



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.

INDIGENISING *the* CURRICULUM or NEGOTIATING *the* TENSIONS *at the* CULTURAL INTERFACE? EMBEDDING INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES *and* PEDAGOGIES *in a* UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM

JANE WILLIAMSON
& PRIYA DALAL

School of Humanities and Human Services, Queensland University of Technology, Beams Road, Carseldine, Queensland, 4034, Australia

■ Abstract

Attempts to Indigenise the curriculum run the risk of implying the application of an “impoverished” version of “Aboriginal pedagogy” and the promotion of corrupted understandings of Indigenous knowledge (Nakata, 2004, p. 11). What is required, Nakata (2004, p. 14) argues, is a recognition of the complexities and tensions at cross-cultural interfaces and the need for negotiation between “Indigenous knowledge, standpoints or perspectives” and Western disciplinary knowledge systems such that meanings are reframed or reinterpreted. Attending to these cross-cultural negotiations and the pedagogical practices they imply are profoundly challenging for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous educators.

This paper focuses on a project at Queensland University of Technology (QUT) which seeks to embed Indigenous perspectives in Humanities and Human Services curricula. It outlines the curriculum framework which was developed to guide the curriculum redesign in its initial phases. This is followed by a discussion of current research that has been concerned to identify material that can support the renegotiations of curricula endorsed by Nakata’s work. The research findings indicate that it is possible to identify a number of pedagogical approaches that can assist that process. Such approaches recognise various levels of engagement beyond the “intellectual”; they insist on a consistent unsettling of Western authority; they acknowledge Indigenous positions/positioning; and require critical self-reflection.

■ Introduction

In 2002, Humanities and Human Services in association with the Creative Industries Faculty acquired a Queensland University of Technology (QUT) Teaching and Learning Grant to embed Indigenous perspectives in their curricula. The grant of \$200,375 was for a period of three years and represented one facet of QUT’s commitment to reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians through the improvement of its educational programmes.

The embedding project had a number of components, including an audit of existing practices, staff development and the production of a web-based resource kit. Central to the project, however, was the identification of a curriculum development model that would enable best practice within Indigenous studies units (subjects) and provide for the incorporation of Indigenous perspectives in discipline-based and professionally-oriented units. The framework that was developed to guide initial curriculum redesign consisted of a set of curriculum principles, graduate capabilities and associated standards. To ensure that all students acquired some insights and skills, introductory units and Indigenous pathways units were identified and targeted for the embedding process. While this framework provided a useful starting point, it was acknowledged that the model needed to engage more fully with “Indigenous knowledge, standpoints and perspectives” in order to identify how disciplinary and professional outcomes for both staff and students might be reframed and understood (Nakata, 2004, p. 11).

This paper reports on the work undertaken in the embedding project to date within Humanities and Human Services. It outlines the initial curriculum framework and discusses the research that is currently being undertaken to identify literature and resources that might support the renegotiations of disciplinary knowledges and professional outcomes endorsed by Nakata’s work (2004). The paper suggests that while there are few resources that provide details of

how the complexities at the cultural interface can be translated into meaningful curriculum outcomes, the research findings indicate that it is possible to identify a number of pedagogical approaches that can assist that process. Such approaches recognise various levels of engagement beyond the “intellectual”, they insist on a consistent unsettling of “Western” authority, they acknowledge Indigenous positions/positioning; and require critical self-reflection. Arguably, the deployment of such pedagogies will assist both the reformulation of disciplinary insights and professional practices within both staff development and classroom contexts.

■ The initial curriculum framework

The audit of units and their practices, which constituted the first component of the project, revealed that, contrary to presumptions/assertions of some academic staff, there were key areas of the curriculum requiring attention. Redesigning the curriculum implied a number of challenges, however. At one level, engaging in the kinds of cross-cultural negotiations that enable the rethinking of knowledges and skills is profoundly challenging (Nakata, 2004) while, at another level, staff can prove reluctant or resistant to engaging the issues in anything other than superficial and stereotypical ways (Driese, 2003; Lampert & Lilley, 1996). Without wishing to pander to the anxieties of some staff, it was necessary to recognise their concerns while seeking to shift them from their comfort zones.

To address these issues the initial curriculum framework was oriented towards a systematic outcomes-based approach. This was consistent with university requirements and assisted with legitimising and authorising the necessary curriculum redesign. Importantly, this approach was developed in consultation with members of the Oodgeroo Unit (the site of Indigenous expertise at QUT) and, as a base-line model of curriculum development, it enabled discussion to move from considerations of what “Indigenous perspectives” might be to a process orientation that could be replicated across a range of disciplines.

The curriculum framework was inspired by the *Cultural standards for curriculum* developed by the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (1998) and informed by other best practice literature including Hart (2003), Kumashiro (2000), Lampert (2003), Nakata (2002, 2004), Phillips (2003) and Reid (2004). These materials pointed to:

- The need to problematise the endeavour of embedding Indigenous perspectives.
- The requirement that students deconstruct their own cultural situatedness in order to appreciate the ways in which the “Other” is framed.
- The hegemonic and appropriating capacities of “Western” disciplines and the dissonance between

Indigenous and “Western” ways of knowing.

- The complexities of interactions at the cultural interface and the difficulties of achieving cross-cultural understandings and acquiring cultural competencies.
- The need to reorient curricula by engaging with alternative ways of knowing and alternative skill sets.

The initial component of the curriculum framework to be developed was a set of guiding principles that were designed to provide reference points against which existing and reformulated curricula could be assessed. Various iterations of the principles were articulated following consultations with staff in the Oodgeroo Unit and staff development workshops. The latest version is outlined in Figure 1. Principles 1 to 6 constitute issues/items that should be addressed/interrogated within the curriculum while principles 7 and 8 are processes that support effective embedding.

It was expected that these curriculum principles might be most clearly delineated in a number of Indigenous studies units that are supported and delivered by academic staff from the Oodgeroo Unit in the programmes within Humanities and Human Services. However, the principles also needed to be identified and operationalised within the undergraduate courses more generally such that a number of associated graduate capabilities could be demonstrated. The graduate capabilities and performance standards developed from the guiding principles are detailed in Figure 2 and Table 1 respectively.

In order to ensure that all students acquired some of the knowledges and skills identified in the guiding principles, the introductory units in each of the undergraduate programmes were designated as core units in the embedding process. Additionally, specific clusters of second and third level units were identified as Indigenous pathways through which students could obtain enhanced and advanced insights and skills.

The development of the performance standards for the graduate capabilities captured various levels of knowledge and skills and provided benchmarks against which student learning outcomes might be assessed (see Table 1). Thus, graduates who have completed a suite of Indigenous studies units might be expected to demonstrate all of the capabilities at an advanced level, while others who have undertaken Indigenous pathways through the degree structures should have acquired enhanced capacities across all the capabilities. Students who have accessed Indigenous perspectives only in the core units should have obtained introductory insights in the first three capabilities and some skills to achieve enhanced outcomes. Currently, work is being undertaken to map the development of the graduate capabilities across the Indigenous studies units, as well as the core and

The curriculum:

1 Identifies and critically assesses dominant cultural paradigms and the ways in which knowledges are located within and contribute to cultural systems. It acknowledges and unpacks cultural perspectiveness and the ways in which the “Other” is framed (e.g., Kumashiro, 2000; Lampert, 2003).

2 Recognises the complexities of cross-cultural understandings but seeks to be culturally inclusive and accommodating of the diversity of Indigenous ways of knowing. It implies a critical reframing of what it means to be Australian (e.g., Nakata, 2002).

3 Provides in-depth and contextualised understandings of lived cultures (knowledges, values, procedures) within Indigenous societies, recognising both the current significance of “traditional” knowledges/skills and the dynamics and diversity of contemporary Indigenous cultures/communities (Nakata, 2002).

4 Acknowledges and develops sensitivity to the appropriate cultural protocols and research ethics for engaging with Indigenous communities.

5 Addresses the issues of social justice for Indigenous peoples and supports the development of informed and active social change professionals.

6 Enables consideration of the inter-relationships between local Indigenous communities and global processes.

7 Utilises appropriate pedagogical and assessment strategies which recognise alternative ways/means of knowing and alternative skill sets by drawing on the expertise of Indigenous peoples/communities.

8 Recognises the fact that embedding Indigenous perspectives is not simply an adding mechanism but involves a reorientation/reframing of curricula.

Figure 1. The guiding principles.

The graduate capabilities include the demonstrated capacity to:

1 Be critically aware and capable of deconstructing their own cultural situatedness and its relationship to the construction of Indigenous knowledges, peoples, etc.

2 Be critically alert to the complexities of cross-cultural understanding and the acquisition of cross-cultural sensitivity.

3 Value and engage with diverse forms of knowledge, “Other” ways of knowing, and their pertinent/related practices.

4 Understand Indigenous cultures and cultural values including the complexity and diversity of Indigenous communities and their contemporary concerns.

5 Actively contribute to contemporary debates on the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples.

6 Recognise and practice appropriate professional skills with respect to their engagement with Indigenous peoples.

Figure 2. The graduate capabilities.

Indigenous pathways units to ascertain the level of activity and provide support for staff.

■ Current activities and research

The curriculum framework has constituted a useful model. However, it was simply a starting point. It only gestured, for example, towards teaching strategies (Principle 7). Moreover, as evaluations of the project in October 2005 (undertaken by Nakata and Lampert) indicated, further work was needed across a range of items. These included engagements with Indigenous knowledge/ways of knowing and the implications of these activities for disciplinary and professional

outcomes, as well as the further up-skilling of staff to meet these requirements.

The extent to which the curriculum framework has enabled staff engagement and critical reflection on their teaching has proved uneven. Some academics engaged enthusiastically with the Project Leader, Mayrah Driese, in the early phases of the grant activity and sought to reshape their activities in line with the framework. One staff member commented, for example, that his unit introduced “students to the contested and contestable notion of human identity”, that he had been “involved in Indigenous education for many years” and retained “a strong interest and commitment” to it. However, the project had “provided an opportunity to reconsider and

Table 1. Performance standards of graduate capabilities.

Graduate capabilities	Introductory	Enhanced	Advanced
Graduating students should demonstrate the capacity to:	Introductory students should demonstrate the capacity to:	Enhanced students should demonstrate the capacity to:	Advanced students should demonstrate the capacity to:
1. Be critically aware and capable of deconstructing their own cultural situatedness and its relationship to the construction of Indigenous knowledges, peoples, etc	Articulate an introductory understanding of the nature of their own cultural situatedness	Demonstrate a capacity to articulate and analyse their own situatedness and its relationships to the construction of Indigenous peoples and cultures	Demonstrate a comprehensive and critical understanding of their own situatedness, its relationship to Indigenous cultures and the implications of these issues for professional practice
2. Be critically alert to the complexities of cross-cultural understanding and the acquisition of cross-cultural sensitivity	Articulate a basic understanding of the complex issues that inform cross-cultural awareness (e.g., the culturally bound nature of particular concepts)	Demonstrate an increased capacity to address and analyse the complexities of cross-cultural understanding and the processes of acquiring cross-cultural sensitivity	Demonstrate competence and confidence in addressing the complexities of cross-cultural understanding in practical contexts and in ways that embody cross-cultural sensitivity
3. Value and engage with diverse forms of knowing and their pertinent/related practices	Demonstrate a basic understanding of the possibilities of other forms of knowledge and other ways of knowing	Demonstrate an understanding and willingness to engage with other ways of knowing and their related practices	Demonstrate confidence and competence in articulating other ways of knowing and their related practices; capacity to apply such knowledges and practices as appropriate in professional contexts
4. Understand Indigenous cultures and cultural values including the complexity and diversity of Indigenous communities and their contemporary concerns	Articulate a basic understanding of Indigenous cultures and cultural values	Demonstrate an increased understanding of the diversity and complexities of Indigenous cultures and cultural values and a capacity to analyse the contemporary concerns of Indigenous peoples	Demonstrate a deep and critical understanding of the diversity and complexity Indigenous cultures and cultural values; a capacity to analyse and engage with the contemporary concerns of Indigenous peoples; and an understanding of the implications of these issues within particular professional contexts
5. Actively contribute to contemporary debates on the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples	Demonstrate an introductory understanding of contemporary social justice debates for Indigenous peoples	Demonstrate an increased capacity to understand, analyse and actively engage in debates about the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples	Actively contribute to the delivery of social justice for Indigenous peoples, particularly in the context of professional practice
6. Recognise and practice appropriate professional skills with respect to their engagement with Indigenous peoples	Demonstrate an introductory understanding of the appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples	Demonstrate increased understanding of appropriate knowledge and skills for engaging with Indigenous peoples in a variety of contexts	Demonstrate the capacity to engage appropriately and sensitively with Indigenous peoples and their concerns in a variety of situations and particularly in the context of professional practice

refine the contribution” his unit made “to the Indigenous embeddedness objective”. Other staff members remained uncertain about the requirements, despite the range of professional development activities provided during 2002-2005 and the personalised support provided by Indigenous staff members. In these instances, staff were frequently unable to see connections between their units and Indigenous perspectives or were anxious about undertaking inappropriate activities.

In order to move the project forward, attend to the renegotiation of the curricula and pedagogical practices suggested by the evaluators, and promote critical and committed engagement by staff, the decision was made to undertake a further comprehensive search and analysis of the literature. This process was undertaken in late 2005 and early 2006 when Priya Dalal obtained a QUT Vacation Research Scholarship to identify and report on the available materials. The purpose was not the collection of more “content” per se but an attempt to ascertain whether there were resources that engaged the cultural interface in ways that both explored disciplinary/professional outcomes and informed pedagogical practices. Such resources, it was thought, would enable a more considered deployment of the curriculum framework and engage staff as they struggled to address the issues.

The research focused initially on Australian Indigenous literature but extended to include materials relating to Indigenous peoples of North America and New Zealand as well as the experiences of people from other cultures who were trying to reconcile Western knowledge with their own. The vast proportion of information found emphasised the need for educators and institutions to find more effective ways of bridging the divide between the different knowledge systems in order to achieve meaningful outcomes, not just for Indigenous students but for all students. However, few reports were explicit in terms of providing practical guidelines for universities to do this. Altogether around 100 items of interest were identified and half of these were relevant to the specific research issues. The resources were obtained after scouring library catalogues and a number of electronic databases and search engines for items on “Indigenous knowledge”, “Indigenous perspectives”, in “higher education/tertiary/university”, in terms of “curriculum”, “cross-cultural education”, “pedagogy” and other related search terms.

The research indicated that some resources do address specific disciplinary and professional issues. Reid’s (2004) work on Indigenous teacher education is a case in point, as is the finer-grained assessment of a compulsory Indigenous studies unit in teacher education at QUT provided by Lampert and Little (2003). In the human services context, the radical pedagogical approaches of Moosa-Mitha and Brown (2000, p. 3) stress the importance of self-reflection and “epistemic humility” in field practice, while Herbert’s

(2003, p. 2) work on research methodologies point to the need for qualitative research to enact a two-way exchange and avoid the processes of “Othering” practised by numerous anthropological investigations. In a related field, the *Indigenous Perspectives in Management Project* (Marshall, 1997) indicated the importance of obtaining the insights of Indigenous managers to support the professional development of Indigenous students of management. Significantly, this report noted the potential of these materials to “interrupt mainstream management theory as it is applied uncritically to Indigenous experiences” (Marshall, 1997). Engaging the Indigenous professional community is clearly central to this endeavour. However, care is needed to ensure that such people are not expected to carry the additional burdens of educating non-Indigenous students alone; non-Indigenous educators and professionals must also learn how to engage with the issues (Howard, 1995).

While there remains a paucity of studies that explore the kinds of renegotiated curricula that are central to the further development of this project (see Marshall, 1997), the literature does indicate a number of pedagogical approaches that, taken together, could both enable staff to acquire a more careful/committed engagement with the embedding process and promote the graduate outcomes noted above. These approaches include:

- recognition and implementation of levels of engagement beyond the “intellectual”;
- a consistent unsettling of “Western” authority;
- acknowledgement of Indigenous positions/positioning; and
- ongoing critical self-reflection.

Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing transcend the notions of knowledge embedded in Western disciplinary systems. As Nakata and Hart (2005, n. p.) noted in their initial *Statement on Indigenous Knowledge* designed to support the embedding processes at QUT:

The fundamental insight on which Indigenous Knowledge Systems are based is that all existence is connected (Ermine, 1995, pp.101-102). Indigenous Knowledge Systems are therefore epistemologically configured in the complex and dynamic relations between the universe, the earth, the seas and the changing environment ... ‘these ecologies do not surround Indigenous peoples; we are an integral part of them and we inherently belong to them (Battiste & Youngblood Henderson, 2000, p. 9).

Similar endorsements are made elsewhere (e.g., Michie, 1999; Slade & Morgan, 2000; Thorpe et al., 2004). The epistemological and ontological differences between holistic Indigenous notions of knowing and

being and the mechanistic and scientific position of Western disciplines suggest not only that analyses of the nature of knowledge should be central to renegotiated curricula (Gale, 2000; Slade & Morgan, 2000) but also that the narrow capacity of Western oriented curricula are inevitably more exclusive than inclusive of Indigenous positions (Michie, 1999; Slade & Morgan, 2000, p. 60).

While some educators have argued that the two knowledge systems are complementary and that combined they can provide "space for conceptualising a more inclusive curriculum" (Thorpe et al., 2004, p. 1), at the very least these debates suggest that a renegotiated curriculum must identify strategies to engage those areas beyond the "intellectual". Thus, Thorpe et al. (2004, p. 2) have utilised holistic teaching strategies that "privilege the voices of Indigenous Australians" and seek to "engage students on emotional, spiritual and intellectual levels" to "move them outside their comfort levels". Others, who insist that the domination and limitations of Western knowledges must be addressed more explicitly, have argued that the curriculum must be driven by those local knowledges that embrace Indigenous concerns and by the pedagogical practices that address those issues (Gale, 2000). Such practices must be cognisant of the values and learning preferences of local Indigenous peoples (see also McLoughlin & Oliver, 1999). As Whap (2001, cited in Lampert & Little, 2003, p. 11) has argued in the context of a Torres Strait Islander Studies class at the University of Queensland, the application of Indigenous knowledge enables students to "Respect, interact, share, negotiate, listen, experience, follow their heart, use their understanding, use their knowledge and participate openly with other students ... This is how Indigenous knowledge works and is shared".

A second element here involves the consistent unsettling of "Western" authority. At one level, the need for this approach is outlined in the first of the curriculum principles and graduate capabilities, namely the requirement that staff and students must address the way they are culturally positioned and privileged as (largely) white subjects within "Western" constructions of knowledge. As Chambers (1996, p. 56) has noted in this context, it is necessary to transform "fieldwork" into "homework". However, drawing attention to "whiteness" does not of itself deracialise the discourse (Reid, 2004, p. 176) and the necessary adoption of a "critical whiteness theory" (Lampert & Little, 2003; Nicoll, 2004, pp. 2-4) is profoundly challenging, requiring acknowledgement of, and support for, the strong and emotionally confronting responses it will engender (Jones, 1999; Lampert & Little, 2003, pp. 5-6).

Unsettling "Western authority" implies a willingness to deconstruct the processes of meaning-making that are constituted as "normal" and consequently rarely

acknowledged. For example, such an approach implies a willingness to "de-universalise and particularise Western norms" (Miyoshi, 1988, p. 531) and to resist the normalisation and translation of Indigenous knowledges within Western frameworks. At the same time, it implies a rejection of essentialism and the tendency to "discover" and appropriate Indigenous "Otherness" (Hamilton, 1990). Similarly, unsettling "Western" authority means challenging existing disciplinary assumptions. These include discarding linear notions of history, recognising various historical spaces and the ways in which new historical topographies are "layered onto the maps produced by continuing imperialism, exploitation, poverty and enforced underdevelopment" (Perera, 1995, p. 8).

Other areas of meaning-making are also important in terms of the ways in which they legitimise academic and professional outcomes. Included here are the documentary systems associated with educational institutions (policies, course/unit outlines, statistical reports, etc) and the normalising and individualising practices they embody which can act to authorise "Western" notions of cultural capital (Hesch, 1996, p. 10; Reid, 2004, p. 179). As Reid (2004, p. 188) has argued, these "cultural technologies" can make "cultural difference" invisible and they constitute significant challenges even when they are recognised. Such insights have ramifications for the documents developed in this project and the need to recognise them as having a tentative status and being subject to ongoing development.

The third pedagogical approach acknowledges Indigenous positions/positioning. Central to this approach is engagement with Indigenous people/communities on their terms and in light of their historical and contemporary experiences. As Phillips (2003, p. 5) has argued, it involves recognition and engagement "at a deep personal level" of the complicity of the academy in the objectification of Indigenous people and of the processes by which they continue to be dominated. Thus, simplistic notions of inclusion are to be eschewed as constituting sanitised, internalised versions of "Otherness" that erase the continuing histories of violence and exploitation (Williamson-Fien, 1996, p. 68). Similarly, the continued deployment of binary oppositions reinforces essentialist arguments and denies the complexities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous interactions (Nakata, 2004, p. 13; Thorpe et al., 2004, p. 2).

How then is the dialogue to be undertaken? The literature suggests that, as in research contexts, the values of "reciprocity, respect, equality, survival, protection and responsibility" (Kaufert & Lavoie, 2003, p. 33) should be paramount in the negotiation with Indigenous people/communities. Using the work of Clapham et al. (1997), Nakata (2004, p. 14) has suggested that a "community pedagogy" in which "meanings and purposes" are negotiated to

clarify the “goals, needs, strategies and roles” is one way forward (see Moosa-Mitha & Brown, 2000). Understandably, the desire for such interaction is not always welcomed by Indigenous peoples and communities. As Jones (1999, p. 2) has argued, a focus on dialogue within the classroom as a means of “moving the oppressed from the margins to the centre” may not mean that the “Others” are willing to share their experiences or to grant the absolution the dominant group desire.

A fourth element here is the requirement for ongoing critical self-reflection. For Lampert (2003, p. 25) this implies a shift in motivation from a “helping” ethos, which engages with Indigenous perspectives in terms of the “ideological, political and intellectual”, to a focus on “personal work” and the dilemmas of white, academic positionality. However, it is also necessary to acknowledge that putatively radical and liberatory educational discourses remain imbued with the “will to knowledge” and the processes of discipline and normalisation (Foucault, 1977, 1981). As Jones (1999) has noted in the context of Indigenous and “white” dialogue, the desire to know on the part of the white community involves “a demand for narrative” (Bhabha in Jones, 1999, p. 4) which reauthorises white power. At issue is the need for redemption on the part of the white community and their “refusal to know” (Jones, 1999, p. 5). Adopting a position of ongoing critical self-reflection is, therefore, an uncomfortable business. It means acknowledging complicity even in “that which we struggle against” (Usher & Edwards, 1994, p. 28); it means resisting control and closure, and recognising the silences, the right to silence, the unsaid and the unsayable (Chambers, 1996, p. 51).

■ Conclusion

The initial curriculum framework provided the project with a means to begin the process of embedding Indigenous perspectives in undergraduate curricula within the School of Humanities and Human Services. The evaluation of the project and the subsequent research activity have both endorsed and challenged that framework. The research has indicated, for example, the significance of Indigenous knowledge and the importance of enabling recognition of the connectedness of existence through practices that resonate with local Indigenous expertise and understanding. Such knowledge must be embedded in the graduate capabilities, particularly number three, and in the ways enhanced and advanced (professional) skills are developed. Similarly, the research has reinforced the necessity to engage critically with cultural perspectiveness (Curriculum Principle 1) and has provided insights into the processes whereby “whiteness” and “Western” authority might be challenged.

On the other hand, the research has also pointed to the capacity of documentary systems, such as the curriculum framework itself, to affirm Western notions of cultural capital, while, as Nakata (2004, p. 15) has argued, “the generation of new knowledge” at the cultural interface “may discontinue or transform some aspects of Indigenous knowledge and understanding” in ways that are challenging and risky. Attending to the negotiations between “Indigenous knowledge, standpoints or perspectives” and Western disciplinary knowledge systems is profoundly challenging (Nakata 2004, p. 14). For non-Indigenous educators, it requires the sort of critical self-reflection that is ongoing and extraordinarily discomfiting. However, for Indigenous people/communities, it is marked by the danger that, once again, their knowledges will be appropriated and corrupted. In assessing and reformulating the activities of this project, we must never lose sight of this last point.

The pedagogical approaches identified by the research, therefore, provide useful tools for interrogating the curriculum framework, and assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum principles and graduate capabilities. Furthermore, as a means for critically engaging with the work undertaken by the project thus far, the pedagogical approaches discussed here offer additional avenues by which academic staff can be encouraged to address their own intellectual and professional commitments and engage more carefully and competently with the embedding processes.

■ Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the contributions that the Project Leaders, Ms Mayrah Driese and Dr Julie McLaughlin, made to the project and its outcomes.

■ References

- Alaska Native Knowledge Network. (1998). *Cultural standards for curriculum*. Retrieved 27 September, 2001, from <http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/currstan.html>.
- Battiste, M., & Youngblood Henderson, J. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: A global challenge*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publications.
- Chambers, I. (1996). Signs of silence, lines of listening. In I. Chambers & L. Curti (Eds.), *The post-colonial question* (pp. 47-62). London: Routledge.
- Clapham, K., Digregorio, K., Dawson, A., & Hughes, I. (1997). The community as pedagogy: Innovations in Indigenous health worker education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 19(1), 35-43.
- Driese, M. (2003). *Developing and enhancing Indigenous perspectives in the curriculum: An initiative of QUT Carseldine and Creative Industries – audit/mapping report*. Unpublished report to QUT Carseldine and Creative Industries Faculty, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland.
- Ermine, E. (1995). Aboriginal epistemology. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 101-112). Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse (I. McLeod, Trans.). In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 51-77). Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gale, P. (2000). Indigenous rights in higher education in Australia: "Not just black and white". In G. R. Teasdale & Z. Ma Rhea (Eds.), *Local knowledge and wisdom in higher education* (pp. 95-108). Oxford: Pergamon for IAG Press.
- Hamilton, A. (1990). Fear and desire: Aborigines, Asians and the national imaginary. *Australian Cultural History*, 9, 14-35.
- Hart, V. (2003). Teaching black and teaching back. *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 12-16.
- Herbert, J. (2003). *Indigenous research: A communal act*. Retrieved 30 November, 2005, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/her03635.pdf>.
- Hesch, R. A. (1996, June). *Indigenous teacher education in neo-liberal settler societies*. Paper presented at the World Indigenous Peoples Conference: Education, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Howard, G. (1995). Unravelling racism: Reflections on the role of non-Indigenous people supporting Indigenous education. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 6(2). Retrieved 30 November, 2005, from <http://elecpress.monash.edu.au/ajee/vol6no2/13howard.htm>.
- Jones, A. (1999, November/December). *Pedagogy by the oppressed: The limits of classroom dialogue*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education and New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Melbourne, Victoria. Retrieved 1 July, 2006, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/99pap/jon99117.htm>.
- Kaufert, J. M., & Lavoie, J.G. (2003). Comparative Aboriginal perspectives on draft values and ethics in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research. *Monash Bioethics Review*, 22(4), 31-37.
- Kumashiro, K. (2000). Towards a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 25-53.
- Lampert, J. (2003). The alabaster academy: Being a non-Indigenous academic in Indigenous studies. *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 23-26.
- Lampert, J., & Lilley, I. (1996). *Indigenous Australian perspectives at the University of Queensland*. St Lucia, QLD: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Unit, University of Queensland.
- Lampert, J., & Little, J. (2003). *The road forward: Recommendations from EDB007*. Unpublished report to Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland.
- Marshall, M. (1997). *Developing and teaching Indigenous perspectives in management*. Retrieved 5 January, 2006, from <http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/webdav/site/carricksite/users/siteadmin/public/dissemination%20strategies%20project%20brief.doc/Marshall%20M.cutsd.pdf>.
- McLoughlin, C., & Oliver, R. (1999) *Instructional design for cultural difference: A case study of Indigenous online learning in a tertiary context*. Retrieved 6 December, 2005, from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/brisbane99/papers/mcloughlinoliver.pdf>.
- Miyoshi, M. (1988). Against the native grain. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 87(3), 531.
- Michie, M. (1999, December). *Where are Indigenous peoples and their knowledge in the reforming of learning, curriculum and pedagogy?* Paper presented at the Fifth UNESCO-ACEID International Conference "Reforming learning, curriculum and pedagogy: Innovative visions for the new century", Bangkok, Thailand. Retrieved 6 December, 2005, from <http://members.ozemail.com.au/~mmichie/aceid.html>.
- Moosa-Mitha, M., & Brown, L.A. (2000, August). *Radical pedagogy and the teaching of anti-racist social work practice in the field*. Paper presented at the IFSW/IASSW Conference, Melbourne, Victoria.
- Nakata, M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the cultural interface: Underlying issues at the intersection of knowledge and information systems. *IFLA Journal*, 28(5/6), 281-291.
- Nakata, M. (2004). *Indigenous Australian studies and higher education* (Wentworth Lecture). Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. Retrieved 1 June, 2007, from <http://www1.aiatsis.gov.au/exhibitions/wentworth/wentworthcontents.htm>.
- Nakata, M., & Hart, V. (2005). *Statement on Indigenous knowledge*. Unpublished document, Oodgeroo Unit, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland.
- Nicoll, F. (2004). Are you calling me a racist? Teaching critical whiteness theory in Indigenous sovereignty. *Borderlands eJournal*, 3(2), 1-10. Retrieved 2 July, 2006, from http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol3no2_2004/nicoll_teaching.htm.
- Perera, S. (1995). Introduction: Fatal (con)junctions. *Meridian*, 14(2), 1-12.
- Phillips, J. (2003). Guest editor's introduction: Decolonising the centre. *Social Alternatives*, 22(3), 3-5.
- Reid, C. (2004) *Negotiating racialised identities: Indigenous teacher education in Australia and Canada*. Altona, VIC: Common Ground.
- Slade, M., & Morgan, D. L. (2000). Aboriginal philosophy in Australian higher education: Its own place in its own time. In G. R. Teasdale & Z. Ma Rhea (Eds.), *Local knowledge and wisdom in higher education* (pp. 51-78). Oxford: Pergamon for IAU Press.
- Thorpe, K., Minter, P., Lui-Chivizhe, L., & Smith, A. (2004). Indigenous philosophy in pedagogy and research. *Synergy*, 19, 1-3. Retrieved 2 July, 2006, from <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/synergy/article.cfm?articleID=2>.
- Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and education*. London: Routledge.
- Williamson-Fien, J. (1996). Studies of Asia: "Trafficking in otherness" or articulating a "geography of the possible". *Curriculum Perspectives*, 16(3), 67-72.

■ About the authors

Jane Williamson is the Executive Director, Northern Campuses at QUT. In her former role as Assistant Director, Teaching and Learning for Humanities and Human Services, she was the Project Director for a QUT Teaching and Learning Grant to embed Indigenous perspectives in the school's curricula. Associate Professor Williamson's research and teaching interests also include the First Year Experience, including Transition Education, and the pedagogical processes attached to internationalising the curriculum.

Priya Dalal is a BA/BLaws, fourth year student at QUT. In the summer vacation of 2005-2006, Priya held a Vacation Research Experience Scholarship with the Centre for Social Change Research during which time she undertook an extensive examination of the literature on Indigenous curriculum materials and approaches.