on strong (additive) bilingual education despite enduring some level of alienation from the school system (as discussed in Ch2; Appendix 1.2; Cummins, 2000; Devlin, 1995).

I will now further detail the CDA analysis of policy text and discourse and follow this with a deeper examination of community findings.
7.2a Boss Talk – weapon of choice

The most common element in the FFHP policy text and discourse was the hierarchy allocated to SAE. This hierarchy manifested in the elevated status and cultural capital of English and English speakers and an unremitting deficit discourse for IL, culture and subjects. The study also found considerable contradictions and inconsistencies in logic and evidence in the policy text and policy discourse (Ch4).

The negative representations of IL, culture and subjects contradicted community findings in this study of government oppression and the value of culture and language in the “achievement of mainstream goals”, which was also noted by Dockery (2010: 35) (and others Ch2). Negative representation of Indigenous subjects also contradicted evidence in Appendix 1.2 and this study’s community findings of the highly valued skills of Indigenous teachers, the achievements of remote Indigenous students in strong bilingual environments with a high percentage of Indigenous community members working in the school and the recognition by community members of how ILs can result in “more adequate adaptations of its speakers to the changing socio-economic ecologies” as expressed by Mufwene (2002: 21).

Negative constructions of Indigeneity were not as overt as that of Macoun’s (2011: 51) analysis of NTER discourse where Aboriginality was found to be “savage and in need of settler-imposed control” and as “primitive and in need of development”. There were also no overt constructions of Indigenous difference as a threat to national cohesion or the manufacture and normalisation of Indigenous crises in the FFHP as discussed by Moran (2005), Kumar (2006) and Wolfe (2006) in relation to the NTER. However, Indigenous failure to reach parity with non-Indigenous students “Despite substantial investment” in the FFHP certainly alluded to a failure to adapt and the threat this poses to national stability. Given the fact that this deficit construction in the FFHP was often strongly tied to individual responsibility for the nation and economy and “destructive choices”, the same NTER implication of a need for ‘mainstreaming’ to ensure national cohesion and Indigenous equivalence (Augoustinos, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999: 363, Cowlishaw, 2003; Veracini, 2007) seems to be operating in the FFHP.

The FFHP also appears to share a number of the same signifiers, metaphors, discourse and linguistic strategies as those used in the NTER suggesting the intertextuality between these two
sets of discourse as a consequence of the historical influence of neoliberalism and settler colonialism. The construal of SAE superiority and the Indigenous blame for educational failure, in addition to the absence of Indigenous agency in the FFHP policy and discourse texts, also indicated, apart from typical “racialising, naturalising and ethnicising” linguistic realisations in racist and discrimination discourse (as discussed by Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 24; van Dijk, 2000), the status of remote Indigenous subjects as ‘outsiders’ and the need for their social control and overt governance, as outlined by Foucault (1982) and Lo Bianco (2001a).

While there were no overt references to criminality and a logic of increased ‘law and order’ apparent in the FFHP texts, as was the case with NTER discourse (Altman, 2013), metaphors of war were enlisted a number of times to support a moral legitimation strategy for the FFHP in addition to punitive strategies to increase school attendance. This also suggests a covert tie of the FFHP to the NTER in its use of “governing through crime” (Anthony, 2010: 90). As outlined by Anthony (2010: 91,93), NTER achieved this with the criminalisation of Indigenous families, particularly Indigenous men, through allegations of child abuse to justify government intervention in provisions that have “little to do with immediately addressing the crime objective” or indeed in “governing crime”. Although the NTER is a somewhat extreme version of the colonial fantasy, ‘governing through crime’ can be seen in the FFHP text and discourse in terms of the implied neglect associated with parents and carers failing to send their children to school, in the abnormality and ‘risk’ associated with remote Indigenous culture and language, the failure of the community to ensure sufficient standard English is used and the ideology of ILs as a ‘problem’ to be overcome for mainstream participation (Lo Bianco, 2001b; Ruiz, 1984, 2010). These are all dysfunctions represented in the FFHP that require ‘mainstreaming’ and ‘normalisation’ to ensure social mobility and, as with the NTER, to “overcome poverty, conflict and poorly functioning political systems” (Altman & Hinkson, 2010: 188; Ch2). The FFHP, thereby, in harbouring these assimilative ideologies, also appears to be exhibiting colonial

---

143 Although these punitive measures of withholding welfare payments did lead to an initial increase in attendance and NAPLAN results in 2009, this was not sustained (Justman & Peyton, 2014). Cowey, et al (2009) found no causal relationship between NAPLAN results and attendance. They noted a considerable number of students who scored highly on assessments but who truanted regularly (Cowey, et al, 2009). This was confirmed informally in an interview with ex-remote bilingual school teacher Kerry Gardiner (pi, 3 April 2014) who noted that some children will achieve no matter what education they receive. This could indicate that what Justman and Peyton (2014: 12) captured in their statistics was a dramatic gain in attendance of high scoring individuals, as opposed to their conclusion of “dramatic increases in measured achievement learning, gained in only one year”. This also suggests that operating here, in terms of NAPLAN results and attendance, is the failure of some students to reach a particular threshold in L1 acquisition or student resistance to identity annihilation (Cummins, 2000).
fantasmatic logic where Indigenous ‘lack’ is overcome with colonial mimicry in order to fashion the Indigenous subject into a colonial ‘ideal’ (Clarke, 2012; McConaghy, 2000; Ch2)

This construal of failure to attain educational outcomes as a consequence of Indigenous deficits reinforces, as Cox (2011: 88) contends, the concept that “change needs to come entirely from Indigenous individuals and communities”. It makes Indigenous communities accountable and responsible for solutions to problems and priorities defined by outsiders who have little cognizance of the factors and issues at hand (Walker, Porter & Marsh, 2012). Given the assimilative intention of the FFHP, this study also revealed an erosion of “the strengths and benefits of established cultures and laws” in the two communities which Cox (2011: 88) also found in Indigenous communities in relation to the NTER.

The outcomes of this research also indicate that there is little, if any, understanding in current policy practice of the symbolic or practical role that a L1 has in relation to academic and behavioural outcomes for students in remote Indigenous communities, in addition to identity, well-being and intergenerational socialisation. There is little understanding of, or desire to understand, the positive consequences of L1 and L2 acquisition in a bilingual education program that treats a dominant and non-dominant language equivalently in the cognitive tasks of schooling. The high focus on behaviourism in the FFHP policy text and discourse (indicated in the text by the need to ensure students are exposed to high levels of Standard English oral, literacy and numeracy skills in the belief this will achieve higher outcomes in SAE standardised tests, such as NAPLAN) has meant the academic and cognitive development and achievements of remote Indigenous children are being severely compromised. They are currently being offered a range of very basic English literacy programs that compromise linguistic and cognitive development in the provision of less meaningful learning experiences and less cognitively demanding teaching instruction than in a well designed ESL program, as warned by Australian linguist Watts (1982) and NT educator Freeman (2014) (but similarly supported by American research of Good, 2015 and Polikoff & Struthers, 2013). That is, the dominant ideologies present in the policy texts appear to present a deafening racialised cacophony through which evidence does not prevail.

The significance of the present study is the exposure of subtle, overt and potentially volatile and dangerous ideologies, harmful images, discourse strategies and persuasiveness in the FFHP texts
that, although underpinned by fallacy (violations of ethical and logical/rational rules as stipulated by Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 69-74; Tindale, 2007; Ch3), can “drastically sway public opinion” (Johnson, 2005: 629). These have led to new understandings of how the symbolic violence of settler colonial ‘othering’, nationalism and neoliberalism permeate discourse on Indigenous difference in IL education policy to serve and perpetuate the interests of the dominant sociolinguistic component of Australian society. These findings thus represent an exposure of the power used to control “broader social patterns of language use”, as discussed by Johnson (2005: 634). However, they can also represent a means by which to address policy failure and negative consequences.

7.2b Community Findings – content analysis and critical discourse analysis of community interviews

The 53 interviews on two communities, comprising both adults and children, revealed a very different picture from that presented by the policy text and policy discourse. The picture was shaped through categories that arose in interviews – school/department response, effects on students, government authority/control, the importance of IL and culture as outlined in both Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. It rendered a representation of governance that was oppressive, undemocratic and damaging to the local economy, academic, social and economic outcomes of students and community well-being.

This ‘picture’ presented by the communities was created using a number of frames including victimisation, injustice, inequality and hegemony.

**Extract 5.39**

I always think they’re trying to wipe [Site 1 people] out or [Site 1 people] will wipe themselves out through what whitefellas are giving them.

**Extract 6.29**

The one thing that they were really good at has been taken away from them.
Extract 6.24

This one is the last one. It’s on the last branch, the last leaf.

Community members also described the negative consequences of the FFHP and monolingual dominant education in terms of poor academic outcomes, behaviour and social dysfunction, identity, well-being and socio-economic outcomes.

Extract 5.5

The only good way for our kids to learn is from our first language. They need to read English through the first language first. Language is the key. You need to think and understand in [IL1] and you need to transfer and translate in English. They caused a lot of damage and want to make it secret.

As discussed in the community analysis chapters, the most noticeable elements about the participants’ responses were their difference from the representations and constructions in political texts. Community responses exhibited an explanatory logic with considerable complexity (entailed as they were in narrative) as opposed to the superficial logic that was often evident in the political texts (such as school attendance, rather than engagement and attendance, leading to higher academic outcomes).

Extract 5.8

Even when I was at the Mission House, here, we’d be going for breakfast and just a bit of touring on the paper and pencil and colouring and that’s all we could do.

In contrast to policy text and discourse, there was also a lack of allusion (although not completely absent) to the tenets or metaphors of globalisation in relation to education and the distinct lack of ‘othering’ in the community texts.

Extract 5.26

[language is culture and land] It’s part of the land and us. We are the land; the land is us. It’s the connection to everything else inside the culture. It’s all to do with the land, the life.
The fact that only non-Indigenous participants referred to these elements and concepts explicitly suggests that these ‘social logics’ or floating signifiers have not generally traversed across from dominant to Indigenous discourses on education (Glynos & Howard, 2007 in Clarke, 2012). This was in agreement with findings of Guenther (2015a) who notes the dominant categories that arose from discussions on the purpose of education, which have particular synergy with this study, are those related to land, language and culture, identity, belonging as well as ‘being strong in both worlds’. This differs from the neoliberal notions of socio-economic mobility and success, demonstrating a disconnection of policy aims from community needs and goals. As outlined earlier, the Indigenous community texts also did not have any of the (even reversed) social, political or fantasmatic logics outlined by Clarke (2012), hence their absence in the analysis.

Although adult members in both communities advocated the need for Western schooling and English acquisition to operate in two worlds, they also showed a clear reference to the ‘danger’ associated with IL loss in terms of identity, morals, values and well-being that occurs with monolingual English language education. They iterated the negative effects such as the inability to practice Indigenous culture and access Indigenous knowledge (important in belonging, identity, self-esteem, land management and economic development in remote areas).

**Extract 6.20**

If the kids just learn English, how are they going to sing and corroboree and all that.

**Extract 6.18**

[If you take language away] ...you’re nobody...You’ve got no identity.

In addition, they discussed the negative effect on student behaviour and academic outcomes when IL and knowledge are eroded. They viewed those without an IL as ‘lost’ which had community-wide negative repercussions such as the physical (including self-harm and suicide) and substance abuse as well as criminal behaviour.

**Extract 6.8**
Elder: Bilingual and English. Both Ways. Making the *chichi* [Children] *rama* [crazy] *Chichi rama* English way. They be rama, they be robbing anything teach English [you know like motor cars and money]

Interestingly, but perhaps not un-expectantly, guardians, parents and school council members at Site 1 – which suffered a greatly reduced IL program after the FFHP – expressed greater concern in regards to the negative academic, cognitive and well-being effects on their children. They also more frequently communicated truanting and classroom behavioural management issues and social dysfunction in their community (which appeared to accelerate when students attended distant boarding schools, although less so for those at Site 2 who developed sufficient L1 language and culture for socialisation, positive identity formation and well-being).

**Extract 5.10**

(changes in the community with change in education) I think stealing ... Bad things they do with that ... Sometime when they take our kids away, they won’t learn a thing, like (IL1). Only learn English. They get into more trouble.

This social dysfunction was also viewed as a result of policies such as the FFHP marginalising traditional Indigenous authority from positions of power to the degree they felt unable to act as role models and powerless to act in the interests of the greater community. Such policies, with a focus on Western pedagogy and curriculum and English, were felt to imbue youth with values and views antithetical to those in traditional Indigenous cultures.

**Extract 5.34**

...I think it’s a breakdown of families. This new generation now. It’s starting now. And, I think it’s also a breakdown of some of the young fellas not being interested in going back to the law and culture thing, all that. And, it maybe somewhere down the track they’ll be new agreements, no bilingual in the school...

**Extract 5.36**

The problems are things like stealing motor cars...they’re things that aren’t really taught by our people. We don’t get to do the mediation in a way that we want to. It’s taken away the rights of all this which they haven’t got.
These findings concur with the findings of de la Sablonnière, et al (2011 in Ch2) who notes social dysfunction as a consequence of the disruption of cultural transmission between Indigenous generations. It also appears to agree with research by Ochs and Schieffelin (1996) and Wilkins (2008) who discuss the greater susceptibility of youth to self-destructive conduct as a consequence of poorly developed self-regulation behaviours arising from incomplete L1 socialisation within the community. To some degree it also relates to the influence of role models in the school on attendance behaviours (where a higher ratio of Indigenous to non-Indigenous staff results in higher attendance rates) discussed by Disbrey (2014) and Guenther (2015d).144

All respondents expressed their concern in relation to the lack of community participation in the school both in terms of cultural excursions, events and lessons and the decreasing number of local professionals. In addition, they reported an increase in deficit discourse following the FFHP.

**Extract 6.28**

Parents used to go to school. [Site 2 people] used to run the school and proper qualified teachers they were. Kids now answer back to mother and father.

These consequences, in terms of behavioural and academic outcomes and policy changes that resulted in a decline in community involvement, employment at and participation in the school (in Appendix 1.2) are in line with Dickson’s (2010) report. The positive academic and behavioural effects of bilingual bicultural education and culturally appropriate pedagogy, the relationship of home language and culture to identity, teaching effectiveness, Indigenous academic achievement as well as the high expectations of students and the community involvement in the school are in agreement with research by Gardner and Mushin (2013), Malcolm (1998), Malcolm and Königsberg (2007), Malcolm and Sharifian (2002), May (2012), Schmidt (1990), Biddle (2012b), Guenther (2015a) and Maughan (2012). These views were also in accordance with other international and Australian research (Margaret Banks in NTDEET, 2005; Beresford & Gray, 144 In contrast, at a later visit in 2015, the state of affairs at the two research communities in this study was reversed when Site 1 had been experiencing a resurgence in the amount of IL education while Site 2 had lost its bilingual program due to NTDE failure to train Indigenous staff replacements and the failure to employ a teacher linguist.
Site 1 respondents also expressed concern in regard to children’s loss of their heritage language as a consequence of learning in a foreign language (monolingual English) and the acquisition of an IL and English mix or pidgin.\footnote{Contrastingly, although community respondents in this study and a report by NTDEET (2005) discussed the disappearance of some words and expressions over time, language mixing was not mentioned as a problem by interview respondents at Site 2.}

**Extract 5.33**

In this new generation now, there’s the languages being mixed up.

**Extract 5.6**

But most of our Aboriginal schools all around the Territory only have a few hours to teach. And, we know that um, that’s where our kids are breaking down the language.

The possible emergence of an English and IL mix or pidgin in the children’s language suggests a failure to acquire the L1 and Standard English sufficiently, as outlined by Cummins (2000) (in Ch2), was occurring at Site 1. This change in language at Site 1 as a consequence of monolingual English instruction is also in agreement with the central desert observations of Baarda (2008b), a study on light Warlpari (English, Kriol, Warlpari mix) by O’Shannessy (2005) in a Central Desert community, McKay (2007) and the Indigenous Canadian findings of de la Sablonnière, et al (2011) (in Ch2). That is, elevating dominant language, literacy and culture in non-dominant IL communities, leads to both the gradual loss and change in ILs and/or the emergence of non-Standard dominant language, intergenerational rupture, lack of traditional family or community authority, loss of cultural values, ethics and norms but without the acquisition of positive Western values, ethics and morals or, indeed, standard language (Ch2).

Importantly, student responses in the two communities also differed in terms of language instructional preferences and languages associated with well-being. Site 2 students had a
greater preference for English speaking teachers (27% opposed to 0%) than Site 1 and an equal sense of well-being using English and an IL (as opposed to an IL only at Site 1). Both these results indicate Site 2 students may have greater cultural tolerance of the dominant group (as opposed to a rejection of dominant culture) as a consequence of instruction in a bilingual environment where there was “collaborative relations of power” (Cummins, 2000: 43). Child respondents at Site 2 also noted “excellent” success in and understanding of lessons in L1 and early literacy abilities. Site 2 students also reported a broader range of community domains where English was used suggesting bilingual education encourages English use in a wider set of domains than monolingual dominant education.

Many of these results agree with the findings of the Little Children are Sacred NT Child Protection inquiry report (Anderson & Wild, 2007) that discussed the failure syndrome – the inability to understand or retain academic knowledge – that arises with being taught in a foreign language. They also show a correlation with earlier NT bilingual studies (Devlin, 1995; Gale, et al, 1981; McKay, 1996; Murtagh, 1982) as well as research on IL programs throughout Australia by Purdie, et al (2008) and Chandler, Haid, Jones, Lowe and Munro (2008) and American meta-analyses by Greene (1998) and Rolstad, Mahoney and Glass (2005) and a pan-African study by Alidou, et al (2006) that concluded the longer education was in a L1, the higher academic results and that maintenance bilingual programs were superior to transitional bilingual programs but even minimal teaching and literacy learning in L1 resulted in significantly higher results in standardised language tests. The results from these studies and this study, thereby, suggest a stronger sense of Indigenous identity, self-esteem and IL socialisation, higher academic and L2 outcomes and well-being for Indigenous students occurs in bilingual (maintenance) programs.

These findings at Site 2 perhaps represent the most unexpected results given their intensity. Despite the much reduced Indigenous staffing levels and reduced community involvement in both schools in addition to the effects of such policies as the NTER, the continuation of a relatively strong bilingual program at Site 2 school was found to have a profound positive effect on student outcomes and community resilience.

146 However, this diverges from the Māori immersion education research which suggests no negative cognitive effects occur with the immersion in Māori of Indigenous students where English is a L1 (May, Hill, Tiakiwai, 2006).
The differences between the two sites was possibly related to the historically higher levels of Indigenous oral and literacy language education at Site 2 that allowed students to reach critical levels of L1 education for positive L2 acquisition (see Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2000; Devlin, 1995; McGrath, 1974; McKay, 1996, 2007 in Ch2). It was also possibly related to the fact that L2 literacy was delayed until Year 4 at Site 2 (in agreement with studies by Collier, 1989; Ramirez, et al, 1991; Thomas & Collier, 2002 in May, 2008; Wilig, 1985, 1987 in May, 2008; in Ch2).

These outcomes also indicate that a strong bicultural bilingual (culturally responsive pedagogy) educational program was in operation at Site 2 school that placed IL, place and culture in a centric position (Christie, 2006a; Disbrey, 2014). The flow-on effect of these factors was the enactment of a situated “world of sense” for students (McCarty, Nicholas & Wyman, 2012: 51). It also enhanced family and community cohesion and an elevated status of IL and culture with consequential enhanced well-being and identity in both worlds and in both English and ILs (Marmion, Obata & Troy, 2014; Purdie, et al, 2008; Wilkins, 2008 in Ch2).

In terms of correspondence between the two communities, of particular note in the community text analysis was the degree of similarity in issues of governance raised in both communities in addition to how they were framed and represented. Both communities, for instance, reported experiencing government policies and management that reduced resources, self-determination and socio-economic participation (including community authority) and were erratic and unpredictable.

This erraticism has been discussed by Moore (2001: 96) as a consequence of the “eternal optimism” in policy that a realm of society can always be better managed and programmed. In this regard, Moore (2001) stated;

Policies and programs continually proliferate, justified by the supposed or actual failure of existing versions and the consequent need ‘to devise or propose programs that would work better’ in delivering whatever is deemed as desirable (Miller and Rose, 1993: 78). In this process of proliferation, whether existing programs are indeed deficient (from anyone’s point of view)

147 That is, the values and authority of the community remain intact with lower self-destructive, suicidal behaviours and consequential social dysfunction (see Hallett, Chandler and Lalonde, 2007: 394 in Ch2).
is beside the point. The warrant for proliferation lies in representing them as so (Moore, 2001: 96-97).

This community view of policy failings also appears to mirror the findings in other studies on remote education systems. Guenther (2015b) suggests such policy weaknesses arise from the failure to study remote education adequately or use expert knowledge to do so, which results in policy inputs based on simple ethnocentric systems. These then have unintentional negative and unpredictable consequences that can lead to interpretation of policy as erratic, as discussed above. Guenther (2015c: 6) contends that to resolve these issues requires the use of “the knowledge and resources of those embedded within the systems to effect the kind of change that evolves or emerges”. That is, policy in these systems should be bottom up (emergent, innovative and novel and inclusive of Indigenous knowledges) as opposed to top down to engender change (Guenther, 2015b).

However, the FFHP, has been imposed from above with no consultation or consideration of Indigenous demands, needs, or indeed, perceptions of success, disadvantage or failure. This policy was formulated using “simple causal pathways that do not exist” (see Guenther, 2015b: 13). These include such presumptions that higher attendance leads to higher academic results, (which, as discussed above, do not necessarily correlate in monolingual English language schools in remote Indigenous contexts, Cowey, et al, 2009) or that English language schooling leads to economic participation in remote communities where, in remote communities, structural and institutional change and bias wrought by colonisation and contemporary policy has led to non-Indigenous ‘outsiders’ now providing the vast majority of services, so that remote Indigenous people are marginalised from most employment opportunities, even if they leave their communities to seek work (Guenther, 2013a; Simpson, 2013; Ch2).

While employment in “hybrid economies” (those affiliated with Indigenous culture and now largely associated with land management, art and cultural tourism) remains and represents the most “bouyant” and “’real’ economy in remote Aboriginal Australia”, their dependency on “culturally distinctive ways of life” and ILs results in a lack of intersection with dominant models of school education in remote areas (Altman & Hinkson, 2010:203). These developments mean, consequently, that the pathway between school and work in remote communities largely does not exist. In contrast, entering mainstream employment, which is high risk for remote
community members (Altman & Hinkson, 2010:204), requires high academic and L2 levels of proficiency which can only be achieved with long term additive bilingual programs. Thus, the limiting of access to bilingual educational opportunities would appear to impede both the educational and employment opportunities for remote Indigenous community youth within and outside of their communities. This restriction was recognised in this study by community members and experts who all advocated bilingual education and the retention of Indigenous culture and language as a strategy for employment.

Given the intention in the FFHP, as with the NTER, “to undermine the hybrid structures Aboriginal people and their collaborators have established over decades that have a greater capacity to accommodate and support difference,” (Altman & Hinkson, 2010: 205), it is little wonder that community members lived in fear of what they perceived as the next policy reprisal.

As discussed earlier, the NTER and the removal of community councils had a dominant role in this construction and representation. However, the FFHP contributed to this effect with the much reduced community interaction with the schools, the decreasing authority, reduced Indigenous curriculum based material, lack of employment and professional status of community members and lack of community development at the schools. That is, it intensified the erosion in self-determination and self-governance.

**Extract 5.12**

We had control. [Non-Indigenous] were just helping the program. [Indigenous] people are good teachers. Now I don’t go into the classroom much. I don’t know what’s going on.

The form of governance evident in the FFHP appears to conform to the reasons for government failure as outlined by Eva Cox (2014a) in her examination of the Australian National Audit Office, the Ombudsman, internal evaluations and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW, 2012) and Closing the Gap Clearinghouse documents. For the FFHP, these reasons included

- “One size fits all” (top down policy) approaches;

---

148 There are also the health factors associated with socio-economic conditions such as unemployment as discussed previously (The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015).
• lack of collaboration and external authorities imposing change and reporting requirements;
• interventions without local Indigenous community control and culturally appropriate adaptation or community development;
• failure to develop Indigenous capacity to provide services and failure to provide ongoing services (Cox, 2014a: 9-11).

This construal of poor governance in relation to the FFHP conforms to the analysis of Indigenous policy by the Productivity Commission in its round table discussion (2013) of Indigenous policy evaluation where Indigenous policy was generally noted as defective, ineffective and not achieving its aims. This is reiterated by Walker, Porter and Marsh (2012), one of whom is a World Bank consultant, in a report on governance in remote areas. They (p. 36) state that contemporary “governance arrangements are a threshold cause of policy failure in remote Australia”. This is a result of the factors discussed above – the increasing central, executive power of government to “define problems and priorities” (without the necessary contextual expertise), to “supervise, audit” and “otherwise discipline the accountability of service providers” and to lay the “responsibility for solving problems … to local communities, households and individuals” (Walker, Porter & Marsh, 2012: 39). The lack of community-led implementation of the FFHP and imputing community blame for its poor implementation would suggest these factors are operating in regards to this policy. The failure to account for socio-linguistic context in the FFHP (also noted similarly by Guenther, 2015d) leads to an onus on the use of inappropriate criteria and thresholds as well as a disproportionate focus on city based general rather than remote parochial interests which in turn results in a questioning of the viability of remote communities (Walker, Porter & Marsh, 2012).

When government-imposed and inappropriate resolutions repeatedly fail, Walker, Porter and Marsh (2012: 39) argue, this leads government to feel “compelled to mount crisis responses and to behave in ways that further undermine local capacity and legitimacy, confidence”. As such, the current system of governance has, they claimed;

...compounded the problems it was hoped that they would resolve. Failures in these modalities have both prompted and been further complicated by top-down, crisis-driven interventions (Walker, Porter & Marsh, 2012: 36).
Chaney (2013: 65) in the 2013 Productivity Commission Report in fact, describes Indigenous policy implementation as “chilling” given the ability of “bureaucrats at all levels to intervene in the lives of [particularly remote] Aboriginal people”. This comment certainly has concordance with the community responses in this study.

In line with other post-NTER policies, the severe limitation of self-empowerment, human rights, esteem and active Indigenous agency in the FFHP also appears to suggest a child-like subjectivity of remote Indigenous community members and a paternalistic form of governance as outlined by Kelada (2008: 5), with strategies and technologies of “1) observation/surveillance, 2) management and control, 3) lack of consultation” that exhibits elements of Foucault’s (1977) panopticism – or penultimate and automatic functioning of power through surveillance.

7.3 Implications of and Recommendations arising from this Research

The analysis of both the policy text and policy discourse (Ch4) and the Aboriginal community responses (Ch4, Ch5 and Ch6) demonstrate that neoliberalism as a contrivance of the modern nation-state and postcolonialism are indeed at play in the FFHP and that it has had deleterious effects on those it targeted. CDA analysis of the policy text and policy discourse revealed repeated framings of Aboriginal people and languages that showed the ideologies, argumentation and grammar, of the bilingual debate as one not grounded in the real world or on the premise of what is just and right but based on hierarchy, domination and paternalism.

This demonstrates two important implications – implications of the research itself, including its limitations, and implications for policy creation. I will deal with the research implications first.

7.3a Research Implications

This study has combined ethnography, case study, CA and CDA, achieving a heightened socio-historical analysis of Indigenous and IL policy in Australia in both its theoretical application and scope. The methodology used and empirical findings in the research link community testimonies and the policy discourse to the disparate integrated elements of Indigenous identity, bilingual
education, Indigenous well-being, the nation-state, neoliberalism and postcoloniality at an elevated and highly detailed level.

Perhaps the most important implication of this is what has been revealed by the methodological approach and the repercussions of these findings. CDA showed that the political institutional discourse in the language education policy texts was replete with recurring deficit discourse, moral legitimization, metaphors of war, grammar of ‘truth’, neoliberal signifiers and metaphors of procession such as ‘increasing standards’ and market ‘equity’. These created texts that appear to be highly persuasive in mainstream settings. They not only confine and constrain the bilingual debate and those engaged in it but, most importantly, lack evidential support. That is, the evidential basis of much of the policy text and discourse when tested against academic research constituted inaccuracies, misrepresentations and falsehoods.

Strategies that denoted Indigenous deficit and White normativity, showed a strong postcolonial construction of IL, culture and people as deficient and ‘outsiders’. Perhaps more insidiously, these strategies revealed a consistent emergence of covert racism that has led to sound and effective policy practice being overturned and the rights of Indigenous people being undermined. That is, the ideologies and discourse strategies represent a danger to both Indigenous people and the integrity of the nation-state (more on this below; see also May, 2012).

However, the degree of detail in the analysis as a consequence of the methodological strategies and methodological approach applied means this study has also allowed an intense examination of how a particular policy has been “recontextualised in particular contexts, how such recontextualisation is related to more widely circulating policy”, and how agents have appropriated such policy in both “creative and unpredictable ways” as outlined by Johnson (2011: 267, 269). It, thus, provides a template for policy analysis that can be used across Indigenous policy platforms and, indeed, mechanisms and strategies to enact policy change.

Another component of the present research that is not common in Australian Indigenous policy or IL policy studies is the primacy and centricity allocated to remote Indigenous voices and communities. This focus on the remote Indigenous ‘place’, as advocated by Christie (2006a),
McCarty, Nicholas and Wyman (2012), makes this language policy research unique. This has allowed the subjectivity of remote Indigenous people to be highlighted as respected and knowledgeable participants and has given “voice to things that are often unknown” as argued by Smith (1999: 3) – a knowledgable examination of which is absolutely integral for more effective future Indigenous policy development. This research has thus formed a much clearer account of the active and knowledgeable Indigenous agents who continue to resist colonial discourse and who act on this resistance to ensure intergenerational continuity of culture, language and Indigenous resilience, exposing colonial discourse as erroneous and damaging.

The centrality of Indigenous voices was achieved through the use of newly emerging Indigenous methodological tools. The consequence of this methodology is an original contribution to a field that aims to decolonise research. To some degree, this is already inherent in the discourse critiques of Reisigl and Wodak (2001) which articulate power differentials and hegemony. However, as noted in Ch3, it also requires ensuring Indigenous views remain central to the research and interpretations of findings arising from the research process. This was achieved through Indigenous participatory research methods such as community agency in data collection and analysis (see Guenther, et al, 2014; Rigney 1999 in Henry, et al, 2008 and Ch3).

In this way, Indigenous insights give voice to the most effective system of education in remote regions – additive bilingual (culturally responsive) education. Community interviews (supported by other empirical research – Ch2 and Appendix 1.2) showed that where a L1 is the sole or major conduit for early primary curriculum delivery and literacy development and is accompanied by effective ESL programs in bilingual schools, remote Indigenous students perform better academically in higher grades with equal English and IL instruction, develop higher English literacy and numeracy abilities, perform substantially better on standardised tests and engage in English communication in more domains and more frequently. Moreover, personal and social development and degree of self-worth are far more pronounced in bilingual students resulting in enhanced resilience, well-being, socio-economic success (including increased employment) and a greater willingness to interact in foreign cultural domains and so participate in the mainstream with an ‘English’ identity.

By identifying the importance of IL to culture, knowledge, identity, and belonging through community interviews, this research also divulges the elements that operate in remote
education and community systems. These are all ingredients required to generate a deep understanding of how remote complex systems interact given how different these paradigms are from mainstream operation. In so doing, this study can provide indications for future strategies of successful and inclusive policy creation and implementation.

7.3b Limitations of the Study

However, being a non-Indigenous researcher also represents a limitation of this research. Despite the inter-cultural capabilities of the researcher as discussed in Ch1 and the close association of the researcher to Indigenous members of remote communities in Central Australia and Alice Springs, the lack of Indigeneity will always limit the analysis in the study. This is particularly so in relation to how IL relates to Indigenous knowledges and culture. For this reason, I cannot claim the authority to act on behalf of communities involved in this study and cannot theorise in particular on IL ontology. However, this is compensated to a degree by the ability of the researcher to ‘listen’ to Indigenous concerns, the trust won from community members through years of work in the location, family ties and following the correct cultural protocols during the research. These have ameliorated inadequacies associated with being non-Indigenous. Another mitigating factor was the sophisticated articulation of concerns expressed by the remote Indigenous respondents themselves. It is also compensated with the deference given to participants in terms of interpretation and understanding as a consequence of the methodology. Even so, these are areas that can and, in fact, are being further investigated by Indigenous researchers.149

As with much Indigenous research, given the scant investigation into Indigenous views and beliefs, validation of the findings and analysis will occur over time with case studies in other communities with other policies while considerable information was obtained from the investigation in the two communities, there are many more communities with unique configurations of sociocultural, linguistic and economic conditions. Comparative investigations at these sights would paint a broader picture of Indigenous policy effects that could enhance both policy development and policy outcomes. The present study is largely qualitative and could have been enhanced with wider access to department resources and locations (such as the

149 Such as ANU PhD candidate and Lajamanu teacher, Steven Jampijinpa Patrick.
schools themselves and NT Department of Education student performance data). The
development and implementation of suitable assessment instruments and analysis of the results
for IL and SAE L2 learning could in future provide additional sources of research interest that
could augment the findings of this study as would a deeper investigation of the qualitative
student findings related to language education and use (in terms of the effects of bilingual
education on positive identity formation in either an IL or SAE and the better use of English
across more domains).

### 7.3c Policy Implications

Despite these limitations, this research clearly confirms that changing language and culture is
not comparable to changing clothes (May, 2012), and will, in fact, invariably lead to lowered
academic, socio-economic and well-being outcomes. May (2012) has argued that language and
cultural change are painful processes that can reduce societal participation and generate social
dysfunction in affected communities. The findings of this present study corroborate May's
argument. The disruption of language and socialisation development in childhood through
assimilative educational practice and policies, thereby, represents a damaging, costly and
ineffective ‘remedy’ to eradicate difference that alienates and marginalises those it targets. It
also contradicts what Guenther (2015d) has established as the remote Indigenous criteria for
the student outcomes of successful remote schools which includes;

- economic participation and wealth;
- literacy and numeracy skills;
- capacity to think;
- individual agency and control
- democratic participation and
- a sense of belonging (Guenther, 2015d).

These criteria relate to the system wide elements of success that include parental and
community involvement and engagement in the school, relationships between teachers, the use
of local language teachers, ESL and multilingual teaching methods (Guenther, 2015d). Missing
in Guenther’s list is the element most essential for remote Indigenous student success as shown
by this study – the need for full bilingual proficiency to support academic success.
Indeed, the failure to acknowledge this final element above leads to a systematic failure to incorporate difference. This is dangerous for the nation-state given the fact that, as May (2012) explains:

... national and ethnic minority groups are increasingly unwilling to settle for the degree of marginalisation and cultural and language evisceration which have historically characterised their incorporation into modern nation-states (May, 2012: 329)

This resistance to language and cultural evisceration has its foundation in “the intervention of postcolonial or black critique ... aimed at transforming the conditions of enunciation at the level of the sign”, Bhabha (2004: 354) claimed. It is this oppositionality that provides the means to voice or ‘signify’ other positionalities. This could extend and re-imagine the nation-state so that the state transforms by incorporating greater cultural and linguistic difference (May, 2012). In so doing, it reduces the instance of ‘resistance identities’, costs to minority groups (particularly Indigenous ones as evidenced in this study) and “mayhem in the modern world” (May, 2012: 324).

This extension of positionalities could possibly be achieved with community empowerment and involvement.

7.3d Recommendation

7.3d1 Recommendation 1 - Reinstatement of bilingual education

The major recommendation of this research is to re-establish bilingual education, especially additive bilingual/ bidialectal and culturally responsive education with integral ESL programs. This combination has been proven to enhance the outcomes of Indigenous students in all remote Indigenous communities. However, in line with BIITE researchers (Lee, et al, 2014), this would involve language maintenance and revitalisation programs as opposed to transitional programs to ensure bilingual programs remained additive and promoted sufficient use of a student’s linguistic skills and competency in a L1. This has to be accompanied by systematic changes that include an officially sanctioned IL policy (as opposed to the policy vacuum that has
existed since 2008) in addition to the offering of ILs at all stages of the curriculum. For maximum effective delivery such programming must be accompanied by a regional response and community leadership. This will ensure the high degree of community collaboration, control and capacity building required to ensure on-going Indigenous service provision as well as culturally and linguistically appropriate implementation of policy as outlined by Cox (2014a). A fair accountability mechanism for schools that takes into account the linguistic profile of multilingual students (as discussed by Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009a in Ch2) and their situated context (as outlined by Guenther, 2013b, and Wigglesworth, Simpson and Loakes, 2011 in Ch2) is also needed.

Of great importance is the need to create IL teaching degrees for remote Indigenous students. BIITE currently has no NT remote Indigenous students in its teaching degree due to the SAE requirements, its failure to provide sufficient face-to-face workshops and on-site tuition and the fact that it delivers a mainstream Charles Darwin University degree which does not cater to the needs, aspirations, desires and socio-economic prospects of remote community members. A new degree model should be created that accommodates the language and cultural strengths and interests of remote teacher education students, enhances the linguistic analysis and knowledge of these students and provides the possibility of assessments in L1, in the same vein as current Māori tertiary systems in New Zealand. It should also have multiple exit points that could lead to paraprofessional qualifications and status.

7.3d2 Recommendation 2 - Indigenous evaluation

Malezer (2013) and Helen Moewaka Barnes (2013) contend that Indigenous empowerment can also be achieved through Indigenous specific evaluations of policies and programs and participatory evaluations.

Batchelor researchers (Lee et al, 2014) advocated for something similar which they termed a Literacy Instructor Course. This has resulted in a number of new vocational education and training certificates and diplomas in Education Support in addition to an Advanced Diploma of Education. While these qualifications go towards advanced standing in the teaching degree program, there is currently no overlap with teaching degree subjects and no pathway to higher education programs creating both an educational, professional and leadership ceiling for remote Indigenous education staff. What I am proposing is an Indigenous language teaching degree that has the same status as a tertiary teaching degree in non-Standard English contexts that not only addresses the linguistic and cultural skills of its students but ensures graduates remain on par monetarily and professionally with their qualified teaching colleagues.
In New Zealand, Indigenous evaluations are characterised by collaboration. Such evaluations in New Zealand have the following characteristics, according to Moewaka Barnes (2013);

- They are controlled and owned by Māori.
- They are conducted for the benefit of Māori (although it may benefit others).
- They are carried out within a Māori world view, which is likely to question the dominant culture and norms.
- They aim to make a positive difference for Māori (Moewaka Barnes 2013; Smith, 1999).

Such evaluations in Australia and especially in the NT could overcome the domination of "government’s value judgments about the well-being and aspirations" of Indigenous people that leads to the imposition of policies and practices completely unsuitable for, and even detrimental to, Indigenous development (Malezer, 2013: 75). Indigenous evaluation could extend to Indigenous control and evaluation of alternative language and numeracy programs and assessment instruments, as recommended by BIITE researches (Lee at al, 2014), that could reliably assess dominant and IL skills of Indigenous learners across various abilities (listening, speaking, reading and writing), dimensions (reception and production) and social domains (as outlined by Baker, 2011 in Ch2). This may allow the routine monitoring of language development which does not appear to be occurring in remote NT contexts (Lee at al, 2014).

7.3d3 Recommendation 3 - Indigenous control and self-government

However, I would also argue that we are currently in a moment where the past has been reinscribed in the logics of a neoliberal and settler-colonial present. In this present situation, structural inequality has been rendered into cultural deficit and “rampant individualism” has replaced the checks and balances of a more just state (Darder, 2012: 413). This has allowed overt institutional control by the ruling class, a lack of plurality and the demonising of difference (Darder, 2012).

Indigenous researcher, Larissa Behrendt (2000), suggested that this is also a consequence of the fact that Indigenous rights to both native title and self-government (which includes language and education) are not articulated in the Australian Constitution, as they are in other settler colonial states such as Canada. National Congress of Australia’s First People co-chair, Les Malezer (2013) believes it is also a consequence of the fact that international human rights and
much legislation that advocate language and cultural rights are valued differently by the two cultures. They have been classified and interpreted by the legislature as ‘special measures’ (measures that result in improvements) as opposed to ‘concrete’ measures (measures that ensure the “full enjoyment of human rights”) when they are in fact the latter (Malezer, 2013). Consequently, these laws and human rights goals are often regarded as aspirational as opposed to mandatory (Malezer, 2013: 76). These rights are also not stated in a treaty as in New Zealand (May, 2012). This then leaves the “Legislature to protect the rights of Australians” with the constitutional amendment of the 1967 Referendum ensuring the Federal Parliament has responsibility for “the protection of the rights of Indigenous Australians” (Behrendt, 2000: i). However, Behrendt (2000) noted, with some insight given the suspension of human rights with the NTER in 2007, that;

> Government policies appear to have so far been ineffective at changing socioeconomic disparities and Indigenous rights remain vulnerable to legislative erosion or extinguishment (Behrendt, 2000: ii)

As a consequence of these developments, alternative voices, particularly indigenous ones, have been silenced in the public domain. This lack of agency and voice means that Indigenous participation in education and language education policy and policy evaluation, and thereby Indigenous autonomy, have been compromised to the degree that equality, social justice and human rights as political ideals have been so undermined they cannot be realised (Sen, 2004). This has not only led to a failure to accord minority language rights but means Indigenous policy creation and implementation generally cannot possibly achieve its goals.

However, Zuckermann, Shakuto-Neoh, Giovanni Matteo (2014) believe that the pursuit of native title compensation claims in terms of language issues would result in sufficient funds for successful language maintenance and revival programs and projects. Indigenous activist Vincent Forrester (pi, 14 April 2014), on the other hand, argues that the only possible solution to this dilemma of language and culture recognition in a democracy – given the fact that majority language speakers remain unmoved, uninformed or unconvinced about the positive impacts that underpin minority language claims – would be recognition of Indigenous sovereignty or the creation and implementation of a treaty. This is the agreement that Indigenous communities in Canada have attained where there is an interdependence between mainstream and Indigenous groups that allows Indigenous communities to co-ordinate and draw on the resources of larger
state enterprises and to have self-rule and jurisdictions over those issues regarded as priorities (Moore, 2002). This would require a third tier of government in which Indigenous people are self-governing (Moore, 2002) but would differ from previous incarnations (such as the ATSIC) in terms of the level of financial and policy control.

Reilly (2006) believes Indigenous governance (but no official institutions of self-government) and legal pluralism (such as in the different tiers of government responsible for different policy areas) are already a constitutional reality in Australia. However, he does concede constitutional change would “ensure Indigenous governance is properly accounted for in government law and policy” (Reilly, 2006: 404). One, some or all of these measures, thereby, may ensure self-governance for Indigenous people and, thereby, the recognition of a separate Indigenous political body with which the nation-state could negotiate (Gover, 2015). The creation of such an Indigenous political body could represent a means to halt continuing transgressions against Indigenous rights and agency and secure the sustainability of language and cultural rights to improve Indigenous social and economic conditions (Gover, 2015).

7.4 Concluding Remarks

This research has explored ethnographically an Australian IL policy, the FFHP, in an attempt to illuminate the elements and effects of judgments, evaluations and ideologies related to ILs and Indigenous people common in contemporary IL policy. It offers a disturbing insight as to how past colonial legacy has reconfigured, returning as a contemporary neoliberal settler colonial permutation of classical colonial linguistic strategies and realisations in the ‘ideological space’ of the policy. As I have argued above, Australia is currently in an historical moment of “‘profound deformation’ of the dominant culture” to the degree where Indigenous voices are not being heard amidst cacophonous proclamations of dominant superiority and tyranny (Bhabha, 2004: 362). This research has usurped this positioning so that the policy targets can render their lived experience of negative socio-economic and academic consequences of government policy failings, the ‘implementational space’ in which they operate, and supply Indigenous solutions. The solution not only involves a recognition of the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Australian nation-state in order to ensure its continuation, but self-governance by Indigenous populations to ensure the institution and continuation of equal rights and social justice to safeguard the perpetuation of Indigenous language and cultural practice.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1.1 – NT Bilingual History – Schools and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Angurugu (Groote Island)</td>
<td>Anindilyakwa</td>
<td>Ceased (year?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>Pitjantjatjara</td>
<td>Two Way – 2000s Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermannsburg</td>
<td>Arrernte</td>
<td>Ceased (year?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milingimbi</td>
<td>Gupapuyngu</td>
<td>Two way - 2000s Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warruwi, Goulburn Is.</td>
<td>Maung</td>
<td>Ceased (year?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oenpelli (Gurbalanya)</td>
<td>Kunwinjku</td>
<td>Ceased - Lasted 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherdson College, Galiwin'ku</td>
<td>Djambarrpuynugu</td>
<td>Two Way 2000s Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Therese's (now Murrupurtiyanu)</td>
<td>Bathurst Island - Tiwi</td>
<td>Originally Gupapuyngu Ceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yayayai (Papunya outstation)</td>
<td>Pintupi-Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased Moved to Papunya after 2 years Formerly Gumatj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yirrkala</td>
<td>Dhuwaya &amp; dialects</td>
<td>Two Way – 200s Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Warlpiri</td>
<td>Two Way – 2000s Ceased 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Pularumpi (formerly Garden Point)</td>
<td>Tiwi</td>
<td>Lasted 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Barunga (formerly Bamyili)</td>
<td>Kriol</td>
<td>Ceased in 90s (lasted approximately 16 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haasts Bluff</td>
<td>Pintupi-Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased in 90s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbulwar</td>
<td>Nunggubuyu</td>
<td>Ceased but re-established 1996 Two Way – 2000s Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wadeye (Our Lady of the Sacred Heart)</td>
<td>Murrinhpatha</td>
<td>Lasted 4 years then recommenced in 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Umbakumba</td>
<td>Anindilyakwa</td>
<td>Ceased - Lasted approx. 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Warlpiri</td>
<td>Two Way – 2000s Ceased 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Docker River</td>
<td>Pitjantjatjara</td>
<td>Ceased in 90s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Bilingual accreditation programs begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>M'Bunghara Homeland Centre</td>
<td>Pintupi/ Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased in the 1990s (Lasted approx. 9 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Waityawanu</td>
<td>Pintupi/ Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lajamanu (formerly Hooker Creek)</td>
<td>Warlpiri</td>
<td>Established as a result of agitation Two Way – 2000s Ceased 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Shift in focus to English reading and writing and mathematics competencies. Shift from language and cultural maintenance for Identity and well-being (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walungurru (Kintore)</td>
<td>Pintupi/ Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased in 90s Became an official independent Aboriginal school with a bilingual program in four language varieties after having operated as a 'de facto' program for several years before that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yipirinya</td>
<td>Eastern Arrernte Pitjantjatjara Warlpiri Western Arrernte</td>
<td>Bilingual until the 1990s Currently language teaching but not bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff reductions and a decline in funding support for programs began to deeply affect operations in bilingual schools from around 1984 onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Pintupi-Luritja</td>
<td>Established as a result of Agitation Closed 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyrippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two Way – 2000s Closed 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Expansion of bilingual education programs was capped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Mt Liebig</td>
<td>Pintupi-Luritja</td>
<td>Ceased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Ltyentye Aputre (Santa Teresa)</td>
<td>Eastern Arrernte</td>
<td>Established as a result of local initiative Ceased (year?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the late 1990s there was a decline in the number of trained Indigenous teachers in schools generally, and in the number of teachers proficient in their traditional languages. A major reason for this was a reduction in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The Country Liberal Party made a decision to &quot;...progressively withdraw the Bilingual Education program, allowing schools to share in the savings and better resource the English language programs.&quot; The CLP Treasurer (Mike Reid) and Minister for Education (Peter Adamson) announced in the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly that bilingual education programs would be phased out in favour of the &quot;further development of ESL programs.&quot; Three reasons were provided; Firstly, Aboriginal people were overwhelmingly concerned about the operation of the bilingual program. Secondly, it was claimed that students in bilingual programs were not performing as well as their peers. The third reason for the decision was that the government wanted to trim the education budget. The move resulted in communities, teachers, linguists and educators rallying in defence of bilingual education, and a petition to Parliament with over 3,000 signatures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Following pressure from communities and the Bilingual lobby, the NT government commissioned the &quot;Learning Lessons&quot; review (co-authored by Bob Collins and Tess Lea, 1999). Its terms were to look into the delivery of education to Indigenous students in the NT. The Collins review noted strong community support for bilingual education and gave qualified support to continuing it - albeit with the name change to 'Two Way' learning. The policy decision reached was that: with 'Two Way' learning, local languages are used primarily as a means of teaching English literacy. A key difference is more thorough tracking of student attendance and progress. By the late 1990s the program Advancing Indigenous Literacy through Intervention for Hearing Disabilities had begun to operate in six schools in conjunction with the Menzies School of Health Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The report &quot;State of ILS in Australia - 2001&quot; refers to the NT's Two Way Learning Program as having 'marginal' status. While the practice of schools did not change with the program name change, it is interesting to note that from 1998 to 2000 the number of government schools offering a bilingual education program reduced from sixteen to twelve schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>The Ramsey report (DEET and Ramsey 2003) entitled The ILS and Culture in NT Schools Review laid the way to dismantling bilingual education programs in the Northern Territory. It challenged the educational reasons for supporting them on the grounds of reported concerns by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people about children's abilities to read and write in SAE, and doubts about the value of learning to read and write in traditional languages. It raised the question of whether the schools should play a role in helping Indigenous peoples maintain languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The ILS and Culture in NT Schools - 2004-05 report (authored by Margaret Banks) recommended two models of bilingual education: the 'staircase' model and the dual early literacy model (or the '50/50' model). Both models include the teaching of oracy and literacy in English and the IL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Syd Stirling, Minister for Education, announced in NT parliament that bilingual education was back on the government's agenda because it was recognised to be &quot;an important teaching methodology&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The NT Indigenous Education Strategic Plan 2006-2009, gave new assurances for the next five-year period for continuation of bilingual training opportunities at the Batchelor Institute for Indigenous Tertiary Education (BIITE), the main institution training Indigenous teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Australian Government announced the intervention - a 'national emergency response to protect Aboriginal children in the Northern Territory' from sexual abuse and family violence. First NAPLAN results released

The then Minister for Education and Training, Marion Scrymgour, announced that all schooling in Northern Territory schools was to be conducted in English only for the first four hours of every school day (Memorandum 2008/2527).

The reason for this policy shift was said to be the poor comparative performance of remote NT students on the national skills tests in 2008, particularly the scores obtained by students in schools with bilingual programs.

DET’s draft Compulsory teaching in English for the first four hours of each school day policy exempted some preschoolers from the four hours of English requirement (November 3). A Data on bilingual schools document was tabled in parliament (November 26) to justify the Government’s abrupt policy change (Scrymgour, 2008).

The Compulsory teaching in English for the first four hours of each school day policy was introduced (NT DET, 2008c). No exemptions were included.

The replacement policy (Literacy for Both Worlds) was withdrawn (January 13). The Compulsory teaching in English for the first four hours of each school day policy was reinstated, unchanged (January 14).

Education and Training Minister Chris Burns released a draft Literacy Framework for Students learning English as an Additional Language on August 31 and the Literacy and Numeracy Improvement policy in August 30 (2011)

Framework for Learning English as an Additional Language introduced 4 June. This keeps the focus remaining on English language oral and literacy acquisition but does make note of the EAL status of remote children and the assistant of Indigenous teachers in L1 oral instruction and interpretation.


Although including well-being, community engagement, Indigenous professional development and greater autonomy for schools, there is still a strong focus on English literacy and numeracy with no mention of bilingual education and/or developing a child’s linguistic L1 skills.

(Source: Taken and adapted from Table 1, Devlin 2009a: 5; Devlin, 2011a: 263-264; Chronology: The Bilingual Education Policy in the Northern Territory, Four Corners, 2009)
Appendix 1.2 NT Indigenous Bilingual Education

Using existing published accounts of NT bilingual education provision (such as policy documents, research literature and historical overviews) as well as interview data from language experts gathered as part of this research (face-to-face, telephone interviews and email correspondence), this appendix outlines the development of Indigenous bilingual education in the NT and at the two specific research sites from the beginning of its implementation to contemporary configurations. By providing such a rich documentation of the views of those often overlooked or marginalised, it contextualises the debate on bilingual education in terms of what beliefs and values are inherent in the FFHP and its effects on the communities themselves. It also aims to examine the history of bilingual education in the NT with a deeper socio-historical lens.

The appendix initially discusses the dominant models of bilingual education that developed in the NT. It then addresses NT bilingual history drawing on both published research and data from research participants (some named and some de-identified) collected through interviews and personal communication. In so doing, it traces the development of bilingual education policy, its impact on schools and critiques the bilingual programs themselves. However, it also aims to disclose the positive pluralist achievements of the past in terms of an emerging Aboriginal curricula, pedagogy, professionalization and economy in public education that led to high socio-economic, academic and well-being returns.

Bilingual Education Models in the Northern Territory

The two bilingual programs implemented in NT schools were the 50: 50 vernacular and SAE oracy and literacy and the *Step Program* or ‘stair case models’ of bilingual education (Devlin, 2009a). The *Step Program* shifts from 95: 5 blend of vernacular oracy and literacy and English oracy to 20: 80 vernacular and SAE oracy and literacy by Year 7 (Collins, 1999). The vast majority of schools adopted the *Step Program* (Devlin, 2009a), described by Harris and Jones (1991: 30) as “a biliteracy model of bilingual education”.

383
Socio-Historical Context

Indigenous bilingual education commenced in NT public schools in 1973 with the election of the Whitlam Labor Federal Government on the advice of Kim Beazley, a later Federal leader of the opposition (Devlin, 2009a; Hoogenraad, 2001). This was a time of great community and professional influence on language policy that culminated in the 1987 National Policy on Languages (Ch2; Lo Bianco, 1987, 2001b). According to Simpson, Caffery and McConvell (2009: 9), the original policy focus was that of helping “each child to believe in himself and be proud of his heritage by the regular use of the Aboriginal language in school by learning about Aboriginal culture”. This meant that schools, according to NT Association for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages President Leonard Freeman (2014: 4), could “maintain first language programs through the grades as something that was valuable in itself. It was not conditional on producing better results than English-only schools”.

Hierarchy of Languages

Appendix 1.1 outlines the historical evolution of the approximately 30 bilingual schools since their inception. Hoogenraad (2001) attributed the paucity of public bilingual schools to the need to apply for bilingual status from the school principal and the Education Department. He stated that if the principal was “unwilling … then it was unlikely to happen and totally unlikely to succeed” (Hoogenraad, 2001: 131). Christine Nicholls, (pi, January 10, 2014) a former principal of Lajamanu bilingual school, added that there was frequently high resistance to bilingual programs by principals and teaching staff, a lack of support by the department for the programs, advocates for bilingual education were demonised and the policy and programs were instigated by a “largely discredited (Federal) Government” that had been superseded quite early

---

151 In 2010, in the NT, there were approximately 300 pre-school, primary and secondary educational institutions and of these, 95 were schools with 85% or higher enrolment of Indigenous students on. Of these, 85% had 100% Indigenous enrolment (Lee et al, 2014; NTDE, 2015). Exact figures of the number of bilingual schools is problematic due to poor department records in addition to some schools being classified bilingual when they only offered part-time IL programs.

152 This was corroborated by both Batchelor researcher Robyn Ober (pc, 22 June 2015) and previous Lajamanu Principal, Christine Nicholls (pi, January 10, 2014). Nicholls recalled her start at Lajamanu School in 1981 where she was to set up the bilingual education program there with no resources except her salary after being told by a department official that “we don’t really support it”. The program she implemented was also unsupported and heavily criticised by the principal and other staff.
on in NT bilingual history by governments less sympathetic to bilingual programs.153 The pattern then, of IL education in a bilingual system, appears to be following that identified by Ruiz (1984) of widespread non-compliance, despite the implied right for language in bilingual policy.

The Implementation of the Step and 50: 50 programs – at the beginning

The implementation of bilingual education programs in schools depended heavily on the work of Indigenous teachers who, although initially largely untrained, because of their Indigenous cultural and language knowledge were generally far more effective than the non-Indigenous often neophyte teachers (Kerry Gardiner, pi, 3 April 2014; Christine Nicholls, pi, January 10, 2014; non-Indigenous ex-teacher, pi, 13 November 2013). This point was reiterated by Gunbalanya teacher, Bulliwana who noted:

Balanda [non-Indigenous] teachers might not have any ideas about working with bininj children. They might not know the language, culture, customs and law (Bulliwana, in Bulliwana, Frawley & Gurnarradj, 2002: 5)

Successful programs also required the rare quality in the NT of highly experienced and qualified ESL teachers for successful English language acquisition.154 In addition, bilingual programs generally involved the work of linguists initially employed by church missions and affiliated organisations such as the Summer Institute of Linguistics (McGrath, 1974). Their role was to give technical linguistic advice, prepare Indigenous literacy resources and train Indigenous teachers, arrange IL classes for non-Aboriginal staff and edit, print and publish Aboriginal language publications (McGrath, 1974). Linguists were later employed by the department as teacher linguistics (“curriculum developers”), literacy production supervisors (“printers”) in...
schools and co-ordinated Aboriginal literacy workers (“writers and artists”) (Harris & Jones, 1991: 31). The proportion of such positions fluctuated with the passage of time but generally there were more Aboriginal literacy workers and teacher linguists than professional linguists, literacy production workers and department office staff. Over time, this was compounded by a reduction of funding allocated to the production of teaching materials (Harris & Jones, 1991). However, a successful program was still contingent on the support of the principal and school leadership.

Dignifying Aboriginal Involvement – at the beginning

There was early “common support” for the bilingual programs, “seen as the first real recognition by [Federal] Government of the value of IL, culture and law,” according to ex-NT Senator Bob Collins (1999: 121) in an Indigenous education review. The bilingual programs provided “a significant means of first language maintenance” for children in addition to a far more involved role for Indigenous people in the schools (McKay, 2011: 312). This was both in terms of paid employment at the schools as well as interaction with elders in the development of Aboriginal pedagogy, resources, curriculum and Aboriginal identity at the school (Disbray, 2014). Linguist Stephen Harris noted in 1999:

When the Bilingual Program began in 1973 Aboriginal people had menial roles in classrooms, these roles pretty much limited to cleaning blackboards and disciplining children …The Bilingual Program overnight dignified Aboriginal involvement in schools by providing roles, mainly in first language teaching and first language reader production, which White teachers couldn’t perform. White teachers became dependent, and while this meant much more work for them in some ways, most of them were excited by the tightness of the role reversal.

These new Aboriginal roles were not only educationally significant but economically significant in the sense that they ended economic dependency for the families involved. People who were sometimes on the dole or had ‘make-work’ jobs now had real jobs with real pay (Harris, 1999: 70).

This view of community empowerment in the schools was supported in a study on bilingual education at Lajamanu by Ron Watt (1993: 33) who reported strong community commitment and involvement in the program as a consequence of curriculum and pedagogy being in line with community culture and the “life of the school” not being “isolated from the community”. He
also noted how bilingual education increased the leadership roles of those who participated in the bilingual programs (Watt, 1993). This was supported by vignettes from those ‘on the ground’ such as the previous Principal of Shepherdson College, Galiwin’ku, Valerie Dhaykamalu, who wrote in 1999:

For children, it is a great joy to be able to learn in their language, as it helps them initially to grasp concepts more easily. Most kids often go home after school and proudly show off work they have done at school. Learning continues in the home because there is parental involvement in classrooms and therefore they can easily relate to what is being taught (Dhaykamalu, 1999: 68,69).

This view of empowerment became expressed in school goals that reflected community beliefs. These beliefs entailed; a prominent role of the school in IL, land and cultural education; Indigenous identity and belonging of children; strength in ‘Both Ways’ or ‘Two Ways’ in terms of Indigenous and non-Indigenous culture; as well as language education and “meaningful engagement in the world” (Guenther, 2015b: 16).

**Team Teaching – 1970s to 1990s**

One of the major features of NT bilingual programs was the team teaching approach where the non-Indigenous teacher was responsible for the English program and the Indigenous assistant teacher (who was often concurrently training, see below) was responsible for the IL section of the curriculum (Harris & Jones, 1991). This led to the professionalization of teaching staff that was unequalled in monolingual English schools where assistant teachers remained untrained either in teaching or interpreting and the non-Indigenous teacher untrained in working with an assistant teacher (Hoogenraad, 2001). However, a very close collegial relationship between the two was required for co-planning and assessment in bilingual programs. By the mid-1980s, team teaching came to incorporate a more formal tripartite system of “Learning Together, Planning Together and Teaching Together” (Disbray, 2014: 134).

155 Learning together represented school professional development sessions organised by the teacher linguist. Planning together and teaching together involved the collegial approaches to teacher planning, delivery and evaluation (Disbray, 2014).
When Indigenous teachers received training from BIITE and began to assert their authority, this led to more qualified Aboriginal personnel teaching language programs as well as challenges against the dominance of SAE (Harris & Devlin, 1997; Christine Nicholls, pi, 10 January 2014). Aboriginalisation of schools also furthered the development of community participation in schools in addition to a stronger bicultural curriculum with more relevant localised Indigenous curriculum and/or a local interpretation of the NT curriculum, largely absent in monolingual English NT schools (Veronica Dobson, pi, 6 April 2014; Kerry Gardiner, pi, 3 April 2014). According to Hoogenraad (2001), these developments gave Indigenous teachers:

...a pioneering role ... to develop new ways of teaching literacy and oral language in both the vernacular and English, more closely adapted to the children’s language abilities and learning strategies and the reality of their learning environment (Hoogenraad, 2001: 137).

It also resulted in higher behavioural and resilience outcomes in Indigenous students since the morals and values of an Aboriginal and a white community could more easily be transferred by an authoritative Indigenous teacher (Veronica Dobson, pi, 6 April 2014).

Teacher Training – 1970s to 1990s

During the 1970s the professionalization of Indigenous teaching staff was largely the responsibility of BIITE (as an annex of an Indigenous college, Kormilda, then as an NT Indigenous vocational and higher education sector provider) (BIITE, 2014). Teachers and assistant teachers were offered various teacher qualification programs. Assistant Indigenous teachers could attain one or two-year teacher assistant qualifications and teachers could complete a training course in three years (See Uibo, 1993).

By 1986, a Remote Area Teacher Education (RATE) program had developed as a decentralised degree from BIITE. It entailed the contextualisation of teaching activities in terms of local sites and experiences through an action research approach to develop Indigenous pedagogies (Harris & Devlin, 1997; Lee, et al, 2014). It, consequently, represented a highly Aboriginalised degree (Harris & Devlin, 1997). It focused heavily on the use of ‘Both Ways’ education (see definition

---

156 A more detailed account of teacher training appears in former Institute Director Veronica Arbon’s 2006 PhD thesis and Martha Kamara’s 2009 PhD thesis.
in chapter 1 and glossary) which led to the development of bicultural programs involving bush trips and food collection as well as studies in kinship. The delivery of this teacher program was effectively community based with short intensive workshops at the main Batchelor campus or annexes (Harris & Devlin, 1997).

These RATE BIITE (two year) teaching qualifications could be completed with an additional year at Deakin University (Deakin-BIITE Aboriginal Teacher Education or D-BATE) which was taken over by BIITE in 1991 (see Bat, 2010 for more information). By 2001, Hoogenraad (2001: 137) noted that BIITE trained teachers employed by NTDE represented the “largest cadre of trained Aboriginal professionals from rural communities in the NT”. Of those teaching in Central Australia by 2001, 78 percent were employed in bilingual schools, two thirds of those graduating from BIITE degrees were from bilingual schools and 80% of Aboriginal school principals were in bilingual schools (Hoogenraad, 2001). The success of both formal and informal training programs for Indigenous professional teachers led Hoogenraad (2001) to report:

This is arguably the greatest achievement of bilingual education in the NT to date, and it is the most potent mechanism for the community to exercise its responsibilities and rights to educate its children. (Hoogenraad, 2001: 137)

Program Problems – 1970s to 1990s

While NT bilingual programs demonstrated considerable success in terms of the increasing role of IL, culture and Indigenous people in schools, which translated into high student attendance, there have also been problems. Tamisari and Milimilany (2003: 4), for instance, noted that until the Aboriginalisation of schools (particularly those of Milingimbi and Yirrkala) in the late 1980s, bilingual education actually resulted in an increase in non-Indigenous teacher employment at these schools in addition to “the reinforcement and institutionalisation of their authority in managing the school, and in controlling the development of all programs.” They were, in actuality, delivering “Three Little Pigs in Gumatj” according to Marika (2000: 47). That is, they

---

157 Other programs in other states, such as Queensland’s James Cook University’s RATEP, South Australia’s Anangu Teacher Education, and the Western Australia Notre Dame program evolved from this model (Harris & Devlin, 1997).
158 The degree program later became largely campus based and the assistant teacher vocational program largely community based.
were delivering “Western concepts, skills and understandings” but through ILs (Robyn Ober, pi, 22 June 2015).

Collins (1999: 121) argued that the intense “rapid expansion” in the programs in the early years also put considerable pressure on available resources. More problematically, by 1982, according to Gale (1990: 78) the bilingual education policy changed to a program aimed at proficiency in English that “foster[ed] greater proficiency in school work”. This effectively meant bilingual programs were subverted, focusing on transition to English and were judged on English proficiency rather than L1 maintenance. This resulted in the programs being highly diluted to the degree that they became ineffective, Freeman (2014) contends. Watt (1993: 30) believed that program deterioration, in fact, began as early as 1976 when it became evident that there was an entrenched “non-committal and even antagonistic attitude by senior offices within the department towards bilingual education”. This occurred to the degree that “Advisory services had also come to a halt and senior positions within the bilingual advisory unit in Darwin remained vacant” (Watt, 1993: 30). During this time there also emerged a directive to reduce all bilingual programs to two trial transition to English programs, which never occurred but led to the loss of programs at Numbulwar, Angurugu and Oenpelli, reducing the number of programs to 16 (Watt, 1993).

The bilingual programs suffered other problems from their initial implementation that plagued them throughout their history. These included problems experienced by all remote Indigenous schools in the NT such as required absences of Indigenous teachers to attend training and the failure of the department to train sufficient numbers of Indigenous staff. Lee, et al (2014) explain that one of the largest factors in remote education delivery was the failure to provide the same ESL and EFL resources, programs and support as were being made available to refugee or immigrant students. The other concern was retention of non-Indigenous staff. According to Dhaykamalu (1999: 69): “the staff turnover is higher than anywhere else in Australia”. Christine Nicholls (pi, 10 January 2014) recalled that Lajamanu School, with a non-Indigenous staff of 10 to 11 teachers, had a turn-over of 56 teachers in two years in the early 1980s. However, such statistics have been recently disputed by Wilson (2014b) who noted that contemporaneously the average tenure for a teacher at a remote NT school is 6.84 years as opposed to 6.9 years in non-remote NT schools. Wilson (2014b) also reported that the median tenure for teachers is 2-3 years in a NT remote school and that more than a quarter of the teachers were newly qualified, which, he stated, was “not unusual” in comparison to interstate statistics. This could indicate that trends

---

159 Lee, et al (2014) maintain the other failure was to provide adequate standards, resources, monitoring and evaluation of English language programs for Indigenous students or to regularly recruit teachers with expertise in EFL and ESL (Lee, et al, 2014).
160 Christine Nicholls (pi, 10 January 2014) recalled that Lajamanu School, with a non-Indigenous staff of 10 to 11 teachers, had a turn-over of 56 teachers in two years in the early 1980s. However, such statistics have been recently disputed by Wilson (2014b) who noted that contemporaneously the average tenure for a teacher at a remote NT school is 6.84 years as opposed to 6.9 years in non-remote NT schools. Wilson (2014b) also reported that the median tenure for teachers is 2-3 years in a NT remote school and that more than a quarter of the teachers were newly qualified, which, he stated, was “not unusual” in comparison to interstate statistics. This could indicate that trends
created a huge drain as resources were diverted to recruitment, support and inservice new non-Indigenous staff since so few had even basic ESL training or, indeed, teaching experience (Freeman, 2014; Hoogenraad, 2001). This resulted in the non-Indigenous staffing of bilingual schools by those with no “training or experience to oversee the program,” who, Freeman (2014: 2) observes, were at a distinct disadvantage compared to local or non-local experienced teaching staff as a consequence of no cultural, language and community knowledge (Guenther, 2015b). This was exacerbated when insufficient numbers of Indigenous staff were recruited and trained for the L1 element of the programs. Freeman (2014: 2) contends that this, in effect, meant that many bilingual programs were “at best subtractive education models”.

One other problem experienced by bilingual schools included what the Australian Education Union has described as the “impediment to school participation” and inequality of resources that has arisen from using attendance figures as opposed to enrolment figures as a basis for staffing and material resource allocation to schools (Kronemann, 2007: 6; Ch2;).

Measures of Success – 1970s

Regardless of these recurrent problems, the bilingual programs were early considered a success by the two United States linguistic consultants, Geoff O’Grady and Ken Hale, employed as consultants for their implementation. They noted in a report tabled in Parliament:

We are extremely impressed with the Northern Territory Bilingual Programs much, so that we are inclined to assert that this program constitutes one of the-most exciting educational events in the modern world (O’Grady & Hale in McGrath, 1974: 8).

Early research on the bilingual programs also supported this claim of success. A study by Murtagh in 1979 (and reported in 1982), for instance, on bilingual education at Beswick Creek and a study by Gale, et al in 1981 at Millingimbi indicated significantly superior L1 Creole and

of employment have changed over the years. It could also suggest that these statistics do not discriminate well between teachers that leave relatively soon (within 6 to 12 months of starting) and those local and non-local teachers who have been working in the education system for three or more decades (the latter are comprised in a statistic of 15% for tenure greater than 8 years). Nor do they show the impact of non-local teachers who have been in the system for a period of time but not the same school. Regardless, the issue still remains of teachers untrained and inexperienced in a bilingual system or a multilingual context.
oral English, English reading and creative writing and mathematics skills at these bilingual schools compared to monolingual schools. This was particularly notable in the higher grades (year 7) where bilingual students outperformed monolingual students in seven out of 10 English literacy and numeracy tests (Gale, et al, 1981). The promising results of these two studies led another researcher (Sommer, 1981 in Lasorsa, 1990: 14) to suggest that these programs showed that “in Australia, the bilingual program bestows intellectual advantage on the Aboriginal child just as the programs overseas do”. Enhanced educational outcomes (L1 and L2 oral proficiencies and attendance) are also supported by other studies in the early 1980s at Beswick Reserve, Yirrkala, St Terese’s, Shepherdson College, Barunga and Milingimbi (Gaglioti, 1999).

Mixed Results – 1980s

Despite such success, accreditation requirements in the 1980s for bilingual schools in the NT seemed to indicate mixed results (Devlin, 1995). This was evident in criterion-referenced Mathematics and English tests where bilingual students, on some subtasks in mathematics and oral and written English, achieved lower outcomes than students from non-bilingual schools (Devlin, 1995). Other studies in the 1990s, also showed only a marginal increase in academic results and not the expected increase in attendance or growth in L2 because of L1 instruction in the early years (Harris & Devlin, 1997). However, testing at Lajamanu in the 1990s, as a consequence of the “right processes and content”, showed considerable English language and numeracy success in their bilingual program (Cataldi & Partington, 1998: 330). The modest program results documented by others could have been the product of the fact that, in NT bilingual education, for the lower grades at least, there was limited English oral and literacy instruction since “English literacy development has barely commenced” and the ever present poor resourcing (Collins, 1999: 42). Freeman (2014) suggests these disparities were due to the 1982 change in policy that focused on English language acquisition and diluted the bilingual aim as a consequence.

161 These tests were developed by Aboriginal school teachers, curriculum advisors and Evaluation and Research NT Education Department staff and then trialled before being administered to bilingual and non-bilingual schools (Devlin, 1995). Year 5 Yirrkala and Year 7 Milingimbi bilingual school students, however, performed markedly better than non-bilingual students while Year 5 Milingimbi students showed mixed results (Devlin, 1995). Some students who undertook the assessment were classified as bilingual students even though they came from non-bilingual schools (Oenpelli). Devlin (1995) claims that this had an impact on the results.
Hoogenraad (2001) essentially made the same point arguing the change in policy led to “a dramatic reduction in system support for bilingual education programs” by the 1990s. He cited the reduction in IL teaching support staff to one for all language programs (including bilingual); reduction in the number of linguists in regional areas who were consulted on bilingual programs as well as TESOL and language programs in non-bilingual schools; and the continued “passive resistance” to bilingual education by education officials and non-Indigenous teaching staff accompanied by a “lack of sanctions and an absence of effective monitoring” (Hoogenraad, 2001: 131, 141).

Program Deterioration – Early 1990s

Although there was an increasing Aboriginalisation of schools, the implementation of ‘Both Ways’ and ‘Two Way’ bicultural bi- or multilingual education in many bilingual schools began to erode with policy change (Marika, 2000). Hoogenraad (2001: 132) maintained, for instance, that NT Education policy by the 1990s was “initial literacy and initial teaching … in the vernacular” as opposed to a bilingual program sustained through primary schooling. In addition, to the ability of teachers, principals and education officials to easily undermine bilingual programs, this meant a considerable number of “nominal” bilingual classrooms and schools were in fact monolingual English ones. As such, many bilingual education schools experienced a common condition of most remote Indigenous schools - the predominant use of a Western curriculum and language. The use of such a curriculum and language, resulted, Keven Keefe (1992: 117) argued, in “a minimal and uneasy engagement or, more commonly, an extreme estrangement” of students and community members from the school.162

Ex-remote NT teacher Kerry Gardiner (pi 3 April 2014) suggested that any poor outcomes in bilingual education were also the failure to follow community development models. Gardiner (pi 3 April 2014) saw this failure as the result of the increasing and intensive use of standardisation and accountability in the school system (largely the governance technologies of managerialism and English language performativity) that are accompanied with little ‘on the

---

162 This is in line with international findings in Ch2.
ground’ interaction and experience. Far more was achieved, he claimed, when “nobody really
cared what was going on” (Kerry Gardiner, pi, 3 April 2014).\footnote{This is echoed by Bat (2013) who argued the increasing use of national competition and performativity mechanisms in teacher registration (such as English literacy and numeracy tests for teachers) is not only precluding prospective remote Indigenous teachers from training and employment but also resulting in the production of culturally incompetent non-Indigenous teacher graduates. This has resulted in “some of the worse possible outcomes” for remote Indigenous education, she (p. 7) argued.}

Such extraneous factors need to be taken into account, Hoogenraad (2001: 132) suggested, when judging the effectiveness of bilingual programs at this time. Despite these factors, Hoogenraad (2001: 139) reported, there was sufficient anecdotal evidence that graduates of bilingual education with high vernacular literacy and oral skills invariably had “the best English[oral] and good English literacy” skills and that these skills were superior to the Indigenous literacy teachers and assistant teachers. Each successive generation was improving in multilingual and literacy skills. In addition, bilingual education led to a number of ‘adult’ vernacular literacy publications that began to appear in remote communities. Harris and Jones (1991: 42), for instance, cite the example of the community newspaper, *Amataku Tjukurpa*, (Amata Times), which had a largely advocacy and reportage function for Pitjantjatjara communities and the recording of “cultural knowledge”.

After this period of accreditation for bilingual schools through testing, the declining support for bilingual education and the decreasing numbers of personnel devoted to the accreditation process resulted in the NT Government changing its accreditation procedure to one termed *moderated self-appraisal* (Devlin, 1995). This marked a period of “long-term departmental opposition” to “longitudinal evaluation of the bilingual education programs to assess their efficacy vis-a´-vis the non-bilingual English-only programs in schools”, academic and ex-principal of Lajamanu, Christine Nicholls (2005: 162) contends.\footnote{Although Nicholls (2005: 162) conducted a “rigorous internal school testing program each year” that demonstrated literacy and numeracy gains from bilingual education, she was never able to get the NT Education Department to accept these statistics.} Devlin (1995) noted with concern that little quantifiable or statistical evidence can be gathered from this self-reporting mechanism and that in addition to expert linguists and anthropologists being used decreasingly in the policy consultation process, student performance data were not linked to the evaluation of bilingual
programs and little research was being conducted on the effectiveness of bilingual education (see also Nicholls, 2005).

**Poor resourcing – Late 1990s**

By the 1990s, moves towards ‘top down’ policy formation (Harris, 1995: 16) and an exclusive focus on English educational outcomes in addition to poorer resourcing began to make considerable inroads into the success of bilingual programs (Collins, 1999; Devlin, 1995). While bilingual programs received less resources over time, there was also a general deterioration in staffing, training (particularly ESL training) and professional development for remote schools in general (Devlin, 1995).165 These issues were indicative of the NT Government’s failure to implement government review and inquiry findings on Indigenous issues, apart from the increasing focus on accountability mechanisms such as English literacy and numeracy testing (Australian Department of Education 1975, cited in McKay, 2007: 110; Collins, 1999; Graham, 1999; Simpson, 2010). A restrictive concern with SAE became emphasized in all states with the release of the 1996 *National School English Literacy Survey* (Masters & Forster, 1997) and the assignment of remote Indigenous students as very low achieving.166 This failure of the NT Government to acknowledge the value of bilingual education in schools and the local community support for these programs led one school to declare in their self-appraisal:

> This is a strong document, it is our word. But now we think that no-one in the Education Department has read our reports because now you are paying people to come and ask us what we want again. Every year you ask us and every year we tell you but you don’t listen to what we say. Some community members say that you will keep asking until we tell you that we want to be Balanda, then you’ll stop asking. We are not Balanda, our skin will always be black (Submission to review in Collins, 1999: 25).

---

165 The Federal Government has recently accused consecutive NT Governments of siphoning off funds destined for remote Indigenous programs to the degree that the “huge backlog of need” in remote areas is not being addressed, claimed former NT Council of Social Service president Barry Hansen (in Aikman, 2015).

166 In fact, the sample of Indigenous students in the survey was not representative, the authors (Masters & Forster, 1997) claimed. Interestingly, the results for Indigenous students were wide-ranging with the top 20% continuing to achieve and making “quite good progress” while the bottom 20% appearing to make “practically no progress” between Years 3 and Years 5 (Masters & Forster, 1997: VII). This result appears to correlate closely to those of Cummins (2000) for subtractive education programs.
Two Way No Way Bilingual Education – 1998 to 2000s

The situation with Indigenous bilingual education in remote NT areas from the late 1990s, became increasingly precarious, according to Devlin (2009a), beginning with Schools Our Focus policy aimed at disbanding bilingual programs (which led to the closure of all except 10 bilingual schools and programs). At the time of this change, the community outrage was palpable. At a meeting in Maningrida, for instance, one erudite speaker from the community, in relation to the NT and Federal Government mainstreaming focus at the time, stated:

> The NT Government is trying to destroy Aboriginal people. This is all part of their plan to destroy Aboriginal language and Aboriginal culture. My children have learned at this school and they have a good education and have gone on and done well. These teachers should be fully supported (Jack Phillips in Maningrida Community, 1999: 23).

Now renamed Two Way, the bilingual program aim was predominantly proficiency in SAE (with 100% SAE by year 5 or 6) as opposed to proficiency in two languages (Devlin, 2009a). Nicholls (2005: 163) contends that from this time bilingual education remained in a ‘policy vacuum’ with limited “formal discussion or dialogue” on bilingual education and no department clarification of the meaning of Two Way learning. Nicholls (2005: 163, 174) reports that the “Two Way learning programs are ill defined, diluted and for the most part, poorly organised versions of the former bilingual education programs [and] …as a practice …it is frankly a shambles … giving virtually no direction to teachers whatsoever in terms of teaching methodology, content or practice”. It also resulted in the permanent closure of many literacy production centres (one has been recently revived at Site 1 and the Site 2 centre has remained active) (Nicholls, 2005). This criticism was corroborated by Hoogenraad (2001), Anderson and Wild (2007) and Simpson, Caffery, and McConvell (2009: 17), who claim that Two Way programs “suffered from neglect, marginalisation and a lack of longer-term institutional support”.

All these factors indicate that Two Way bilingual education was essentially a subtractive model of language education (Cummins, 2000). This view was evident in a report commissioned by the NT government on secondary schooling:
There is inequity in education provision across the Territory’s urban, regional and remote schools. The critical issue underlying much of this inequity is the lack of, or inequitable distribution of human and physical resources. Equity of resourcing does not mean equal resourcing – it means differential resourcing according to local needs. There are wide variations between schools in the levels of resourcing, and in the quality of infrastructure, its maintenance and its degree of utilisation. There is no secondary provision at all in many remote areas (Ramsey, 2003: xii).167

The failings of Two Way education were exacerbated by falling numbers of Indigenous teacher graduates. The higher SAE entry requirements for teacher training courses, falling resources and reduced recurrent funding allocated to BIITE for remote teacher and assistant teacher training, particularly since 1998, led to a lower number of course entrants, chiefly from remote communities (Bat, 2010, 2013; Devlin, 2011a). For those who gained entry, the need to study in a foreign language (SAE) led to lower completion rates (Bat, 2010; non-Indigenous ex-teacher, pi, 13 November 2013). Consequently, by the mid-2000s there was a dramatic decline in remote teacher graduates (Bat, 2010; non-Indigenous ex-teacher, pi, 13 November 2013). This has resulted in only 51 students graduating from teacher training courses at BIITE since 2003 and no current NT remote teaching degree candidate in these programs (Lee, et al, 2014). The situation was so concerning that it led the Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity (advisor to the then Federal Department of Education Minister, Julia Gillard) to state:

BIITE has trained most of the Indigenous teachers working in remote communities in the NT. It is a tragedy that over the last few years the pressure for BIITE to be financially viable has led to a decrease in numbers of young Indigenous people from remote communities undertaking teacher training at BIITE. This has had, and is having, calamitous effects on the education of children in remote communities (Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity, 2010, in Devlin, 2011a: 262).168

By 2001 to 2004 additional territory wide testing was implemented for all NT primary students. The Multi-Level Assessment Program (MAP) began operating and indicated lower levels of

167 Kronemann (2007: 17) stated that the CLP when in power from 1978 to 2001 “had consciously taken policy decisions not to extend secondary services to remote communities”. Indeed, it closed residential colleges specifically provided for Aboriginal students.
168 Gillard’s remedy to increase remote teacher training course recruitment was to have BIITE deliver a non-Indigenous Charles Darwin University (CDU) teaching degree through a partnership organization (Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledge) based at the CDU Darwin campus. This has further “disrupted local Indigenous student recruitment” according to Lee, et al (2014: 53). The courses delivered at Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledges and Education are still not delivered remotely, have no remote assistance strategies, no new remote Indigenous enrolments and resulted in a steep decline in BIITTE undergraduate enrolments.
English literacy and numeracy in Year 3, but superior levels by Year 5 and Year 7 in bilingual schools compared to English only schools (Devlin, 2005; NTDEET, 2005). This was an anticipated trajectory of L2 acquisition in bilingual programs (in line with Cummins, 2000 theories; see also NTDEET, 2005). Although hampered by a “limited quantum of available data”, the MAP results did indicate the success and “real benefits” of the bilingual programs in the NT, despite the “fluctuating policy environment”, difficulties and lack of support, according to Devlin (pi, 16 January, 2014).169 By 2005 there were some assurances by the NT Government that it would retain bilingual education. The Indigenous Education Strategic Plan for 2006-2009, in fact, stated that the NT Government would “strengthen the bilingual program and improve its effectiveness and sustainability to deliver outcomes” (in Devlin, 2011a: 260).

The Intervention and the FFHP - 2007 and 2008

However, the bilingual programs were again affected by broader Indigenous policy developments from 2007. The abolition of the CDEP in remote communities due to the NT Intervention (as discussed in the introduction) meant that at least 223 Indigenous school placement positions (teacher assistants) in 52 communities were no longer funded (Kronemann, 2007). The dramatic result, according to Lee, et al (2014) is that:

... few remote schools are staffed with local Indigenous teachers. In fact we have found it difficult to obtain accurate figures about the numbers of locally trained and currently employed Indigenous education graduates in the Northern Territory. Employment and engagement of local Indigenous educators and assistants has been recommended consistently for many decades by those who have sought to improve schooling in remote communities. While this approach has featured in the Northern Territory education story over the years, it has received only intermittent support in practical terms (Lee, et al, 2014: 8).

This was exacerbated by a housing crisis. During the initial stages of the Intervention, NT government housing that had previously been reserved for teachers in remote areas was redirected to Federal Intervention workers “leading to suspension or disruption of education services” (Kronemann, 2007: 13). This loss of CDEP funding combined with merging community

169 This was reiterated in a NTDEET, 2005 report which also stated, however, their concern regarding the “low rate of achievement of students” in both Two-Way learning and monolingual schools (NTDEET, 2005: 36). Such a statement appears to indicate a lack of recognition of the ESL status of remote schools.
councils into larger non-locally controlled shire councils and the divesting of social service funds to peak bodies rather than local Aboriginal organisations created high unemployment and despair (AHRC, 2010; Altman, 2009; Altman & Russell, 2012; Kronemann, 2007). At this dramatically deteriorating moment in Indigenous affairs, the NT Government introduced the FFHP. This resulted in the effective abolition of bilingual education and the loss of positions, resources and community involvement in schools (Sleath, 2013).

Following FFHP implementation, some schools haphazardly stored or destroyed bilingual resources (Brian Devlin, pi, 16 January 2014; Christine Nicholls, pi, 10 January 2014). Gibson (2011) and Williams (in Gibson, 2011) reported in addition that there was also “curriculum interference” and a loss of community “governance and control through school councils” (where school councils were removed from the majority of schools). Box (in Gosford, 2011) reported the pointed exclusion from schools of community members and Indigenous staff (through high fences and locks preventing school entry). When this was combined with the effects of the Intervention, it led to a deep decline in student attendance in many remote Indigenous schools as well as community and student alienation from these schools.170

**Punitive Measures**

To address this decline in attendance, the Federal Government enacted a punitive School Enrolment and Attendance Measure which involved the suspension of welfare payments for 13 weeks to parents of truanting children in addition to compulsory parenting skills classes (Dickson, 2010; Gibson, 2011).171 In relation to these issues, Nadine Williams, spokesperson for the Australian Education Union, stated:

170 A dramatic reduction in attendance, for instance, occurred at Warlpiri schools in addition to a steep decline in collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous school staff, according to Dickson (2010). This attendance pattern contrasted with the high attendance (82%) discussed by Devlin at Shepherdson College in the 1980s (in HRSCATSIA, 2012: 85). A non-Indigenous ex-teacher (pi, 13 November 2013) described the failure of parents to encourage children to go to school as the result of a “disconnect” arising from IL and culture no longer being a priority. This resulted from Indigenous adults no longer forming part of the school or being involved in its decision-making processes.

171 This policy was reinforced July 18, 2014 (see Scullion, 2014). However, it has been heavily critiqued for not addressing why students were absenting themselves from school and for imposing increasing harm and stress on those families already vulnerable (Lee, et al, 2014). Such policies have also been linked in the USA to increased child abuse and neglect (Lee, et al, 2014).
The problem with the whole roll out is it’s patronising, suggesting parents have no idea how to look after children ... Aboriginal people are very aware of the judgments being made about them [all as a group], that they don’t send their children to school. Education and respect has got to be Both Ways. But they see absolutely no respect for their own system of education that has lasted many more thousands of years than our system (Williams in Gibson, 2011).

Subsequent Policy Development - 2011 to now

The FFHP policy was later reinforced with subsequent policies (or lack of policies that specifically addressed IILs). These later policies included *Literacy and Numeracy Improvement* (2011) that related to the need of SAE for “community participation and work” and referred vaguely to monitoring and evaluating EAL students according to their linguistic and cultural background. Concurrently (in late 2010), the NTDE released the *Literacy for both worlds policy* (see Devlin, 2011a; Freeman, 2014: 4) which stipulated that remote schools could include L1 in the early years of schooling but were required to switch to English in Year 2 for “intensive English instruction” by Year 3. Although this policy advocated bilingual education in the early years, the directive contradicted “Cummins’ interdependence hypothesis and the significant body of international evidence that supports it”, Freeman (2014: 4) argues. However, it was quickly withdrawn and the FFHP policy reinstated by January 2014.

Over the next few years, a series of new procedures and policies reduced staffing and funding, effectively removing all bilingual innovation and NTDE support. The *2012 Framework for Learning English as an Additional Language* (NTDET, 2012) discussed the importance of EAL strategies with the acquisition of SAE as the only aim. Interestingly, it used Cummins’ (2000) and Baker’s (2011) distinction between academic language and social language but only in terms of L2 acquisition as opposed to the transfer of such skills from a well-developed L1. It made vague references to the recognition, value, inclusion of home cultures, languages, knowledge and experience in the “language learning process” but maintained a restricted translative role for L1 (NTDET, 2012: 5) as opposed to an IL being implemented in organised language planning, the lack of which had been critiqued by previous reports (Anderson & Wild, 2007; Collins, 1999). This approach, NT principal Leon White (in Murdoch, 2014) explains, “Is to misunderstand the power of those languages to actually help the kids learn mathematics, science and a whole range of things”. It also, according to Kerry Gardiner (pi, 3 April 2014), fails to recognize communities
as an “invaluable resource” for children who “need all the leg ups they can get to master the Western world and the Aboriginal world”. By 2013 the English as an Additional Language/Dialect policy was issued but this was not accepted by the Minister and the unit responsible for professional development and the policy was dissolved (Disbray, 2014). Concurrently, there was a reduction by 71 staff in the hiring of teachers with EAL qualifications (Lee, et al, 2014).

The NTDE now relies on the ACARA national curriculum for remote Indigenous contexts and has no formal policy that addresses IL contexts, first and L2 development and Indigenous teacher training. A draft report on Indigenous education (Wilson, 2014a) suggested the complete removal of bilingual education and the adoption of a curriculum in remote Indigenous schools that dealt with (cognitively unchallenging) basic English language literacy and oral skills for the first four years. This was subsequently reviewed in a final report on Indigenous education (Wilson, 2014b). In this review, the report made mention of bilingual education and acknowledged that while it historically conferred some small academic advantage, suggested the continuation of oral bilingual or biliteracy programs occur only; in schools where students are Indigenous and English is not their L1; where it is “feasible” (which could be open to varying degrees of interpretation); and “where a trained teacher is available” (Wilson, 2014b: 122, 173) (which is problematic given the failure of NTDE in providing adequate training opportunities for

---

172 This curriculum document, however, does substantially address curriculum needs for language maintenance and revitalization. In addition, steps are underway by NT Board of Studies at the time of writing to re-develop the Indigenous language and Cultural Outcomes section in the Northern Territory Curriculum Framework (NTDEET, 2002). They currently have a draft paper, A Draft Plan for the Teaching and Learning of Indigenous Languages and Cultures in Northern Territory Schools (the Plan), that entails the development of a continuous curriculum pathway from T – 10 (Senior Years units are available through South Australian Curriculum and Vocational Education and Training).

173 To justify this position, Wilson (2014b) used limited research that failed to distinguish between the additive or the subtractive status of bilingual programs. One study he used was conducted at Menzies school of health by a non-educationalist and non-bilingual medical expert, another was a general non-ESL early childhood reference. Wilson (2014b) also used the NAPLAN results that showed no differences between monolingual remote schools and the five government schools he categorised as bilingual - Milingimbi, Lajamanu, Maningrida, Yirrkala and Yuendumu. Unfortunately, three of these schools had been either transformed into monolingual English schools and/or had greatly reduced IL1 programs and so were no longer operating as bilingual (Maningrida, Yuendumu and Lajamanu). He also failed to include successful bilingual schools in these NAPLAN results (Areyonga, Shepherds on and Numbulwar) (Wilson, 2014b). Wilson (2014b) also did not separate the results according to year levels which would have showed the normal trajectory of L2 acquisition in bilingual programs (less in the early years due to lack of exposure to L2 and greater L2 acquisition in later years than monolingual schools as discussed in the Literature Review). Nor were the results separated according to the level of L1 literacy and oracy and type of bilingual program operating at the schools. Of most concern to a number of people was the recommendation to abolish high school learning in remote communities, thus giving many Indigenous students no chance to complete high school or acquire higher English language standards necessary for further study. Kerry Gardiner (pi, 3 April 2014) commented that the loss of cultural learning as a result of a forced removal from communities of children for a high school education was “insane” and “You couldn’t have done a worse thing by communities”.

401
prospective remote Indigenous teachers and the lack of Indigenous desire to join the NTDE because of racism in schools, Hall, 2016).

Disbray (2014) has argued that the lack of bilingual policy and this Indigenous education report is evidence of monolingual education and a monoglossic ideology still dominating education policy in the NT. This appears to be confirmed by the Indigenous Education Strategy (NTDE, 2015), derived from the Wilson report that makes no mention of bilingual education but does promise greater cultural awareness; language and team-teaching training for non-Indigenous school staff; more employment of and staff development and training for Indigenous staff; and the development and implementation of policy related to Aboriginal languages and cultures. However, there remains a focus on the development of English language “NT-wide age benchmarks for numeracy, writing, reading, phonemic awareness and sight words” (NTDE, 2015) against which remote Indigenous students will be measured despite their ESL or EFL status. There are also current fears that the recent program implementation of Noel Pearson’s Good to Great Schools Australia English Language Direct Instruction literacy program in remote NT schools is cognitively unchallenging and will lead to both the further deterioration in resource support for bilingual education and student academic outcomes (Oaten, 2015).

Neo-liberalism and Settler Colonial Logic in the FFHP

Devlin (2011a) believes that the FFHP has resulted in a growing public reaction against bilingual education. This was steeped in the neo-liberal market ideology of competition that has the potential to further undermine effective teaching and learning (Devlin, 2011a):

The new tilt against bilingual education disallows heterogeneous and hybrid methods that suit local circumstances, restricts opportunities to build on local linguistic and cultural resources through first-language literacy and serves as a disincentive to Indigenous staff wishing to draw on their own valued knowledge by arranging appropriate teaching and learning activities for young students during prime teaching time. This backlash ideology is deceptive for it is cloaked in the language of increased opportunities while it seeks to limit the use of the students’ own languages in instructional contexts (Devlin, 2011a: 272).

---

174 This program entails a highly repetitive and highly pre-scripted literacy program that is very resource intensive and as of 7 September 2015 was rolled out to 15 NT remote schools (Oaten, 2015).
These developments align with Lo Bianco’s (2001b) observation in regards to the deliberate marginalisation of multicultural community-based groups and language professionals, depleting their advocacy and involvement in policy. These developments have led to the restriction of language claims in an environment where literacy is constituted according to Human Capital principles which replace Human Rights (Lo Bianco, 2001b). The actions brought against bilingual education through the decades of its existence in the NT also appear to indicate the operation of ‘regimes of truth’ (Foucault, 1980), in educational institutional and political discourses comprised of postcolonial discourse of the Indigenous ‘other’ with its notions of high cultural deficits (or ‘lack’) in Indigenous cultures and languages (Clarke, 2012; Howard-Wagner, 2007: Nicholls, 2000; Piller & Takahashi, 2011).

These suppositions are similar to the findings of Guenther, Disbray and Osborne (2014) who claim that the ‘Human Capital Theory’ discourse stream (directly informed by neo-liberal globalisation and the domination of the market) is the prevailing rationale in contemporary IL education policy.\(^\text{175}\) It is also a philosophy that, although largely evidence free, Guenther, et al (2014) argue, and “based on tacit assumptions” is particularly prevalent in Indigenous education policy contexts. It has also typically addressed the ‘lack’ of desirable ‘outputs’ of education investment with simplistic solutions (none of which show empirical evidence that they work) (Guenther, Disbray & Osborne, 2014). These simplistic solutions include such strategies as; “quality teachers …effective and explicit instruction; …sending students to boarding schools; penalising parents; and finding ways to transition students into ‘real jobs’” (Guenther, Disbray & Osborne, 2014: 283). As such, the FFHP can be considered a significant strategy in its dilution of Indigenous bilingual education in the NT, but one of many that have encroached on Aboriginal authority and agency.

Having discussed the territory-wide historical developments in bilingual education in the NT, I will now focus on the historical developments of bilingual education at the specific sites under investigation in this thesis.

\[^\text{175}\] Guenther, Disbray and Osborne (2014: 283) have succinctly outlined the various educational philosophies that have influenced all educational policy into four discourse streams; a “social and societal rational for education” which has evolved from the ideas of Dewey and Freire; “a development rationale for education” which focuses on social equity; a positivist “knowledge and skills rationale for education”; and a “Human Capital Theory” of education which they claim focuses on investment gains and distribution of income as a consequence of education.
Bilingual Education in Site 1

Site 1, with a current population of approximately 800 as of 2015, was established 300km north of Alice Springs as a government settlement for ration and welfare delivery in 1946 (Brown, Townsend, Pinkerton & Rogers, 2011). It was created in response to concerns at the time by Finke River Mission Lutheran Minister Pastor FW Albrecht of the indiscriminate shooting of Indigenous people by White settlers and government authorities (Brown, et al, 2011). Unlike other areas, Indigenous people who would populate Site 1 were not incorporated into the pastoral industries and so relied heavily on the few compassionate Whites since their land had become denuded from mining and agriculture (Brown, et al, 2011). Missionaries to the settlement started the first school and kindergarten and, in return for establishing the community, people at Site 1 received rations and some wages (Brown, et al, 2011). Even though the community was established, it was common for families to return to the bush and traditional life in outstations for long periods. Despite the better availability of food at Site 1, malnutrition and communicable diseases were common as a consequence of overcrowding and poor sanitation and housing with many residents still living in makeshift or traditional shelters (humpies) (Brown, et al, 2011; Disbray, 2014).

In 1975, after the Site 1 school had been operating for 20 years, the first bilingual education program was established. It began with five classes, three early primary, one upper primary and one post-primary class. Site1 teaching assistant staff at the school (there were no trained teachers) had limited English and little experience with IL1 literacy but engaged in weekly planning with non-Indigenous staff (Disbray, 2014). The bilingual education model was the Step Program, common to most NT remote schools. It involved initial IL1 literacy (Grades 1-3) with English oracy and increasing amounts of English literacy in subsequent years until English literacy represented the majority of literacy education (Buschenhofen, 1980; Laughren, 2013).

One of the six linguists employed by the Australian Department of Education in the NT assisted with the establishment of the program (Laughren, 2013). Although initially all disciplines were taught in English, since there was no developed IL1 program for all curriculum elements, except for IL1 reading and writing, an IL1 social science curriculum was developed by 1980 and a natural science curriculum was developed soon after (Buschenhofen, 1980). Buschenhofen (1980) noted that the bilingual program not only produced the same results for English literacy as the primary
English monolingual program, but arrested development of a mixed English-IL1 language or pidgin that was common prior to the introduction of the bilingual program. The oracy and literacy design of the program is shown in figure Appendix 1.2a below.
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**Known**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades I &amp; II</th>
<th>Grades II &amp; IV</th>
<th>Grades V &amp; VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic L1 Oracy</td>
<td>Initial L1 Literacy</td>
<td>Expanded L1 Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial English Oral</td>
<td>Expanded L1 Literacy</td>
<td>Expanded English Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanded L1 Oracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial English Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded English Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Appendix 1.2a: An overview of the IL1-English program at Site 1 by Bushenhofen (1980: 307).

By the 1980s, a considerable number of local Indigenous teachers (eight) were in training with the RATE program or linguistics program offered by the School for Australian Linguistics (now housed at BIITE).

In the staffroom and classroom context, there was a ‘team teaching’ approach where IL, Indigenous knowledge, curriculum staff and pedagogy were given equal status to English language, English speaking staff, curriculum, knowledge and pedagogy. IL lessons were delivered once a week to non-Indigenous school staff at the Site 1 school by Indigenous staff.
after teaching hours. In addition, non-Indigenous staff were to co-plan and co-deliver lessons with and support the formal training of Indigenous staff (Disbray, 2014). There was also considerable whole school professional development co-ordinated by the teacher linguist (Disbray, 2014). This was a period where there was heavy involvement of the local community, Indigenous control over schools and large numbers of Indigenous assistant teachers and teachers in the school as well as an integrated curriculum across science, mathematics and literacy (Disbray, 2014). These teaching, professional development and community engagement arrangements were reiterated by former teachers interviewed during the data collection period.

By the 1990s, on-site teacher training resulted in the start of the Site 1 professional network (Disbray, 2014). The involvement of Indigenous staff at the school also gave rise to the annual cross-regional workshops devoted to the development of a bilingual and bicultural curriculum, resource development, teaching methodology and professional development (Disbray, 2014). These regional workshops were attended by community elders and Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff and funded inconsistently by the NTDE (Disbray, 2014).

The amount of educational opportunities given to Indigenous staff resulted in 10 fully qualified Indigenous teachers, and even greater numbers of assistant teachers and literacy workers. One qualified Indigenous teacher recalled that there were 20 local Indigenous staff working at the school by the 1990s, with one teacher assistant for every non-Indigenous teacher and two in early childhood classes. In addition, there were three gardeners, three cleaners and three literacy teachers (Oldfield, 2011). One retired Indigenous teacher respondent noted that Indigenous staff also formed very strong relationships with non-Indigenous staff, often socialising after hours. Some of these staff were Indigenous men but with the requirement of Ochre cards (a “working with children” check) and police checks and with the high incarceration rate of Indigenous men, they are now excluded from the school. They are thus unable to provide any role modelling to boys within the school (HRSCATSIA, 2012: 44).

Integral to this program were the Indigenous literacy centres in the region which produced more than 700 titles over three communities, the majority produced at Site 1 (Disbray, 2014). This reading material focused on cultural knowledge (ceremony, social practice and organisation, land), environmental knowledge (ecosystems, fauna and flora, hunting and resource location skills), local history and Tjulkurlpa (religious) stories and generally reflected the curriculum at
the school (Disbray, 2014; Laughren, 2013). The type of literature produced was various – fiction, advanced readers with work books, posters, flash cards, teacher handbooks, dictionaries, planners, calendars, audio-visual material, community newsletters (which included local poetry) and reference works (Disbray, 2014; Laughren, 2013).

Despite attempts by the NT Country Liberal Party Government in 1998 to disband all bilingual programs in the NT, the program at Site 1 survived. Following the election of a Labor Party NT Government in 2001, many recommendations from a 1998 Senator Bob Collins report favourable to bilingual programs were implemented. A community controlled model for school programs was also momentarily implemented as was another 2008 initiative, ‘Remote Learning Partnerships’ (Gosford, 2011). This sought to forge agreements between communities, such as Site 1, with the NT Government regarding expectations and responsibilities (Gosford, 2011). However, under the FFHP, these agreements were over-ridden.

Respondents in this research noted that the interaction between the school and the community began to deteriorate from 1998 when the first bilingual education reduction was implemented. It appears that from this time there was also a deterioration in time allocated to L1 learning. One non-Indigenous community member during the data collection period related that once the FFHP was introduced, virtually no interaction occurred between the community and the school and only two trained Indigenous teachers were retained on staff. In addition, part-time instructor funding for older community members to participate in the school curriculum was stopped, remote area training also ceased as did mentoring for Aboriginal teachers (Oldfield, 2011). The position for a community liaison officer was also removed, the bus service to pick up school children stopped as were food programs – breakfast, lunch, fruit – and the Night school for adults (Oldfield, 2011).

The literacy centre also ceased operation. Community members on the school board (pi, 17 February 2014) during the data collection period related that this was later re-funded with an on-going grant from an Indigenous education and training trust – an educational trust fund from mining royalties and independent of government to improve education, wellbeing and employment at Site 1. Many of those on the committee of this trust and school board were

---

176 Only 45 minutes daily of L1 learning was reported to be undertaken by children as opposed to 2 hours at Site 2 and four hours at Wadaye (NTDEET, 2005).
workers at the school when it was under the bilingual system. This education and training trust now exclusively funds the Indigenous literacy centre at Site 1. IL and literacy was re-introduced from transition to Year 2 in 2014 as part of an isolated agreement with the NTDE and is taught by one long term Indigenous teacher. However, it generally remains across the classes a part-time IL instruction as opposed to bilingual. There are some night community education classes now operating one to two nights per week (but no language classes) and a new Federal Government food program at a cost to parents has been introduced for the children (school board member, pi, 17 February 2014).

Bilingual Education at Site 2

Site 2 was established in the 1920s when local people fled the Petermann area to a community north of site 2 and then to the current Site 2 location. This was a consequence of drought and ‘rifle times’ – where large numbers of people were murdered by White settlers (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011; Vincent Forrester, pi, 14 April 2014). In 1943 a government ration depot was opened at Site 2 and an agreement made with a Lutheran mission to provide welfare services (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011). A number of buildings were erected for mission staff and local residents so that by 1949 a total of 390 people were residing at the site (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011). In 1950 a local school with 50 students (growing to 85 by 1953) was opened, staffed by the superintendent’s wife, but it was not until 1952 that a pre-fabricated purpose-built school was erected (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011).

Site 2’s bilingual program commenced in 1973 under a white principal (Williams, 2011). This position was then filled by a local Indigenous teacher who further developed the program (Vincent Forrester, pi, 2 April 2015). By 1974, the Site 2 school had a student population of 73 (some families had drifted back to a Western settlement in the 1970s), five Indigenous teachers and six non-Indigenous teachers (McGrath, 1974). The program was very similar to that of Site 1 with Indigenous vernacular and oral English (30 minutes per day) being introduced in the first year of schooling and English literacy being introduced 1.5 to two years after schooling commenced (McGrath, 1974). This English literacy introduction eventually extended to Year 4 by the early 2000s due to the far higher gains in L1 literacy and transference to L2 (Freeman, 2009). The intermediate primary grades involved continuation of oral English, English literacy lessons and some lessons taught in English (McGrath, 1974). The upper grades by 1974 did not
have vernacular oracy or literacy but this changed soon after the bilingual program commenced (McGrath, 1974).

The function of Aboriginal teachers (untrained in 1974 but some undergoing teacher education and several achieving qualifications later on), as in Site 1, was to run the vernacular language program (McGrath, 1974). In this they received some assistance from non-Indigenous teachers and linguists. They also illustrated and wrote picture books, story books, songs and rhymes (McGrath, 1974). One afternoon a week the girls in the school participated in Inma, traditional singing and dancing with the old women in the main square (McGrath, 1974). There were also many bush school excursions, bush camps and excursions to other communities conducted by adults from the community (Aboriginal elder, pc, 11 March 2014; Ex-assistant teacher, pi, 12 March 2014). The non-Indigenous staff worked with the Indigenous staff to learn the local language or underwent an intensive language course or both (McGrath, 1974).

During this time, community interaction with the school was actively encouraged and adults often co-taught the lower grades with singing and dancing (McGrath, 1974). Participation of many community members occurred when these classes were given outside the classroom (McGrath, 1974). The songs developed in the local language at the school by Aboriginal teachers began to be used regularly by parents in student homes (McGrath, 1974). At some stage in its history, the Site 2 literacy centre also developed a community newsletter (ex-assistant teacher, pi, 11 March 2014).

Over the years, a network of schools with the same language began to operate to facilitate the production of resources and allow the professional development between Aboriginal teachers. However, this co-operation stopped after the 1998 policy that extinguished other bilingual schools in the area (ex-assistant teacher, pi, 11 March 2014). By 2004, the strain in terms of the availability of vernacular literacy resources became marked (NTDEET, 2005). The school continued to use resources developed in the 1970s and 1980s that were problematic as a consequence of quantity (children were frequently re-reading the same texts) their poor production quality and their use of a vernacular that had since changed with some words and expressions no longer being used in the community (NTDEET, 2005).
Despite these difficulties, the bilingual program at Site 2 appeared to remain positive with a large proportion of teaching and learning remaining in the vernacular compared to comparative schools. Freeman (2014), for instance, notes the year 5 results for MAP tests that indicated 100% for reading in 2005, 33% in 2006 and 50% in 2007 compared to the NT very remote school average for 2005 of 19%. In addition, Gary Barnes (then the NTDET Chief Executive) stated that Site 2 had all the “ingredients for success” in a bilingual program (Freeman, 2014: 6). At the time of the introduction of the FFHP, all staff except the Principal, were local Indigenous people and English literacy, as discussed above, was only introduced (in Year 4) after students achieved sufficient oral English acquisition (Freeman, 2009).

When the FFHP was posted on the NT government education web site, the community responded by taking a group of elders and children to the Alice Springs town council lawns and then the NT education offices in Alice Springs to protest. Upon their return, they painted the school wall with the words ‘learning together’ (ex-assistant teacher, pi, 11 March 2014). A group of parents then launched a Human Rights Commission complaint of racial discrimination against the NT Government under the auspices of the Human Rights Law Resource Centre and pro-bono lawyers from legal firm Lander and Rogers (Schleiger, 2010). The case was brought before the commission in February 2010 and led to a series of meetings with NTDET staff, including Gary Barnes, the Chief Executive of NT DET, complainants, school staff, the legal representatives and a member of the Australian Education Union in Alice Springs at Site 2 (Williams, 2011). The community and staff persisted in both the delivery of bilingual education at the school and supporting the Human Rights case and the government eventually relented. By 2011, the government entered into a private agreement with the Site 2 school to allow its continuation of bilingual education. The program had the continuing support of a teacher linguist and the literacy centre but little else and no bilingual education professional development for staff. The program has continued in this manner relying on, apart from several community members helping in the literacy centre, only one Indigenous teaching staff member, an Indigenous teacher assistant and a non-Indigenous teacher linguist to implement the Indigenous vernacular program (ex-assistant teacher, pi, 11 March 2014). The Education Department failure to employ a linguist and the retirement due to illness of the sole qualified Indigenous teacher meant that
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177 Freeman (2014) noted that the phonics based programs being used in most remote schools contrasts considerably in outcomes with the two ‘tried and true’ remote bush programs used in the Site 2 school. These programs were the urban Indigenous based Walking Talking Texts by Fran Murray (1995), which involved a number of diverse activities associated with the exploration of a text, and Do-Talk-Record, an experientially based writing program.
the bilingual program was suspended during sometime between 2015 to 2016 (a period after data gathering) accompanied by reports of increased behavioural management difficulties and truanting of students.

**Summary of Appendix 1.2**

In summary, bilingual education in the NT began in 1973 and continued for a number of decades with varying, but usually positive, results in terms of community socio-economic outcomes, the professionalization and training of Indigenous staff, the equal status of Indigenous and non-Indigenous teaching staff and student academic success. Despite these positives, it appears to be largely and generally implemented in a subtractive manner with some children in some bilingual schools receiving dominant language education only. This subtraction is evidenced by an apparent failure to ensure adequate resourcing, in terms of physical materials, human resources and professional development; and attempts to undermine individual school programs by department and school staff. Lack of Education Department support resulted in the attempt by the NT Government to remove bilingual programs from remote Indigenous NT schools in 1998. The bilingual policy that emerged after the 1998 decision, the *Two Way Learning Program*, also suggests subtraction in its dominant focus on English language and literacy development at the expense of L1 (and, consequently, L2) development. The involuntary L2 learning (as opposed to ‘elective’) status of remote Indigenous students and the inequity in education provision between remote and non-remote school sites also indicates subtractive bilingual education predominated in NT contexts during much of its history (Cummins, 2000; Devlin, 2009a: Dhaykamalu, 1999; Lasorsa, 1990; Simpson, Caffery & McConvell, 2009). This subtraction is also apparent in the histories of bilingual education at Site 1 and Site 2. Although Site 2 historically retained its bilingual status, the increasing concern for English literacy and language acquisition has meant an eroded and often unsupported or less supported IL program in both communities.

This description aligns with CLPP accounts in language policy of colonisation, hegemony and ideology and the influence of neo-liberal globalisation where less prominence is given to non-dominant language varieties in educational policy (Corson, 2001; Lo Bianco, 2001a; Tollefson, 2008; Ch2). It also indicates evidence of settler colonial logic where a perceived Indigenous ‘lack’ or deficit in English language is rectified with a policy shift toward monolingual dominant
education (Clarke, 2012; Pajaczkowska & Young, 1992). There is also the allusion to neo-liberal logic where lifestyle and language ‘choice’ are the cause of failure, thus requiring punitive measures as opposed to addressing poor L1 development and structural inequalities (Clarke, 2012; Cummins, 2000; Davies & Bansel, 2007). The lack of research on the ideology and logic embedded in such a language policy in addition to the social, emotional and even material effects experienced by communities associated with the implementation of the policy means that these are potential areas that can be explored qualitatively in this research. In this research, they are explored using CDA and CA on key policy texts and interviews from two communities (both with a long history of bilingual education but where one effectively stopped bilingual programs) to ascertain the ideological underpinnings of the FFHP and its effects. Ch4, 5 & 6 represent this exploration with Ch3 outlining the methodology associated with data acquisition and analysis.
Appendix 3.1 - Interview Questions

The interview questions below for adult community members were open-ended and largely involved; perceptions on the importance of ILs in the community; community reaction to the introduction of the FFHP; impacts of the FFHP in terms of community involvement in and treatment by the school; changes in school practises and effects on students; interactions with the government and any changes in professional status of Indigenous workers at the school. Not all the questions were asked of each participant. The questions asked depended on the prior experience and role of the respondent.

Interview with Experts 1

Bilingual and First Language Education

1. In what way have you been involved with bilingual education in the Northern Territory? And when did this involvement start?
2. How in your experience has the NT and Federal Governments responded to Australian ILs? What evidence do you have for your assessment?
3. Have there been any efforts on the part of the key entities involved with the study of ILs (such as the Applied Linguistics Association, Australian Linguistics Society, key university Linguistic Departments) regarding First Language Instruction in the Territory?
4. Could you tell me what ILs mean and represent to Indigenous people?
5. Can you describe the role of English and ILs in the Territory today?
6. What do you believe a language policy in Indigenous education should achieve?
7. In your opinion, what would be an ideal/proper Language Policy for the Northern Territory and why?
8. Who are the bilingual teachers? Can you refer to any training issues [where they were trained, for how long? Etc., Did training increase or stop? Do you know why?]
9. Which materials are used/were developed? Do you know what’s happened to those materials?

The First Four Hours of English policy

1. What has been the role of both the Territory and Federal Department of Education (NTDEET, DEEWR), in relation to First Language Instruction and the First Four Hours Education Policy?
2. What was the status of bilingual education programs in the Northern Territory prior to the First Four Hours? After?
3. How many languages were used in education prior to the First Four Hours?
4. What were the criteria for the choice of a particular language and its consequent introduction as a medium of instruction?

Policy Implementation
5. Can you talk about the society’s (both national and territory) overall reaction to First Language Instruction in the Territory?
6. Do you know of any differences of opinion in different populations and/or geographical areas (urban/rural)?
7. Do you know of any reaction at the community level to the First Four Hours policy?
8. What responses have you noted from parents and/or students?

Community interview – Adult community members

Policy implementation

1. Was there any community reaction after the policy came in? If so, what was it? Do you know why there was this reaction? Have there been any changes in community opinion/perception over time since the introduction to the English only policy?
2. What, if any impact has occurred on community participation in the school since the First Four Hours of English was introduced? What was community participation in the school and curriculum like before and after the policy? What kinds of things did/do people do? How was the community treated before and after the policy?
3. Did/Do you have any involvement in the school? What are/were the benefits/problems? Did the First Four Hours policy have an impact on your involvement in the school? If so, how did your involvement change?
4. Has there been any change in school practice since the First Four Hours of English was introduced? If so, what practises did schools change, stop or create to implement the policy? Do you know if these practices had any effect on students and/or the community in any way?
5. Were there any effects on or changes in students when the First Four Hours of English policy was implemented? If so, what were these effects or changes?
6. When the First Four Hours of English policy was introduced, do you know of any impact on language workers at the school? If so, what effects did it have

If you were a teacher, answer the following;

Bilingual education and first language education

1. Were ILs used as languages of instruction or were ILs taught as subjects before the First Four Hours of English was introduced? Do you know anything about after?
2. What was the time assigned for each language in the classroom per week before the policy was implemented? Do you know about after?
3. Do you know if this had any impact on students learning English or a First Language?
4. Did you get any training for teaching in a first language or English? How much training did you get?
5. Who gave the training?
6. What were the languages taught at the school?
7. What languages did you teach? How long were you teaching these?
8. What resources or materials were needed and made for teaching language? Who made them? Do you know if they still exist and if they are being used?

Policy Implementation
9. Do you know of any changes in and effects on students since the First Four Hours of English policy came into effect?
10. Did the FFHP have any impact on your decision to leave your position at the school?

Community Interview – students

English and Other languages

1. What’s language(s) do you speak? Where do you speak this/these languages?
2. What languages do you want to learn at school? Why?
3. What languages don’t you like? Why?
4. What languages do your parents think are important to learn?
5. Do you like to learn English? Why? Why not?
6. Do you like to learn your own language at school? Why? Why not?

School Experience and language

1. Do you like being taught by Indigenous or non-Indigenous teachers or don’t care? Why?
2. What do you remember about the time that all lessons until lunchtime had to be taught in English?
   a. Did things change in the classroom? If so, how did they change?
   b. Did the teaching change? If so, how did it change?
   c. Did you learn more or less or just the same? What makes you think so?
3. What did/does learning in an IL make you feel? Did/do you feel good about yourself or bad? Why or why not?
4. How did learning in English make you feel? Did you feel good about yourself or bad? Why? Why not?
5. Do you learn better at school learning in English? What makes you think so? Do you like school more?
6. Do you do better at school learning in your own language? What makes you think so? Do you like school more?
Appendix 3.2 - Expert Plain Language Statement

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

Consent form – Adult Policy Creator/Implementer or Expert

PROJECT TITLE: Talking Black Fella – an analysis of the First Four Hours Policy

Name of participant:

Name of investigator(s): Janine Oldfield (student researcher), Professor Joseph Lo Bianco (Principal researcher), Dr Paul Molyneux (other researcher)

1. I consent to participate in the project named above, the particulars of which - including details of methodology (qualitative interview) - have been explained to me. A written copy of the information has been given to me to keep.

2. I authorise the researcher or assistant to use for this purpose the qualitative interviews referred to under (1) above.

3. I acknowledge that:
   (a) the possible effects of qualitative interviews have been explained to me to my satisfaction;
   (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied;
   (c) the project is for the purpose of research and not for treatment; (for medical research)
   (d) it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information request or mandatory reporting by some professions and the Northern Territory Government because of child, abuse and domestic violence
   (e) participation in the project may have implications in terms of protecting my identity
   (f) by agreeing to be part of the research, the interview will be video-recorded or audio-recorded and I understand that audio and video-recordings will be stored at University of Melbourne and will be destroyed after five years.
   (g) I can have a copy of the findings
   (h) that this form, once signed and returned to the student researcher, will be retained by the researcher

   I consent to this interview being video recorded
   ☐ yes ☐ no
   (please tick)

   I consent to this interview being audio recorded
   ☐ yes ☐ no
   (please tick)

   I consent to my identity being revealed
   ☐ yes ☐ no
   (please tick)

   I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings
   ☐ yes ☐ no
   (please tick)

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

(Participant)
Appendix 3.3 – Community Adult Plain Language Statement

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT – Adult Community Member

This is for you to keep

Anangu Mungu Wura: Talking Black Fella

An Analysis of the Northern Territory First Four Hours of English Policy.

Introduction
You are asked to be part of the ‘Talking Black Fella’ project. You don’t have to and if you change your mind, the researchers won’t use your information and will destroy it. You can also decide not to answer some questions if you don’t want to answer them.

This study looks at the ‘First Four Hours of English Only’ policy brought into all schools in the Northern Territory in 2009 and the taking away of bilingual education. Bilingual education is learning in English and Warbari/Pitjanjara. This study looks at both the policy and what happened to two remote indigenous communities after the policy was brought in – Ayreyonga which used human rights to put back their bilingual program and Yuendumu whose bilingual programs stopped.

This research project has been approved by the Central Australian Human Research Ethics Committee (CAHREC) and the University of Melbourne Human Ethics Committee.

Who is funding the project?
The PhD is being funded by the University of Melbourne and the field work is being funded by Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education.

What will I be asked to do?
As a participant, you will either be talking in a group of 5 – 10 (after being given some questions) and, if you have been an Indigenous teacher, telling about your experience in bilingual education individually to the

Each interview will take no longer than 1 hour.

The student researcher will visit the community at the end of 2014 to tell everyone what is written in the research project in a way that you feel comfortable with. The student researcher will also show the findings of their research at conferences and other places that participants want the student researcher to show their work in.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
Who you are will be kept confidential and the information and your identity will be kept securely, will not be accessible and will be destroyed after 5 years. This means that although information you give in the interview will be used as part of the research, no one will be told who you are or that you participated in the research and your name will be kept in a safe place and the interview and your name will be destroyed after 5 years. Any video or audio recordings or transcript you give will be held in a computer digital file that needs passwords while the student researcher is in the community and held in secure university computer storage when they get back on campus. This means that any recordings and writings on what you said will be in a file that needs a secret password on the student researcher’s computer until they get back to their university and it will be locked up at the university. The student researcher and their supervisors will be the only ones who can see this information. However, you may still be identified because the community is small. This means that people may be able to guess who you are and government agencies and departments may

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285  F: +61 3 8344 8529  W: www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au
know that you have participated in this research. This may affect any agreements or services or work you have, such as teaching, with those agencies or departments and/or you could lose your job. In addition, it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information request or mandated reporting to the Northern Territory Government if information involves child abuse and neglect, underage sexual activity and sexual abuse domestic and family violence where there is serious physical harm. This means, a law court or government agency or department might make the researchers give them information from you or they have to give the information about abuse and violence to the police because it is the law.

**What are the risks or benefits from participating?**
The main risk you take in becoming part of the study is that people may guess who you are and this may result in the stop of some government services, agreements or work. Also, becoming part of the study takes up some of your time. It is hoped, though, that this study will result in improvements at the school and negotiations between the government and the community. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Should you wish not to keep going with the project, or you don’t want the researcher to keep text, audio or video of what you have said you just say so and the student researcher will give you any written information on you and computer files or destroy them if you want. Your decision to not do the study won’t have anything to do with your marks or grades or access to courses at Batchelor Institute or the University of Melbourne if you a student at these places.

**Where can I get further information?**
If you want more information, you can contact the student researcher (Janine Oldfield 0402424103), the main researcher (Joseph Lo Bianco, 0407 798 978) and the other researcher (Paul Molyneux, 03 8344 8202) anytime by mobile or email below if you want to talk about the project and have any problems with it. You can also contact the Central Australian Committee (CAHREC) Secretariat on 08 8951 4700 or email cahrec@flinders.edu.au. You can also talk to the university - the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, on ph: 03 8344 2073, or fax: 03 9347 6739 and any of the supervisors below. Also, two Shire council workers have agreed to personally talk about the project as well. These are Peter Wilson (Ayrengya) and Sasha McKell (Yuendumu).

**How do I agree to participate?**
If you want to be part of the research, please show that you have read or have had the information interpreted so that you understand it by signing the consent form and giving it to the student researcher.

Name of Student Researcher : Janine Oldfield

Telephone : 040 2424103

Email: j.oldfield@student.unimelb.edu.au

Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jo Lo Bianco</th>
<th>Paul Molyneux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0407 798 978</td>
<td>03 8344 8202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, on ph: 03 8344 2073, or fax: 03 9347 6739

Central Australian Committee (CAHREC) Secretariat on 08 8951 4700 or email cahrec@flinders.edu.au
Appendix 3.4 – Community Student Plain Language Statement

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

Child PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT

for children and caregivers

This is for you to keep

"Talking Black Fella"

Hello. My name is Janine Oldfield. I am a student at the University of Melbourne. I am doing a project to find out about bilingual education (Learning in English and Werpari/Philpantjara). This project is being funded by the University of Melbourne and Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education.

When I finish my project it will be part of my degree, called a “PhD”. My teachers, Professor Joe Lo Bianco and Paul Molyneux, helped me with my project. They are called my “supervisor”. We all work in “the School of Education”.

Your community group at the shire council and your parent/guardian have said it was OK to give you this letter and to get someone to say it in a language you understand to tell you a bit about my project. Once you have read the letter, you can see if you want to be part of the research.

If you want to be part of the project, I will ask you some questions about what it is like in bilingual classes and what it was like before, after they stopped and when they began again to see how good or bad you felt, how good at school you were and are and whether you like going to school. This will be video- or audio-recorded. If you don’t want to answer some questions you don’t have to and if you want to stop, you can tell me and you can stop. If you decide not to be part of the project at all, you can tell your parents who can contact me or the other researchers, you can tell me, a teacher or Principal and I can get rid of the information you’ve given me.

Only my supervisor and I will see your answers, so please don’t worry that your teacher might look at them. The project will have nothing to do with your school work. But, being a small community, people may guess that you were part of the project and this may change the way some people talk to you and how they treat you.

After the project is over, I will put all the computer files [including audio or video] in the university storage for 5 years. I have to do this because it is a University rule. After that my supervisor will destroy them.

Remember, you don’t have to take part unless you want to. If you have any questions you can talk to your parent, aunty, uncle or gran. If they don’t know the answer to your question, they can ring me (Janine Oldfield, 0402424103), or my supervisor (Joseph Lo Bianco, 0407 798978), or the Research Ethics Office at the University (08 8344 2073) or the Central Australian research ethics person (08 8951 4700) for you.

If you want to be part of my project, and your parent/s agree, please sign your name on the next page where it says “child consent”, and get your parent or guardian to sign as well.

Yours Sincerely, Janine Oldfield

Name of Researcher: Janine Oldfield

Telephone: 0402 2424103

Email: JOldfield@student.unimelb.edu.au

Supervisors

Jo Lo Bianco

Graduate School of Education

University of Melbourne

0407 798 978

Paul Molyneux

Graduate School of Education

University of Melbourne

03 8344 8202

The Executive Officer,

Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, on ph: 03 8344 2073, or fax: 03 9947 6799

Central Australian Committee (CAHREC) Secretariat on 08 8951 4700 or email cahrec@flinders.edu.au

Melbourne Graduate School of Education

The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia

T: +61 3 8344 8285  F: +61 3 8344 8529  W: www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au
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Appendix 3.5 – Expert Consent Form

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

Consent form – Adult Policy Creator/Implementer or Expert

PROJECT TITLE: Talking Black Fella – an analysis of the First Four Hours Policy

Name of participant: 

Name of investigator(s): Janine Oldfield (student researcher), Professor Joseph Lo Bianco (Principal researcher), Dr Paul Molyneux (other researcher)

1. I consent to participate in the project named above, the particulars of which (including details of methodology (qualitative interviews)] have been explained to me. A written copy of the Information has been given to me to keep.

2. I authorise the researcher or assistant to use for this purpose the qualitative interviews referred to under (1) above.

3. I acknowledge that:
   (a) the possible effects of qualitative interviews have been explained to me to my satisfaction;
   (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied;
   (c) the project is for the purpose of research and not for treatment; for medical research
   (d) it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information request or mandatory reporting by some professions and the Northern Territory Government because of child, abuse and domestic violence
   (e) participation in the project may have implications in terms of protecting my identity
   (f) by agreeing to be part of the research, the interview will be video-recorded or audio-recorded and I understand that audio and video recordings will be stored at University of Melbourne and will be destroyed after five years.
   (g) I can have a copy of the findings
   (h) that this form, once signed and returned to the student researcher, will be retained by the researcher

I consent to this interview being video recorded □ yes □ no (please tick)

I consent to this interview being audio recorded □ yes □ no (please tick)

I consent to my identity being revealed □ yes □ no (please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary report on research findings □ yes □ no (please tick)

Signature __________________________ Date __________

(Participant)

HREC: 1340987.1; Date: 23/08/13; Version: 2.
Appendix 3.6 – Community Adult Consent Form

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

Consent form – Adult Policy Creator/Implemener or Expert

PROJECT TITLE: Talking Black Fella – an analysis of the First Four Hours Policy

Name of participant:

Name of investigator(s): Janine Oldfield (student researcher), Professor Joseph Lo Bianco (Principal researcher), Dr Paul Molynieux (other researcher)

1. I consent to participate in the project named above, the particulars of which - including details of methodology (qualitative interviews) - have been explained to me. A written copy of the information has been given to me to keep.

2. I authorise the researcher or assistant to use for this purpose the qualitative interviews referred to under (1) above.

3. I acknowledge that:
   (a) the possible effects of qualitative interviews have been explained to me to my satisfaction;
   (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied;
   (c) the project is for the purpose of research and not for treatment (for medical research);
   (d) It is possible for data to be subject to subpoenas, freedom of information request or mandatory reporting by some professions and the Northern Territory Government because of child, abuse and domestic violence
   (e) participation in the project may have implications in terms of protecting my identity
   (f) by agreeing to be part of the research, the interview will be video-recorded or audio-recorded and I understand that audio and video-recordings will be stored at University of Melbourne and will be destroyed after five years.
   (g) I can have a copy of the findings
   (h) that this form, once signed and returned to the student researcher, will be retained by the researcher

I consent to this interview being video recorded

☐ yes ☐ no
(please tick)

I consent to this interview being audio recorded

☐ yes ☐ no
(please tick)

I consent to my identity being revealed

☐ yes ☐ no
(please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings

☐ yes ☐ no
(please tick)

Signature ____________________________ Date ____________________________

(Participant)

HREC: 1340387/1; Date: 23/08/13; Version: 2.0
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Appendix 3.7 – Community Student Carer Consent Form

Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy

Parent/Guardian and Child Consent form
This means you can say no

Talking Black Fella

Name of participant: ________________________________

Name of investigator(s): Janine Oldfield, Joe Lo Blanco, Paul Mchyneux

I, give

(parent/guardian last name) ________________________________

(parent/guardian first name) ________________________________

For my child (named below) to participate in the above research study

(child last name) ________________________________

(child first name) ________________________________

(age) ________________________________

(current school year) ________________________________

In giving consent or saying yes, I agree that

(1) I have read the information Statement or had it translated and understand the time it will take for my child to be part of the study including any inconvenience, risk, and their implications and what my child has to do which is an interview and answer questions from a student researcher. This means I have had explained any problems that might happen because of the interview with my child.

(2) The researcher has given me the chance to talk about the Information and ask any questions I have about the study and they have been answered to my satisfaction. This means I am happy with how things have been explained and am happy to go ahead with the interview. They have also given me a plain language statement to keep.

(3) I understand that I can take my child out from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s), Batchelor Institute or the University of Melbourne or my child’s school now or in the future and that the information given by my child will be destroyed.

(4) I understand that my child being in this study is completely voluntary – I don’t have to agree that my child participates in the study and I can withdraw them from the study at any time.

(5) I understand that if I have any questions about my child’s participation (help) in this research, I can contact

Janine Oldfield (0402424103, J.oldfield@student.unimelb.edu.au)

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285  F: +61 3 8344 8529  W: www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au

HREC: 1340357.1; Date: 10/09/13; Version: 2.0
b. Dr Paul Molyneux (03 8344 8202),

c. Professor Joe Lo Bianco (0407 798 978),

d. Human Ethics Office at the University (the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics, The University of Melbourne, on ph: 03 8344 2073, or fax: 03 9347 6739) or the

e. Central Australian Committee (CAHREC) Secretariat on 08 8951 4700 or email cahrec@flinders.edu.au.

(6) I agree that research data gathered from the results of the study may be published (put in a newspaper, magazine or journal) and that my child nor I will be identified, but there is a chance my child and I will be known because the community is small.

(7) I understand that after my child and I sign and give back this consent form it will be kept by the researcher.

(8) I agree that:

(a) the problems of being part of the project (of being possibly identified by government departments and services) have been explained to me and I understand it;

(b) the project is for research;

(d) I have been told that the confidentiality of the information I give will be safe at a computer storage place at the University of Melbourne but that the data, because of a law court order (subpoena); the law of freedom of information; or because some jobs require reporting of information; and the Northern Territory Government requires mandatory reporting of information that involves child abuse and neglect, underage sexual activity and sexual abuse domestic and family violence where there is serious physical; that this information may have to be given to others.

(e) that with my saying yes, the interview with my child will be video or audio recorded;

(f) my child’s name will be given a made up name in any publications that comes from the research;

(g) that although my child’s identity will remain confidential, the community is small so people may know they have participated and this may affect how my child and I are treated in the school and community.

(g) the student researcher will return to the community to talk about the findings and that I can have a copy if I want.

I consent to this interview being video recorded 
☐ yes ☐ no (please tick)

I consent to this interview being audio recorded 
☐ yes ☐ no (please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings  
(to be sent to you via the community mail address) 
☐ yes ☐ no (please tick)

Parent Consent

Signed: ________________________________________________

Print Name: ________________________________________________

Date: ________________________________________________

Child Consent

Signed: ________________________________________________

Print Name: ________________________________________________

Date: ________________________________________________
### Appendix 3.8 – 10 Ethical Rules of Argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 1</th>
<th>(freedom to argue):</th>
<th>Parties must not prevent each other from advancing or casting doubt on standpoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>(obligation to give reasons)</td>
<td>Whoever advances a standpoint is obliged to defend it if asked to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td>(correct reference to previous discourse by the antagonist)</td>
<td>An attack on a standpoint must relate to the standpoint that has actually been advanced by the protagonist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4</td>
<td>(obligation to matter-of-factness)</td>
<td>A standpoint may only be defended by advancing argumentation relating to that standpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5</td>
<td>(correct reference to implicit premises)</td>
<td>A person can be held to the promises she or he leaves implicit. Conversely, antagonists must not be attacked on premises that cannot be inferred from their utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 6</td>
<td>(respect of shared starting points)</td>
<td>A standpoint must be regarded as conclusively defended if the defence takes place by means of arguments belonging to common starting points. A premise must not falsely be taken as a common starting point, and conversely, a shared premise must not be rejected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 7</td>
<td>(use of plausible arguments and schemes of argumentation)</td>
<td>A standpoint must be regarded as conclusively defended if the defence takes place by means of arguments in which a commonly accepted scheme or argumentation is correctly applied. A standpoint must be not considered to be conclusively defended if the defence does not take place by means of schemes of argumentation which are plausible and correctly applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 8</td>
<td>(logical validity)</td>
<td>The arguments used in a discursive text must be valid or capable of being validated by the explicitisation of one or more unexpressed premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 9</td>
<td>(acceptance of a discussion’s results)</td>
<td>A failed defence must result in the protagonist withdrawing her or his standpoint, and a successful defence in the antagonist withdrawing her or his doubt about the standpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 10</td>
<td>(clarity of expression and correct interpretation)</td>
<td>Formulations must be neither puzzlingly vague nor confusingly ambiguous, and must be interpreted as accurately as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

178 Taken from Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 71).
Appendix 3.9 – Pragmatic Fallacies – violations of ethical and logical rules

These are taken and adapted from Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 69-74) and Tindale (2007) and include only those relevant to this investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fallacy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum and baculum</td>
<td>'threatening with a stick'</td>
<td>Intimidation, threatening to use force instead of using plausible arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘If you don’t change this law, we won’t vote for you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum ad hominem</td>
<td>Attack on antagonist’s character or personality</td>
<td>Attack on a person’s “credibility, integrity, honesty, expertise, competence …” rather than refuting antagonist’s arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a fallacy of relevance)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Violates Rule 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallacy of relevance</td>
<td>Persuading one to accept the conclusion or consequence of something but using evidence that doesn’t support this conclusion or consequence – they are irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum of misericodiam</td>
<td>Appeal for compassion</td>
<td>Faked or pretend plight to invoke compassion to win an argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘We all know that the Klu Klux Clan are the real victims of exclusion.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum ad populam</td>
<td>Pathetic fallacy</td>
<td>Populist appeal to the “prejudiced emotions, opinions and convictions of a specific social group or to the vox populi instead of relevant arguments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violates Rule 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum ad ignorantiam</td>
<td>Appeal to ignorance</td>
<td>This refers to an argument, thesis, treatise as being deemed true if it has not been proven false or an argument being true because the opposite was proved false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violates Rule 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentum ad verecundiam</td>
<td>Appeal to a respected authority</td>
<td>Falsely backing one’s argument with reference to authorities that are incorrectly construed as knowledgeable, competent or qualified, are prejudiced or misquoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violates Rules 4 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundum quid</td>
<td>Hasty generalisations</td>
<td>Using a quantitative sample that is not representative. Can be composition (replacing whole with part) or division (replacing part with whole). Violates rules of logic and ethical rules 5 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post hoc, ergo propter hoc</td>
<td>After this, therefore because of this</td>
<td>Mixing up events chronologically to construe an untrue causal relationship, often ignoring complex factors. E.g. higher immigration causing higher unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallacy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petirio principia (fallacy of presumption)</td>
<td>Begging the question Circular argument/reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“...assuming in an argument that what has to be proved is already proved (Reisigl &amp; Wodak, 2001: 73)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. Indigenous people are a burden on the country because they overload working people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violates rule 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigged questions</td>
<td>Manipulative questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions that contain one or more presuppositions that are open to discussion, presuppose an incorrect starting point or falsely impute something to someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. When will the Federal Government stop favouring Indigenous people over the average Australian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violates rule 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignoratio elenchi</td>
<td>Ignoring the counter-proof of the counter argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evasive strategy where a thesis or standpoint is discussed or proved but is not the thesis or standpoint in question but an irrelevant one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violates rules 3 and 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straw man fallacy</td>
<td>Twisting somebody’s words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting a distorted picture of the antagonist’s standpoint in order to be able to refute the argument more easily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violates rule 3 and when intentionally misinterpreting the premise, it violates rule 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajectio in alium</td>
<td>Discursive construction of scapegoats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reversing the victim-victimiser and putting the blame or responsibility on someone else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violates rule 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fallacies relevant to this study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument of half truth</td>
<td>Not revealing all the information so an incorrect conclusion is made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallacies of presumption</td>
<td>Fallacies that begin with a wrong or false presumption and so can’t logically prove a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Sequitur</td>
<td>Making a conclusion based on a premise that has no relationship to the conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim lives in a big building so his apartment must be big</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False dichotomy (fallacy of presumption)</td>
<td>Giving only two alternatives as the only ones when in fact there are more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You have only two choices in reducing cholesterol, to become vegetarian or to take medication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association fallacy - False association or analogy</td>
<td>Stating that two things are the same because they share a quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIs are used in bilingual education IIs are used in remote monolingual schools Therefore, bilingual and monolingual schools are the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativity fallacy</td>
<td>Stating that a claim may be true of others, or particular circumstances, but does not apply to themselves or particular contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous bilingual education in Australia is different from Indigenous bilingual education overseas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3.10 – Topos of argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topoi</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Political Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantage or usefulness</td>
<td>If an action is useful then one should perform it</td>
<td>Usefulness of ‘guest workers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uselessness/disadvantage</td>
<td>If one thinks the outcomes of a decision will not occur or if other political actions or decision will more likely lead to these outcomes, then the original decision has to be rejected</td>
<td>Reducing penalties for discrimination so that judges will increase the number of guilty verdicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition/name interpretation</td>
<td>If an action or person or object is named, then they should have the qualities of X</td>
<td>‘economic refugee’ – if someone is a refugee, they are fleeing persecution. If someone leaves their home country for economic reasons they are not avoiding persecution. If somebody is not persecuted, he or she is not a real refugee. If somebody is not a real refugee, then he or she should not have the rights of a refugee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Cause and effect relationships based on probability. If an action occurs, it should have a particular consequence.</td>
<td>If Indigenous people are involved in policy making then policies have a better chance of success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Testimony is a topos that relies on authority for its reasonableness – statistics, expert opinion, the law.</td>
<td>Statistically, smokers are ten times more likely to acquire lung cancer than non-smokers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarianism</td>
<td>If an action or decision conforms to human rights, then it should be performed. If an action or decision doesn’t conform to human rights then it shouldn’t be performed.</td>
<td>Advocacy for the equal treatment of workers regardless of citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Equal actions, persons, situations should be treated equally</td>
<td>All low income earners should receive social security benefits regardless of citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Because a state or group is responsible for a problem(s) they should act to find solutions.</td>
<td>Reduce immigration to reduce unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden (consequence)</td>
<td>If a problem constitutes a burden, one should act to reduce the problem</td>
<td>Reduce the numbers of refugees because they represent a responsibility burden on society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances/costs</td>
<td>If a situation or action causes revenue loss or costs too much money then one should perform actions that diminish the costs or loss</td>
<td>Change education policy to less costly alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>Because reality is as it is, then a specific action/decision should be performed</td>
<td>Social and economic conditions in communities have changed and this requires changes in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>If numbers prove a specific topos, then a specific action should or should not be carried out</td>
<td>The 1967 referendum where the majority of respondents said ‘yes’ to the right to vote for Aboriginals meant that this right was attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law or right (specific form of topos of authority)</td>
<td>If a law or norm prescribes or forbids a specific politico-administrative action, then that action has to be performed or omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Something is done or omitted because an authority deems it so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>History dictates that specific actions or decisions have specific consequences and so one should perform or omit such actions in particular situations A subtype is ‘history teaching lesson’ focuses on a change from the past</td>
<td>‘We have learned from the past’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The culture of a specific group of people gives rise to particular problem in specific situations</td>
<td>Deficiencies of Indigenous culture gives rise to poorer academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>If the right or offer for help is abused, then the right should be change or offer of help withdrawn or measures against the abuse should be taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken and adapted from Resigl and Wodak (2001: 77-80) and Glenn and Goldthwaite (2008: 151-156)
Appendix 4.1 - COMPULSORY TEACHING IN ENGLISH FOR THE FIRST FOUR HOURS OF EACH SCHOOL DAY and Guideline

1 POLICY
Teaching and learning programs in Northern Territory (NT) schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day, in order to improve literacy and numeracy results, particularly for Indigenous students.

The teaching and learning of Indigenous languages and culture may be scheduled during afternoon sessions.

Each school, in conjunction with its school council, will ensure that its school timetable addresses this requirement.

The requirement is subject to a common sense interpretation to allow for the timetabling of morning classes for Languages Other Than English (LOTE) in secondary schools and colleges.

2 BUSINESS NEED
In October 2008, the Minister for Education and Training directed that, as of 2009 all NT students are to undertake their teaching and learning programs in English for the first four hours of every school day. This decision was made in response to an identified need to make improvements in literacy and numeracy for all NT students, in particular the results being achieved by Indigenous students.

The ability to read and write and to be numerate is the foundation for all school learning. Good literacy and numeracy skills are critical if young people are to complete their schooling successfully. These skills are also required if they are to participate fully in the economic and social development of the NT and the nation.

Despite substantial investment by the NT and Australian governments in supporting the improvement of literacy and numeracy skills for students, and the genuine effort of Department of Education and Training (DET) staff over many years to improve results, there has been no significant improvement in NT students’ literacy and numeracy outcomes.
3 RESPONSIBILITIES

Principals
Principals are responsible for:
- working together with school councils to ensure the school timetable complies with this policy
- ensuring teachers, Assistant Teachers and other support staff have access to appropriate training or professional development to enable them to operate effectively in ‘English only’ classrooms
- negotiating for permission to vary the school timetable from time to time to accommodate special circumstances, e.g. a cultural excursion,

Schools managers
Schools managers are responsible for
- providing advice to schools and school councils on the design of timetables that meet this requirement
- brokering of appropriate support (e.g. ESL and/or cross-cultural effectiveness training) for teachers and classroom support staff
- ratifying school timetables to ensure they meet the requirements of this policy.

General Manager Teaching Learning & Standards
The General Manager Teaching, Learning and Standards is responsible for:
- the development of suitable curriculum materials that assist schools in implementing this policy effectively
- responding to requests from schools managers to provide professional learning support for teachers and support staff, to assist in the effective implementation of this policy.

Executive Directors
The Executive Directors in Northern and Central Australia are responsible for the effective implementation and monitoring of this policy in their regions.

4 DEFINITION
This direction should not be interpreted to mean that the first four hours of each school day are to be spent solely on teaching the subject English. Teaching and learning programs are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day, and may encompass instruction in a range of learning areas, e.g. science, mathematics, health education as well as English.

5 RELATED POLICIES
English Literacy and Numeracy Strategy
Length of School Day
Requirement to Provide Instruction for the Full School Year
Physical Activity Requirements for Schools

www.det.nt.gov.au
1 INTRODUCTION

The provision of an environment at school where English is used regularly in a variety of ways will support the development of proficiency in English literacy and enhance numeracy skills. Students in remote and very remote communities need increased opportunities to learn and practise their English literacy skills. Four hours of instruction in English each school day will give them these opportunities.

This guideline has been developed to support implementation of the Teaching in English for the First Four Hours of Each School Day policy.

2 SCOPE

It may be necessary for schools to provide some translation of terms and concepts required to assist students’ understandings, particularly in the early years of schooling, in areas where English is not the first language of students. However, the focus for instruction in the first four hours of each school day is to be modeling, scaffolding and encouraging students to use Standard Australian English.

This policy is in addition to the existing requirements for schools to:

- design learning programs that are working towards meeting outcomes in English or English as a Second Language (ESL) as defined in the Northern Territory Curriculum Framework (NTCF)
- identify literacy and numeracy targets and the programs and resources that will be used to meet these targets in the short and longer term in their Annual Operational Plans and their four year Strategic Improvement Plans, under the Accountability and Performance Improvement Framework (APIF)
- provide at least two hours of English oracy, literacy and numeracy instruction each school day.

The currently endorsed and supported literacy approaches include Accelerated Literacy, First Steps and Stepping Out, Quick Smart Literacy and Walking Talking Texts. Endorsed and supported numeracy approaches include Quick Smart Numeracy and Count Me in Too.
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Mr Calma knows (or if he doesn't, he ought to) that the division of remote Northern Territory schools into "bilingual" and "English only" schools is spurious. The reality is that in the many areas where a particular regional language is spoken by most or all students then that language is used as a vehicle for teaching English and learning areas, whether the school is a designated "bilingual" school or not.

Although there is a small number of fully qualified Aboriginal teachers (spread out amongst the "bilingual" and "English only" schools), for the most part when the class is addressed in an Aboriginal language it is by Aboriginal teacher assistants.

While some "bilingual" schools retain linguists who assist with the production of literacy materials, there are virtually no non-Aboriginal teachers who speak the relevant regional language with sufficient fluency to be able to teach in it. Most can barely speak the language at all, and this includes non-Aboriginal teachers at "bilingual" schools.

What sets the designated "bilingual" schools apart is that they receive 20% more funding and a range of models eg step, or 50-50. The policy that the Northern Territory Government is introducing seeks to increase and improve the exposure of students to standard Australian English (SAE) from the very beginning of their schooling and to require that the morning classes in each school day will be devoted to core subjects. Aboriginal language and culture programs may be taught in the afternoon, and resources will be available for such classes to extend beyond regular school hours.

It is understood and accepted by the Northern Territory Government that it will take time for the teaching of core subjects in the morning to be conducted only in English, and the role of Aboriginal teachers and teacher assistants will continue to be valued as an important tool for teaching students the core curriculum subjects (in particular English) which they need to master to progress to secondary and then tertiary education.

There is nothing wrong with the bilingual teaching model in principle, but nowhere in the Territory is that model viably and effectively implemented, despite the additional funding allocated to the "bilingual" schools.

In the 1999 Learning Lessons report commissioned by the Northern Territory Government it was noted that the reality in Northern Territory "bilingual" classrooms was that "the proportions of languages used, and the quality of instruction delivered, varied widely from year to year depending on the experience and skills of the teachers available at any one time, and the school leadership support for bilingual education". (p121)

It was also noted that "when one or both of the languages used in the classrooms are not functioning effectively, overall language acquisition outcomes are negatively affected". (p122)

Historical assessment data reviewed by the authors of Learning Lessons indicated that at that time "bilingual" schools, or some of them, were achieving positive outcomes in comparison with benchmark non-bilingual schools. The most recent
data shows that that situation has changed.

Mr Calma's article treats the nine so-called "bilingual" schools as a single generic group, which is grossly misleading for a number of reasons.

One of them is that while at some schools (eg Yirrkala or the schools in the "Warlpiri Triangle") there is a regional Aboriginal language universally accepted as the applicable local lingua franca, at others there is a multiplicity of local Aboriginal languages.

When that scenario applies the adoption of one particular language as a language of instruction in the school is profoundly political and often contentious at the local level.

Which brings me to Mr Calma's showcasing of Maningrida School in my electorate as a successful "bilingual" school. Maningrida is a Western Arnhem Land town which was developed as a Government "settlement" in the mid-20th Century, resulting in the coalescing there of a number of different language groups. Under Aboriginal protocol they were and continue to be visitors on the land of the traditional owners, whose language is Ndjebbana.

In the country surrounding Maningrida there are many outstations and one of the largest language groups still successfully living on their country is the Burrarra language group. Over the years many Burrarra people have moved into Maningrida to live. There are also many people from other language groups in Maningrida, including a significant contingent of Kunwinjku speakers.

For many years the only Aboriginal language taught at the Maningrida school was Burrarra. A Ndjebbana program has commenced only in the very recent past.

When I was last in Maningrida I spoke at length to Aboriginal teaching staff and to parents of school age children. One of the most senior traditional owners told me that he regarded the bilingual program at the school to be Burrarra-dominated, and that he would continue to refuse to send his children there unless they were to be taught in English (as he was taught himself when attending school).

I am supportive of language and culture programs catering both to Burrarra and Ndjebbana being offered to students in the afternoon at the Maningrida School, but in the mornings children should be taught core curriculum subjects with an emphasis on SAE.

Mr Calma makes reference to some success stories from Maningrida. I would be happy to meet with him and explain to him how and why those success stories do not translate into an endorsement of "bilingual" education.

Mr Calma comments on attendance patterns at Maningrida. I regret to inform him that attendance levels at the Maningrida School continue to be extremely poor. The "Transforming Indigenous Education" policy which the Northern Territory Government is introducing involves a range of targeted measures, emphasis on SAE is only one of them.

In regard to attendance it is proposed that the existing truancy powers and processes under the Northern Territory Education Act be enhanced so that effective action in relation to non-attendance can be taken at all remote communities, including Maningrida.

In my recent discussion with Aboriginal teaching staff at Maningrida, a number of staff members expressed resentment about what they perceived as an undervaluing of their potential contribution, and about the amount of time that they were relegated to tasks like pencil sharpening. A majority of Aboriginal staff confirmed interest in and enthusiasm for the development of career path opportunities for them which would lead to conventional teaching qualifications.

A focus and emphasis on such transition of Aboriginal teaching assistants into qualified teachers is another aspect of "Transforming Indigenous Education". The reality is that while most Aboriginal teacher assistants are fluent in their own regional Aboriginal language, their capacity to assist the classroom teacher across all learning areas (including English), even if using their own language as a tool, is limited.

The non-Aboriginal teacher assigned to the class (who does not properly speak the relevant Aboriginal language) is similarly lacking in the required skills and capacities to address this problem.

The destination we want to reach is one where the job of teaching the class is undertaken effectively and comprehensively by one teacher - preferably a local Aboriginal person fluent in both SAE and the relevant regional Aboriginal language.

- first published ABC Unleashed (23/12/2008)
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• ABC Indigenous Employment
R: At the beginning of this year, there was a new policy came in which was the first four hours of teaching. What was the thinking behind that policy?

GB: Yeah, look um. I’d have to say from the outset that teaching in the First Four Hours of English categorically does not mean that the home language of the community won’t also be used in that first four hours because good teaching is about making sure you build from where the kids are at. So, if kids have got language and they’ve got culture, that needs to be a feature of how we go about delivering in those first four hours.

R: So, what does that policy mean then?

GB: What that policy means is that they’ll be an explicit focus in the first instance on teaching in English and that we’ll have our assistant teachers who know the local language, support those teachers in delivering those concepts to the kids.
R: So, how is it different from what happened before this policy?

GB: Um, look, in many regards, um, I guess it’s the explicitness that makes the difference. We absolutely want our young Indigenous people to become proficient in the use of English language. Um, that’s fundamentally important. It’s the language of learning. It’s the language of living. And, it’s the language of the, of the, ah, the main culture in Australia. Um, so it’s being explicit around the importance of that. It’s making sure that students have both their own language and culture. At this school in Lajamanu, every afternoon, they do Warlpari language and culture. Their planning here, ah, with the new senior teacher which is a new position that’s been created in this school, they’re planning for a big event in week 7. They do that every term where language and culture is taken onto country. So, community members are in this school. It’s not an either, or. We want what the community wants and that’s to have kids proficient at language, that is English language, Standard English and at their own language.

R: So, um, under what use to be called firstly bilingual or Two Way and the Step Program, kids learnt to read and write a little bit in Warlpari first. Um, will that still happen?

GB: Um. Look um, they’ll be learning about Warlpari language and culture in the afternoon. So, certainly it will still happen.

R: Will they learn to read and write in Warlpari though, do you think?

GB: Look, they. I think they will because I’ve seen the materials that are here and the materials that have been used to capture that oral language in written form are part of what happens in that afternoon session. Um, it really will be a community based decision but um whether the community wants that to continue. I believe that they will. And, as I’ve said, repeatedly, this is not an either nor scenario. We fundamentally want both. We want our students in the territory to be proficient in English language and we want ah, our students to know and understand and to learn about their local language and culture. I reckon the territory’s ahead of the game.
R: What do you say to the people that say, as a teaching point, um, it’s easier and more effective to learn to read, and we only learn once, and it’s better to pedagogically to learn that in your own language. What do you say to that?

GB: Look, what I say is that um, the step approach to doing things is a high risk strategy. Um, it’s high risk for a couple of reasons. Number 1, um, you need to ensure that there’s continuity of staff within our schools. That’s a big problem in the territory. Number 2, you need to make sure that the students are attending on a regular basis. Across the territory, our attendance is not as it could be. Um, number 3, we need to make sure that there’s strong leadership in the community and community engagement. All of those factors when you line them up say to me that probably the rest of the country’s got it right and we should get on board with that and it is the strategy that most of our schools have been using. And, that’s to teach in English but to have that teaching supported in the other language. Certainly, there’s no evidence to suggest um that the Two Way bilingual Step Program delivers any better results than the approaches that I’ve described.

R: There’s no silver bullet and what some people have said to us is, that if only they would stay with one system long enough we’d be able to find out. We’ve had bilingual, we’ve had, you know Two Way, we’ve had the Step Program, now we’ve got this. There’s a lot of confusion. Um, isn’t that a problem?

GB: Look, um. I think there is some confusion. And, um, and, what I’ve tried to do is to work with principals and work with communities to allay some of the fears that have arisen out of that confusion. There was confusion around, ah, whether, ah, the community based people that worked in our schools could speak their home language. Of course they can, not only ah, can they but we want them to during that first four hours as they support the learning that’s taking place. But, look, um, communities are moving past that confusion. If you have a look at this community here at Lajamanu, they started their planning in November last year and they’ve come up with something that works for them. Um, if, if they keep this in place, if they, if we can keep teachers here longer because keeping teachers in Lajamanu has been an issue. If you have a look, um, at the staffing profile here, in a staff of about 12 or 13 um teachers, we’ve got six of them that are recent arrivals. Now, that’s where I need to focus my energy on. Get the programs
bedded down, um, get the community on board, get the teachers wanting to stay, and get um, um commitment and we can fly in the territory.

R: What about schools like Yirrkala where they’re just continuing to do what they did. They’re ignoring and saying they don’t want a part of this new policy. Does that concern you?

GB: Look, um, my staff have been to Yirrkala and um I’ve ah, had, held recent discussions with the principal at Yirrkala and look I’m very positive about there being a move towards Yirrkala, um, adopting, this approach. Um, as I said, I think there was some confusion and, ah the approach being painted as either bilingual or English, this is another form of bilingual and as soon as people understand that this is something that supports home language and culture being taught in the school and being used as the basis for teaching in English I think the heat will go out of the debate.

R: What do you say to people who say this is putting the Warlpari culture and language aside, putting it into one hour at the end of the day and whatever the Federal Government is doing is museumfying the language.

GB: Oh, look, I, oh, ah, I don’t agree with that at all. In fact, the Warlpari way of living, the Warlpari way of doing business, is actually infused into all of the teaching that happens in this school. As is the local language and culture in all of the other schools. You can teach in English and contextualise that teaching that picks up and builds on culture and builds on language and look, that’s what the research tells us that what good teaching is about is looking at the faces in front of you and working from where they’re at. And so, while there is specialist program work and dedicated work that’s happening in the afternoon, um, here, my view quite clearly and it’s evidenced is that these are proud Warlpari students who know about their culture, who tell me what their T shirts stand for and the various groupings that they’re in and who bring their culture, and their teachers’ acknowledge their culture in the day to day teaching. So, ah, this is not about residualising or de-emphasising the importance of language and culture, it’s about contextualising it and making it a part of the way in which we do business.

R: But has there been any real measure of the effectiveness of bilingual education.
GB: Look, I think there’s been a range of measures that have been applied. Um, obviously bilingual in that form, ah, you know, has not generated huge attendance. If the community’s really really valued and thought what was happening in the school was so important, then they would vote with their feet and be in those schools.

R: I guess as you said there is a lot of factors that affect attendance to be fair.

GB: Oh, absolutely, but attendance is usually off the back of passionate people in schools, running programs that they know and value as a community and feeling engaged with. So, um, attendance is one thing. Teacher turn-over is another thing. Um, in some of these communities, the teacher turnover is, quite frankly, not what it should be. And, um, you know, if teacher’s were truly engaged and believed in these sort of programs as being the answer to delivering fantastic outcomes in those young Indigenous people’s lives then they probably would stay longer. So …

R: What about support from the department though. They need that too.

GB: Look, ah, I believe they’ve got adequate support from the department. I can’t speak about ah, you know what’s happened in the past but ah what I’ve read and been able to ascertain, this program, amongst many other programs that exist in this space, has been well-resourced and well-supported. And, certainly, I think, ah, as I’ve said, ah, this is not an either or debate. This is um, and I think it could have been painted as that, this is about um, ah, quality outcomes in, um, ah, preparing kids to use standard English as a currency for learning and at the same time, and preserving, growing, Indigenous culture. The Northern Territory is the first um, state, to offer ILs as a dedicated senior secondary subject. NSW is just thinking about doing it now. The Northern Territory are ahead of the game in this space.

R: But, it was painted as an either or debate, wasn’t it? Was that a mistake?

GB: It certainly wasn’t painted as an either or debate.

R: It was painted as the first four hours of tuition will be in English.
GB: It wasn’t painted as an either or debate from the department. And, we’ve been at pains to make sure that people understand that, um, it’s a story about ‘and’ rather than either or.

R: Did the minister make a mistake?

GB: Look, I wasn’t, ah, in the department at the time the education minister who introduced this policy, ah, was in place. But I have read the press releases at the time and the communiques that went out at the time and I can quite honestly say that there was a balanced approach to painting this as not an either or solution. So, ah, um, no, um, I don’t think she did make a mistake.

R: You can see why people feel a bit confused. The policy seems unclear. It flips and flops around and then they look at the government and they wonder if the government is going to be there for another week or month or for how long.

GB: I’m not making any comment on the political dimensions of the Northern Territory but what I can say is that if you read the policy and I’d encourage you to read the policy, the policy is very clear about the learning in English being supported with home languages.
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Northern Territory: Bilingual Education

Dear Mrs Irwin

Thank you for your letter of 9 June 2009, forwarding a petition recently considered by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Petitions regarding changes to Indigenous bilingual education programs in the Northern Territory. I apologise for the delay in responding.

The Australian Government is committed to maximising the learning opportunities and life chances of Indigenous Australians. The Government is also committed to languages education in Australian schools, and recognises the important role Indigenous language learning plays in some schools. In recognition of this commitment, Australia formally endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on 3 April 2009.

The Northern Territory Government’s policy that programs in its schools are to be conducted in English for the first four hours of each school day is about ensuring that Indigenous children have the opportunity to be taught and learn English. The learning of English is a fundamental skill that all Australians, including Indigenous Australians, must have to successfully progress through school and participate in life beyond their schooling years.

As indicated in other related correspondence, I recognise the importance of Indigenous languages and I am pleased to advise that my Department will be working with the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts to develop an Indigenous Languages Action Strategy.

It is important to note that the teaching and learning of Indigenous languages and culture may be scheduled in Northern Territory schools during afternoon sessions.

Significant funding for languages education in government schools is being provided to the states and territories through the National Education Agreement, allowing jurisdictions flexibility to determine how funding is allocated. Funding can be used to support Indigenous language programs.

$56.4 million is also being provided over 2009 to 2012 through the Schools Assistance Act 2008 to support the teaching of languages, including Australian Indigenous languages, in non-government schools.

The Government is providing an additional $56.4 million over four years through the Indigenous Education (Targeted Assistance) Act 2000 to expand intensive literacy and numeracy programs to assist Indigenous students who are not achieving at the level of the rest of their class, and to provide professional development materials and support to teachers to enable them to prepare and maintain Personalised Learning Plans for Indigenous students.

The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, agreed to by all Australian Education Ministers in December 2008, commits Australian schools to work in partnership with local communities to promote learning outcomes for Indigenous students.

Finally, through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) processes, all Australian Governments have committed to halving the gap in the reading, writing and numeracy achievements between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students within a decade.

I thank you for bringing this important matter to my attention and trust this information is of assistance.

from the Minister for Education, Ms Gillard
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