Toward a Land-Based Curriculum:

An Australian Indigenous Discourse Analysis

Josh Cubillo

University of Melbourne: Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE)

Submission Date: September 12, 2019

Supervisors: Professor Elizabeth McKinley & Dr Nikki Moodie

1

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my dear friends Todd Fernando and Lilly Brown for your kindness, honesty, and academic guidance.

To my wonderful supervisors Liz and Nikki, thank you for your patience, generosity and constant support. My sentiments are extended to Professor Fazal Rizvi who served as the chairperson on my theses committee.

And lastly, thank you to my beautiful family, Donna, Jaylene and Dawson. Your love and encouragement always pushes me to be better.

Professional editor, Eloise Chandler, provided copyediting and proofreading services, according to the guidelines laid out in the university-endorsed national 'Guidelines for editing research theses'

Table of Contents

Introduction

In this theses I explore the extent to which the Australian Curriculum maintains and reiterates a broader perspective of settler colonialism. Despite movements towards incorporating Indigenous education within the national education system, Indigenous peoples and knowledges continue to be subordinated in favour of Eurocentric world views and pedagogies. There is much complexity surrounding the term 'Indigenous education' and according to Ah Sam and Ackland (2005), this is evident in scholarship that fails to differentiate between education of Indigenous students, and education about Indigenous peoples, history, heritage and contemporary experiences. When making reference to 'Indigenous education' in this theses, I mean the connected objectives: education of Indigenous students and education of Indigenous histories and epistemologies (Ah Sam & Ackland, 2005; & Moodie, 2019).

As such far from being depoliticised, the Australian Curriculum represents a site of struggle and power through which government entrenches settler colonial policies that silence Indigenous claims to sovereignty. In this Introduction, I first illustrate the broader context (personal, historical and political) which informs my approach in this theses. I then present the theoretical and methodological resources through which my investigation is framed. Furthermore, I speak to how this investigation is structured: introducing the focus and aims of each Chapter. Drawing from an Alaskan example, I show how other settler colonial contexts may be instructive for Australian educator and curriculum developers with particular emphasis on science curriculums. Additionally, an analysis of the Marrung: Victorian Aboriginal Plan (2016-2026) will also occur to illustrate the way policy and curriculum developers have thought about Indigenous education in Victoria. Finally, it is through my analysis that land-based

education emerges as a key theme as a way to understand the calls for culturally responsive pedagogy and the importance of language, identity and community.

Context and Rationale

My Education and Journey

As a descendent of the saltwater peoples of the Northern Territory – the *Larrakia* and *Wadjigan* nations – I have always felt comforted and at home by the ocean. As far back as I can remember I was always fascinated with history and my culture. Every school holiday our family used to pack the car and travel to my grandmother's Country – *Bulgul* – a three-hour trip on dusty roads west of Darwin. These trips were always memorable because we would meet other family members out on Country and enjoy the holidays fishing and hunting with the old people. As we travelled across the land, the old people would recount stories to us younger ones about the different landmarks and their significance: teaching us to read the landscapes, and what this meant for seasonal food, animal and weather patterns. I learnt, for example, about the significance of the appearance of *bidjpidi* (dragonflies). They indicate that the dry season is coming and that we should expect torrential rains. These rains will inevitably knock down the long grass, signifying the end of the *barlmba* (wet season). This also means it would be a good time to fish in the creek because the fish will be seeking shelter from rougher seas. My *ngalmalg* (sister) and I were fortunate to have this kind of upbringing – we were educated in two worlds. My peoples' knowledge of '*gwo'yal-wa*' (Country) has been accumulated over many thousands of generations. It has taught us how to survive and live sustainably against the odds (King, 2011; & Whitehorse et al 2014).

7

In this theses I use 'Country' (with a capital) to mean a place of origin –

literally, culturally and spiritually. In addition to cultural knowledge taught to me I am

also informed by academics such as Langton (1997), Moreton-Robinson (2013), Rose

and Robin (2004), Whitehorse et al, (2014) and Martin and Mirraboopa (2003) to

express what Country means to me. The term 'Country' encompasses all the beliefs,

places, resources, stories, and cultural responsibilities held by Indigenous people,

because of our familial connection to the land with which we simultaneously hold

ancient geographical tenure. As such, Country is a sophisticated environmental and

spiritual environment that supports the social connections between Indigenous

Australians (Moreton-Robinson, 2013). The learning I acquired from my Elders was

outside mainstream or formal schooling I had received. In Australia we call this

'learning on Country'; in the international literature it is referred to as 'Land-based

education' (see for example, Tuck et al., 2014, Gruenewald, 2008; & Calderon, 2014).

I am reminded of one of my earliest recollections of learning history at school.

In 2002 I was fourteen years old and in Grade Nine. I recall being introduced to the

topic of Australian history in my Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE) class.

We learned about Captain James Cook and the significance of 1788 as the time of

Australia's 'discovery' before moving on to learn about the First and Second World

Wars. The teacher would read from the allocated textbook and then assign the

questions at the end of the chapter for the class to answer. These history lessons

played on my mind throughout my schooling years. I was never given the opportunity

to share or taught any of the knowledge I was acquiring on Country with my Elders.

For me, the history I was learning from my Elders during school holidays began long before James Cook's arrival and his 'discovery' of Australia.

My experience of the exclusion of Indigenous knowledge from the curriculum is not atypical. Research conducted in Australia and elsewhere suggests such exclusion is common, albeit experienced differently across settler states around the world. Ojibwe scholar Megan Bang (Bang et al., 2010), for example, found that Indigenous content in the United States, if taught, was often organised as the last chapter in classroom textbooks. Throughout my education and then professional life as a teacher, it was difficult for me to understand why Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's knowledges were so excluded from the State curriculum. This prompted me to ask and consider the following questions. How did the knowledge of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, who were in Australia tens of thousands of years before the British colonists, come to be so disregarded? Who writes the curriculum? Who selects knowledge for the curriculum? In order to answer these questions, I first provide a brief history of Indigenous education policies in Australia.

A Brief History of Indigenous Education Policies

The history of Indigenous education policies in Australia can be divided into three distinct periods: The Mission period (segregation); the Protection era; and, the Assimilation period (Partington, 1998; & Patrick, & Moodie, 2016). All of these policies – formally implemented from the 1850s to the 1980s – set out to 'teach and civilise' while at the same time exclude, separate, segregate and forcibly remove Indigenous children (Parbury, 1999). Across Australia many religious and charitable

institutions were granted the responsibility of educating Indigenous children, with a mandate to 'cure' a generation of Indigenous people by 'civilising' them into a European way of life (Partington, 1998; & Patrick & Moodie, 2016). It was through such education policies that Indigenous people were promulgated as 'less than' the British colonists. Eventually this colonial ideology found its way into legislation (Dudgeon et al., 2014). In the 1960s, the Menzies Government overtly promoted the idea that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people should give up their culture to assimilate and 'enjoy' the same standards of living as white Australians (Commonwealth of Australia, 1961, p. 1051). As a result, this further embedded the notion that Indigenous people were regarded as 'less than' White settlers, particularly in mainstream Australia. This history illustrates the flow-on effects that such laws or policies have in silencing Indigenous knowledges within and outside the education system. It also provides context to why some Indigenous people have been reluctant to engage with the education system.

The silencing of Indigenous knowledges today ties to educational practices and policies past (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003). Every Indigenous person is, in some way, affected by the different legislation implemented across the country throughout the three periods mentioned above. Even children who were not removed from their communities and placed in missions during the Protection and Assimilation periods had minimal education. State schools would deny Indigenous children admission to avoid public racist outcry from white Australians (Gray & Beresford, 2008). The legislative agenda during these periods mirrored Australia's colonial societies' perceptions of Aboriginal people and how they 'must' be treated (Dudgeon et al, 2014).

In order to understand the long Australian history of poor outcomes for Indigenous students we must also acknowledge the equally long history of discriminatory policies perpetrated against them. Throughout Australian colonial history complex social, cultural, environmental, economic and health frameworks have been used as tools to disadvantage or eliminate any achievement prospects for Indigenous students (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012). According to Patrick and Moodie (2016) education policies have consistently assumed and relegated Indigenous people as 'other' and deficient in comparison with mainstream Australia (p. 169). This is reflected in the failure to acknowledge and embed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges in curriculum. However, the absence of these knowledges has meant that everyone misses out on being presented with a holistic view of the world (Mercier & Leonard, 2017). By contrast, the education I received allowed me to develop a rounded view of where the Indigenous knowledge I was acquiring from my Elders complemented the mainstream education I was receiving. These broader points speak to the importance of embedding Indigenous knowledges in curriculum for all students. As will be discussed below, embedding Indigenous knowledges can be seen as corrective to deficiencies in pedagogy within the current curricula. However, to ensure their appropriate integration, Indigenous peoples must be involved in curriculum design. This involvement also ensures the acknowledgement and practice of Indigenous sovereignty within the education context.

The Importance of Embedding Indigenous Knowledges and Sovereignty in

Curriculum

Indigenous knowledges and sovereignty play a crucial role in overturning the

problems that have arisen out of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education

policies (Patrick & Moodie, 2016). Porter (2002) helps to conceptualise the meaning

of sovereignty in its simplest form which is Indigenous communities having the

freedom to choose what their future will be. Issues surrounding sovereignty need to

be raised when speaking about Indigenous education because such education should

address the desire Indigenous people have to determine their futures and the way they

relate with the world (Brayboy et al., 2012). Inculcating an understanding of how

education policies have contributed to the exclusion of Indigenous people is part of

this. It would also strengthen non-Indigenous empathy, awareness of, respect and

strategies for teaching Indigenous students (Patrick & Moodie, 2016). Chapter 2 will

further explore the history of the Australian Curriculum to see how overarching

objectives for the education of Indigenous students and implementation of Indigenous

content have evolved over time to support Indigenous sovereignty.

Article 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(UNDRIP) provides an outline of what Indigenous self-determination looks like in

educational practice:

> 1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational
> systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a
> manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.
> 2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and
> forms of education of the State without discrimination.
> 3. States shall, in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, take effective
> measures, in order for Indigenous individuals, particularly children, including
> those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an
> education in their own culture and provided in their own language.

Article 14 of the UNDRIP provides a significant reference for education institutions to consult when considering Indigenous education. It conveys an understanding and measure of how educators contribute to Indigenous sovereignty in a culturally respectful manner.

Battiste (2002) states that "the use of Indigenous knowledge in educational institutions is an act of empowerment, self-determination and sovereignty" (p. 4). The teaching of Indigenous knowledges needs to bear several objectives in mind, such as "anticipation of mutual benefit and knowledge sharing in an environment of respect between students and teachers" (Mercier & Leonard, 2017, p. 26). Brayboy and Castagno (2009), affirm that there is a shared consensus by most Indigenous educational leaders, parents, and scholars that schools should teach and facilitate the interaction across the different knowledge systems. With this in mind, it is important to note that Indigenous people are more likely to disengage if they believe the curriculum is trying to assimilate them (Colman-Dimon, 2000). When teachers merge Western Science and Indigenous knowledges in their lessons for example, they need to be careful in making comparisons between the two. Such comparisons often lead to Western Science being made the benchmark for other knowledge systems to adhere to (Mercier & Leonard, 2017; & Scantelbury et al., 2001). In this instance, the settler colonial curriculum reinforces its dominance. Educators need to understand the way invasion has continually eroded Australian Indigenous people's independence, power to self-govern (sovereignty) and control of their traditional lands (Veracini, 2010). Key to enacting sovereignty in curriculum is acknowledging the different world views and experiences of Indigenous students, in other words connecting 'school culture' with 'home culture'.

Connecting 'School Culture' with 'Home Culture'

Indigenous students are able to successfully navigate the two different world-views or 'code switch' (Klug & Whitfield, 2012) when their culture is visible and a central part of schooling (Gilliland, 1995). Indigenous students who master the art of code switching are both culturally and academically prepared to succeed in their own communities as well as 'mainstream' society (Reyhner & Jacobs, 2002). Teaching through an Indigenous lens should be a constant reminder to educators that every student learns in their own way and brings with them their own knowledge systems. Each student brings their own distinct 'virtual school bag' to the classroom that consists of different experiences, knowledges and interests (McGregor & Mills, 2017). These resources students draw on to make meaning of the world. In this way knowledge can be seen as a living process, rather than a commodity that can be controlled or possessed by an educational institution (Battiste, 2002). Incorporating Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum acknowledges this. It is also important because the learnings, practices and principles can teach students from other cultural backgrounds about living sustainably (Nelson, 2011). Mercier and Leonard (2017) also proffer that teaching Indigenous knowledges presents an opportunity for non-Indigenous students to learn about other ways of knowing to produce new knowledge in a safe environment. Additionally, Sleeter and Grant (2003) have advocated for Indigenous students to become comfortable and familiar with mainstream customs as well as their home cultures so that they can negotiate the 'codes' and rules to make informed decisions (Delpit, 2006). A curriculum that is inclusive of Indigenous knowledges prepares students to authentically connect with their communities in a holistic way (Battiste, 2002). As Milgate and Giles-Browne (2013) discerns, there is a

correlation between the inclusion of Indigenous parents and community members in curriculum production and Indigenous student enjoyment of schooling and optimism about their future prospects (Milgate & Giles-Browne, 2013). Furthermore, when Indigenous students can see themselves in the curriculum through the use of language or connections to local community, their academic achievement improved (Demmert, 2001).

The Importance of Language

According to Agbo (2001), in order for schools to be culturally responsive to the needs of Indigenous students, the curriculum must connect to students' lives through their culture and language. In doing so, schools act as places that deal with the ongoing effects of colonisation whilst validating Indigenous students' local knowledges (Mercier & Leonard, 2017). As Castagno and Brayboy (2008) note, policy makers rarely make the connections between education and sovereignty. However, when pedagogy recognises sovereignty and self-determination, schools are better equipped to provide appropriate schooling for Indigenous students (Rigney, 2001). Appropriate schooling and goals of sovereignty, like those specified in Article 14 of UNDRIP, can only be realised through ongoing communication with local Indigenous communities (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). This ongoing consultation and communication is what Moll and Ruiz (2005) regard as the core element of sovereignty through education - "the extent to which communities feel themselves to be in control of their language" (p.299).

Research conducted with Native American Elders in the United States has supported the notion that strong communities, relationships and Indigenous

knowledge systems are maintained and developed through language acquisition (Battiste, 2002). Language is also vital for environmental sustainability, spirituality, and connections to land because it encompasses sacred knowledge and cultural identifications relating to the environment (Benally & Viri, 2005). Key to becoming culturally responsive as an educator is investing in becoming culturally competent in oneself. This means educators immersing themselves in the community through different projects and community events (McCarty & Watahomigie, 2004; & Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). Cultural competence also means recognising the important role that language plays in Indigenous education.

Many Indigenous communities in the United States have taken the responsibility to teach their languages outside of the school setting (Hermes et al., 2012). However, when culturally responsive schools embed Indigenous languages into their curriculum, their students are strengthened, empowered and engaged. This is because the topics they are learning are of interest and meaning to them (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). Additionally, research produced by Castagno and Brayboy (2008) as well as Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) affirm that educators who know, and care, about their Indigenous students, understand their culture, speak their language and are active in the local community, deliver a more effective education. For Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist (2003), effective education means that education institutions retain Indigenous students for longer. There is also greater engagement from Indigenous students because the curriculum and classroom reflect the communities they are coming from (Lewthwaite et al., 2015). Having addressed the background context for this theses, in the section below I outline the theoretical and methodological framing of my investigations.

Theoretical & Methodological Framing

In this theses I employ Foucault's theory of power/knowledge and Wolfe's approach to settler colonialism to help guide my analysis and understanding of the production of power through the Australian Curriculum. Foucault (2013) argued that power works through culture and customs, institutions and individuals. Foucault's observations on power, particularly through the transfer of knowledge, has been a significant theoretical point of reference for settler colonial scholarship and theory, particularly in its application to invasion. As such, building on Foucault, settler colonial theory asserts that settler colonial power manifests through rendering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people invisible (Wolfe, 2006). Writing in the context of education, Ball argues that the use of Foucault's power/knowledge nexus has assisted Indigenous scholars to challenge the ideas that underpin the Australian Curriculum (Ball, 2013 p.5). This is because Foucault's power/knowledge theory urges us to consider how power works through discourse. Accordingly, in the Australian Curriculum, settler colonial power is demonstrated through the favouring or prioritisation of Eurocentric knowledges in curriculum discourse.

Young (1995) interprets 'discourse' as the particular kind of language that specialised knowledge has to conform to in order to be regarded as true. Luke (2002) further describes discourse as "an understanding of the centrality of language, text and discourse in the constitution of not just human subjectivity and social relations, but also social control and surveillance" (p. 99). Drawing on both definitions of discourse, in this theses I argue that education policymakers have used the Australian Curriculum to both silence Indigenous people and continue the production of Eurocentric ways of knowing. As a result, curriculum writers have framed Indigenous

people as deficient in comparison to non-Indigenous people. To counter this, I will explore why curriculum writers should be more explicit about embedding local Indigenous knowledges in the Australian Curriculum through the lens of Article 14 of UNDRIP. Indigenous academics Lowe (2017) and Rose (2012) for example, have urged curriculum writers to encourage educators to develop and teach local Indigenous knowledges as doing so would provide the opportunity to disrupt colonial curricula.

Foucault's power/knowledge theory has inspired generations of scholars more broadly to utilise and adapt his approach to discourse analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) developed to scrutinise language used by governments in documents and statements such as curriculum to strengthen the view that Western knowledges have been, and continue to be, favoured. According to the CDA approach, language should be understood as a practice of doing, being and saying. In line with this, Gee (2014) suggests that certain practices belong to social groups or institutions: each time a person uses language they do so in a way that is expressive and fit for the conventions they are accustomed to.

In this theses, I will use CDA to read different curriculum and policy documents as a means of gaining a deeper understanding of government intentions and practice. By deploying CDA and power/knowledge theory together, I will unpack the way in which language is being used in documents such as the Australian Curriculum, to maintain the dominant culture's power through the reproduction of knowledge. Critical discourse analysis emphasises the power behind discourse rather than just the power in discourse (Fairclough, 2013). Fairclough's (2013) use of CDA helps to

identify the way power plays out through language conventions which privilege certain knowledges. In this theses, I apply power/knowledge theory and CDA to the Australian and Alaskan education contexts to understand this power dynamic in dominant discourses on Indigenous education.

It is important to critique the curriculum and understand how Indigenous knowledges are embedded within it because a curriculum that encompasses Indigenous knowledges means students are being taught a holistic view of the world in an environment that is culturally safe and responsive. When Indigenous knowledges are embedded this creates a safe place for non-Indigenous students to learn about other ways of knowing whilst encouraging all students to interact and produce new knowledge in a revolutionary way (Mercier & Leonard, 2017). Moreover, a curriculum that encompasses Indigenous knowledges is beneficial to all students because the learnings can teach us lessons about the world that Eurocentric ideologies tend to ignore (Nelson 2011).

With the broad descriptors around 'history', 'culture' and 'language' in the Cross-Curriculum Priorities currently there is minimal accountability to teach and assess Indigenous content in Australian classrooms (Whitehorse et al., 2014). In the Australian Curriculum, the Cross-Curriculum Priorities provide learnings that can be embedded into different key learning areas by teachers at their discretion. The Cross-Curriculum Priorities are made up of the themes of sustainability, Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures. The themes are intended to help build on and support the understandings and knowledge that is being taught in the different priority subjects (Salter &

Maxwell, 2016). It is appropriate to understand the way other settler colonial states embed Indigenous knowledges in their curriculums and what learnings can be drawn from their contexts because there is minimal accountability in having Indigenous knowledges taught in Australia. My investigation of education in other settler colonial societies suggests the Alaskan context offers relevant and useful insights for Australia. The Alaskan Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) has been established to support Native people, educators and government organisations in gaining access to Indigenous knowledge Alaskan Natives have acquired over millennia. The ANKN is an exemplary example of educational sovereignty and I am particularly interested in the way these knowledges are embedded and how closely this aligns to the targets of sovereignty in Article 14 of UNDRIP. Understanding how the Alaskan education system embeds Indigenous knowledges in their curriculum is important because it provides a critical model for Australian educators to reference, particularly in understanding the effectiveness of using Elders in the design of culturally responsive curriculum, as well as the benefits of using online resources.

In this theses, I will build on the analysis of understanding the way Indigenous knowledges are embedded in the Australian and Alaskan education contexts and will suggest Australia's efforts can be improved by employing Land-based education. Below I briefly outline how I have structured this theses by providing a short overview of each chapter.

Structure of Chapters

Chapter I. – Theory & Methods (reading curriculum)

In Chapter 1, I will expand on Foucault's power/knowledge nexus as well as CDA. I will explain how the theory will be used to examine the Australian and Alaskan

education contexts and the discourses that surround them. Understanding the discourses of the Australian and Alaskan contexts will also allow me to interpret the way in which both contexts embed Indigenous knowledges into their curriculum.

Chapter II. – Australian Curriculum & Cross Curriculum Priorities

Chapter 2 will historicise how the Australian Curriculum was developed, in particular, by taking note of the policies that preceded this document. I will proceed by investigating the extent to which Indigenous knowledges, culture and languages have become a curriculum priority and the benefits to this.

Chapter III. – Alaskan Curriculum & Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools

In Chapter 3, I provide a brief history to the current Alaskan educational context. This will be followed by a review of the importance of Indigenous knowledges and cultural pedagogy within curricula. I will then explore how the Alaskan Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) went about producing a Culturally Responsive framework for schools.

Chapter IV. – Land-based & Learning of Country Education

Chapter 4 introduces the idea of local curriculum. I will propose land-based education as a pedagogical practice that could be used as a way to embed Australian Indigenous knowledges, contest colonial curriculum and act as a culturally responsive pedagogical practice.

Chapter I. – Theory & Methods (reading curriculum)

Introduction

As discussed in the Introduction, in this theses I apply the theories of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Foucault's power/knowledge nexus and settler colonialism to highlight the ways in which dominant Eurocentric narratives and knowledges are entrenched in educational policies and curricula. I particularly use these theories to identify, understand and analyse disparities that have occurred in the development of curriculum documents, particularly with respect to embedding Indigenous content. This combined theoretical approach plays an important role for analytical support and design, as it helps address Indigenous educational disadvantage while envisaging alternative ways of knowing.

Theory is a particularly important tool for navigating the complex historical and contemporary issues under investigation. It is also, as Stephen Ball (2005) argues, useful in challenging dominant ideas:

> Theory is a vehicle for 'thinking otherwise'; it is a platform for 'outrageous hypotheses' and for 'unleashing criticism'. Theory is destructive, disruptive and violent. It offers a language for challenge, and modes of thought, other than those articulated for us by dominant others. It provides a language of rigor and irony rather than contingency. The purpose of such theory is to de-familiarize present practices and categories, to make them seem less self-evident and necessary, and to open up spaces for invention of new forms of experience (p. 62).

Foucauldian and Settler Colonial theories offer insight into how and why Indigenous knowledges have been deliberately silenced in the design and implementation of the Australian Curriculum. Critical discourse analysis builds upon this by focusing in on how language itself is used to privilege certain knowledges

while subordinating or silencing others. In this Chapter I extrapolate the ideas behind these theories, addressing how they link with each other, and demonstrate in detail how these theories inform my investigation. I proceed first by discussing the issues associated with settler colonialism and its implications for Indigenous education. Understanding settler colonialism helps give a historical perspective to colonial policy and its intent to erase Indigenous people from history. I follow this by extending Foucault's theory of the power knowledge nexus: how power is used to deliver certain knowledges and re-establish dominant structures. Foucault's theory of power/knowledge urges us to question 'how is it that this statement appeared, rather than some other in its place?' (Foucault, 2013, p. 27). Asking questions about how something has come to be can restrain and immobilise what is thought to be normal and accepted. Understanding a problem through this lens allows alternative ways of seeing the problem and making sense of it. I then address how CDA builds on the Foucauldian premise by examining the way knowledge is expressed through language in policies. Critical discourse analysis is a method informed by Foucauldian understandings of discourse which align with approaches to discourse used in critical policy analysis. Researchers such as Rizvi and Lingard (2010), Gale (2001) and Bacchi (2009) have a history of employing Foucauldian discourse theory when dissecting different policies. In this part I will foreground how CDA will be used in my theses to examine the way in which the Australian Curriculum is written to highlight and favour colonial narratives whilst silencing Indigenous knowledges.

Settler Colonialism and its implications for Indigenous Education

The lack of Indigenous representation in the national curricula is
a reoccurring theme in settler colonial societies. Settler colonialism is a specific

formation and practice of colonialism in which the coloniser comes to stay, makes themselves the sovereign, and, subsequently, the arbiter of citizenship, civility and knowing (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2013). Education in Australia has been dominated by a Settler Colonial curriculum: silencing Indigenous knowledges whilst perpetuating Eurocentric ways of knowing as the most valued in the reproduction of knowledge (Willinsky, 1999). This curriculum is dangerous for Indigenous people because it operates within a logic of elimination. It 'destroys to replace' Indigenous ways of being (Wolfe, 2006, p.).

In Australia this logic of elimination is reflected in there being no compulsory Indigenous content in the curriculum. Instead, the most accessible way to teach Indigenous content in the Australian context is through the Cross-Curriculum Priorities. During the first 11 years of schooling there are three key Cross-Curriculum Priorities in the Australian Curriculum (version 5.1) (ACARA, 2012). These Priorities include Australia's engagement with Asia; Sustainability and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures. The idea behind these Cross-Curriculum Priorities is that they work towards helping students engage with and better understand the world they live in by providing students with the correct tools and language to do so. They set out to create an environment that encourages conversations between teachers, students and learning areas, and the wider community (Whitehorse et al., 2014). However, the inclusion of Cross-Curriculum Priorities is not compulsory. Rather, they *can* be included in all school subjects *when* educators deem them to be appropriate. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures, excluded from the core curriculum, thus become discretionary add-ons. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's interactive views of the world,

our living spiritual connections with land, sky, winds and water are likewise rendered separate, and occluded from sustainability education (Whitehorse et al., 2014).

As Lowe & Yunkaporta (2013) discern, the Australian Curriculum promotes a learning environment that favours colonial ideas by omitting Indigenous histories and social knowledges while privileging Settler paradigms. An example of this is evident through the way Settler curriculum privilege the term 'place' over 'Country'. Settler ontologies and understandings of 'place' seems to hold precedence in the Curriculum (Whitehorse et al., 2014), which contradicts Indigenous perspectives and value of the term 'Country'. In other words, while the Australian Curriculum recognises the idea of Country, it does so through the paradigm of place, a concept that carries the notion that the land is empty, uninhabited (Whitehorse et al., 2014) and something that can be harvested for economic gain. 'Country' and its connection to the social, ecological and spiritual, must supplant 'place' as a term to in which describes … "lived, known, loved, understood, mapped and cared for" (Whitehorse et al., 2014, p. 24).

This very notion of 'place' informed the way settler colonialism expanded with minimal concern for Indigenous peoples (Stephenson & Ratnapala, 1993, p. 25) or acknowledgement of their dispossession (Seddon, 2001; & Lowe & Yunkaporta, 2013). For this reason, curriculum developers have been seen to be deficient in understanding Australian Indigenous notions of Country (Whitehorse et al., 2014).

Throughout my experience as an educator it seemed evident that such systematic denial of Indigenous knowledge and culture within education contributed to Australian Indigenous disadvantage and marginalisation. Scholar Mark Rose

(2012) has described the continued refusal to teach Indigenous knowledges to students as "tantamount to a silent apartheid that has been enacted in Australian classrooms from the sandpit to the sandstone ever since the Western education system began in Australia" (p. 6). The suppression, and mistreatment, of Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum has meant that many Australians have not been taught about the knowledge Indigenous people have developed over extended periods of time – knowledge that is still practiced and understood today (Rose, 2012). In this process, the project of colonialism grew its prominence and power and it is only through a holistic education that encompasses both Western and Indigenous knowledges that an appreciation for Indigenous knowledges can grow (Lowe & Yunkaporta, 2013).

Another way Settler colonialism has suppressed Indigenous knowledges in education is through language. Due to the ongoing acts of colonisation, learning in my traditional languages, *Larrakia* and *Batjamalh*, has been difficult because the universal or mandatory language of my formal education was English. Even in the writing of this theses, I am limited or restricted to English – submitting in *Larrakia* or *Batjamalh* was not an option. Not being able to speak and learn through Indigenous language directly relates to the colonial project of ridding the 'natives' of their culture, language and land (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2013). An extension of this issue is lack of access. As Rasmussen and Akulukjuk (2009) describe, for many Indigenous peoples 'language is not something developed in isolation in human brains, but in relationship to land and water' (p. 279). Oceans and land have harvested and developed Indigenous languages over thousands of years. Language reflects human interaction with plants, animals and the elements. Although I would love to

teach in an Indigenous language I am not fluent in, there are dangers in doing so. For example, as McKinley and Keegan (2008) explain, transferring English to an Indigenous Language is an intricate process that should be treated delicately. The interpretation of an Indigenous language is not as simple as a one-to-one translation because the construction of new words in any language inevitably involves a transformation of the underlying epistemology.

Colonial authority is maintained by structures and systems that are reasserted each day of occupation (Wolfe, 2006, p.388). Colonial education is one such system. The control of language in Australian curricula provides just one example of this. Another is the treatment of Indigenous knowledge as science. For many years there has been a debate over whether Indigenous knowledges with respect to land and sustainability should be treated as are equally valid to western modern scientific approaches. For some academics and practitioners, Indigenous ecological knowledge in Australia is detailed, localised, and well-grounded in first-hand observations (Cajete, 2004; Pasco, 2014; & Rose & Robin, 2004). Others however have refuted these understandings. Personally, I remember learning about weather patterns as a student in my Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE) class. As I engaged with the lesson, I applied the knowledge I learnt from my Elders and felt smart when I shared it with the class. One example of what I shared was my knowledge that when the cicadas are heard buzzing in the morning, it signifies the day will be very hot and humid. If I was preparing for field work on a day where cicadas could be heard buzzing in the morning, I would prioritise morning field work to avoid the afternoon heat in an effort to maximise full participation. Despite this demonstrated relevance of Indigenous knowledges in understanding Australian ecology, and their grounding in

observation passed through generations, the Australian Curriculum excludes them from in the pedagogy of Science, exclusively teaching western scientific knowledges and paradigms (Seddon, 2001).

The ways in which such learning practices and discourses are influenced by Settler Colonial ideologies are important to acknowledge because they demonstrate how the Australian Curriculum – far from being depoliticised – has the authority to maintain power structures as well the ability to dissolve power (Seddon 2001). According to Foucault, discourse always involves a form of violence in the way it imposes its linguistic order on the world: knowledge has to conform to its paradigms in order to be recognised as legitimate (Young, 1995). One example of this is the debate surrounding the import and recognition of Indigenous knowledges in science. Foucault (1980) suggests:

> [t]he exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power… Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of region, domain, implantation, displacement, transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power (p. 69).

In the next part I explore how Foucault's treatment of power/knowledge lends further insight to Settler colonialism within education, and in particular how we can use this to investigate the mechanisms through which Indigenous knowledges are suppressed.

Foucault's Power/Knowledge Nexus

Foucault's insights on the interrelationship between power and knowledge provides guidance on how we can understand how Settler colonialism is reproduced in the Australian Curriculum. As Feder (2011) – drawing on Foucault – notes, 'power works

through culture and customs, institutions and individuals' (p. 56). Although Foucault does not explicitly critique or discuss the mechanisms of colonialism, his assessment on power and the transfer of knowledge has been a significant theoretical point of reference for scholarly analysis of the impact of invasion. However, Foucault's power knowledge nexus also enables Indigenous people to challenge the ideas that underpin the Australian Curriculum (Ball, 2013 p.5). In the Australian context, one colonial idea that is manifest in curriculum is land as property. The mandate of the settler colony has always been to remove and sever Indigenous people's connection to Country (Wolfe, 2006). One way this has been operationalised is through discursively diminishing Indigenous peoples' connections to Country through projecting notions of ownership of land in education. As such Indigenous understandings and connection to Country are not engaged within the Australian Curriculum. Instead, Eurocentric understandings of land/Country dominate conversations involving the environment. This conception of land as property also influences place-based education as it exists in the Australian Curriculum (for example, outdoor education and studies of society and environmental education).

Through Foucault's analysis of power, policies in education can be linked with authoritative allocation of values (Ball, 1990). This enables us to see whose values are validated in policy, and whose are not. As demonstrated above through the example of land as property, colonial ideologies and philosophies continue to inform current curriculum, pedagogy and educational practices (Hickling-Hudson et al., 2004). Curriculum assists in regulating and asserting control over Australian nationalism rhetoric, so that there is a collective voice from the people to progress the nation, strengthen national identity and fulfil national destiny (Seddon, 2001). Curriculum content reflects a process of colonial conscious and unconscious decision

making (Hickling-Hudson et al., 2004). The direct consequence of this is that curricula pattern colonial inclusion and exclusion, which directly informs what knowledge, skills and dispositions that are taught (Seddon, 2001).

Foucault enjoins us to explores how power plays out in education system in effort to understand how it may be disrupted. Individuals and systemic structures each have their own distinct characteristics which are maintained by the 'power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces' (Foucault, 1980, p. 74). Curriculum has the ability to distribute influence and authority in society because it supplies the formation of singular and structural centres of power as well as the limitations on the exercise of that power (Seddon, 2001). Applying this to the Australian context, the powers of the settler colony are reproduced because only the dominant culture's learnings of social and political discourse are being taught (Seddon, 2001). Indigenous peoples have been disadvantaged and marginalised due to their removal in the formation of Australia as well as the systematic denial of Indigenous knowledge and culture within education. As Rizvi and Crowley (1993) have argued, people who develop curriculum in Australia have largely lacked the courage and will to deal with the tasks of building key national documents that cater to the socio-economic environment of Indigenous students' actual lives and understandings.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) builds upon the Foucauldian approach to power/knowledge through applying the theory to language. CDA approaches language as a practice of doing, being and saying which both reflects and enacts the

norms and conventions of particular social groups and institutions. Each time a person uses language they do so in a way that is expressive and fit for the conventions they are accustomed to (Gee, 2014). This methodological approach of CDA also dovetails with the framework of settler colonial theory which seeks to unpack and historicise deficit discourse for Indigenous people in Australia. Uniting these three theoretical frames, in this theses I examine how curriculum documents in Australia and Alaska disadvantages Indigenous people through the use of language which favours colonial ideologies over Indigenous understanding of the world.

Critical Discourse Analysis emphasises the power behind discourse rather than just the power in discourse (Fairclough, 2013). As Gee (2004) writes,

> '…we humans are always making knowledge and belief claims within these systems. We can use language to make certain forms of knowledge and belief relevant or privileged or not, in given situations; that is, we can use language to build privilege or prestige for one sign system or way of knowing over another' (p. 35).

By employing the methodological lens of CDA, researchers can focus in on how language expresses particular policies. This in turn provides insight into how certain policies filter into the classroom: how the text positions teachers and readers in relation to each other and how the social structures become realised through discourse (Lewis, 2006). Interest in this methodological and theoretical approach has grown steadily (see e.g. Harvey, 2003; & Moje & Lewis, 2007). The theoretical underpinnings of CDA help us to examine how power and social relations, characteristics, and knowledges are built through spoken, visual and written texts, giving perspective to their consumption and production (Lewis, 2006). Moje and Lewis (2007) suggest that CDA is able to observe the power dynamics that occur during exchanges because it is able to account for the way everyday written and

spoken texts are organised in social structures. Critical Discourse Analysis should be regarded as a diplomatic approach that breeds subtle and intricate readings and interpretations, has rigorous standards, and makes visible the researcher's stance and commitments (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

According to Fairclough (2001), CDA views discourse as site for social and class struggle. It sets itself the objective to raise people's consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, as a step towards social emancipation (Fairclough, 2001). Critical Discourse Analysis provides the instruments for investigating the evolution of system structures and the workings of power in the broader contexts (Lewis, 2006). It also allows for agency to be analysed by asking questions around when and how people or institutions are able to move freely within the system (Lewis, 2006). Wodak (1996, p. 20) refers to CDA as a 'socially committed scientific paradigm' that sets out to seek the truth and is heavily influenced by a postmodernism standpoint. In this realm, discourse that is influenced by power is shown to be most important (Harvey, 2003).

One of the main criticisms of CDA is that its reading of ideologies is imposed rather than systematic (Lewis, 2006). As such, Lewis (2006) stresses the importance of not using CDA as the purpose and result of the research. Instead, he cautions researchers to use CDA as a method in examining meaningful research question and aims. Proponents have argued that CDA has the ability to recognise and deconstruct the structures that are used to oppress people, particularly in ways that reproduce dominant structures of power (Lewis, 2006). However, some critics caution that the methodology may be limited in helping to understand the way language is used to

create changes in thinking, contemporary ideas of reference and disturbing power production or regulating discourse (Lewis, 2006). For example, Luke (2004) suggests that while CDA may make researchers aware of the role texts play to reproducing injustices and inequity, it cannot do much to transform these conditions and progress positively. Moreover, Kress (1993) suggests that CDA critiques without self-implication as it is used as an instrument by researchers to examine words of those who are less conscious. For Kress (1993), this inevitably reproduces the power dynamics that CDA sets out to reverse. To overcome the reproduction of power dynamics, Kress (1994) suggests researchers should search for markers of power seen through in their own structures and design, and reflexively use CDA as a means to overcome them. Researchers need to ask exploratory questions to ensure open dialogue with many world views. To address issues concerned with the way settler colonialism works, I have relied on Indigenous scholars and worldviews so that Eurocentric curriculum and its power can be critiqued.

How I Apply these Theories in this Theses

In the chapters that follow I employ Settler Colonial theory, Foucault's theory on power/knowledge and Critical Discourse Analysis to investigate how Eurocentric ideas are prioritised, and Indigenous knowledges silenced, in Australian and Alaskan curricula. In order to understand whose knowledges are being privileged, this investigation must attend to the historical context of current curriculum content. In this way I will offer an analysis of the pedagogical practices past and present in these two educational contexts, Critical Discourse Analysis will be applied to curriculum policies to understand the way language has been used to establish and silence Indigenous knowledges in the Australian Curriculum. Settler colonial theory will be

used as a frame through which to understand why Indigenous people have been regarded as 'less than' when measured against non-Indigenous people. Understanding the ways in which the respective colonies situated Indigenous people as deficient is key to appreciating how such power played out, and continues to play out, in educational institutions – it helps to identify which knowledges are being prioritised and reproduced. This analysis will lend support for the inculcation of pedagogical practices of land-based education in both colonial contexts as a means to contest colonial curriculum and privilege the voices of minority groups.

Throughout Australian colonial history, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, the knowledges, cultures have been routinely posited as deficient. This has worked to reaffirm the dominance of settler colonialism. According to Wolfe (2006), one way this has logic has manifested is through the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from Country, justified by the notion that settlers could use the land more effectively than Indigenous peoples could (p. 389). Such discourse has been supported by global academia, social media, travel books, religious and philological studies which further enhances its reach and influence (Hickling-Hudson et al., 2004). In this theses, my analysis of settler colonialism in education will confront this stereotype as something bestowed on minority groups by the 'dominant' culture in the present world (Tuck et al, 2014). As Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernandez (2013) argue, existing curriculum studies have not escaped the Colonial obsession with removing Indigenous knowledges and replacing them with their own. Settler ideas still dominate to the field of education, particularly in the recounting of Australian colonial history (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012).

Critical Discourse Analysis calls for an examination of the way discourse works to reproduce power and knowledge specific to a group or institutions agenda (van Dijk, 1993). In effort to highlight the extent to which Settler colonialism continues to infiltrate education systems today, I use CDA to analyse the way language is used in curriculum documents, both explicitly and implicitly, to reflect its ideologies and strategies. In synergy, CDA will also expose how Indigenous knowledges are subsequently being embedded or silenced in the Australian Curriculum. Wodak and Meyer (2009) advocate for the use of CDA so that the relationship between context and discourse can be analysed. Similarly, Fairclough (2001b) uses CDA to examine the way language is used in context, although he does so as a means ascertaining discriminatory power relations. He feels it is necessary to understand how language can influence, maintain, reproduce and challenge issues of power. Fairclough's (2013) approach to CDA uses a three-dimensional framework, where text, discourse practices and social practices are identified. The context made up of discourse practices, where the "processes of text production, distribution and consumption" (Fairclough, 2013, p. 2) are analysed, involves maintaining power and sharing ideology. As I will discuss in later chapters, the system of schooling and the deficit discourses that surround Indigenous peoples are propagated through languages informed by settler colonial agendas. These agendas discredit and disvalue Indigenous knowledges whilst uplifting Eurocentric ideologies. This exemplifies reasoning for analysing the general and common elements and identifying the assumptions evident.

Settler colonialist discourses, which inform the way Indigenous Australians are framed and responded to, must be contested through a process of challenging colonial power. In this way CDA lends itself to broader efforts of decolonisation.

Decolonisation requires 'unlearning' that which is presented as 'self-evident' in the dominant culture and formal education (Gruenewald, 2008). According to Gruenewald (2008), a key means of achieving this is through teaching more socially just and ecologically sustainable ways of being in the world. Such learnings help students to question the way they see the world they live in. As such, decolonisation works to reject and transform dominant ideas while recuperating and reintroducing traditional, cultural forms of interaction such as apprenticeships and intergenerational relationships. Re-inhabitation and decolonisation depend on each other (Gruenewald, 2008). In this theses I will address how the Australian Cross-Curriculum key competencies, and interventions such as embedding land-based education have the potential to implement these concepts. By applying the theories of Settler colonialism and Foucault's power/knowledge nexus through the methodology of CDA, in the chapters that follow I aim to both exemplify how curriculum can be both decolonialised and re-inhabited.

Chapter II. – Australian Curriculum & Cross Curriculum Priorities

Introduction

In this chapter, I utilise Critical discourse analysis, and Foucault's power/knowledge theory to analyse how Indigenous knowledges have been embedded in, or omitted from, the Australian Curriculum. The history of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education in Australia has, since 1788, been made up of different policies – policies that saw Indigenous children endure the consequences of a discriminatory system that 'separated, segregated, excluded, 'protected' or removed from their families' (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012, p.11). Acknowledging this history is important because it provides a context to allow deeper understanding of the inherent and long-form politicisation of current education systems in relation to Indigenous students. In other words, the analysis of the historical development of such policies provides insight into the ways Indigenous people have been excluded from the education system, enabling us to explore how such exclusion still plays out, albeit more subtly and in strategic ways. One such example of this modern form of exclusion, which I will address, is the policy of only allowing Indigenous knowledges to be taught through the non-compulsory Cross-Curriculum Priorities. I will also explore how currently policies, developed ostensibly under the premise of making education more accessible for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, continue a long-held colonial frame of assessing Indigenous student outcomes by reference to white settler norms and knowledges (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012).

Indigenous content: Policy Interpretation & Analysis

In 2008 the Commonwealth Government, under Prime Minister Kevin Rudd, passed the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Act (2008). This Act empowered the federal government to form a national education body to deliver 'the functions of curriculum, assessment and reporting at the national level' (Julia Gillard, media release, 2008). The ACARA Act was the product of three decades of lobbying by different Federal Governments to establish a uniform curriculum across the nation. States and Territories are still responsible for employing teachers, running schools and developing curriculum (Harris-Hart, 2010). As Reid (2005) and Harris-Hart (2010) have respectively discerned the passage of the ACARA Act largely rested on three assertions:

- there needed to greater consistency across education systems for students who transferred across State/Territory boundaries;
- that a national curriculum would be more efficient through the sharing of scarce resources; and,
- that a national approach would help produce a sense of national cohesion, unifying students as Australian.

What is remarkable about these assertions – upon which the policy of nationalising the curriculum was based and given legislative force – is that they did not seem, at least in my opinion, to consider the impact of a nationalised curriculum either on Indigenous students or the teaching of Indigenous knowledges. Firstly, was any thought given to the effects of a national curriculum on the many Indigenous students who have to leave their Country for schooling? Secondly, would the 'sharing of scarce resources' address the wide-spread reluctance to teach Indigenous content amongst educators or the failure to implement standards of accountability through the curriculum to do so? And finally, how is national cohesion to be achieved without respectfully incorporating Indigenous knowledges and engagement in the telling of

Australian history? The apparent failure to foreground these questions suggests a continuation of the settler colonial mandate to exclude Indigenous people in conceptualisations of Australia's past, present, and future.

There were two pivotal documents developed and implemented in the lead up to the drafting of Australian Curriculum: the Hobart and the Adelaide Declarations. These were developed by the previous State and Territory Education Ministers and included broad objectives that related to Indigenous education. As such, these documents provide important historical background to the current embedding of Indigenous content and the teaching of Indigenous students in the Australian Curriculum. The Hobart Declaration, a collective statement by State, Territory and Commonwealth Ministers of Education, was produced on the side of the 60th anniversary of the Australian Education Council in 1989 (Barr et al., 2008). It is regarded as the catalyst for the development of subsequent educational policies in Australia, including the launch Australian National Curriculum. The Adelaide Declaration, which reinforced and expanded upon the principles in the Hobart Declaration, was published a decade later on, April 1999. The Indigenous Overarching Objectives and the Cross-Curriculum Priorities can be tracked back through these two policy documents, which successively emphasised the need to create a culturally inclusive curriculum (Parkinson & Jones, 2019).

The 1989 Hobart Declaration speaks to States thinking on shared educational goals for the future in relation to schools across Australia. It includes an overarching objective 'to provide students with an understanding and respect for our cultural heritage including the particular cultural background of Aboriginal and ethnic

groups (ACARA, 2012)'. The emphasis on 'understanding and respect' for the cultural heritage of Aboriginal people signified an important shift in educational policy. It was no longer the preserve of the state to determine appropriate curriculum content relating to Indigenous people – this was to be determined nationally. While the expanded references to Indigenous people and Aboriginal culture indicated that policymakers were turning their minds to the importance of Indigenous inclusion, a deeper analysis of the text suggests certain limitations if not flippancy in their thinking at the time. There are two overarching and interrelated issues in how this objective is framed: the first relates to the conflation of 'Aboriginal and ethnic groups' in the second clause; the second, derives from the vague reference to 'our cultural heritage' in the first.

The clause that clumps together the cultural backgrounds of 'Aboriginal' and 'ethnic groups' is problematic for several reasons. Firstly, the diversities of Indigenous people become homogenised. Furthermore, the text only refers to the cultural background of 'Aboriginal groups' which raises the question of why reference to Torres Strait Islander culture and heritage was omitted. Secondly, the equal emphasis on acknowledging the backgrounds of Aboriginal and ethnic groups, racially frames and flattens as 'other' the backgrounds of all people of colour. This is problematic in and of itself, but it also works to reduce the diversities of ethnic groups while minimising Indigenous educational self-determination. Indeed, in relation to Indigenous education sovereignty, does 'understanding and respect for our cultural heritage' mean engaging with Indigenous culture beyond boomerangs and didgeridoos? The statement doesn't highlight the importance of engaging with Indigenous culture through creating meaningful relationships with the local

Indigenous community (Tripcony, 2000). There is also no mention of the importance of Indigenous knowledges or languages which, as Moll and Ruiz (2005) note, is a core element of sovereignty – it enables communities the autonomy and control of their language. In terms of the vague reference to 'our cultural heritage' – does this mean Australia's migrant and coloniser history? Such questions that arise from the inclusion of this objective within the Hobart Declaration suggest that curriculum developers had barely considered the complexity Indigenous education.

The text of the Hobart Declaration was updated in 1999 through the Adelaide Declaration. The Adelaide Declaration included a further two objectives relating to Indigenous content and students. These were that:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students have equitable access to, and opportunities in, schooling so that their learning outcomes improve and, over time, match those of other students
- All students understand and acknowledge the value of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures to Australian society and possess the knowledge, skills and understanding to contribute to and benefit from, reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.

By analysing this text, we can see that with the evolvement of the Hobart to the Adelaide Declaration the language changed to include reference to Torres Strait Islander students and 'culture'. However, despite the expansion in reference, and inclusion of a reference to 'equity', closer analysis suggests, once more, a series of problematic assumptions and limitations made by the policy-writers. Take, for example, the first of the two new objectives. On the surface, this reads as an attempt to address 'equitable' schooling experiences for students. However, it begs to be asked how equity was to be achieved if the standard of 'equity' as its starting point meant that Indigenous student outcomes would be measured against the success of non-Indigenous students. Indigenous students, with the help of their families and

communities, need to be the ones who determine what success looks like for them. Measuring equity through comparing Indigenous to non-Indigenous students presupposes that Indigenous students are 'deficit' or less than 'other students' (Meadmore, 2001); and, will inadvertently fall below the standards that are not set by themselves. This underlying premise pitches Indigenous students as the problem that needs to be fixed, averting attention away from the curriculum that has failed them.

In the second of the new Objectives, reference is made to all students 'understanding and valuing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures'. However, it is unclear whether policy makers thought how students could do so when the curriculum itself does not value the learnings of Indigenous knowledges (Tripcony, 2000). It does after all failing to ensure Indigenous education is treated as a core subject. It is further unclear what the drafters had in mind when they wrote 'understanding and acknowledging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures', particularly given there is no explicit instruction to build relationships with Indigenous communities. Finally, the objective includes the goal of contributing to and benefiting from reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. According to Reconciliation Australia (2018), truth-telling and the acceptance of the history this sheds light on is pivotal to achieving true reconciliation. The text however makes no mention of the importance of either in education priorities. This is remiss and lends itself to the accusation that the kind of reconciliation the drafters had in mind was one controlled by non-Indigenous people, avoiding the subject of collective guilt.

The overarching Indigenous education objectives in the Hobart and Adelaide documents, discussed above, signify that while their drafters were thinking about including Indigenous knowledges into the curriculum as well as improving outcomes for Indigenous students, they lacked imagination. A closer analysis of the respective texts suggests the use of carefully crafted and precise language to silence Indigenous people and knowledges, while maintaining, if not strengthening, the Eurocentric dominance in the curriculum.

In 2008, twenty years after the Hobart Declaration was created, Ministers of Education reconvened to talk about the purpose of school and in doing so identified five areas where schooling had changed the way people interacted with each other. These particular changes culminated in the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (ACARA, 2012). This Declaration presented a significant opportunity for policy writers to build on the Hobart and Adelaide Declarations' goals relating to Indigenous education. However, policy writers failed to capitalise on this opportunity. Instead, the Melbourne Declaration included two National overarching goals for schooling in Australia:

- Australian schooling promotes equity and excellence;
- All young Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens (ACARA, 2012).

These overarching objectives are significant as they do not mention Indigenous or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Rather, the objectives speak to targets for 'all young Australians'. Set side by side, the objectives seem somewhat contradictory, with the first promoting equity in schools, while the latter advocates for 'all learners' becoming 'active and informed citizens'. The term 'informed citizens' very much speaks to the industrial model of schooling which provides undifferentiated student

education and has the mandate to prepare students for the workforce (Giroux, 2001). In contrast, the idea behind 'equity' is about every student succeeding through providing different levels of support. The word 'excellence' jumps off the page: who determines what that success looks like?

In interpreting the Melbourne objectives, it is worth reflecting on the Declaration's wider content, specifically its explicit linkage between education and economy: 'Schools play a vital role in…ensuring the nation's ongoing economic prosperity and social cohesion' (MCEETYA, 2008). This statement assumes that good schooling has a close relationship to mainstream economy. As no reference was made to embedding Indigenous knowledges, it seems implied that the policy position had defaulted to a normative presumption that education –and students – would assimilate to a Western model. By implication, it seems that it was thought that Indigenous students, under this model, would need to assimilate to be judged good students. This assumption ignores evidence that Indigenous students are better engaged when they can see themselves represented in the curriculum and when their classrooms reflect the communities they are coming from (Lewthwaite et al, (2015). In this way the broader policy reinforced Eurocentric knowledges and values while once more silencing Indigenous knowledges. By not including specific Indigenous students' goals Indigenous students were instead assimilated in the 'all young Australians' category. This omission, needless to say, reflected a further step away from recognising Indigenous people's desire for educational sovereignty. Instead, in line with settler colonial theory, it rendered them invisible.

Ultimately the policy formulations articulated in the Hobart, Adelaide and Melbourne declarations culminated in what is now the Australian Curriculum. In framing this

document, the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority

(ACARA) (2012) stressed the functions of the Australian Curriculum in the following

ways: it sets out what is to be taught, what students need to learn and the expected

quality of that learning. Interestingly they also acknowledged that education should

cater for the diverse ways in which young people learn and be adaptable in its

pedagogy. Explicitly nodding to its previous attempts to include reference to

Indigenous education ACARA further propounded that the national curriculum brings

together Indigenous educational expertise and efforts to achieve the overarching

goals. Accordingly, the Australian Curriculum was pitched as building on statements

set in the Hobart and Adelaide Declarations to teach students about the histories and

cultures of Australia's Indigenous peoples, their contributions, and the ongoing

impacts of colonisation in Australia. Through the Australian Curriculum, it is stated

that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students would value the importance of

pursuing excellence within education settings that respect and promote their cultural

identity (ACARA, 2012, p. 7). As well as including the Indigenous overarching

objectives, three key Cross-Curriculum Priorities were included that teachers could

apply when engaging with students in their first 11 years of schooling (version 5.1).

These Priorities consist of Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia;

Sustainability and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures. The

Cross-Curriculum Priorities were described as working towards helping students

engage with, and better understand, the world they live in by providing students with

the correct tools and language to do so.

The Australian Curriculum in Victoria and the Marrung Aboriginal Education Plan (2016 – 2026).

As I am currently residing In Victoria, I will review the Marrung Aboriginal Plan to understand the way Indigenous student outcomes and Indigenous content in education are thought about. The Australian Curriculum was authorised by the Board of ACARA and implemented through the Victorian Curriculum in October 2013 (ACARA, 2012). At that time, only four of the now sixteen Australian Curriculum subjects had been completed, accepted and embedded in the state of Victoria. Three years later, in 2016, the Victorian State Government launched the Marrung, a strategic plan developed collaboratively with the Victorian Aboriginal Education to achieve greater educational outcomes for all Indigenous students. This document also set out the target to have local Indigenous knowledges and histories celebrated through an education that is holistic, respectful and responsive to all student worldviews (DET, 2016).

The *Marrung* is a 10-year plan that is guided by the strategic guidelines to ensure Koorie students have the opportunity to access the developments afforded to them by the Education State reforms for Koorie Victorians. The Education State reforms presents the Victorian government policy agenda to build a world class education system and transform Victoria into 'the education state' (DET, 2016). The *Marrung* policy is embedded in the State reforms and is thus pitched as aligning with the latter's overarching targets. These targets appear linked to Article 14 of the UNDRIP in as much as they aim to 'uplift and support the aspirations of Koorie students and their communities.' It is envisaged the *Marrung* will contribute and build on the commitments made in the *Victorian Aboriginal Affairs Framework 2013–2018*

(VAAF). The policy has largely been built on the premise that Koorie students are better learners when their classroom feels connected to their communities and families (DET, 2016). The *Marrung* policy writers directly correlate educational success with culturally supportive and responsive learning environments in all levels of schooling. Additionally, the *Marrung* aligns with overarching national and state frameworks and policies to advance the socio-economic status of Koorie people (DET, 2016).

Throughout the *Marrung* text, there is constant acknowledgment of the roles and responsibilities of local community and families in contributing to education. However, 'Close the Gap' rhetoric is equally pervasive. 'Closing the Gap' is an Australian government strategy that aims to reduce the disadvantage faced by many Indigenous people in a number of areas including education (Pholi, 2009). Pholi (2009) has problematised this policy – its premise and its rhetoric. They argue that Closing the Gap 'reduces Indigenous Australians to a range of indicators of deficit, to be monitored and rectified towards government-set targets' (p. 1). Accordingly, Closing the Gap policies play a significant role in the inequality in power and control associated with the Indigenous advancement in Australia. For Pholi (2009), the 'gap' that needs to be improved is the relationship that exists between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people and the struggle Indigenous people endure to have control over their own affairs. The extent to which this plays out in Australian education policy is reflected in the fixation on Indigenous students' results which are assessed in parity with non-Indigenous students. Indigenous students are mostly assessed based on their competence to conform to Eurocentric ways and standards of knowing (Pholi, 2009). I would argue, in line with Pholi (2009) that for the educational capabilities of

Indigenous students to increase, there needs to be a conscious effort to contest deficit policies like these that are premised on ill-informed ideas of what counts as educational success.

Deficit policies proceed on the basis that the outcomes of Indigenous people will be improved when their progress matches their non-Indigenous counterparts. Regardless of the intention of the policy writers, at the outset this situates Indigenous communities and students in a position of being 'less than', requiring them to change and be reformed. Indigenous people are often seen as deficient, needing to gain particular skills, qualities and traits so that they can achieve and compete with non-Indigenous students. Paradoxically, although the history of settler-colonialism (in particular its silencing and elimination of Indigenous sovereignty) is frequently earmarked as one of the main contributors to the 'gap' in Indigenous achievement and capacity, there is no push for solutions to come from Indigenous communities. For Altman (2009), aspirations that have statistical measurements attached to them tend to be 'hollow', particularly when they do not reflect the desires of Indigenous people and do not examine the socioeconomic divide. Comber and Kamler (2004) have observed that by framing minority students in deficit, such policies ingrain substandard expectations of student worthiness and capacity, hindering teachers capacity and interest in teaching them. Most students who are not performing well at school are often stereotyped by their teachers as being deficient and from disadvantaged backgrounds. Research conducted by Sarra et al. (2018) suggests that teachers who hold these views are rarely ever challenged within the education system particularly when extraordinary educational inequalities were exposed.

As suggested by Lowe (2017), negative stigma of Indigenous and minority students can be overturned by working with community and parents to embed relatable curriculum. Interestingly this is also what the *Marrung* pitches itself as aiming to achieve under the heading: 'Building community engagement in learning and development'.

> Local collaboration with parents/carers and community organisations plays a key role in providing the structure and expertise to enable the learning and development of children, young people and adults. Through building trust and social capital these partnerships generate a culture of high expectations and shared responsibility for learning (DET, 2016).

While the encouragement of family and community engagement does come through the document strongly, there is no mention of developing and including more Koorie content into the Australian Curriculum. Much of the focus is on 'supporting' Koorie students in the classroom and improving retention rates. An example of this can be found under the *'Excellent in Teaching, Learning and Development: The School Years'* where one of the further action items reads:

> …extending the Early Years Koorie Literacy and Numeracy Program to provide literacy and numeracy support to Koorie students not meeting Year 3 reading and numeracy benchmarks in Years 4 and 5 (DET, 2016, p. 28).

In this text student support is presented as the answer to the problem of *Koorie* students not meeting certain benchmarks. Once more this alludes to the idea that *Koorie* students need to conform to colonial ways of knowing in order to 'succeed'. It again assumes that the problem lies with the *Koorie* student and not the curriculum that is being taught. Foucault once said school is 'meant to be an instrument which acts with precision upon its individual subjects' (Foucault, 1980, p. 40). In this instance the instrument appears to be the conformity of students to the standards of the colonial curriculum.

With there being no scope in the *Marrung* strategic plan under the different 'Excellent in Teaching, Learning and Development' sections to incorporate any/more Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum, difficulty may otherwise be encountered in increasing the engagement levels of Indigenous students. Because many Indigenous parents have viewed schools as hostile environments (Groome & Hamilton, 1995), a process of active listening to Indigenous people is needed to overcome experiences of mistreatment and inappropriate pedagogy (Routh, 1997; & Colman-Dimon, 2000). Despite this, there is consensus amongst many Indigenous parents that school is the best means for their children to gain a social and economic identity (Jordan, 2017). Studies conducted by Hanlen (2002), Harrison (2011) and Harrison and Greenfield (2011) with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander parents suggested a general desire for the incorporation and affirmation of Indigenous perspectives and histories through schooling to affirm cultural heritage. Teaching in a way that promotes cultural heritage can only occur when strong and positive relationships between teachers, schools, parents and communities have been forged. If the *Marrung* can assist teachers in valuing the cultural identity of their Indigenous students from an asset perspective, they will be equipped with the knowledge and tools to facilitate a learning environment that caters for many learning styles (Valencia, 1997).

Development of Indigenous science examples

In October/November 2018, ACARA released 95 examples on how to support educators in implementing Indigenous knowledges into the science curriculum for all year levels. The new resources were developed in consultation with ACARA's Indigenous Advisory Group chaired by Professor Mark Rose. The Advisory Group is made up of ten Indigenous educational specialists who provide advice and guidance

to ACARA on Indigenous specific curriculum. The group provides direction on who should be consulted, critically reviews documents, and advises on the quality and suitability of documents for implementation (ACARA, 2017) (See Appendix 1for advisory group members). The 95 examples provide an expansion of the ACARA standards and seem a considered and valuable resource through which students and teachers may realise and understand a rounded view of the world encompassed by alternative viewpoints. Their publication was framed as an acknowledgement of the importance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges in the curriculum (ACARA, 2018). However, this resource – published years after the launch of the Australian Curriculum – appeared almost as an afterthought. Further, there is no mandate for teachers to embed the examples into their teaching; they are an 'optional' resource only. Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority may as such be unrealistically optimistic about their being able to encourage teachers to become culturally responsive in their teaching, engagement and achieving educational outcomes for Indigenous students.

Despite receiving support from current Prime Minister Scott Morrison and Chief Scientist Alan Finkel, the elaborations of how teachers might implement Indigenous knowledges in the science curriculum were mocked. The front page of Sydney's Daily Telegraph described them as 'nothing more than a silly distraction' (Washington, 2018, p.1). These sentiments were followed up by conservative social commentator Kevin Donnelly attributing ACARA's publication to political correctness. Donnelly further argued that the implementation of this knowledge would, rather than increasing academic rigour, 'dumb it down' (Washington, 2018, p. 1). However, as Indigenous educator and science curriculum specialist, Joe Sambono

(2018) countered, the sentiments expressed by Washington and Donnelly ignored that the exemplified Indigenous knowledges had tried and tested over many generations; indeed, such rigour lends weight to the argument that they be taught as a core subject. Further, as Barnhardt and Kawagley, (1998) and Barnhardt (2014) have articulated, the embedding of Indigenous knowledges as suggested by this publication, would – rather than distract– complement Eurocentric ways of knowing and improve intersectional analysis and understanding. As Sambono (2018) has argued contriving the 95 elaborations in to a poorly thought-out binary issue of Western science vs Indigenous science was reductive. Instead:

> It is simply a matter of understanding that all groups of humans around the world and throughout history have hypothesised, experimented, made empirical observations, gathered evidence, recognised patterns, verified through repetition, made inferences and predictions, and developed branches of knowledge that helped them to make sense of the world around them and their place within it (Sambono, 2018).

Although the 95 elaborations marked an important step forward in having Indigenous content taught, as sign posted above, the question remains as to whether teachers will embed the examples. Burridge & Chodkiewicz (2012) stress the need to increase the quality of teaching through professional development, and consultation with local Indigenous communities. As it stands, many educators feel they have insufficient knowledge about Indigenous people and culture (Harrison & Greenfield, 2011). This inhibits their confidence to teach Indigenous content. Indigenous education advocates have also suggested that unless there is strong leadership through policy that monitors and gives educators the confidence to embed Indigenous content into their teaching, this will not be prioritised in practice (Parbury, 2011; & Wilson-Miller, 2011). Teachers remain unaccountable in the extent they prioritise the teaching of Indigenous knowledges, as demonstrated through leadership, policy and curriculum documents.

Analysis and interpretation: Cross-Curriculum Priorities

As demonstrated above, over the past 30 years three different Declarations have been produced which address in their different ways the embedding of Indigenous knowledges in the Australian Curriculum. The advent of the Cross-Curriculum Priorities can be seen as an extension of the Declarations and the Australian Curriculum more generally. They set out to create an environment that encourages conversations between teachers, students and learning areas, and the wider community (Whitehorse et al., 2014). Despite these successive developments however, the education outcomes of Indigenous students and education of Indigenous knowledges remains relatively unchanged, irrespective of the good intentions of those who do want to work collegially with Indigenous people. This would suggest that a multi-layered approach is required to ensure the objectives of Indigenous education in curriculum documents are met (Vass, 2013). There is much complexity surrounding the term 'Indigenous education'. According to Ah Sam and Ackland (2005), this is evident in scholarship that fails to differentiate between education of Indigenous students, and education *about* Indigenous peoples, history, heritage and contemporary experiences. When making reference to 'Indigenous education' in this theses, I mean the collegial objectives: education in Indigenous students and education of Indigenous histories and epistemologies (Ah Sam & Ackland, 2005).

The omission of Indigenous knowledges through the publication of examples of how to implement them within the science curricula extends much further across the different subject areas. One particular lacuna which has major implications throughout Curricula is the idea of Country. This gap in embedded knowledge affects how students apprehend the results of colonisation: how the colonial power justified

its occupation; how sovereignty was enacted and lost; and the legacies of the forced removal of Indigenous people from their Country (Lowe & Yunkaporta, 2013). For Whitehorse et al. (2014), the idea of Country in the Australian Curriculum is mostly overlooked and lives as an attachment to the settler idea of Place. For Lowe and Yunkaporta (2013) the curriculum fails to give a precise account of Indigenous histories and realities. Instead the content is weak, and at times tokenistic. Engagement with place demands, and should contain, a thorough analysis of the dominant ideas of place and offer different perspectives of land. It should provide space to question unconscious attitudes about the environment, histories and Indigenous knowledges (Calderon, 2012). Indigenous peoples need to be central when endorsing models of sustainability and community so that students do not miss out on the opportunity to enhance their learnings through the use of Indigenous knowledges (Calderon, 2012). However, Eurocentric ideologies and values continue to inform current curriculum, pedagogy and educational practices (Hickling-Hudson et al., 2004). This systematic rejection of Indigenous knowledge and culture within education exacerbates the disadvantage, dispossession and marginalisation experienced by Indigenous people throughout the colonialisation of Australia.

According to Fridel (2011), teachers should apply educational practice that builds on continuing practices of knowing rather than considering Indigenous knowledge as disconnected from culture. Unfortunately, it seems unlikely that this insight will be implemented in the short-term future. Teachers have already voiced their concerns about not having enough time or resources to teach Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content (Nakata, 2011). They have also expressed concerns that they themselves have insufficient knowledge about Indigenous people and culture

(Harrison & Greenfield, 2011). As Lowe & Yunkaporta (2013) and Nakata (2011) respectively note the Australian Curriculum has failed to deliver suitable tools to develop deep understanding and knowledge of the cultures and histories of Indigenous peoples and their connection to country.

Nakata (2011) stresses that teaching Indigenous perspectives cannot be limited to content. Rather, Indigenous perspectives should also be represented accurately in the delivery of content. This is difficult because it becomes incumbent on teachers to understand and convey Indigenous perspectives (Nakata, 2011). According to Harrison & Greenfield (2011) ACARA has made important steps towards reconciliation by writing Indigenous perspectives into the national curriculum and providing students with the opportunity to learn about Indigenous histories and cultures. However, many questions and key themes have emerged subsequently, including the need to increase the quality of teaching through professional development and consultation with local Indigenous communities (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012). Professional development and whole school reform will have limited success if concerns of social dislocation, disengagement of schooling, negative attitudes and low expectations for Indigenous students are not addressed (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012).

While there are still many issues facing the way Indigenous knowledges are taught, these issues reflect broader issues of government policy. As Parbury (2011) and Wilson-Miller (2003) discuss, problematic approaches to Indigenous education are informed by problems associated with assimilation, missionary experiences, special treatment and the framing of Indigenous peoples, cultures and rights in

political demonstrations (Parbury, 2011; & Wilson-Miller, 2003). Gunstone's (2012) research highlights the complexity of these issues, drawing attention to the extent to which more recent government policies have operated to further inequality in Indigenous education outcomes. For Gunstone (2012) government refusal – particularly between 1991 and 2000 – to recognise the impact of colonisation on Indigenous peoples resulted in Indigenous content not being taught. It seems that both State and Territory government failed to understand that addressing Indigenous issues in education through policy affect the socio-economic disadvantage Indigenous people face.

As Bruce Pascoe (2011) describes, Indigenous people in education have been positioned as the 'other' through the colonial discourses of history. Pascoe (2011) argues that this negative understanding of Indigenous people as savages needs to be addressed through examining the effects of colonial history and implementation of strong educational policy (pp. 3-9). Mark Rose (2012) supports Pascoe's claims in his chapter 'The Silent Apartheid'. Rose states that Indigenous knowledge and understandings continue to be "essentially mute and invisible in the curriculum" (p. 67). For Rose colonisation and the narration of history have been used as tools to devalue and suppress Indigenous knowledges. The normalisation and centring of Western education system in Australia has privileged the dominant European based culture whilst silencing and situating Indigenous knowledge on the margins (Herbert, 2012). According to Seddon (2010), the education system is a crucial mechanism for constructing and reconstructing the social. He argues that it should be used to facilitate "the kind of learning in civil society that will address inequalities embedded in national histories" (p. 93).

As Seddon (2010) and others (see eg: Nakata, 2007; Welch, 1988; Rose, 2012; & Martin, 2014) assert, history sets the foundations for the present: it is important to acknowledge the past so we can understand how this has impacted the now. Despite the many efforts to unmask Eurocentric privilege in the curriculum, persistence is needed to realise further Indigenous content being taught, particularly in the fields of history and science. Unless teachers and educational leaders take it upon themselves to embed Indigenous knowledges, then documents such as the Australian Curriculum will remain uninspiring words without actions.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have used Critical Discourse Analysis and power/knowledge theories to read the history, policies and discourses relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education in Australia. By doing so, two key issues in realising the aspiration to have more Indigenous knowledges embedded in the Australian Curriculum have been identified. Firstly, my analysis indicates that past education policies have seen Indigenous students endure the consequences of a discriminatory system – a system which has prevented us from accessing education as well as having our knowledges valued (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012). In order to have Indigenous knowledges embedded in the curriculum, Indigenous people need to guide this change so that issues of sovereignty and racism can be addressed. Secondly, my analysis has identified certain language choices manifest in current policies that frame Indigenous students as a problem that needs to be fixed rather than problematising the education system that has failed them.

In the next chapter, I will use the Alaskan context as a case study to understand alternative practices of Indigenous education. I particularly examine how Native Alaskans practised sovereignty within the education context in developing their own cultural standards to embed Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum. Through the lens of Article 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, I will evaluate and critique whether these developments in the Alaskan education context could be regarded as a model for Indigenous education reforms in the Australian context.

Chapter III – The Alaskan Context and Curriculum

Introduction

In this chapter I build on my analysis of how Indigenous knowledges are addressed and/or embedded in curriculum by exploring alternative strategies, policies and practices of embedding Indigenous knowledges within the Alaskan context. Alaska has been chosen for analysis due to certain commonalities it has with the Australian context: it is a settler colony, it is constituted with a diversity of Indigenous cultures, and it maintains a two-tier government system. Within the Alaskan context however, there has been a greater attempt to respect and practice Indigenous sovereignty with respect to Indigenous education. There an Elders Council informs the development of Indigenous curriculum materials and content. A resource bank has also been established – the Alaskan Native Knowledges Network (ANKN) - for schools and educators to access. Of particular interest is the way the ANKN and the Elders Council have developed and employed culturally responsive standards to ensure the cultural and educational needs of Native Alaskan students are met. I believe the Alaskan context can offer insights for Australia for the way that it is teaching Indigenous knowledges through land-based education.

In this chapter, like the last, I will apply Foucault's power/knowledge theory and Critical Discourse Analysis to read the Alaskan education context and the culturally responsive standards developed by ANKN. I do so in effort to discern how power has been and is played out there, taking particular heed of how Native Alaskan peoples have navigated the education system to have their knowledges embedded. I will then evaluate whether any learnings can be taken from such approaches in

helping Australia embed more Indigenous knowledges into the National curriculum, and if so, whether similar initiatives might be applied to the Australian context.

Alaskan Educational Context & Background

In order to understand the Alaskan education context, an understanding of the landscape (and its political and social geography) must first be described. Many of the people who live in small villages in the rural parts of Alaska are Alaskan Natives (Kawagley et al., 1998). There are roughly 20 different Indigenous languages spoken throughout Alaska and most Indigenous students speak an Indigenous language as their first language. Many families in rural Alaska live a life that is reminiscent of the traditional lifestyle they have perfected over many generations (Kawagley et al., 1998).

Although the numbers of Native Alaskans who are migrating to the bigger cities is increasing, the terms 'Native' and 'rural' are regularly used interchangeably (Barnhardt, 2001). Additionally, the term 'Native' is also used to bundle all Native groups together, failing to reflect the diversity of Alaskan Native groups (Skinner & Leonard, 2017). The three main groups of Indigenous peoples in Alaska identify themselves as *Eskimo, Indian* and *Aleut*. The three Indigenous groups have distinct cultural differences but mostly share a system of beliefs and values that includes: priority of communal and family considerations over individual considerations, a belief in sharing versus accumulating, and a respect for spirituality and an interconnectedness with the natural world (Kawagley, 2006).

Like many other Indigenous students globally, Native Alaskan students can often find the education system to be irrelevant, confusing and humiliating (Malin, 1997). In the

North American context, this is mainly due to the utilisations of a school system that is reflective of a colonial education model imposed on Indigenous communities 400 years ago (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997). Native Alaskan students attend school with different interactional and learning styles from those being used in the classroom. In this setting they are forced to participate in a cultural context that does not resemble the student's community and cultural norms. Willinsky (1998) suggests today's curriculum is still tied to white colonial schemes of:

> fostering a science and geography of race, renaming a good part of the world in homage to its adventurers' homesick sense of place, and imposing languages and literatures on the colonized in an effort to teach them why they were subservient to a born-to-rule civilization (p.4).

Resonating with the Australian experience, Barnhardt (2001) notes that past policy makers in Alaska were obsessed with introducing assimilatory solutions to the 'Native' problem. One method by which this attempted was through adopting strategies used by other countries to disenfranchise Indigenous communities globally (Barnhardt, 2001). And, one of the main vehicles for doing was the education system.

Education often sold to Indigenous communities as a beacon of hope. However, Hickling-Hudson and Ahlquist (2003) have critiqued the Alaskan education system as outdated and not geared to produce positive and self-confident scholastic identities. It is also a common held belief, that in order to succeed in education, one must severe their ties to culture and community of origin (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003). This is evident in policies that forbade Alaskan Native students to speak their native languages at school, and Native Alaskan cultural traditions were discouraged or prohibited. As a result education thus became a colonial tool to eliminate Alaskan Native culture (Kawagley et al.,1998) and Indigenous knowledge systems.

Colonial educators and administrators in Native Alaskan schools widely promoted that Indigenous languages and cultures were the reasons for Indigenous school failure (Kawagley et al.,1998). This contradicted research conducted by Deyhle and Swisher (1997) who suggest the contrary: being strong in your culture and language relates positively with school success. For Kawagley et al. (2003), a classroom that is inherently *Yupiaq*, must look and feel like the community outside the school fence. Such classrooms would be filled with many people from the community including Elders, practical activities tasks would be assigned, and students would be encouraged to work together to fulfil meaningful tasks similar to ones encountered on a daily basis. Accordingly, the environment (this could also be read as Country as per the discussion in Section: My Education and Journey) should be seen a teaching resource that is used regularly with both Indigenous and English languages being spoken, as Kawagley et al. (1998) suggests both play an in important role in teaching *Yupiaq* language because it is a tool of the spirit and therefore the voice of the culture.

Native Alaskan Worldviews & Culturally Appropriate Pedagogy

Despite colonial attempts to destroy their relationships with the environment, Native Alaskans still practice rich and diverse cultures. There are 20 discrete knowledge and language groups that continue to thrive in communities all throughout Alaska. There is also an increasing enthusiasm, within and beyond community, for the insights of Indigenous knowledges in medical practices, resource management, biology, climate patterns, human behaviour and education (James, 2001). Foucault (1980) suggests Western modern science has been made true by successive colonial societies over the

last millennia. This claim to truth has become so universalized that it is rarely

contested by any civilisation (p. 66). However, as Battiste (2002) writes,

> Indigenous knowledge is far more than the binary opposite of western knowledge. As a concept, Indigenous knowledge benchmarks the limitations of Eurocentric theory—its methodology, evidence, and conclusions—reconceptualizes the resilience and self-reliance of Indigenous peoples, and underscores the importance of their own philosophies, heritages, and educational processes. Indigenous knowledge fills the ethical and knowledge gaps in Eurocentric education, research, and scholarship (p. 5).

The Indigenous knowledges that *Yupiaq* people possess have been developed by

personal observations of, and interactions with, the natural world over many

generations. This has also been aided through storytelling and the handing down of

knowledge from generation to generation, particularly knowledge that was crucial to

surviving (Kawagley et al., 1998). *Yupiaq* people have obtained their knowledge

spiritually by observing the essence of people and by viewing the world through the

five elements of earth, air, fire, water, and spirit (Kawagley, 2006). As Kawagley et

al. (1998) acknowledge, spirit is often missed in the constructs of Western knowledge.

Further the *Yupiaq* understand the relationship and responsibility they have to the

environment. This appreciation for environment has been mostly absent from Western

cultural traditions (Kawagley et al., 1998). Finally, in distinction to Western science

which forms its own discipline, *Yupiaq* scientific knowledge is interdisciplinary.

Practised through art, hunting and craftsmanship, knowledge is conceived as

something that is produced as opposed to something discovered in a

laboratory (Kawagley et al., 1998). Through many years of observation, Yupiaq are

experts with connecting to place and are able to predict the weather by using

mathematical equations that have been tried and tested (Barnhardt & Kawagley,

1999; Cajete, 2000; & Eglash, 2002).

Western science and education are often structured according to subject areas that are knowledge specific, void of context and taught in isolated classrooms. In this setting, students are often assessed objectively about what they should know rather than putting their knowledge into practice (Barnhardt, 2005). In an Indigenous setting, if a student is competent in their knowledge, they will have the capabilities, grounded through their relationship to their land, to survive, provide for themselves and contribute positively to their community. Unlike the western classroom, the student's accumulated knowledge is tested and observed in real life settings (Barnhardt, 2005). Western science tends to be impersonal, formal, elitist and promotes a mechanistic view of the universe (Kawagley et al., 1998). As a result, science class for most Native Alaskans is problematic because they feel unconnected to a lot of the information that is presented to them. Additionally, content that is taught through textbooks or lectures often involve the use of terms that are foreign or unfamiliar to Native students.

The tendency of Western pedagogy to grade students competitively similarly goes against the cooperative values of Native Alaskan pedagogies (Kawagley et al., 1998). Indeed, when education policy changes were implemented in favour of standardised testing, many Native Alaskan parents expressed concerns that this would negatively impact culturally responsive pedagogy (Beaulieu et al., 2005; Castagno, & Brayboy, 2008). Emphasis on standardised testing lends itself to a focus on teaching to the masses (Kawagley et al., 1998; Meadmore, 2001). This pedagogical practice does not cater for multiple learning styles and ignores the strengths and knowledges Native Alaskan students possess (Ermine et al., 1995). In this way, the parents' concerns aligned with scholars such as Kawagley et al. (1998) who argue that

including Indigenous knowledge and languages into the class is the most effective way to improving engagement and learning. Through standardized testing practice, which does not cater for their cultural ways of knowing, *Yupiaq* students are excluded from engaging in the learning process.

Culturally responsive schools understand that their students have a strong connection to their communities, traditions, cultural heritage and are able to explain how their local knowledge relates to their cultural beliefs and other knowledge systems (Barnhardt, 2014). For *Yupiaq* culture to be effectively incorporated in the classroom, it requires students, staff and schools to function autonomously which usually starts with an acknowledgement of Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum.

Research conducted by Yellow Bird, (2001) and Yellow Bird and Snipp (2002) reveals Native Alaskan students have the utmost respect for their Elders and understand their standing in community. Cultural traits are closely linked to family structures and differ quite significantly to other cultural groups. For example, in some communities, an elder sharing their knowledge will not usually *say* a lot. Instead the learner is expected watch and notice how a task is being conducted. Cultural practices such as these must be understood by educators desirous of implementing culturally responsive pedagogy as they play a significant role in the diverse learning and teaching processes of Alaska Native students (Pewewardy, 2002). In order for teachers to be effective with Indigenous students, they must be equipped with pedagogy that emphasises guided practice, provides a cooperative learning environment, student guided learning, practical and tactile learning opportunities (Kawagley et al.,1998; Pewewardy, 2002; & Demmert, 2011). Teachers must also

recognise their worldviews are much different from those that Native Alaskan students possess.

Teachers can only effectively teach Native Alaskan students by building strong relationships with the students and understand that Native Alaskan students show competencies in education in different ways from their non-native counterparts (Ward, 1993; McAllister & Irvine, 2000). In the settler colonial settings of Australia and Alaska however, an industrial factory model of education was employed. This regime, built around Eurocentric ideologies, tended not to account for students' backgrounds and interests, with the teacher allowing little flexibility in what is being taught. Today, history, geography and science continue to be taught in this vein, and the structure and organisation of the lessons are set with the teacher having full control of the learning that is happening (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003). The method is driven by the content rather than basing the learning around the student and problems that need to be solved (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003). In this type of setting, Indigenous students are not represented in the curriculum or teaching resources. Their cultural contributions to different subject areas are silenced.

Curriculum taught in this way contributes to systemic factors that produce inequities in our societies. Challenges to this kind of curriculum are however rejected by teachers who claim that Indigenous students must understand the (colonial) world in order to be successful. In other words, knowing the language and culture of colonial society will hold students in good stead educationally. This observation contradicts Deyhle and Swisher's (1997) research finding that bilingual education and use of local knowledge and language are important for empowerment, and

empowerment is important for educational success. In the education sphere, it is important for teachers to be across power-knowledge discourses so that they can teach an unbiased curriculum and help all students be critical when it comes to learning all knowledges. Indigenous students in particular must understand, learn and navigate the discourses of power so that they can see that histories are located in time and place and represent the oppressor's dominant ideas (Hickling-Hudson & Ahlquist, 2003).

With respect to reframing curriculum accordingly, Michel (1996) cautions that Indigenous parents might become averse to having non-Indigenous educators teaching content that involves the cultural backgrounds of Indigenous students. The issue of having Indigenous content taught by inexperienced teachers also poses concerns for some members of the Indigenous community. Such concerns are echoed by wider discussions about Indigenous content being left for Indigenous educators to teach (Barnhardt, 2014). The Culturally Responsive Schools policy suggests a way through this impasse by stressing the importance of involving community and parents in student education, whether through programs or design of curriculum. When schools employ strategies to build relationships with parents and community members in this way, they are taking the necessary steps to produce culturally appropriate and inviting environments (Barnhardt, 2014).

Returning to Foucault (1980), an "analysis of power is an analysis of the mechanism of repression" (p. 90). In applying this insight to the Alaskan setting, understanding the way Indigenous knowledges are being silenced must be understood so thought can be given to disrupting power strategically. In the following section, I explore how the Alaskan Rural Systemic Initiative (AKRSI) have undertaken such an

analysis of the Alaskan education context. This analysis was undertaken in effort to gain systems-level insight to how Indigenous knowledges are being embedded into the Alaskan curriculum.

Culturally Responsive Teaching and Pedagogy

Issues of hidden curriculum and lack of understanding for Indigenous students are addressed through Culturally Responsive Schooling (CRS) in the United States. In what follows, I briefly review some of the definitions offered for culturally responsive curriculum, teaching, and schooling.

According to Jester (2002), CRS encourages student educational success while advocating for connection and respect to cultural identity. Additionally, CRS helps students to become critically aware of structures of social inequities and what this looks like in society and the school (Jester, 2002). For Belgarde, Mitchell, and Arquero (2002), culturally responsive curriculum generally endorses and takes steps to include the languages and cultures of students, facilitating the process of co-constructing knowledge in the classroom. The idea is that when cultural connections are made in curriculum and accurate accounts of the past and present are taught (Agbo, 2001), students are more likely to succeed in both western and their own community environments (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; & Lipka, Hogan et al., 2005).

When students feel empowered and have greater agency within their schools and communities, education is both more meaningful and socially responsible (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). Most Indigenous parents are supportive of having culture taught in the school curriculum, particularly when Indigenous communities contribute to its design (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Brayboy et al., 2012; & Beaulieu et al., 2005). When Indigenous communities are included in culturally responsive

schools, issues of racism, sovereignty and language, are dealt with, which leads to the reclaiming and revitalising of what has been displaced by colonialisation (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; McCarty & Lee, 2014).

In culturally responsive schools, it is necessary for non-Indigenous teachers to develop their cultural competence to teach Indigenous students so that relationships with students and their communities can be developed. Teachers of Indigenous students can become culturally responsive by exploring the communities in which their students live, participating in community events, and collaborating with community members on projects both within and outside of the school (McCarty & Watahomigie, 2004). It is also important for community members to be welcomed into the school and be given the opportunities to work with the school on producing culturally inclusive curriculum (Cleary & Peacock, 1998).

Developing & Implementing Native content for Alaskan Curriculum

The Indian Education Act and Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act – both introduced in the 1970s – set the foundation for Native Alaskans to have their culture and languages taught in the schools they control. In 1995, the Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative (AKRSI) was established to record Alaskan Indigenous knowledge systems and develop them into practical curriculum. A crucial element to the AKSRI strategy was to connect the way Indigenous knowledge systems and the formal education systems work to complement each other (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 1998; & Barnhardt, 2014). This exercise of power within the Alaskan education system produced "new objects of knowledge and accumulation of new bodies of information" (Foucault, 1980, p. 51). The analysis undertaken by AKRSI extended to understand the way Indigenous knowledges were

being embedded into the Alaskan curriculum, highlighting the way power works through the school institution (Feder, 2011). In this way AKSRI asked questions of the Alaskan curriculum to understand the boundaries of colonial power production and to see where the opportunities existed to embed Native Alaskan knowledges (Bacchi, 2011; & Wang, 2011).

Building on AKSRIs work, in 1998 Native Alaskan educators from different regional associations supported each other to produce and adopt the Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools. This resource guides educational institutions to embed Native Alaskan knowledges into the curriculum so that students' cultural well-being is achieved through appropriate schooling (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 1998; & Battiste, 2002). These Standards have since been recognised by the Alaskan Education board and are now embedded through all levels of schooling throughout the state. Ongoing reviews of these standards are conducted by schools and community to ensure their application fits local circumstances (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008).

As stated previously, there was universal consensus amongst Native Alaskan educators that to be effective, teachers of Indigenous students needed to be equipped with pedagogy that emphasized guided practice, provided a cooperative learning environment, student-guided learning, and practical and tactile learning opportunities (Kawagley et al., 1998; & Pewewardy, 2002). To help facilitate this kind of learning, AKSRI developed curriculum materials and cultural resources for teachers to employ in their classrooms. This initiative has been supported by the Alaska Native Science Camps and Fairs, where students are afforded the opportunity to work with Elders on

fixing local environmental science issues (Barnhardt, 2014). The importance of

including Native Elders in the educational process and using the environment as a tool

for education is a reoccurring theme throughout the AKSRI documents, and

supported by the larger community (Battiste, 2002; & Johnson, 2002).

AKSRI has also made accessible a data base for educators. The database is a

repository of Alaskan-based curriculum resources suitable for teaching Indigenous

content. Knowledge accessed through the database is a combination of Native and

Western streams (Barnhardt, 2014). This innovation is now internationally recognized

(Skinner & Leonard, 2017). AKSRI has also developed another online tool: the *Spiral

Pathway for Integrating Rural Alaska Learning* (SPIRAL). This initiative for

culturally-oriented online resources is structured according to grade levels and

arranged into 12 themes. Each provides a list of downloadable materials for teachers

to use (Barnhardt, 2014).

Educators can feel confident in knowing models and guidelines have been

developed through the Alaskan Education Department and the Alaska Native

Knowledge Network (ANKN) to support teachers working with Native Alaskan

Students. The ANKN provides support for educators to maintain cultural standards. It

developed in response to research that showed a strong connection between teachers

who possess sufficient cultural knowledge and the success of an Indigenous students

(Butterfield, 1994). The standards ANKN has produced guide schools in providing

culturally responsive schooling to Indigenous students (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008).

Professional development, which exposes teachers to different cultural activities

and curriculum resources, is readily available through the new teacher's induction

program (Barnhardt, 2014). This is particularly important as it trains teachers to be

aware of the cultural backgrounds of the students they will teach and to learn how to provide a practice that is reflective, observational, experiential, and critical (Pewewardy, 2002). Such training emphasises that teachers should consciously attune their pedagogy to Alaska Native students' communication styles, ways of reasoning, inspirations, and the social norms they are accustomed to (Pewewardy, 2002).

The initiatives outlined above have served to strengthen the quality of Native Alaskan education and the Indigenous content that is taught in schools. The AKRSI Annual Report (2004) recorded that the educational experiences and academic performance of Native Alaskan students have consistently improved in schools throughout Alaska since 1998. Since the first Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools were released, Native education organisations have developed multiple guidelines. These include: Guidelines for the Preparation of Culturally Responsive Teachers; Guidelines for Respecting Cultural Knowledge; Guidelines for Nurturing Culturally Healthy Youth; Guidelines for Strengthening Indigenous Languages; Guidelines for Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs, and Guidelines for Culturally Responsive School Boards (Barnhardt, 2014). With the purpose of integrating Indigenous knowledges into all aspects of schooling, these Guidelines have been deeply guided by Indigenous ways of knowing. Like the majority of students, Native Alaskan students tend to be more engaged with learning when content is relatable and familiar to them and can be seen as something they can use outside the classroom (Battiste, 2000; Kawagley, 2006; & Lipka & Ilutsik, 2014). To help promote this much emphasis has been placed on producing more qualified Alaska Native teachers and administrators, and further engaging Elders and local experts in the educational process. The surge in Native educator associations has

helped facilitate this as well as providing leadership opportunities for Indigenous educationalists (Barnhardt, 2014). In these ways, students are supported to be culturally strong and positive contributors to their communities (Barnhardt, 2014).

Alaskan Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools

Much like the Australian context, Alaska has curriculum standards for 10 content areas. These include the crossover of English, Mathematics, Science, Geography, and History. Standards for *English Language Arts* and *Mathematics* are listed in the Alaska *English/Language Arts and Mathematics Standards* while the standards for all other subjects are contained in the *Alaska Standards: Content and Performance Standards for Alaska Students* (5th edition) (Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, 2016). That English and Mathematics are given their own document suggests these subjects are prioritised in the Alaskan curriculum. Notably however *Cultural Standards* are not included in there. Instead these standards are found within the *Alaska Standards: Content and Performance Standards for Alaska Students*, situated separately as another subject under their own heading. In this way, the Alaskan curriculum standards read similarly to their Australian counterparts. Cultural standards seem like an 'add on', akin to the way Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures are taught as Cross-Curriculum Priorities rather than core subjects in the Australian context.

As discussed in the previous chapter Australian Curriculum writers have to date largely focussed on embedding Indigenous knowledges within the teaching of science. For the purpose of later analysis, I begin by reading the Alaskan curriculum standards to those listed under the same subject. I will then critique the Cultural

Standards as they exist separately. As I did in previous Chapter, my reading will be conducted through a CDA frame.

Critical Discourse: Content & Cultural Standards

In the Alaskan science curriculum there are seven standards. Each standard is accompanied by several criteria illustrating what the successful outcomes should look like. Noticeably, the Standards tell the reader what the students 'should' know or be able to 'apply' in reference to learning scientific knowledge. 'Should' and 'apply' are directive words. They imply students will be learning in a structured way with little to no autonomy. Classrooms that sanction minimal student-guided learning do not cater for multiple learning styles. Subsequently they ignore the strengths and knowledges Native Alaskan students have (Ermine, et al., 1995). Indeed, no reference is made to Native Alaskan knowledges despite standards addressing *Concepts of Life science, Concepts of Earth Science, Cultural, Social, Personal Perspectives and Science and History and Nature of Science*. Instead the language and phrases emphasise the dominance of Settler Colonial ideals within Science. As such the Standards rehearse that science 'requires empirical evidence', 'integrity', 'logical reasoning', 'structure'. 'understanding theories', 'logical arguments', and 'critical review in striving for the best possible explanations of the natural world'. The language employed suggests that these settler colonial ideals are not open to discussion, exploration or inclusive of other world views.

Language that is used to disregard alternative ways of working is what Fairclough (2001, p. 33) would term as discriminatory power relations. Such language influences, maintains, and reproduces issues of power. In this instance, Indigenous knowledges

have directly been ignored and power has been given to Eurocentric ways of knowing. The same can be said of the way language is used in the illustrative criteria accompanying each stand. For example, the text accompanying the *Cultural, Social, Personal Perspectives* standard states that a student should:

- G2 – develop an understanding that the advancement of scientific knowledge embraces innovation and requires empirical evidence, repeatable investigations, logical arguments, and critical review in striving for the best possible explanations of the natural world;
- G3 – develop an understanding that scientific knowledge is ongoing and subject to change as new evidence becomes available through experimental and/or observational confirmation(s); and,

- G4 – develop an understanding that advancements in science depend on curiosity, creativity, imagination, and a broad knowledge base. (Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, 2016, p. 57)

Addressing G2 first, this criterion emphasises the value of empirical evidence. Empirical evidence is based on observation. According to Sambono (2018), Indigenous Knowledges have been developed through day to day analysis over many generations. The use of 'empirical evidence' thus provides an opportunity for Standard developers to relate the concept to Indigenous Knowledges, demonstrating equality of import. However, this opportunity is not taken. The G2 criterion also refers to scientific knowledge as a subject that embraces and requires 'critical review in striving for the best possible explanations of the natural world'. Indigenous people have developed beliefs, values, respect for spirituality and an interconnectedness with the natural world (Kawagley, 2006). The five elements of earth, air, fire, water, and spirit that Kawagley (2006) writes about also connect well with explaining the 'natural world' through a Native Alaskan lens. The element of spirit is often missed in the constructs of Western knowledge, particularly with the relationship it has to land (Kawagley et al., 1998). That the criterion does not acknowledge the import of Native

Alaskan knowledges here represents yet another failed opportunity to include Indigenous ways of knowing.

Similarly, the G3 criterion to might have opened itself to interact with Indigenous Knowledges. Their inclusion would enhance the sought after 'scientific' enquiry. Instead standard writers exclude the learnings Indigenous knowledges can provide, suggesting their drafters' limitations in conceptualising holistic education. The G4 criterion again encourages students to approach science enquiry holistically by stating 'that advancements in science depend on curiosity, creativity, imagination, and a broad knowledge base.' Despite reference being made to developing 'curiosity' and having a 'broad knowledge base' Indigenous knowledges are not promoted. 'Curiosity' of other cultural knowledge would contribute to collaborative knowledge exchange and integrated learning opportunities knowledge exchange and integrated learning opportunities (Kawagley et al., 1998).

As previously stated, teaching Indigenous knowledges offers an opportunity for non-Indigenous students to learn about other ways of knowing and to produce new knowledge in a safe environment (Mercier and Leonard, 2017). By reviewing the language in the above Science standards, it becomes evident that power and knowledge is maintaining the mandate of settler colonial education. Indigenous ways of knowing are silenced while colonial structures are reproduced and reinforced (Fairclough, 2013).

__Embedding the Cultural Standards__

Upon reading the Cultural Standards, it seems glaringly obvious that they were constructed by different writers with different objectives. The Cultural Standards were drafted by The Alaska Native Knowledge Network. They call for a different pedagogical approach: practical, hands on and student centred. Instead of using phrases found in Science such as 'should know or be able to apply', the cultural standards use words including 'demonstrate', 'engage', 'grounded', 'build on', 'actively participate'. Such words suggest active participation, with the students having autonomy over how they interact with the cultural standards. In this way they chime with Castagno & Brayboy (2008) observation that when students feel empowered and have greater agency within their schools and communities, education is both more meaningful and socially responsible. While it is unclear whether Native Alaskan youths were consulted in the drafting of the Standards, the writers have succeeded at least in incorporating language that encourages student autonomy in learning.

Interestingly, although drafted by Native Alaskans with the agenda to make schools culturally responsive to their communities, the terms 'Alaska Native' or 'Indigenous' are not used throughout the Cultural Standards. Each standard opens with the phrase 'Culturally knowledgeable students are…', a more inclusive language choice which might otherwise have read 'Native students are...' (Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, 2016, pp. 28-29). This could be considered a direct tactic of the writers to acknowledge the import of everyone's cultural backgrounds. Non-Indigenous students are not excluded: they are able pick up the cultural standards and apply them to their own cultural backgrounds. The Cultural

Standards' gestures towards inclusiveness are further highlighted in B1: 'acquire insights from other cultures without diminishing the integrity of their own' (Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, 2016,p. 28). That said, the standards certainly lend themselves to the way most Native Alaskans learn. Nelson (2011) believes curriculum that embeds Indigenous knowledges provides learnings, practices and principles that teach students from other cultural backgrounds about living sustainably (Nelson, 2011). Mercier and Leonard (2017) also proffer that teaching Indigenous knowledges provides an opportunity for non-Indigenous students to learn about other ways of knowing to produce new knowledge in a safe environment. According to Brady (1997), in schools that embed Indigenous-based curriculum, students develop respect for and build an appreciation of Indigenous history, culture and society . Each of the standards seem to apply these authors insights. They reiterate the importance of 'community' and 'family' – aligning with Yellow Bird and Snipp's (2002) observations that cultural standards should reflect Native Alaskan students understandings of their place in community and in particular their respect for their Elders and land.

While the Standards make sufficient reference to Native Alaskan emphasis on engaging and building relationships with the environment and community, there is no mention of including Native languages. This omission is important to note. As Kawagley et al., (1998), Kawagley (2006) and Castagno and Brayboy (2008) articulate respectively, Indigenous languages play a vital role in teaching – they are tools for the expression of the soul. For Benally and Viri (2005), language is vital for environmental sustainability, spirituality, and connections to land because it encompasses sacred knowledge and cultural identifications with the environment. By

failing to include reference to the role and importance of language, the Standards ignore Deyhle and Swisher's (1997) observation that teaching languages in Alaskan schools is fundamental to maintaining traditional knowledges and increasing academic success of Native Alaskan students. The omission likewise seems to ignore Article 14 of the United Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) which stipulates that 'Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning (UNDRIP, 2007)'. Language is a fundamental component of Indigenous sovereignty (Moll & Ruiz, 2005): it should be strongly considered by curriculum writers when developing Indigenous specific content.

Despite this, the drafters seem to have been open minded in their approach: the standards prepare Native Alaskan students to navigate other knowledge systems, grow the understanding and appreciation for other cultures. This is illustrated in the way Cultural Standards E6 and E7 are worded:

- E6 – anticipate the changes that occur when different cultural systems come in contact with one another;
- E7 –determine how cultural values and beliefs influence the interaction of people from different backgrounds.

It is disappointing that a similar openness in approach was not undertaken by the drafters of the Science content standards. Indeed, on reading the Cultural standards it seems that they readily could have been embedded throughout the *Content and Performance Standards.* Surely this would have given educators and students are greater sense of ownership and led to their greater reference. Cultural Standard D5 and E4 for example could easily reside in the Science. They read:

- D5 – Identify and utilise appropriate sources of cultural knowledge to find solutions to everyday problems and
- E4 – determine how ideas and concepts from one knowledge system relate to those derived from other knowledge systems.

That they have not been included, and instead sit separately within the Standards document, suggests a prevailing status quo in Alaskan pedagogical thought – one that emphasises Eurocentric ways of knowing, and thus, maintains the power of Eurocentric curriculum.

Questions of the Alaskan Framework: Concluding Thoughts

As an international observer, it appears to me that the Alaskan education context is engaged with Indigenous governance process. In this process, the Alaskan Rural Systemic Initiative (AKRSI) is engaging with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) in relation to education, land, and cultural and intellectual property rights. Although the United States was delayed in signing to the UNDRIP, it is apparent that sovereignty has been pursued and practiced by Native Alaskan educators. Their work to date demonstrates particular engagement Article 14, which calls for local Indigenous control of education and pedagogy.

Despite a burgeoning academic literature on the importance of embedding Indigenous knowledges and culturally responsive standards in Alaska (see Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Brayboy et al., 2012; Beaulieu et al., 2005; Kawagley et al. 1998; Kawagley 2006; & Barnhardt, 2014), few scholars have articulated the appropriate standards for teaching Indigenous knowledge. Whyte (2017) states that Indigenous knowledges are something that have governance value for Indigenous peoples. Accordingly embedding Indigenous knowledge plays an integral role in the way

communities plan for the future. The responsibility and right to plan for the future are key components of self-determination. Yet, in my analysis of the AKRSI documents and standards, this has not come through strongly. Despite an emphasis on having Elders and Indigenous communities involved in designing curriculum (see Kawagley et al. 1998; & 2006), equal weight has not been placed on student involvement. To me this seems a great limitation of both the AKRSI documents and broader scholarship which advocates for community engagement. It appears consultation with Indigenous youth has tended to be overlooked when the planning and aspirations of Native Alaskan students and education are spoken about (Skinner and Leonard, 2017).

As Matunga (2013) has written, Indigenous planning for future generations must be an act of 'internalised self-definition and externalised advocacy' (p. 4). Jojola's (2013) seven generation model of planning provides an example of intergenerational planning. This model is often employed by Indigenous communities to respond to the violence committed against them by settler colonial societies. Key to such resistance is ensuring the survival of Indigenous knowledges, and that this can only be achieved through committing to political change in dominant power systems (Prusak et al., 2016). Applying this fully in the Alaskan education context means that discussions of Indigenous students' needs must be informed by Indigenous students. Students are an invaluable source of intergenerational transmission of Indigenous knowledges (Battiste, 2002). The sustainability of Indigenous knowledges depends on the active engagement and involvement of current Indigenous students in the development of curricula. This would ensure that knowledge can be sustained and developed for future generations.

Despite this criticism, the AKSRI resources do guide educational institutions in embedding Native Alaskan knowledges into the curriculum and encourage educators to use land as a learning tool. Looking across the AKSRI documents, it seems clear that the Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools has been strengthened by the establishment and provision of the online database of Indigenous curriculum resources. It is unclear however, how frequently these resources are reviewed. I have also been unable to find any reference to how educators were held accountable to the cultural standards. This suggests a risk that teachers may only endeavour to be culturally responsive in line with the AKSRI interventions if they see and believe in their benefit for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. This omission in design mirrors the discretionary approach taken in the Australian context, where there is little mandate, in terms of policy, for educators to teach Indigenous knowledges through the Cross-Curriculum Priorities. In the next Chapter (IV) I build on the insights gleaned through my successive analysis of curriculum in the Australian and Alaskan contexts to make the case for a more responsive pedagogical practice of land-based education.

Chapter IV. – Land-Based & Learning on Country Education

Introduction

While the culturally responsive pedagogy, teaching and standards implemented in the Alaska context provide alternative examples of how to systemically embed Indigenous knowledges, they stop short of disturbing the hegemonic status of Eurocentrism within the curriculum. By applying insights from the critical analysis undertaken in the preceding chapters, in this Chapter I argue in favour of a pedagogical practice of land-based education or learning on Country as a means of unsettling the Eurocentric curriculum. I also argue that Learning on Country provides a means of embedding Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum. Through attending to both aspects, the pedagogical practice of Learning on Country I propose contests Setter colonial discourses. In doing so, I hope to demonstrate Learning on Country as a practice of decolonialisation.

Learning on Country provides a way of contesting settler colonial curriculum and philosophies, which have continually denied Indigenous perspectives in history and environmental education, particularly in relation to land. Throughout this chapter, I explore the significance of Country for Indigenous people to highlight how Indigenous conceptualisations of land differ from prevailing Eurocentric notions. In doing so I have two interrelated goals. The first is to demonstrate how the consequences of invasion and the ongoing acts of colonisation in Australia have impacted both curriculum design and teaching of Indigenous content. The second is to demonstrate how practices of land-based education can be used to intersect Western thought with Indigenous knowledges in education. It is my view that a such a

reckoning of Indigenous conceptualisations of land addresses cross-curricular priorities of sustainability and history, lending itself to a more integrated and critical pedagogical practice. In doing so it encourages change on a deeper level because it works towards understanding the problems associated with settler colonial societies. For me this is the main import of learning on Country. It works to balance the perspective in the way subjects, such as history, science, and environmental studies, are taught. By inserting an Indigenous viewpoint and practise to curriculum, land-based education de-centres predominant settler colonial ways of knowing. Remarkably, Northern American work on culturally responsive schools (CRS) has tended not to address issues of territoriality and Eurocentric notions of land as discussed previously in chapter I. For me this seems strange. If CRS is concerned with embedding Indigenous knowledges through the teaching of Indigenous culture and language, then a thorough interaction with land is surely needed because land and language are inherently connected. As such land-based education can be seen to augment the learnings obtained from the Alaskan context. I believe through this, the objectives of this theses – to strengthen engagement with Indigenous students and their communities and embed Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum – could be realised. These goals directly relate and work to achieve the targets set in Article 14 of UNDRIP.

Problematising settler colonial education

One of the main functions of settler colonialism is to render Western traditions and thought superior whilst weakening Indigenous culture by recourse to disciplinary institutions. In Australia, this was attempted through the institutional programming of policies of assimilation and dispossession – policies which removed Indigenous

people from their most powerful source of knowledge and strength – the land (Pascoe, 2011). The dispossession of land has impacted on the way Indigenous people transfer knowledge, particularly in with respect to Indigenous governance and ethics both of which value having intimate relationships with the land (Pascoe, 2011). As educators have begun to recognize the limitations of a monocultural education system, we have seen the emergence of new pedagogical practices which seek to acknowledge and contribute to the way Indigenous knowledge can enhance Western education. However, if educators are serious about contesting the dominance of Settler Colonial curriculum and using Indigenous knowledges to provide a holistic worldview, they must facilitate opportunities for students to develop relationships with the land (Rose & Robin, 2004).

Indigenous and non-Indigenous ideologies concerning the concept of 'Country' differ significantly. This difference in understanding shapes much of the colonial educational discourse surrounding Indigenous people. Colonial understandings and content related to land continue to be taught through the Australian Curriculum. The Curriculum is replete with colonial concepts of land as property and as a material possession. By understanding that these concepts form part of the colonial politic, we can begin to see how school and repressive schooling exercises reflect broader exercises of power (Rose, 2012; Wang 2011).

Foucault (1980) argues that to emancipate ourselves from powers' disciplinary effects, we must first examine the origins of knowledge and the construction of discourse. To do so we must overlook the kinds of observation, types of awareness and ideas of philosophy that dominate mainstream knowledges. Foucault instead urges us to focus on the tactics and strategies of power. For educators contesting the

Settler-Colonial paradigm, this presents the challenge of devising a system of education for all people – that is, one that respects the epistemological and pedagogical foundations provided by Indigenous as well as Western cultural traditions. Currently, the broad descriptors around 'history', 'culture' and 'language' in the Cross-Curriculum Priorities suggest very minimal accountability to teach and assess Indigenous content in the classroom. In the following sections, I will provide a deeper analysis of how a model of land-based education could intervene here and the practical implications this has on curriculum.

What the Literature say about Land-Based Education

Land-based education is a relatively new educational/academic concept in Australia. As a result, I will draw on the work of international scholars researching similarly colonised countries such as Canada, New Zealand and the USA. According to Tuck et al., (2014) a curriculum of land-based pedagogy works to address the problems associated with settlement. It sets itself the job of determining a long-shared future between Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and humans and the environment. Land-based education addresses issues involved with land, natural environment and the non-human world which are frequently overlooked by mainstream social and cultural scholarship (Gruenewald, 2008, p. 143). A primary function of land-based education is also to have Indigenous peoples lead discussion regarding education in communities. When this occurs, it improves relationships and consultation between local Indigenous peoples and schools (Calderon, 2014, p. 28).

The pedagogical practice of land-based education stresses the importance of critique which sheds light on the politics of conceptualisations of place. Such political

analysis informs understanding of the differences in how Indigenous people understand place and why it was important for settlers to displace Indigenous people off their land (Tuck et al., 2014, p. 4.). In this way, Land-based education foregrounds settler colonialism while presenting students with opportunities to understand the land, water and nature through an Indigenous lens. It challenges students to consider the principles and politics of naming as well as how Indigenous agency and resistance connects with Indigenous cosmologies (Calderon, 2012). For educators, the constructs of land-based education encourage greater examination of the importance of engaging with the environment (Whitehouse et al., 2014). They also demand that teachers identify and interrogate prejudices in pedagogy and philosophies that either support settler ownership of stolen land, or support other settler ideologies of land which work to the detriment of Indigenous peoples (Tuck et al., 2014).

Understanding Land-based & Place-Based Education

Advocates of place-based education argue that the pedagogy prepares students to strive towards maintaining cultural and ecological integrity in their local environments (Woodhouse & Knapp, 2000). In favour of sustainability, proponents assert that students must acquire knowledge of ecological patterns, structures of relationships and the lasting effects human actions can have on their environment (Woodhouse, & Knapp, 2000). This helps students to form a strong sense of place so that they can take appropriate political action on ecological issues (Gruenewald, 2008; Woodhouse, & Knapp, 2000). Teachers can help students form a strong sense of place by spending regular time outdoors working on sustained relations with the community and environment (Gruenewald, 2008).

Although place-based education stresses the importance of community engagement and needs, it stops short of including decolonisation aims within its pedagogy despite its complement to cultural and ecological sustainability (Calderon, 2012). Tuck et al., (2014) suggest that colonialism in general, Indigenous rights and sovereignty are likewise not addressed. Additionally, issues such as history, present and future tend to be ignored. Interestingly, research comparing student engagement with place and land-based pedagogies suggests that the latter tend to result in better outcomes. For example, Friedel's (2011) research – comparing education outcomes across place and land-based pedagogies in Canada – found that the lessons learnt by First Nations students in outdoor and environmental education proved less effective than the experiences gained from the students being able to relate to one another through kinship and community. Place-based students and educators benefit from land-based education because it requires that they question their bond to land as a vibrant ecological and cultural development of rehabilitation and recovery (Calderon, 2012). Indigenous knowledge that has been acquired through extended periods of watching and learning can offer many learnings to all types of students who endeavour to find a more efficient way to exist on earth (Barnhardt, 2005).

Place-based pedagogy is celebrated for the way it promotes and instils pride and responsibility for the local community whilst enriching students' educational experiences (Gruenewald, 2003; Smith, 2002; and Sobel 2004). Linking the classroom to the cultural and physical environment in which the students are located is emphasised very important engagement tool in its practice. This is particularly so for Indigenous students whose families have developed an intimate relationship with the land that surrounds and nurtures them (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 1999; McCarty,

2002; and Semken & Morgan, 1997). By integrating Indigenous cultural and scientific knowledge, placed-based learning would expand to incorporate cross disciplinary learning priorities (Cajete, 2000). It would allow for learning about alternative ways of understanding the world, which students can adopt and apply to increase their understandings of why things come to be the way they are (Barnhardt, 2005).

Land-based education or learning on Country differs from place-based education. A central point of difference is that land-based education acknowledges that land (Country) is central to settler colonialism (Calderon, 2014, p.33). It contests conventional curriculum by making settler colonialism visible (Tuck et al., 2014, p. 7). Incorporating Indigenous knowledge and concepts of place are vital to this process (Calderon, 2012). Land-based education thus allows students to gain awareness of the continued settlement process, the occupation of un-ceded Indigenous land, and Indigenous histories and cultures (Tuck et al., 2014, p. 14). Through such knowledge, students' connections to each other and the regions in which they live are strengthened (Gruenewald, 2014, p. 321 & Tuck et al., 2014, p. 14).

Although I am yet to find any empirical work in the literature about the effectiveness of Land-based education, examples such as the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority's (GBRMPA) reef education programme in Australia, and the Old Minto Cultural Camp in Alaska, suggest that land-based education may work well in practice (Appendix 3). The GBRMPA and the Old Minto Cultural Camp are land-based education examples that highlight the relationships that have been developed between schools and the local Indigenous communities. The examples have also been successful in emphasising the embedding of Indigenous knowledges

into their teaching which speaks to one of the main objectives of land-based education: contesting settler colonial curriculum whilst offering itself as an opportunity to promote the teaching of Indigenous histories and knowledges (Tuck et al., 2014).

Much like culturally responsive schooling, land-based education is a strength-based educational practice that promotes sovereignty and desired educational outcomes for Indigenous people. As Seddon (2001) suggests, what counts as valued knowledge is a consequence of socially produced selective traditions. As these traditions affect education, they ripple onward to have wider economic and cultural affects, patterning power and inequality, and its dynamics of conservation and renewal. Seddon's (2001) idea is useful as it helps to illustrate how those of the dominant culture disperse their own agenda and knowledge while ignoring the views of the minority. With respect to Settler colonialism, we can see its affects in the Australian Curriculum, and the onward affects it has in society by removing or ignoring Indigenous knowledges and histories. As a means of intervening in this process in Australia, land-based education could be taught to fulfil two of the three Indigenous Cross-Curriculum Priorities of sustainability and history (Whitehorse et al., 2014). Such a curriculum would address the problems associated with settlement and set itself the job of determining a long-shared future between Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and humans and the environment (Tuck et al., 2014, p. 14).

Land Based Pedagogy as Resistance and Right

As Foucault (1997) has written it is only through resistance that we can reverse power relations. Such resistance can take the form of violence, flight, deception, and other strategies. Without these markers of resistance, "there would be no power relations at

all" (Foucault, 1997, p. 292). Increasingly, there is a growing demand from Indigenous communities, scholars, and activists to resist colonialism collaboratively and on the international level. More and more discussions are taking place to contest colonial philosophies which have continually denied other perspectives within environmental education, particularly Indigenous relations to land. Actions to date have sought to articulate the intersections of environmentalism and Indigenous rights (Tuck et al., 2014). As Tuck et al., (2014) have noted such discussions and actions, uniting Indigenous peoples around the world, highlight the importance of contesting settler colonialism in domestic education systems.

The intersection of land, environment, education and Indigenous rights has also been expressed in the United Nations (UN) *Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP). This Declaration establishes a framework for State members to ensure the 'survival, dignity and wellbeing of Indigenous peoples' (United Nations General Assembly, 2007) (See Appendix 2). In Article 14, Indigenous autonomy in education (and importantly the role of language in education) is articulated as a matter of universal right (United Nations General Assembly, 2007).

Notably, of the 148 UN State members, Australia, America, Canada and New Zealand – all Settler Colonies – were the only countries who initially voted against incorporating the UNDRIP recommendations (United Nations General Assembly, 2007). Although all have since passed the recommendations, this is a significant point as it highlights the attitudes of politicians who also worked against the embedding of Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum in the education context of Australia and Alaska. Given this broader political context, it may seem unsurprising then that

Eurocentric ideologies and ideas continue to inform current curriculum, pedagogy and educational practices in both states (Hickling-Hudson et al, 2004).

Curriculum regulates and asserts control over nation-building rhetoric. It is propounded as providing a collective voice, progressing the nation, strengthening national identity and fulfilling national destiny (Seddon, 2001). What is included within curriculum is determined by a process of conscious and unconscious decision making. The pattern of inclusion and exclusion this creates directly informs what knowledge, skills and dispositions that are taught (Seddon, 2001). Curriculum also contributes to the teaching of selective valued learnings of social and political discourse (Seddon, 2001). Curriculum has the ability to distribute influence and authority in society because it supplies the formation of singular and structural centres of power as well as the limitations on the exercise of that power (Seddon, 2001). Indigenous people have been disadvantaged and marginalised due to dispossession in the formation of Australia as well as the systematic denial of Indigenous knowledge and culture within education. Recent Australian education and its nation-building curriculum have further contributed to embedding of such disadvantage (Seddon, 2001).

Settler colonialism in the Australian Curriculum can be disrupted by using land-based education as it allows Indigenous voices, knowledges, epistemologies, values and ontologies to be heard. Land-based education acknowledges that Indigenous knowledges are the most viable knowledge systems related to sustainability, community building and addressing issues of territoriality (Brandt, 2009). Furthermore, land-based education better accounts for the history, present and

future by attending to its embedded issues of colonialism and Indigenous rights and sovereignty (Tuck et al 2014, p. 2). Ignoring Indigenous epistemological creates gaps in the way knowledge is created; it supports Settler Colonial power (Calderon, 2012).

Power/knowledge nexus

Foucault's idea of power/knowledge is helpful in understanding how Settler Colonial ideas inform curriculum. Foucault theorises the nature of modern power as power/knowledge, which he finds is an indissoluble unity (Fitzsimons & Smith, 2000). A prime example of where and how this power manifests is formal education. According to Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernandez (2013), schooling in colonised countries has altered the history of the national imagery through discourses. Such discourses maintain symbolic logics that justify the theft and occupation of Indigenous land, and frame Indigenous people and knowledges as lesser than. Discourse creates power, which is implemented and generates itself on bodies (Nievas, 1998). The Australian Curriculum is one such body: rules and regulations serve the settler colonial curriculum. It is a site where power through knowledge is manufactured and suppressed.

Through the Curriculum, regulation is created when patterns of normality are formed, and the relationships of oppression and compliance are established (Nievas, 1998). For Ball (1990), education works to render its students as subjects of power, as well as constituting them as powerful subjects. By critiquing schools as places of power, we challenge ourselves to reflect on how we are subjected to, and wield, power and knowledge. Though discomforting, this understanding allows us to think differently about schools, knowledge, and power and to build new communities of action (Apple et al., 2009). Ultimately, as Foucault (1976) notes, power is not

necessarily positive or negative; it is relational. Understanding it, acquiring knowledge about its effects is essential to powers contestation (p. 261).

When endeavouring to contest social, institutional and political change based on dominant society views and beliefs, people 'inevitably' reinvest in 'power-mechanisms' they set out to refuse. Ultimately, power is strengthened by being accepted as 'truth' by majority or mainstream society; this acceptance allows it to influence the dominant culture agenda (Foucault, 1976). In this way, power, according to Foucault (2007), needs to be seen as a constructive system that embeds itself across the entire social body. Accordingly, the analysis of the operation of power and knowledge in education helps us to question assumptions that are framed as self-evident. And, indeed this is how many recent educational theorists have sought to unmask the political nature of the settler colonial curriculum. In this way the Foucauldian method of problematising knowledge claims by interrogating how they have been questioned, analysed, classified and regulated (Bacchi, 2011) becomes a form of resistance against Eurocentric ideologies and social control (Wang, 2011).

Resistance in the education realm should be thought of as the reversing of power relations rather than the search of a freedom from oppression (Wang, 2011). For Wang (2011), the process of individual capacity-building is the exercise of education itself and it renders the formation of powerful subjects. Individually or structurally, Foucault's philosophy on 'problematization' – which informs his general power/knowledge theory – can be used to analyse the Australian Curriculum and provide a critical consciousness for disrupting taken-for-granted 'truths' (Bacchi, 2011).

Conclusion

Although still a relatively 'new' pedagogical concept in the education field, land-based education has been advocated by Indigenous academics and educationalists because of its links to Indigenous ways of knowing and addressing issues such as sustainability and colonialism. I have argued that land-based education encourages teachers to provide a balanced approach which is inclusive of Indigenous worldviews in subject areas such as science, history and environmental studies. This is also where land-based education and culturally responsive pedagogy differ: culturally responsive schools do not tend to address issues of territoriality and Eurocentric notions of land. If Culturally Responsive Schooling is concerned with embedding Indigenous knowledges through the teaching of Indigenous culture and language than a thorough interaction with land is needed because land and language are inherently connected.

Land-based education helps educators and students contest issues associated with settler-colonial curriculum by providing opportunities to develop relationships with the land (Wildcat et al., 2014). Developing relationships with Country can offer students many learnings and benefits to all types of learners as they endeavour exist in a world that is more sustainable (Barnhardt, 2005). Linking the classroom to the cultural and physical environment in which the students are located is a very important engagement tool as student's connections to each other and the regions in which they live are strengthened (Gruenewald 2014, p. 321; Tuck et al, 2014, p. 14). As stated previously, land-based education is a strength-based educational approach that promotes sovereignty and desired educational outcomes for Indigenous people which is clear goal of the UNDRIP through article 14. The promotion of self-

determination and educational success is a commonality that is shared between culturally responsive schools and land-based educators.

Finally, while I have presented land-based education as a way to contest colonial curriculum and strengthen students' connections to the community and country, land-based education can be used as a way to teach Indigenous knowledges through the Cross-Curriculum Priorities.

Theses Summary

Throughout this theses, I have sought to demonstrate that the education of Indigenous students, and the education about Indigenous peoples, in Australia are deeply contentious, political practices. Curricula is informed by past and present Australian government policies that have sought to displace and erase Indigenous people and knowledges through a settler colonial mandate.

Drawing on both Settler Colonial and Foucauldian Power/knowledge theories, in Chapter 2, I critically examined how these policies over time have figured and been reproduced in Australia through key education documents, culminating in the national Australian Curriculum. My examination showcased the importance of further research into, and recognition of, the reasons why Indigenous knowledges have been ignored in the production of educational curricula. For analysis purposes, in Chapter 3, I investigated how such policies manifested in the Northern American state of Alaska. Alaska was chosen due to its similarity to the Australian context as a settler colony and as site encompassing diverse Indigenous cultures, languages and knowledges. There, in contrast to Australia however, Native Alaskans have had greater success in embedding Indigenous knowledges in curriculum and thus centring land. To enhance my examination in both Chapters I employed the methodological framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This framework foregrounds the ways in which language enacts institutional and social conventions. I employed CDA as a means to scrutinise the document text and identify how certain language devices were used to perpetuate Western Settler Colonial knowledges whilst silencing others.

The analysis of Australian and Alaskan education contexts yielded valuable learnings, particularly with respect to the importance and benefits for *all* students of writing curricula which incorporates Indigenous knowledges, culture and languages who learn about. In Chapter 3, I discussed the ways Indigenous knowledges in Alaskan curriculum became a priority for the Alaskan Native Knowledge Network (ANKN). As a result, the Culturally Responsive framework for schools was launched, connecting school culture with home culture. This linking of the classroom to the cultural and physical environment in which the students lived proved a very important engagement tool. It strengthened students' connections to each other and the regions in which they live (Gruenewald, 2014, p. 321 & Tuck et al., 2014, p. 14). The analysis of the Alaskan context also highlighted the importance of sovereignty, language and engagement with local community in appropriately embedding Indigenous knowledges in the curriculum. Follow up research on the impact this had on student outcomes emphasised greater student engagement in learning – speaking to the importance of creating a curriculum that is specific to their local environment, community and employment industry. The extent to which this was achieved in the Alaskan context has led to a general consensus and push for local curriculum from international scholars (Gruenewald, 2008; Hickling-Hudson et al., 2004; & Tuck et al., 2014). In light of the insights afforded from research on the Alaskan education context, Australian research and educators must begin to engage in the necessary steps to ensure local curricula gravitates towards Indigenous people.

Building on these insights, in Chapter 4 I proposed land-based education as a pedagogical practice that can be used to embed Australian Indigenous knowledges, contest colonial curriculum and act as a culturally responsive pedagogical practice.

'Learning on Country' has been an educational pedagogy that has been occurring for many generations in Indigenous communities (Tuck et al., 2014, Gruenewald, 2008; Calderon, 2014; Moreton-Robinson, 2013; Rose & Robin, 2004; & Whitehorse et al., 2014). My review of international scholarship on the benefits of land-based education practised elsewhere identified three consistent observations. Firstly, it is a form of strength-building; secondly, it allows students to develop relationships with Country (Wildcat et al., 2014); and, thirdly, it encourages awareness and critique of the issues associated with settler colonial curriculum. Learning on Country benefits all types of learners as the pedagogy works to encourage students to monitor their carbon footprint and strive for a more sustainable world (Barnhardt, 2005).

If the negative stigma and deficit discourses that surround Australia's Indigenous people is to ever change, then an accurate account of history and the embedding of Indigenous knowledges must occur. The inclusion of Indigenous knowledges and pedagogy means all students benefit because the learnings offer lessons about the world in a safe environment that Eurocentric ideologies tend to ignore (Nelson, 2011; Mercier and Leonard, 2017). It is increasingly clear that Indigenous education policies, to date, in Australia have failed to promote Indigenous self-determination or greater connection to local communities. While curriculum writers have been thinking about progressing the status of Indigenous education since 1989, the progress itself has been slow. A key hindrance has been the extent to which Indigenous knowledges have continued to be sidelined in favour of Eurocentric models. Indeed, this is reflected in policies which frame the problem of Indigenous education as something that would be fixed if Indigenous student outcomes measured up to *existing* curricula objectives. This frame fails to address the substance of the

matter: the absence, devaluing and neglect of Indigenous knowledges and rights to autonomy in education.

There needs to be greater emphasis on embedding Indigenous knowledges in the Australian Curriculum. This is not occurring through the current mechanism of the Cross-Curriculum Priorities. Teachers must be held accountable by the national curriculum in embedding Indigenous knowledges and schools should support them by providing the necessary professional development and time to develop this practice. For Indigenous knowledges to become prioritised by teachers, this must be directed by education policies and enforced by educationalists in leadership positions. The Alaska Cultural Standards provide exemplary models of how to provide guidance to teachers, while holding them accountable to teaching and recognising the value of Indigenous knowledges. By positing Indigenous knowledges in dialogue with Eurocentric ways of knowing, these Standards encourage teachers to challenge their worldviews and pedagogical practice.

It is incumbent that Indigenous education policies include and reflect the desires of Indigenous communities. This means supporting strengths-based approaches and establishing benchmarks that are determined by Indigenous people. The success and desires of Indigenous students must not be compared to that of non-Indigenous students because Indigenous students are faced with different barriers in education. Indigenous students should not be regarded as a problem that needs to be fixed. Instead, there must be greater emphasis on how the education system and curriculum can better engage and represent Indigenous learners and communities. Only then will reconciliation between Indigenous communities and States become

closer to being achieved – when the actions of non-Indigenous people match the desires and educational aspirations of Indigenous peoples.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - State and Territory Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Group

NAME	POSITION	ORGANISATION
Ms Gail Barrow	Manager	Aboriginal Education South Metro Region WA
Prof. Peter Buckskin	Dean & Head of School	David Unaipon College of Indigenous Education and Research University of South Australia
Mr Will Davis	CEO	Beenleigh Housing and Development Company Ltd Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing and Community Development
Ms Lillian Miller	Education Officer	Indigenous Education Catholic Education Services, Cairns
Ms Kaye Price	Independent Educator	ACT
Prof. Mark Rose	Executive Director of Indigenous Strategy and Education	Latrobe University
Ms Mary Senj	State Coordinator, Aboriginal Education	NSW DET
Ms Myra Singh	Academic Fellow	School of Education, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst

| Mr Michael West | CEO & Founder | Guwaali |
| Mr Paul Hewitt | Executive Director, Curriculum, Teaching and Assessment / Registrar of Teachers, BOS | ACARA Board Member |

Appendix 2 - United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Article 1

Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law.

Article 2

Indigenous peoples and individuals are free and equal to all other peoples and individuals and have the right to be free from any kind of discrimination, in the exercise of their rights, in particular that based on their Indigenous origin or identity.

Article 3

Indigenous peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Article 4

Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions.

Article 5

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural institutions, while retaining their rights to participate fully, if they so choose, in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the State.

Article 6

Every Indigenous individual has the right to a nationality.

Article 7

1. Indigenous individuals have the rights to life, physical and mental integrity, liberty and security of person.

2. Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security as distinct peoples and shall not be subjected to any act of genocide or any other act of violence, including forcibly removing children of the group to another group.

Article 8

1. Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.

2. States shall provide effective mechanisms for prevention of, and redress for:

   a. Any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities;

   b. Any action which has the aim or effect of dispossessing them of their lands, territories or resources;

   c. Any form of forced population transfer which has the aim or effect of violating or undermining any of their rights;

   d. Any form of forced assimilation or integration;

e. Any form of propaganda designed to promote or incite racial or ethnic discrimination directed against them.

Article 9

Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right to belong to an Indigenous community or nation, in accordance with the traditions and customs of the community or nation concerned. No discrimination of any kind may arise from the exercise of such a right.

Article 10

Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories. No relocation shall take place without the free, prior and informed consent of the Indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return.

Article 11

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature.

2. States shall provide redress through effective mechanisms, which may include restitution, developed in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs.

Article 12

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to manifest, practice, develop and teach their spiritual and religious traditions, customs and ceremonies; the right to maintain, protect, and have access in privacy to their religious and cultural sites; the right to the use and control of their ceremonial objects; and the right to the repatriation of their human remains.

2. States shall seek to enable the access and/or repatriation of ceremonial objects and human remains in their possession through fair, transparent and effective mechanisms developed in conjunction with Indigenous peoples concerned.

Article 13

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.

2. States shall take effective measures to ensure this right is protected and also to ensure that Indigenous peoples can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings, where necessary through the provision of interpretation or by other appropriate means.

Article 14

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.

3. States shall, in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for Indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside

their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language.

Article 15

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information.

2. States shall take effective measures, in consultation and cooperation with the Indigenous peoples concerned, to combat prejudice and eliminate discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among Indigenous peoples and all other segments of society.

Article 16

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish their own media in their own languages and to have access to all forms of non-Indigenous media without discrimination.

2. States shall take effective measures to ensure that State-owned media duly reflect Indigenous cultural diversity. States, without prejudice to ensuring full freedom of expression, should encourage privately-owned media to adequately reflect Indigenous cultural diversity.

Article 17

1. Indigenous individuals and peoples have the right to enjoy fully all rights established under applicable international and domestic labour law.

2. States shall in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples take specific measures to protect Indigenous children from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral

or social development, taking into account their special vulnerability and the importance of education for their empowerment.

3. Indigenous individuals have the right not to be subjected to any discriminatory conditions of labour and, inter alia, employment or salary.

Article 18

Indigenous peoples have the right to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights, through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures, as well as to maintain and develop their own Indigenous decision-making institutions.

Article 19

States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the Indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them.

Article 20

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems or institutions, to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development, and to engage freely in all their traditional and other economic activities.

2. Indigenous peoples deprived of their means of subsistence and development are entitled to just and fair redress.

Article 21

1. Indigenous peoples have the right, without discrimination, to the improvement of their economic and social conditions, including, inter alia, in the areas of education,

employment, vocational training and retraining, housing, sanitation, health and social security.

2. States shall take effective measures and, where appropriate, special measures to ensure continuing improvement of their economic and social conditions. Particular attention shall be paid to the rights and special needs of Indigenous Elders, women, youth, children and persons with disabilities.

Article 22

1. Particular attention shall be paid to the rights and special needs of Indigenous Elders, women, youth, children and persons with disabilities in the implementation of this Declaration.

2. States shall take measures, in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, to ensure that Indigenous women and children enjoy the full protection and guarantees against all forms of violence and discrimination.

Article 23

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, Indigenous peoples have the right to be actively involved in developing and determining health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions.

Article 24

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to their traditional medicines and to maintain their health practices, including the conservation of their vital medicinal plants, animals and minerals. Indigenous individuals also have the right to access, without any discrimination, to all social and health services.

2. Indigenous individuals have an equal right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. States shall take the necessary steps with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of this right.

Article 25

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard.

Article 26

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.

2. Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.

3. States shall give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories and resources. Such recognition shall be conducted with due respect to the customs, traditions and land tenure systems of the Indigenous peoples concerned.

Article 27

States shall establish and implement, in conjunction with Indigenous peoples concerned, a fair, independent, impartial, open and transparent process, giving due recognition to Indigenous peoples' laws, traditions, customs and land tenure systems, to recognize and adjudicate the rights of Indigenous peoples pertaining to their lands, territories and resources, including those which were traditionally owned or otherwise

occupied or used. Indigenous peoples shall have the right to participate in this process.

Article 28

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to redress, by means that can include restitution or, when this is not possible, of a just, fair and equitable compensation, for the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used, and which have been confiscated, taken, occupied, used or damaged without their free, prior and informed consent.

2. Unless otherwise freely agreed upon by the peoples concerned, compensation shall take the form of lands, territories and resources equal in quality, size and legal status or of monetary compensation or other appropriate redress.

Article 29

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources. States shall establish and implement assistance programmes for Indigenous peoples for such conservation and protection, without discrimination.

2. States shall take effective measures to ensure that no storage or disposal of hazardous materials shall take place in the lands or territories of Indigenous peoples without their free, prior and informed consent.

3. States shall also take effective measures to ensure, as needed, that programmes for monitoring, maintaining and restoring the health of Indigenous peoples, as developed and implemented by the peoples affected by such materials, are duly implemented.

Article 30

1. Military activities shall not take place in the lands or territories of Indigenous

peoples, unless justified by a relevant public interest or otherwise freely agreed with or requested by the Indigenous peoples concerned.

2. States shall undertake effective consultations with the Indigenous peoples concerned, through appropriate procedures and in particular through their representative institutions, prior to using their lands or territories for military activities.

Article 31

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.

2. In conjunction with Indigenous peoples, States shall take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights.

Article 32

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources.

2. States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the Indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.

3. States shall provide effective mechanisms for just and fair redress for any such activities, and appropriate measures shall be taken to mitigate adverse environmental, economic, social, cultural or spiritual impact.

Article 33

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions. This does not impair the right of Indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the States in which they live.

2. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine the structures and to select the membership of their institutions in accordance with their own procedures.

Article 34

Indigenous peoples have the right to promote, develop and maintain their institutional structures and their distinctive customs, spirituality, traditions, procedures, practices and, in the cases where they exist, juridical systems or customs, in accordance with international human rights standards.

Article 35

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine the responsibilities of individuals to their communities.

Article 36

1. Indigenous peoples, in particular those divided by international borders, have the right to maintain and develop contacts, relations and cooperation, including activities for spiritual, cultural, political, economic and social purposes, with their own members as well as other peoples across borders.

2. States, in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples, shall take effective measures to facilitate the exercise and ensure the implementation of this right.

Article 37

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the recognition, observance and enforcement of Treaties, Agreements and Other Constructive Arrangements concluded with States or their successors and to have States honour and respect such Treaties, Agreements and other Constructive Arrangements.

2. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as to diminish or eliminate the rights of Indigenous Peoples contained in Treaties, Agreements and Constructive Arrangements.

Article 38

States in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples, shall take the appropriate measures, including legislative measures, to achieve the ends of this Declaration.

Article 39

Indigenous peoples have the right to have access to financial and technical assistance from States and through international cooperation, for the enjoyment of the rights contained in this Declaration.

Article 40

Indigenous peoples have the right to have access to and prompt decision through just and fair procedures for the resolution of conflicts and disputes with States or other parties, as well as to effective remedies for all infringements of their individual and collective rights. Such a decision shall give due consideration to the customs, traditions, rules and legal systems of the Indigenous peoples concerned and international human rights.

Article 41

The organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system and other intergovernmental organizations shall contribute to the full realization of the

provisions of this Declaration through the mobilization, inter alia, of financial cooperation and technical assistance. Ways and means of ensuring participation of Indigenous peoples on issues affecting them shall be established.

Article 42

The United Nations, its bodies, including the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, and specialized agencies, including at the country level, and States, shall promote respect for and full application of the provisions of this Declaration and follow up the effectiveness of this Declaration.

Article 43

The rights recognized herein constitute the minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the Indigenous peoples of the world.

Article 44

All the rights and freedoms recognized herein are equally guaranteed to male and female Indigenous individuals.

Article 45

Nothing in this Declaration may be construed as diminishing or extinguishing the rights Indigenous peoples have now or may acquire in the future.

Article 46

1. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, people, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations or construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States.

2. In the exercise of the rights enunciated in the present Declaration, human rights and fundamental freedoms of all shall be respected. The exercise of the rights set forth in

this Declaration shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law, and in accordance with international human rights obligations. Any such limitations shall be non-discriminatory and strictly necessary solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for meeting the just and most compelling requirements of a democratic society.

3. The provisions set forth in this Declaration shall be interpreted in accordance with the principles of justice, democracy, respect for human rights, equality, non-discrimination, good governance and good faith.

Appendix 3 – Land-based Education Examples

The GBRMPA Sea Country Guardians Programme – Whitehorse et al. (2016)

The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority's (GBRMPA) reef education programme is an example of land-based education in Australia. This is a programme that has seen a collegial partnership between the Traditional Owners in eastern Cape York and the Torres Strait and the education staff at GBRMPA. The Sea Country Guardians Program is offered to all primary and secondary students in schools who wish 'to commit to the protection and conservation of Australia's World Heritage listed Great Barrier Reef' (ReefED, 2011). The Localised Education Program draws upon the traditional Indigenous knowledge of the area and is linked to scientific environmental knowledge with the aim of giving young people the tools to care and assume responsibility for local reefs. A community approach is taken in every aspect of the program so that students can learn from their Elders and develop their leadership skills. Local languages are employed throughout the curriculum so that students can gain an appreciation and respect for new learnings and Indigenous

customs. This is further enhanced by learning that occurs outside the classroom 'on Country' and students learn the old ways through watching and learning. Biermann and Townsend-Cross (2008) have argued this model has great potential to effect positive educational change for all learners.

The community-based and hands-on approach employed by the program is fundamental to making a real difference to the health and resilience of the Reef. Guardians are taking what they are seeing and learning and sharing the information with their networks. There is a real sense of responsibility and call to action amongst students. They are going beyond what is required by law in an effort to protect the reef. This kind of student action ensures the environmental sustainability of the Great Barrier Reef is ongoing. It also helps to improve the operations and economic sustainability of industries in the local area.

Old Minto Cultural Camp – Ray Barnhardt (2007)

One of the key initiatives to be implemented through the Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative/Alaska Native Knowledge Network is the Elders and Cultural Camps. The community of Minto has afforded the opportunity for tertiary students to spend a week at the Old Minto Cultural Camp on the Tanana River under the guidance of local Elders and their families. The Cultural immersion program allows teachers and non-Natives to experience Native Alaskan culture before undertaking graduate courses. By river boat, participants are taken down the Tanana River to the site of the former village of Minto where they set themselves up in one of the ten cabins for the week. Throughout the week, participants are expected to perform tasks that contribute to living in a fishing community and everything that is taught by the Elders is taught through participation in different activities and projects. The design of the program

envisages teachers becoming students and students becoming teachers. Camp is concluded with a special feast during which speeches and stories are shared by the people of Minto. At the end of camp, everyone is connected to place and the ancestors of the land though a cultural exchange that cannot be experienced or learnt by reading a textbook. Teachings from camp Minto are passed on through the environment and the learning experience itself. Students are able to use the strong sense of culture and place they have learned and apply to their education. The experience makes participants see the world differently and everyone leaves with a different experience. Camp Minto is equally important for the Minto people as it provides them with an opportunity to reconnect with their land and cultural heritage. They also have access to teachers to speak to about how they can pass down their traditional knowledges down to their children. This is an instance of two-way learning: teachers are also able to self-reflect about how they may use Elder's expertise and cultural camps in their own teaching.

References

Agbo, S. (2004). First Nations perspectives on transforming the status of culture and language in schooling. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *43*(1), 1-31.

Ah Sam, M., & Ackland, C. (2005). The curriculum: A doorway to learning. In J. Phillips & J. Lampert (Eds.), *Introductory Indigenous studies in education: The importance of knowing* (pp. 182–200). Sydney, Australia: Pearson Education Australia.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous knowledge and science revisited. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2*(3), 539-620.

Alaska Native Knowledge Network. (1998). *Alaska standards for culturally responsive schools*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network

Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative. (2004). *Annual report*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network.

Altman, J. C. (2009). *Beyond closing the gap: Valuing diversity in Indigenous Australia* (Vol. 54). Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research.

Aoki, T. T. (2004). *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki*. XXX: Routledge.

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012). *Shape of the Australian Curriculum*. Retrieved from https://acaraweb.blob.core.windows.net/resources/The_Shape_of_the_Australian_Curriculum_v4.pdf

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2013). *Cross-Curriculum Priorities*. Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/curriculum/cross-curriculum-priorities

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018). *New elaborations to help teachers incorporate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures in the Australian Curriculum: Science.* Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/docs/default-source/Media-Releases/20181029-ccp-media-release.pdf?sfvrsn=2

Ball, S. (1990), *Politics and policy making in education: Explorations in policy sociology*. Routledge.

Ball, S. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S., (2005). *Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen J. Ball*. Routledge.

Ball, S., & Olmedo, A. (2013). Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education, 54*(1), 85-96.

Bang, M. (2007). *The cultural context of learning: Native American science education.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois.

Bang, M., Medin, D., Washinawatok, K., & Chapman, S. (2010). Innovations in culturally based science education through partnerships and community. In *New science of learning* (pp. 569-592). Springer, New York, NY.

Banks, K. (2018, November 4). The truth about the Kooriculum. *IndigenousX.* Retrieved from https://Indigenousx.com.au/the_truth_about_the_kooriculum/

Barnhardt, C. (2001). A history of schooling for Alaska Native people. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 40(1), 1-30.

Barnhardt, R. (2005). Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaska Native ways of knowing. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 36*(1), 8-23.

Barnhardt, R. (2014). Creating a place for Indigenous knowledge in education: The

    Alaska Native Knowledge Network. In *Place-based education in the global*

    age (pp. 137-158). Routledge.

Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, A. O. (1998). *Culture, chaos and complexity: catalysts*

    for change in Indigenous Education.

Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, A. O. (1999). Education Indigenous to place: Western

    science meets Indigenous reality. *Ecological Education in Action, 17*, 140-

    159.

Barr, A., Gillard, J., Firth, V., Scrymgour, M., Welford, R., Lomax-Smith, J., ... &

    Constable, E. (2008). *Melbourne declaration on educational goals for young*

    Australians. Carlton, Vic: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment,

    Training and Youth Affairs.

Barry, N. (1994). Alienation in Aboriginal education in the Northern Territory. *The*

    Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 22(2), 155-162.

Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education:*

    A literature review with recommendations. Ottawa: National Working Group

    on Education.

Battiste, M., & Youngblood, J. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and*

    heritage: A global challenge. UBC Press.

Beaulieu, D., Sparks, L., & Alonzo, M. (2005). *Preliminary report on no child left*

    behind in Indian country. Washington, DC: National Indian Education

    Association.

Belgarde, M. J., Mitchell, R. D., & Arquero, A. (2002). What do we have to do to

    create culturally responsive programs?: The challenge of transforming

American Indian teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 24*(2), 42-54.

Bickmore-Brand, J., Startling, S., & Milgate, G. (2018). *Tertiary examples that shift Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander constructs from being "a problem to solve" to an essential part of our Australian identity.*

Biermann, S., & Townsend-Cross, M. (2008). Indigenous pedagogy as a force for change. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 37*(S1), 146-154.

Brady, W. (1997). Indigenous Australian education and globalisation. *International Review of Education, 43*(5-6), 413-422.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review, 37*(5), 425-446.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA. *Teaching Education, 20*(1), 31-53.

Brayboy, B. M. J., Fann, A. J., Castagno, A. E., & Solyom, J. A. (2012). *Postsecondary education for American Indian and Alaska Natives*: *Higher education for nation building and self-determination* (ASHE Higher Education Report 37: 5). John Wiley & Sons.

Burkett, M. (2013). Indigenous environmental knowledge and climate change adaptation. In R. Abate & E. Kronk (Eds.), *Climate change and Indigenous Peoples: The search for legal remedies*. Edward Elgar.

Burridge N., Chodkiewicz A. (2012). An historical overview of Aboriginal education policies in the Australian context. In N. Burridge, F. Whalan, & K. Vaughan (Eds.), *Indigenous education. Transgressions* (pp. 9-21), Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Butterfield, R. A. (1994, June). Blueprints for Indian education: Improving

    mainstream schooling (pp. 1-8). *ERIC Digest.* Retrieved from

    https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED372898.

Cahape, P., & Howley, C. B. (1992). Indian nations at risk: Listening to the people.

    Summaries of papers commissioned by the Indian Nations at Risk Task

    Force of the US Department of Education.

Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence.* Clear Light Pub.

Cajete, G. (2004). Philosophy of native science. *American Indian thought* (pp. 45-57).

Calderon, D. (2014). Speaking back to manifest destinies: a land education-

    based approach to critical curriculum inquiry. *Environmental Education*

    Research, 20(1), 24-36.

Castagno, A. E. (2012). "They Prepared me to be a teacher, but not a culturally

    responsive Navajo teacher for Navajo kids": A tribal critical race theory

    analysis of an Indigenous teacher preparation program. *Journal of American*

    Indian Education, 3-21.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for

    Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational*

    Research, 78(4), 941-993.

Cleary, L. M., & Peacock, T. D. (1998). *Collected wisdom: American Indian*

    education. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Collins, B., & Lea, T. (1999). *Learning lessons: An independent review of Indigenous*

    education in the Northern Territory.

Colman-Dimon, H. (2000). Relationships with the school: Listening to the voices of a

    remote Aboriginal community. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous*

    Education, 28(1), 34-47.

Comber, B., & Kamler, B. (2004). Getting out of deficit: Pedagogies of reconnection. *Teaching education, 15*(3), 293-310.

Commonwealth of Australia. House of Representatives. (1961). *Parliamentary debates*. Canberra, Australia: Commonwealth House of Representatives.

Cotton, S. (1984). Alaska's 'Molly Hootch case': High schools and the village voice. *Educational Research Quarterly, 8*(4), 30–43.

Craven, R. (1998). Getting started: Understanding and teaching Aboriginal studies effectively. *Perspectives on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education* (pp.191-219).

Dauenhauer, R. (1997). *Conflicting visions in Alaskan education*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Veniaminov Bicentennial Project.

DeJong, D. H. (1993). *Promises of the past: A history of Indian education in the United States*. Golden, CO: North American Press.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* The New Press.

Demmert Jr, W. G. (2001). *Improving academic performance among Native American students: a review of the research literature*. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Demmert Jr, W. G. (2011). What is culture-based education? Understanding pedagogy and curriculum. *Honoring our heritage: Culturally appropriate approaches to Indigenous education*, 1-9.

Department of Education and Training. (2016, July). *Marrung Aboriginal Education Plan 2016 – 2026.* Retrieved from

https://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/about/programs/aboriginal/Marrung_Aboriginal_Education_Plan_2016-2026.pdf

Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (2008). *Staff in Australia's schools 2007*. Melbourne, Australia: ACER Press.

Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (2018). *Closing the gap: Prime Minister's report*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Deyhle, D. (1995). Navajo youth and Anglo racism: cultural integrity and resistance. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3), 403–444.

Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: from assimilation to self-determination. *Review of research in education, 22*(1), 113-194.

Eglash, R. (2002). Computation, complexity and coding in Native American knowledge systems. *Changing the faces of mathematics: Perspectives on Indigenous people of North America* (pp. 251-262).

Ermine, W., Battiste, M., & Barman, J. (1995). Aboriginal epistemology. *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp101-112).

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* Routledge.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: SAGE.

Feder, E. (2011), 'Power/knowledge', in D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts* (pp. 55-68). Durham: Acumen Publishing Limited.

Fogarty, B., & Wilson, B. (2016). Governments must stop negatively framing policies aimed at First Nations people. *Sovereign Union*. Retrieved from

http://theconversation.com/governments-must-stop-negatively-framing-policies-aimed-at-Indigenous-australians-60558

Fogarty, W., Lovell, M., Langenberg, J., & Heron, M. J. (2018). *Deficit Discourse and Strengths-based Approaches: Changing the Narrative of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health and Wellbeing*. Canberra, Australia: National Centre for Indigenous Studies, The Australian National University.

Foley, W., & Schubert, L. (2013). Applying strengths-based approaches to nutrition research and interventions in Indigenous Australian communities. *Journal of Critical Dietetics, 1*(3), 15-25.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (2013). *Archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge.

Foucault, M., Morris, M., & Patton, P. (1979). *Michel Foucault: Power, Truth, Strategy*.

Franklin, C. (1995). Culturally Relevant School Programs for American Indian Children and Families. *Social Work in Education, 17*(3), 183-92.

Gale, T. (2001). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(5), 379-393.

Garcia, J., & Shirley, V. (2013). Performing decolonization: Lessons learned from Indigenous youth, teachers and leaders' engagement with critical Indigenous pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 28*(2).

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

Gilliland, H. (1995). *Teaching the native American*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy*. na.

Gray, J., & Beresford, Q. (2008). A 'formidable challenge': Australia's quest for equity in Indigenous education. *Australian Journal of Education, 52(*2), 197-223.

Groome, H., & Hamilton, A. (1995). *Meeting the educational needs of Aboriginal adolescents*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2008). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Environment research, 14*(3), 308-324

Hankes, J. E., & Fast, G. R. (2002). *Changing the Faces of Mathematics: Perspectives on Indigenous People of North America*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Hanlen, W. (2002). Indigenous literacy: Learning from the centre not the margin. International Journal of Learning: *Proceedings of the Learning Conference 2002*, 9.

Harrison, N. (2011). *Teaching and learning in Aboriginal education* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, N., & Greenfield, M. (2011). Relationship to place: positioning Aboriginal knowledge and perspectives in classroom pedagogies. *Critical Studies in Education 52*(1), 65-76.

Harvey, S. (2003). What is critical discourse analysis?. *Perspectives: The American Sociological Association Section Newsletter*, 26, 2,4,7.

Herbert, J. (2012). "Ceaselessly circling the centre" Historical contextualization of

    Indigenous education within Australia. *History of Education Review, 41*(2),

    91-103.

Hermes, M. (2007). Moving toward the language: Reflections on teaching in an

    Indigenous-immersion school. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 54-71.

Hermes, M., Bang, M., & Marin, A. (2012). Designing Indigenous language

    revitalization. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(3), 381-402.

Hickling-Hudson, A., & Ahlquist, R. (2003). Contesting the curriculum in the

    schooling of Indigenous children in Australia and the United States:

    From Eurocentrism to culturally powerful pedagogies. *Comparative*

    Education Review, 47(1), 64-89.

Hickling-Hudson, A., Matthews, J., & Woods, A. (2004). Education, postcolonialism

    and disruptions. *Disrupting preconception: Postcolonialism and education*

    (pp.1-16).

Hogarth, M. (2017). Speaking back to the deficit discourses: A theoretical and

    methodological approach. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 44*(1),

    21-34.

Inglis, S. H. (2002). Speaker's experience: A study of Mi'kmaq modality (Doctoral

    dissertation), Memorial University of Newfoundland.

James, K. (Ed.). (2001). Science and Native American communities: Legacies of pain,

    visions of promise. U of Nebraska Press.

Jennings, M. (2004). *Alaska Native political leadership and higher education: One*

    university, two universes (Vol. 9). Rowman Altamira.

Jester, T. E. (2002). Healing the unhealthy Native? Encounters with standards-based education in rural Alaska. *Journal of American Indian Education, 41*(3), 1-21.

Johnson, E. B. (2002). *Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it's here to stay.* Corwin Press.

Jojola, T. (2013). Indigenous Planning: Towards a Seven Generations Model. In R. Walker, T. Jojola & D. Natcher (Eds.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 457–72). Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.

Jones-Sparck, L. (2010). Effect of modernization on the Cup'ik of Alaska. In XXX (Eds.), *Alaska Native education: Views from within* (pp. 317-331).

Jordan, D. (2017). Australian Aborigines: education and identity. Education and Cultural Differences (pp. 61-87). Routledge.

Kauffman, P. (2003). Diversity and Indigenous policy outcomes: Comparisons between four nations. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Diversity in Organizations, Communities, and Nations*.

Kawagley, A. O. (2006). *A Yupiaq worldview: A pathway to ecology and spirit*. Waveland Press.

Kawagley, A. O., Norris-Tull, D., & Norris-Tull, R. A. (1998). The Indigenous worldview of Yupiaq culture: Its scientific nature and relevance to the practice and teaching of science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 35*(2), 133-144.

Kawagley, O. (1990). Yup'ik Ways of Knowing. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17*(2), 5-17.

King, K. C. (2011). How understanding the Aboriginal Kinship system can inform better policy and practice: Social work research with the Larrakia and Warumungu Peoples of Northern Territory. (Doctoral Theses), Australian Catholic University. Retrieved from https://researchbank.acu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1391&context=theses.

Kisker, E. E., Lipka, J., Adams, B. L., Rickard, A., Andrew-Ihrke, D., Yanez, E. E., & Millard, A. (2012). The potential of a culturally based supplemental mathematics curriculum to improve the mathematics performance of Alaska Native and other students. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 43*(1), 75-113.

Klug, B. J., & Whitfield, P. T. (2012). *Widening the circle: Culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children*. Routledge.

Klump, J., & McNeir, G. (2005). *Culturally Responsive Practices for Student Success: A Regional Sampler*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Kort, B., & Reilly, R. (2001, July). *Evolving educational pedagogy in developing nations*. Retrieved from https://affect.media.mit.edu/projectpages/lc/Kort.pdf.

Kress, G. (1993). Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 169-191.

Krupnik, I., & Jolly, D. (2002). *The Earth Is Faster Now: Indigenous Observations of Arctic Environmental Change.* Fairbanks, AK: . Arctic Research Consortium of the United States.

Kukathas, C. (1992). Are there any cultural rights?. *Political Theory, 20*(1), 105-139.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant

  pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Langton, M. (1997). Grandmothers' law, company business and succession in

  changing Aboriginal land tenure systems. *Our land is our life* (pp. 84-117).

Lewis, C. (2006). At last: "What's discourse got to do with it?" A meditation on

  Critical Discourse Analysis in literacy research. *Research in the Teaching of*

  English, 40(3), 373-379.

Lewthwaite, B., Osborne, B., Lloyd, N., Llewellyn, L., Boon, H., Webber, T., ... &

  Harrison, M. (2015). Seeking a pedagogy of difference: What Aboriginal

  students and their parents in North Queensland say about teaching and their

  learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online), 40*(5), 132.

Lipka, J., & Ilutsik, E. (2014). *Transforming the Culture of Schools: Yup¡ k Eskimo*

  Examples. Routledge.

Lipka, J., Hogan, M. P., Webster, J. P., Yanez, E., Adams, B., Clark, S., & Lacy, D.

  (2005). Math in a cultural context: Two case studies of a successful

  culturally based math project. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 36*(4),

  367-385.

Lomawaima, K. T. (2000). Tribal sovereigns: Reframing research in American Indian

  education. *Harvard Educational Review, 70*(1), 1-23.

Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). " To Remain an Indian": Lessons in

  Democracy from a Century of Native American Education. Teachers College

  Press.

Lowe, K. (2017). Walanbaa warramildanha: The impact of authentic Aboriginal

  community and school engagement on teachers' professional

  knowledge. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 44*(1), 35-54.

Lowe, K., & Yunkaporta, T. (2013). The inclusion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait

Islander content in the Australian National Curriculum: A cultural, cognitive

and socio-political evaluation. *Curriculum Perspectives, 33*(1), 1-14.

Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical

discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 96-110.

Luke, A. (2004). Notes on the future of critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse

Studies, 1*(1), 149-157.

Malin, M. (1997). Mrs Eyers is no ogre: A micro study in the exercise of power. *Race

matters* (pp. 139-158).

Martin, K., & Mirraboopa, B. (2003). Ways of knowing, being and doing: A

theoretical framework and methods for Indigenous and indigenist re-

search. *Journal of Australian Studies, 27*(76), 203 - 214.

Matunga, H. 2013. Theorizing Indigenous Planning. In R. Walker, T. Jojola, & D.

Natcher (Eds.), Reclaiming Indigenous Planning (pp. 3–32). Montreal:

McGill-Queen's University Press.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural

teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 3-24.

McCarty, T. L. (2002). A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-

determination in Indigenous schooling. XXX: Routledge.

McCarty, T. L., & Watahomigie, L. J. (1998). Language and literacy in American

Indian and Alaska Native communities. *Sociocultural contexts of language

and literacy* (pp. 69-98).

McCarty, T. L., Romero, M. E., & Zepeda, O. (2006). Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous

youth counter-narratives on Native language loss and

revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly, 30*(1/2), 28-48.

McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 101-124.

McConvell, P., & Thieberger, N. (2001). *State of Indigenous languages in Australia-2001.* Canberra, Australia: Department of the Environment and Heritage.

McGregor, G., & Mills, M. (2017). The virtual schoolbag and pedagogies of engagement. In B. Gobby & R. Walker (Eds.), (pp. 373-392). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

McKay, B. (Ed.). (1999). *Unmasking whiteness: Race relations and reconciliation.* Queensland Studies Centre, Griffith University.

McKinley, E., & Keegan, P. J. (2008) Curriculum and language in Aotearoa New Zealand: From science to pūtaiao. *L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8*(1), 135-147.

Martin, K., & Mirraboopa, B. (2003). Ways of knowing, being and doing: A theoretical framework and methods for Indigenous and indigenist re-search. *Journal of Australian Studies*, *27*(76), 203-214.

Meadmore, D. (2001). The pursuit of standards: simply managing education?. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 5*(4), 353-365.

Mercier, O. R., & Leonard, B. (2017). Indigenous knowledge(s) and the sciences in global contexts: Bringing worlds together. *Handbook of Indigenous education* (pp. 1-29).

Meriam, L. (1928). *The problem of Indian administration*. Johnson Reprint Corp.

Michel, C. (1996). Re-Reading Disney: not quite Snow White. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 17*(1), 5-14.

Milgate, G. & Giles-Browne, B. (2013). "Creating an Effective School for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Students". Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/Indigenous_education/32

Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Canberra, Australia: Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs.

Moje, E. B., & Lewis, C. (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp. 15-48).

Moll, L. C., & Ruiz, R. (2005). The educational sovereignty of Latino/a students in the United States. *Latino education: An agenda for community action research* (pp. 295-320).

Moodie, N. (2019). Learning about knowledge: threshold concepts for Indigenous studies in education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 1-15.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2013). Towards an Australian Indigenous Women's Standpoint Theory. *Australian Feminist Studies, 28*(78), 331-347.

Morphy, H. (1995). Landscape and the reproduction of the ancestral past. *The anthropology of landscape: Perspectives on place and space* (pp. 184-209).

Nader, L. (2014). *Naked science: anthropological inquiry into boundaries, power, and knowledge*. Routledge.

Nakata, M. (2007). The cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 36*(S1), 7-14.

Nakata, M. (2011). Pathways for Indigenous Education in the Australian Curriculum Framework. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 40*, 1-8.

Nelson, M., (Ed.). (2008). *Original instructions: Indigenous teachings for a sustainable future.* Simon and Schuster.

Nelson, M., (2011). Becoming Metis. In A. Deming & L. Savoy (Eds.), *The Colors of Nature: Culture, Identity, and the Natural World*. Milkweed Editions.

Ongtooguk, P. (1992). Their silence about us: The absence of Alaska Natives in curriculum. (Unpublished manuscript). University of Alaska Anchorage: Institute for Social and Economic Research.

Parbury, N. (1999). Aboriginal education: a history.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85-100.

Parkinson, C., & Jones, T. (2019). Aboriginal people's aspirations and the Australian Curriculum: a critical analysis. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 18*(1), 75-97.

Partington, G. (1998). "In those days it was that rough". Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history and education. In G. Partington (Ed.), *Perspectives on aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education* (pp. 27-54). Katoomba, NSW: Social Science Press.

Pascoe, B. (2010). How it starts. In R. Perkins & M Langton (Eds.), *First Australians* (2nd ed.). Carlton, Vic: The Miegunyah Press.

Pascoe, B. (2011). History: The real gap between black and white. In G. C. Milgate, N. Purdie, & H. R. Bell (Eds.), *Two way teaching and learning: Toward culturally reflective and relevant education.* Camberwell, Vic: ACER Press.

Patrick, R., & Moodie, N. (2016). Indigenous education policy discourses in
Australia. *Global learning in the 21st century* (pp. 165-184). Rotterdam:
SensePublishers.

Pewewardy, C. (2002). Learning styles of American Indian/Alaska Native students: A
review of the literature and implications for practice. *Journal of American
Indian Education,* 22-56.

Pewewardy, C., & Bushey, M. (1992). A family of learners and storytellers: The
American Indian Magnet School. *Native Peoples Magazine, 5*(4), 56-60.

Porter, R. B. (2002). The meaning of Indigenous nation sovereignty. *Arizona State
Law Journal, 34(1),* 75-112.

Prusak, S. Y., Walker, R., & Innes, R. (2016). Toward Indigenous Planning? First
Nation Community Planning in Saskatchewan, Canada. *Journal of Planning
Education and Research, 36*(4), 440–450.

Purdie, N., Milgate, G. C., & Bell, H. R. (Eds.). (2011). *Two way teaching and
learning: Toward culturally reflective and relevant education.* Camberwell,
Vic: ACER Press.

Rasmussen, D., & Akulukjuk, T. (2009). My father was told to talk to the
environment first before anything else. In M. McKenzie, P. Hart, H. Bai &
B. Jickling (Eds.), *Fields of green: Restorying culture, environment, and
education* (pp. 285-299).

Reconciliation Australia (2018, May 10). Truth-telling central to reconciliation
process [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.reconciliation.org.au/truth-
telling-central-to-reconciliation-process/

ReefED. 2011. Reef Guardians Schools Overview: About the Program. *Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority*. Retrieved from http://www.reefed.edu.au/home/guardians/about_the_program.

Reid, A. (2005). *Rethinking national curriculum collaboration: Towards an Australian Curriculum.* Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Science and Training.

Reyhner, J. (2006). American Indian/Alaska native education: An overview. *American Indian Education*. Retrieved from https://www2.nau.edu/~jar/AIE/Ind_Ed.html.

Reyhner, J., & Eder, J. (2017). *American Indian education: A history.* University of Oklahoma Press.

Reyhner, J., & Jacobs, D. T. (2002). Preparing teachers of American Indian and Alaska native students. *Action in Teacher Education, 24*(2), 85-93.

Rhodes, R. W. (1994). *Nurturing learning in Native American students.*

Rizvi, F., & Crowley, V. (1993). *Ethnicity and curriculum. Australian Curriculum Reform: action and reaction.* Canberra, Australia: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.

Rigney, L. I. (2001). A first perspective of Indigenous Australian participation in science: Framing Indigenous research towards Indigenous Australian intellectual sovereignty. Kaurna Higher Education Journal, 7, 1–13.

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 1-18). Routledge.

Rose, D. B., & Robin, L. (2004). The ecological humanities in action: An invitation. *Australian Humanities Review, 31*(2).

Rose, M. (2012). The 'silent apartheid' as the practitioner's blindspot. In K. Price

    (Ed.), *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education: An introduction for*

    the teaching profession (pp. 64-80). New York, NY: Cambridge University

    Press.

Routh, R. O. (1997). The Strelley Community School Nyangumarta Language and

    Cultural Maintenance Program. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous*

    Education, 25(2), 27-32.

Salter, P., & Maxwell, J. (2016). The inherent vulnerability of the Australian

    Curriculum's cross-curriculum priorities. *Critical Studies in*

    Education, 57(3), 296-312.

Sambono, J. (2018, November 11). Indigenous science goes far beyond boomerangs

    and spears. *IndigenousX*. Retrieved from

    https://Indigenousx.com.au/Indigenous-science-goes-far-beyond-

    boomerangs-and-spears/.

Sarra, C., Spillman, D., Jackson, C., Davis, J., & Bray, J. (2018). High-expectations

    relationships: A foundation for enacting high expectations in all Australian

    schools. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education,* 1-14.

    Doi:10.1017/jie.2018.10

Seddon, T. (2001). National curriculum in Australia? A matter of

    politics, powerful knowledge and the regulation of learning. *Pedagogy*

    Culture and Society, 9(3), 307-331.

Seddon, T. (2010). Two orientations to education system reform: Australian and

    South African politics of remaking "the Social." In I. Snyder &

    J. Nieuwenhuysen (Eds.), *Closing the gap in education?: Improving*

outcomes in southern world societies. Melbourne: Monash University Publishing.

Semken, S. C., & Morgan, F. (1997). Navajo pedagogy and earth systems. *Journal of Geoscience Education, 45*(2), 109-112.

Shales, J. W. (1998). Rudolph Walton: one Tlingit man's journey through stormy seas Sitka, Alaska, 1867-1951(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Skinner, O. P., & Leonard, B. G. (2018). "A World in which [Alaska Natives] Make the Important Decisions": Re-Examining Institutional Discourses and Governance in Higher Education. In E. McKinley (Ed.), *Handbook of Indigenous Education* (pp. 1-25). Singapore: Springer.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1999). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Smith, G. A. (2002). Place-based education: Learning to be where we are. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(8), 584-594.

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd.

Smith, R. G. (1996). Towards a composite educational research methodology: Balancing the authority equation in Aboriginal education. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 24*(2), 33-41.

Sobel, D. (2004). Place-based education: Connecting classroom and community. *Nature and Listening, 4*, 1-7.

St Denis, V., Bouvier, R., & Battiste, M. (1998). *Kiskinahmahkewak: Aboriginal teachers in publicly funded schools*.

Stephenson, M. A., & S. Ratnapala (Eds.). (1993). *Mabo: A Judicial revolution: The Aboriginal land rights decision and its impact on Australian law*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Swisher, K. (1990). Cooperative learning and the education of American Indian/Alaskan Native students: A review of the literature and suggestions for implementation. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 36-43.

Swisher, K. G., & Tippeconnic III, J. W. (1999). *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education*. Charleston, WV: ERIC/CRESS.

Szasz, M. (1999). *Education and the American Indian: The road to self-determination since 1928*. UNM Press.

Taylor, L., & Stevens, E. (1991). American Indians, mathematical attitudes, and the standards. *The Arithmetic Teacher, 38*(6), 14.

Tharp, R. G., & Yamauchi, L. A. (1994). Effective Instructional Conversation in Native American Classrooms. (Educational Practice Report: 10).

Tripcony, P. (2000). The Most Disadvantaged? Indigenous Education Needs.

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 29*(1), 72-89.

Tuck, E., McKenzie, M., & McCoy, K. (2014). Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (2007). Retrieved from https://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html

Valencia, R. (Ed.). (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Villegas, M., Neugebauer, S. R., & Venegas, K. R. (2008). *Indigenous knowledge and education: Sites of struggle, strength, and survivance*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED525758.

Ward, C. J. (1993). Explaining gender differences in Native American high school dropout rates: A case study of Northern Cheyenne schooling patterns. *Family Perspective, 27*(4), 415-444.

Washington, J. (2018, November 5). Experts say Indigenous knowledge will enrich science education. *NITV News*. Retrieved from https://www.sbs.com.au/nitv/nitv-news/article/2018/11/05/experts-say-Indigenous-knowledge-will-enrich-science-education

Welch, A. R. (1988). Aboriginal education as internal colonialism: The schooling of an Indigenous minority in Australia. *Comparative Education, 24*(2), 203–215.

Whitehouse, H., Watkin Lui, F., Sellwood, J., Barrett, M. J., & Chigeza, P. (2014). Sea Country: navigating Indigenous and colonial ontologies in Australian environment education. *Environmental Education Research, 20*(1), 56-69.

Whyte, K. (2017). What do Indigenous knowledges do for Indigenous peoples?. In M. Nelson & D. Shilling (Eds.), *Keepers of the green world: Traditional ecological knowledge and sustainabilit*y.

Wildcat, M., McDonald, M., Irlbacher-Fox, S., & Coulthard, G. (2014). Learning

from the land: Indigenous land based pedagogy and

decolonization. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 3*(3).

Willett, V. B. (2012). Islands of culture: the experiences of post-secondary Cree

language teachers (Doctoral dissertation).

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end.*

University of Minnesota Press.

Willinsky, J. (1999). Curriculum, after culture, race, nation. *Discourse: Studies in the*

Cultural Politics of Education, *20*(1), 89-112.

Wilson-Miller, J. (2003). *Re-thinking Aboriginal history: Self-concept for a nation.*

Auckland, New Zealand: NZARE AARE.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. Longman.

Wolfe, P., (2006). m and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research*

8(4), 387-409.

Woodhouse, J. L., & Knapp, C. E. (2000). *Place-based curriculum and instruction:*

Outdoor and environmental education approaches. Retrieved from

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED448012.

Wooltorton, T. (1997). Nyungar Education in a South West Australian location: A

Perspective. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 25*(2), 37-42.

Wotherspoon, T., & Schissel, B. (1998). *Marginalization, decolonization and voice:*

Prospects for Aboriginal education in Canada. Discussion Paper, Pan-

Canadian Education Research Agenda. Canada: Council of Ministers of

Education.

Yazzie, T. (1999). *Culturally Appropriate Curriculum: A Research-Based Rationale.*

Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED427906.

Young, R. J. (1995). Foucault on race and colonialism. *New Formations*, 25, 57-57.

Scantlebury, K., McKinley, E., & Jesson, J. (2001). *Imperial knowledge: Science, education and equity*.
Pholi, K. (2009). Is' Close the Gap'a useful approach to improving the health and wellbeing of Indigenous Australians?. *Australian Review of Public Affairs: Journal, 9*(2).

Alaska Department of Education and Early Development (2016). *Alaska Standards: content and performance standards for Alaskan students*. Retrieved from https://education.alaska.gov/akstandards/standards/ContentStandards.pdf