



The Australian Journal of **INDIGENOUS EDUCATION**

This article was originally published in printed form. The journal began in 1973 and was titled *The Aboriginal Child at School*. In 1996 the journal was transformed to an internationally peer-reviewed publication and renamed *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*.

In 2022 *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* transitioned to fully Open Access and this article is available for use under the license conditions below.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

CROSSING OVER: COLLABORATIVE and CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHING of INDIGENOUS EDUCATION in a HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

SHIRLEY MORGAN¹
& BARRY GOLDING²

¹ Aboriginal Education Centre, University of Ballarat, University Drive, Mt Helen, Victoria, 3353, Australia

² School of Education, University of Ballarat, University Drive, Mt Helen, Victoria, 3353, Australia

■ Abstract

This paper explores the dynamics and outcomes from a collaborative, cross-cultural approach to teaching an Indigenous education elective unit in a Bachelor of Education (Primary) undergraduate degree at University of Ballarat in 2009. The three facilitators, one non-Aboriginal and two Aboriginal were a lecturer, an Aboriginal Centre Manager and Local Aboriginal Education Consultative Group member from the Ballarat and District Aboriginal Cooperative respectively. The paper explores the open-ended and collaborative approach used to facilitate the learning, including pedagogies, activities and assessment. The paper, and the collaborative cross-cultural teaching approach it arguably embodies, is presented as a model of desirable practice with undergraduate education students, in particular for pre-service teachers undertaking a P-10 Bachelor of Education degree. As we describe later in the paper, these pre-service teachers, with some exceptions, in general had very limited and often stereotyped knowledge and experience of Aboriginal education, Aboriginal students or Aboriginal perspectives in other areas of the school curriculum. The teaching process we adopted and that we articulate in this paper attempted to address this previous lack of engagement with the subject matter of Indigenous education by actively modelling the processes of local Aboriginal consultation and collaboration that we were trying to teach.

■ Introduction

In the first semester of 2009, three people, each with diverse backgrounds in Indigenous education came together to offer an Indigenous Education unit to 29 non-Indigenous, third year Bachelor of Education (P-10) pre-service teachers. While the broad academic unit is called Indigenous Education, we tended, by virtue of our position in south eastern regional Australia to focus on Aboriginal (and sometimes specifically Koorie) education and studies. The presenters included a lecturer from the School of Education, the Aboriginal Centre Manager and a Local Aboriginal Education Consultative Group member from the Ballarat and District Aboriginal Cooperative community. While the goal of the collaboration was simply to deliver a unit focusing on Indigenous education, the outcomes of the teaching collaboration proved to be something unexpected, very different and more diverse than anticipated. In this paper we outline what we planned, what we did and what we learnt. We conclude with our reflection of the wider lessons we learnt from our experiences that we can carry forward to the next time we deliver this unit.

■ About the authors

What we, the authors, bring to the Indigenous Education unit is an important consideration. We consider our identities as presenters and professors of Indigenous knowledge as equally important as our substantive professional teaching positions. The multiple identities of the three main unit facilitators, presented individually below as Shirley, Marj and Barry, were found to be increasingly important to explore and clarify with our students, and also between us, as the unit progressed. Indeed, what each of us said and professed about the many aspects of Indigenous education came to be understood as being inseparable from who we were and where and how our knowledge had originated.

As the Manager of the University of Ballarat Aboriginal Education Centre, I (Shirley) am a Kamilori woman whose family comes from Coonabarabran

in north-west New South Wales. I am a mother and a grandmother and had only been in Ballarat for 12 months after 10 years at the University of Western Sydney. Although my previous teaching had been restricted to training in cultural competencies and one-off university lectures, I brought to the Indigenous Education course something qualitatively different and valuable: my life experiences as a teenager mother living in a world of drug abuse, alcoholism and connections with the prison system. What is seen by society as a stereotypical Aboriginal upbringing, for me was my family. Despite this deep "inside" knowledge, I was seen as an Aboriginal "outsider" as my Aboriginal heritage originates from several Aboriginal nations beyond the wider region that our students were drawn from and would likely teach in.

It was critically important in terms of the authenticity of student experience that we drew on local Aboriginal experience. Marj, the Local Aboriginal Educational Consultative Committee (LAECG) representative who actively collaborated with us in most of the one-hour, weekly lectures and two-hour weekly tutorials is a Wotjobaluk woman whose country is the Wimmera-Mallee area of north-western Victoria. Marj had recently been awarded an Honorary Teaching Fellowship with the university and had been actively involved in reclaiming what had previously been widely regarded as a "lost language". Marj was a mother and a grandmother who had worked for the Department of Education and Early Childhood as a Koorie Educator for over ten years. It was also through Marj's personal experiences that she had come to understand the importance of properly prepared and educated teachers of both Aboriginal education and of Aboriginal students. Marj was aware that while in much of the university catchment area Aboriginal students comprised a small minority of the school-age population, the statistics on school retention and the practical problems she faced daily in her professional life suggested significant and persistent barriers in schools that Aboriginal students and their families faced in their many Aboriginal nations across western Victoria.

As the non-Aboriginal School of Education staff member who was allocated to teach the Indigenous Education unit, on one level, my (Barry's) Aboriginal

experience was academic rather than lived. On another level, I was born, have lived and worked in the same (Jajawurrong) Aboriginal nation north of Ballarat for most of my life. I became aware as a young person with a passion for history, geology and archaeology of the material evidence of Aboriginal Australians in the now heavily farmed land and landscape but like many older Australians was totally unaware as a child that living people and nations were still connected and associated with this land. I was 20 before I realised this history and was totally out of my cultural depth as the first non-Aboriginal Coordinator of Aboriginal Programs at the School of Mines and Industries (TAFE) in Ballarat. In the 1990s, with somewhat more knowledge and sensitivity I became the program Facilitator for the Open Learning Australia Indigenous Online Project. I was in 1999 co-author, with Tony Dreise, of Partners in a Learning Culture, Australia's National Vocational Education and Training policy for nearly a decade. I admit I still have a lot to learn about Indigenous education.

■ Context in which we developed this program

Ballarat is a regional Victorian city with a population of around 90,000 people. The Indigenous population is relatively small at approximately one per cent (ABS, 2010). A large proportion of the Indigenous population do not come from Ballarat and many are people from the Stolen Generations who were placed in the former Ballarat Children's Home (BCH, 2010). Given that most of our pre-service teachers come from regional Victoria and most will return there or to Melbourne to teach, the students we train are more likely to teach about Aboriginal studies in Victoria, rather than teach large numbers of Aboriginal students, though we had to ideally prepare them for both possibilities. Table 1 summarises the Koorie enrolments in the broader Grampians region that includes Ballarat. The Highlands Local Learning and Employment Network (LLEN) centred on the city of Ballarat has the majority of Koorie enrolments. As with most Australian communities, Indigenous (mainly Aboriginal) Australians in the Grampians region are skewed towards youth.

Table 1: Koorie secondary school enrolments in the Grampians region by Local Learning and Employment Network (LLEN) by Year level, 2008.

Year Levels	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12
HLEN	27	31	32.6	25	16.2	11
CGLEN	1	1	3	1	0	1
WSMLLEN	5	6	9	5	3.8	0
NCLLEN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grampians Totals	33	38	44.6	31	20	12

Key: LLEN = Local Learning & Employment Network; H = Highlands; CG = Central Grampians; WSM = Wimmera Southern Mallee; NC = Northern Central.

■ Background to our initial approach in planning the unit

The standard academic way of delivering a higher education-level unit is to work from an already university sanctioned unit description or unit outline. This rigid and “top-down” method runs counter to the idea of accommodating for what the diverse learners bring to the higher educational context in terms of prior knowledge and preferred learning styles. It is also inconsistent with constructivist views of education, where students actively create knowledge and meaning by being immersed with other students in learning contexts, rather than being passive recipients of predetermined truth. In addition, the typical pre-service teacher student body is diverse and has a diverse range of preferred learning styles. Knowing and understanding these learning styles helped us to teach more effectively. Through identifying learning styles, we were able to capitalise on the strengths and skills of the students in our unit.

Each of us anticipated, from our previous teaching experience, that most of these non-Indigenous pre-service teachers in our class would have had very limited face-to-face exposure of Aboriginal people. Very early on in the class we became aware that many of our pre-service teachers held what Foley (2010, p. 171) describes as “discredited and racially discriminatory stereotypes of Aboriginality”. In the first class, several students openly questioned the notion of Stolen Generation, and several were uncomfortable with the idea of being alone with an Aboriginal presenter. Several students anticipated early on that Aboriginal studies would involve the first of Price’s (2005) teaching approaches: that is about being taught about traditional Aboriginal society as if there was some single, romanticised Aboriginal society. The idea that Ballarat had contemporary Aboriginal connections through the Stolen Generations and that some Aboriginal people who did not conform to their Aboriginal stereotype were actually going to teach them based on local histories and events (Harrison, 2008, p. 130) was therefore quite confronting. In Phillips and Whatman’s (2007, p. 185) words, we were challenging “students to explore and interrogate their *own* way of seeing and understand how these have evolved over their histories ... in many cases razing ‘old’ knowledge”. In Butler’s (2007) terms, we were identifying Aboriginal perspectives in the university, and by implication in schools, as a site of a philosophical struggle. We were, in effect going to be critically exploring and getting students to take personal responsibility their own, adult “dreaming” about Aboriginal people in this place rather than what many had expected: being taught Aboriginal studies through the safe and familiar medium of Aboriginal stories from elsewhere, such as through illustrated “dreamtime” stories in children’s book. In the process, the literature anticipated we would

be unearthing what Giroux (1997, p. 287) described as the “repressed, unspeakable racist unconscious of the dominant White culture”. Beresford and Partington (2003, p. 19) emphasise the importance of “involvement of the Indigenous community in developing policies and programs” in order to implement the National Aboriginal Education Policy. Aboriginal education presupposes localisation and Aboriginal community consultation. Despite the need to consult that was highlighted throughout national and state Indigenous education policies, in our case, it was difficult to be truly and actively consultative with the local Aboriginal communities due to the academic and time constraints of all parties. Our compromise was to develop a framework for delivery that had a fairly certain beginning, a roughly planned middle and a very open-ended conclusion. We acknowledged at third year level in an education course student expectation would include a clear start to the unit, as well as clear expectations about the assessment tasks they would need to undertake. We anticipated that the latter part of the unit would allow us (and them) to negotiate delivery and content.

Within the conventional structures of text-based, academic inquiry and classroom learning we began by diversifying the pedagogy. We proceeded with the expectation that lectures and tutorials would be collaborative and involve considerable narrative and dialogue (Power, 2004). In our first class we sensed that our students had chosen this elective unit for different reasons. It was therefore considered useful as a class “icebreaker” to ascertain why students chose to do the elective. We did this through discussion in a circle in the first tutorial. The answer was understandably disappointing: the majority of the class stated that they had a choice between units. It was either Learning about English as a Second Language or Indigenous Education, and most (but not all) students thought that Indigenous Education was the “easier” option. If we were to actually achieve real change in the way these students thought about Indigenous education, then an innovative approach was needed to connect with them.

■ What the literature says we should do

Pre-service Teacher Education is the education and training provided to student teachers before they have undertaken professional teaching as a qualified teacher. During the pre-service education program the pre-service teacher is required to learn how to use their knowledge to formulate lesson plans to teach their classes. A major focus during such education programs is the practicum, where the pre-service teacher is placed within a school setting and “shadows” an experienced teacher. The pre-service teacher will typically be given opportunities to develop skills through lesson plans, teaching lessons and classroom management.

Within this cohort of pre-service teachers, we encountered a relatively low level of knowledge about Indigenous issues which supported the innovative approach we chose to take:

Australian institutions such as the federal and state public sectors, educational research groups and the primary, secondary and tertiary sector should stop hiding behind policy failure and acknowledge there must be new solutions and directions ... so that all Australians can understand and appreciate the true history of Australia and then and only then, will Aboriginal children succeed at school (Mooney & Craven, 2005, p. 1).

In their nationally commissioned report, *Teaching the Teachers Core Aboriginal Studies: Impact on Teaching* to the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA), Craven et al. (2005) examined postgraduate teachers' ability and commitment to teach Aboriginal studies in Australian schools. They concluded that core Aboriginal studies does assist graduate teachers in teaching Aboriginal students more effectively. Their study also showed that pre-service teachers felt that undertaking a unit in Aboriginal studies does make a significant difference and they believed they were, as a consequence, more capable of teaching Aboriginal students.

The Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training conducted an inquiry into Teacher Education in 2007. Their report (SCEVT, 2007) described the lack of evidence on the effectiveness of different approaches to teacher education as follows:

While research has demonstrated that the quality of student learning in schools directly and significantly reflects the quality of the classroom teacher, we have limited research evidence to draw on to determine how best to prepare teachers ... There is a dearth of contemporary reliable evidence about the impact of teacher education on, for example: teacher performance in schools; student learning outcomes. The extent to which the organisation and content of teacher education courses is informed by research has not been seriously tested in Australia. Much of the effort is sporadic, local, largely about perceptions, and with very little reference to the outcomes for either the graduates as they enter the profession, or for the students they teach. By international standards the funding for research in this critical area is seriously lacking. The research needed to elucidate critical factors in teacher education can only be generated if academic staff has the time and resources to support them as active researchers.

Recent surveys of beginning teachers and/or supervisors and principals present a mixed picture of the effectiveness of teacher education programs. For instance, in a recent survey of beginning teachers by the Australian Education Union (AEU), 38% of respondents were satisfied with their pre-service education, 40% of respondents rated it as preparing them "well" or "very well" for the reality of teaching and 22% rated it as "poor" or "very poor" (SCEVT, 2007, pp. 2-3).

■ What we did

Most of the students who attended the Indigenous Education class confirmed in the first tutorial that they had minimal contact with Indigenous (including Aboriginal) people, in Ballarat or elsewhere. Many had stereotypical, negative or poorly informed perceptions of Aboriginal people. All agreed what they had been taught in school was very limited. Very few were able to identify one Aboriginal nation, locally or otherwise. Some students were uncomfortable or disbelievers about Australia's Stolen Generation. The students were shown a copy of the *Bringing Them Home* (2007) DVD to introduce the students to the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families. This DVD illustrated to students the real and personal experiences of several Indigenous people who were removed from their families as children and placed on missions, reserves and in institutions. During tutorial discussions on racism, most of the students acknowledged that they were racist, but when we began to unpack this we found that the racism was usually based on an irrational fear, typically directed towards one particular race. At this early point in the unit we began to ask ourselves "What did these students need to make them culturally aware teachers?" We concluded that they needed support and encouragement to honestly and openly identify what they believed, even if some of what they believed was poorly informed or irrational. They needed a safe environment where it was their choice to raise questions or concerns with which they were grappling, and where they knew that they would not be admonished for asking. Most of all, from the outset, they did not need PowerPoint presentations full of acronyms stating which departments funded which programs. Statistics are a powerful tool and can be used to provide the basis of strong arguments for change, but these students did not need to write down statistics that they would never look at again. Our teaching had to be based around what they knew, what they wanted to know more about and what they could be taught. After the first lecture and tutorial we therefore paused to ask what the students felt confused about, as well as what they needed or

wanted to know more about. This was consistent with our constructivist approach to learning.

We were careful to try and find a balance between acknowledging Indigenous disadvantage in relation to education, and not reinforcing the idea of Indigenous deficit. We stressed that statistics are averages, that there are exceptions, and that having low expectations of Aboriginal learners is very likely to result in low achievement. We discovered that students had heard the statistics on Aboriginal disadvantage often enough. There is a danger that they can be glibly repeated to the point where most non-Indigenous Australians no longer register their personal or community significance. This includes that Indigenous Australians have a much lower life expectancy to other Australians: a higher rate of imprisonment – 16 times higher than other Australians; higher unemployment – almost four times higher, more hospital admissions for women following violent acts – 24 times higher, and lower median family income – 68% less than other Australians (HREOC, 2008, pp. 9-12).

The students were made aware early on of the location of the Aboriginal Education Centre in the university and were encouraged to visit the Centre, consult informally with staff and to utilise the resources available. While most of our effort was directed towards what students might teach about Indigenous education to non-Indigenous students, we also anticipated that some students might teach elsewhere in Australia where the proportion of Indigenous students in their classes would be higher. We stressed that Indigenous children would bring a unique culture to the classroom, and that teachers would have much to learn from this. In Australia, the responsibility for the early years of childhood education is spread across federal, state and local governments.

The nature and impact of European settlement in Australia, including resulting government policies, historically has had a detrimental impact on Indigenous peoples that still resonates through our children today. The two Aboriginal presenters explained this impact by sharing personal stories, narratives of disadvantage and experiences of racist behaviour from which the students gained new insights. Many students were amazed about the recent nature of Indigenous exclusion, not only in school, but also as voters and citizens. Many students were unaware that some of the behaviours still occurred today. It was important to establish and reinforce that the reality of situations Indigenous Australians find themselves in is conspicuously different from the majority knowledge that is taught in mainstream education.

■ What students brought to the classroom

Many students took the opportunity to undertake the unit, thinking that this would be “an easy unit to pass”. By contrast, many students found the unit confronting

and challenging, mainly because it challenged (and often negated) their many misconceived ideas of Indigenous peoples, which included; “they are slackers and unreliable”, “they aren’t really black unless they come from the Northern Territory”, “if they haven’t got real dark skin they aren’t real ones”, “they get handouts for nothing”, “they get free Toyotas and then abandon them when they run out of petrol”, “they are always drunk and they are all addicted to drugs”. Furthermore, the stereotypes students aired was that “they can’t learn”, “they are all on the dole”, “they get free housing”, “it all happened over 200 years ago, they should get over it”, “if we weren’t here they wouldn’t have houses”, “they are long-term unemployed and they run on Koorie time”. We discovered that many of these ill-conceived ideas came from their families and the media.

It is important to stress, for balance, that some students in the class, particularly the mature-age students came with more open and accepting attitudes. One non-Aboriginal student had an adopted Aboriginal brother and when he felt safe, shared some of his experiences with the class. What all pre-service teachers found hardest to accept was what we called “observing Aboriginal protocols”. By this we meant being obliged as teachers as we were also obliged, wherever they went and wherever they taught, to work and consult with local Aboriginal people, communities and nations about what they taught, and to develop curriculum for *that place*, rather than teaching Aboriginal studies curriculum as generalised Indigenous Australian knowledge that had no need to consider people or context.

■ Discussion

As presenters we feel that we learned as much from the students and from our interactions with fellow presenters, as the students learned from the unit. We made a decision for the following year, in 2010, to change the power dynamic and have the non-Indigenous lecturer in a support rather than a lead role. We concluded that having a team teaching is preferable to having one presenter. We evaluated the unit via the University of Ballarat Student Evaluation of the Course (SEC) and Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). The average results from the 10 items on both surveys averaged 4.8 out of a possible 5.0 on a five point Likert scale (where 5 is excellent, and 1 is very poor). This student feedback validated the methods that we chose in delivering the course. They particularly appreciated tutorials “in the round” which placed students and presenters in a circle where dialogue could take place in all directions across the circle. Despite the initial uneasiness with our approach, it is clear from the students’ descriptive comments that over the twelve weeks of the unit they found it rewarding and the teaching staff friendly, helpful, professional and

enthusiastic. They also felt that the teachers had a genuine concern with the outcomes and knowledge they received from the course. Before the course was offered to students the next year, however, we were aware, based on student feedback, of the need to structure the course so that the aims and objectives were clearer. As a postscript, as our paper was being finalised in mid-2010, the decision had been made to make the unit compulsory in 2011 for all students in the Bachelor of Education (P-10 course), increasing the student lecture size by a factor of 10 and adding the need for more tutors.

We believe that the combination of both an Indigenous and non-Indigenous lecturer was an especially beneficial method of delivery for the unit in that it revealed a deeper understanding to students from the interactions between the presenters. For example the non-Indigenous lecturer often expressed anger when presenting material about entrenched Indigenous racism, discrimination and disadvantage. At first he could not understand the Indigenous lecturer's calm attitude and acceptance of this, until it was explained that showing anger only served to increase the racist attitudes that Indigenous people often faced. Through such interactions, students realised that rather than coming with certain knowledge or truth, presenters learned from each other because of the immediacy of being able to question each other's opinions. Students in this sense became a very active part of the class as they witnessed and sought clarification of these and other differences.

■ Conclusion

As Australia grows more diverse, some questions that have always challenged us will become unavoidable: How do we live with and learn from people who think, believe, and behave differently from us? How do we teach children to respect such differences? Questions such as these are crucial for teaching education courses, as the ways in which the next generation of teachers see the world and their place in it are being shaped in today's classrooms.

We conclude that the approach we took was very successful given the feedback received from the students. From their participation in this Indigenous Education unit it is likely that 29 students will become much better and more culturally aware teachers of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. There is a need to encourage higher education Institutions to be flexible in their approach and to promote best practice by respecting and responding to the needs of students.

The unit we taught was optional. Our expectations in delivering this unit were that in doing so we would diminish misunderstandings and lack of knowledge of Aboriginal people today, in this place, and would thus help to foster a larger multicultural society. The

majority of reports into Indigenous education written over the past three decades recommend a need to introduce and resource mandatory Indigenous studies into the pre-service teacher education curriculum. This recommendation has been endorsed by the national Federation of Aboriginal Education Consultative Groups. Guidelines and related policies have been distributed to all 36 Australian higher education institutions by the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. Up to 2007 (Faculty of Education, 2007) only approximately 50% of higher education institutions had taken up the recommendation. Bruffee (2002, p. 13) urged educators to seek to identify common ground amongst diverse cultures when he stated that:

Today, increasingly, our survival depends less on distinguishing "us" from "them" than on discovering and cultivating the common ground that lies beyond our carefully tended gardens. Higher education cannot cease examining and celebrating diverse cultures. But we must also acknowledge that if we stop there, and rest contentedly with just acknowledging and celebrating difference, we remain merely connoisseurs of the exotic.

We are understandably delighted that our unit will now become common ground and accessible to all (10 times as many) pre-service teachers in 2011.

■ Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the generous, valuable and sustained input into the teaching and organisation of the Indigenous Education unit from Marj Pickford, Koorie Education Development Officer, Department of Early Childhood Development and former Local Aboriginal Education Consultative Group (LAECG) Chair.

■ References

- Australian Bureau Statistics (ABS). (2010). *National regional profile: Ballarat (C) (Local Government Area)*. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/LGA20570Population/People12002-2006?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=LGA20570&issue=2002-2006&num=&view>.
- Australian Education Union (AEU). (2006). *National being teachers survey results*. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, from <http://www.aeufederal.org.au/Publications/Btsurvey06.html>.
- Ballarat Children's Homes (BCH). (2010) *Ballarat orphanage 1909-1968*. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, from <http://www.pathwaysvictoria.info/biogs/E000031b.htm>.
- Beresford, Q., & Partington, G. (2003) *Reform and resistance in Aboriginal education*. Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press.
- Bruffee, K. (2002). Taking the common ground: Beyond cultural identity. *Change Magazine. American Association for Higher Education*, 31(1), 10-17.

- Butler, K. (2007). Overcoming terra nullius: Aboriginal perspectives in schools as a site of philosophical struggle. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 32(1), 93-101.
- Craven, R., Halse, C., Marsh, H., Mooney, J., & Wilson-Miller, J. (2005). *Teaching the teachers core Aboriginal studies: Impact on teaching*. Vol 2. Canberra, ACT: Department of Education, Science and Technology.
- Bringing Them Home. (2007). *Bringing them home: National inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families DVD*. Sydney, NSW: Ozris Productions.
- Faculty of Education. (2007). *University of Melbourne, Submission No. 62 to Top of the Class*, House of Representatives Inquiry into Teacher Education. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, from <http://www.aph.gov.au/House/committee/evt/teachereduc/report.htm>.
- Foley, D. (2010). Aboriginality and pedagogy. In R. Connell, C. Campbell, M. Vickers, A. Welch, D. Foley, N. Bagnall & D. Hayes (Eds.), *Education, Change and Society* (pp. 168-204). Oxford: South Melbourne.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harrison, N. (2008). *Teaching and learning in Indigenous education*. South Melbourne, VIC: Oxford University Press.
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) (2008). *Face the Facts*. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, http://www.hreoc.gov.au/education/face_facts/index.html, and <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/moo05315.pdf>.
- Mooney, J. (2004). *Teaching Pre-service teacher's Aboriginal studies: What really works?* AARE Paper MOO053515. Retrieved 19 March, 2010, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/moo05315.pdf>.
- Mooney, J., & Craven, R. (2005). *Teaching Aboriginal studies: Producing inclusive Australian citizens*. AARE Paper MOO053515. Retrieved 19 March, 2010, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/moo05315.pdf>.
- Morgan, S. (2006). *It isn't our job to deal with the natives. That's your job. Experiences of the outsider worker in higher education*. Honours Thesis, University of Western Sydney.
- Phillips, J., & Whatman, S. (2007). Decolonising preservice teacher education reform at many cultural interfaces. *Proceedings: The world of educational quality: 2007 AERA Annual Meeting* (pp. 184-194). Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association.
- Power, K. (2004). Yarning: A responsive research methodology. *Journal of Australian Research in Early Childhood Education*, 2(2), 37-46.
- Price, K. (2005). Aboriginal studies and Torres Strait Islander studies. In C. Marsh (Ed.), *Teaching studies of society and environment* (pp. 276-98). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training (SCEVT). (2007). *Top of the class*. Retrieved 26 March, 2010, from <http://www.aph.gov.au/House/committee/evt/teachereduc/report.htm>.

About the authors

Shirley Morgan is Manager of the University of Ballarat Aboriginal Education Centre. Shirley is a Kamilori woman, mother and a grandmother, whose family comes from Coonabarabran in north-west New South Wales. Shirley has an academic background in adult education and has worked in Ballarat for approximately two years, after 10 years at the University of Western Sydney.

Barry Golding is an Associate Professor in the School of Education at the University of Ballarat. His research specialises in access and equity issues in adult and vocational education previously inclusive of Indigenous Australians and most recently focused on men's learning and wellbeing through community contexts. He is separately an Adult Learning Australia Research Fellow and Board member and Patron of the Australian Men's Sheds Association.