EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Evaluation Report of the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model (Hereafter referred to as the Model) provides evidence that the Model is a flexible and effective research methodology to work with language and cultural groups from Yolngu Matha, Burarra, Tiwi, Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha.

During the early stages of introducing this Evaluation Project to potential participating communities, it was noted that the positive response to being involved in trialling the Model with their community members, who were living public place lifestyles in Darwin and Palmerston, was in part due to the culturally sensitive and appropriate way of engaging with Indigenous people during the Phase One Project (The First Language Research and Consultation Indigenous Itinerant Project 2003). Another additional element to the level of high participation for this Evaluation Project can also be attributed to use of appropriate Indigenous protocols to respectfully engage and explain the purpose of the Project.

A further critical element of the Model was the employment of Indigenous first language speakers from the participating language and cultural groups. Each of the participating communities was responsible for identifying suitable senior people to undertake the initial training and work on the Project. Most of the Indigenous researchers had family living in Darwin and Palmerston in public places and were keen to continue their contact with their family through this Evaluation Project.

The methods and processes used during the Evaluation Project created opportunities for the Indigenous first language researchers to fully engage in the research; in data analysis and continual feedback loops to Community (this included the cycles of research progress, findings and corroborating recommendations). Memmott and Fantin (2001) argue that diversionary strategies such as sobering-up services or Indigenous volunteer Night Patrols do not usually replace the need for a long-term commitment to changing the life circumstances of itinerants and park dwellers. In this context, they cite the following steps to problem resolution proposed by Hale (1996):

1. Councils to take leadership in reconciling inequity between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and not fuel racism by a ‘blame-the-victim’ stereotyping of itinerants.
2. Change the systems that perpetuate inequality and discrimination, rather than focus change upon those itinerants who are then branded as deviant or deficient in some way.
3. Require a long-term commitment to change the life circumstances of itinerant people, rather than a ‘law and order’ response.
4. Require a Community Development approach that emphasizes empowerment and self-determination whereby the itinerants define their problems, needs and solutions.
Both the Evaluation methodology and the Model’s approaches utilise principles from Community Development practices, Indigenous Research Reform Agenda, and fully supports the empowerment of people to take ownership of their “social problems” and to find realistic solutions for social change.

The aims of the Evaluation were to:

(a) Evaluate the applicability of the Model through the application of the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model (Hereafter referred to as: the Model) with five additional Language and Cultural groups;

(b) Evaluate the effectiveness of the Model through assessment of quality of the information and range of complex data; and

(c) Adapt and further refine the Model.

A summary version of the findings against these aims found that the Model is conducive and flexible to working with Yolngu Matha, Tiwi, Burarra, Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha language and cultural groups. In depth data about the reasons why Aboriginal people might move to live in Darwin, why they end up or choose a public place lifestyle and what their intentions are to return to their respective communities were obtained. Due to the nature of the Aboriginal relationships, use of participants’ first language and methods to discuss these sensitive issues it became evident that research participants were prepared to discuss a wider range of social issues.

With complimentary methods utilised for the Evaluation Project and the Model it was possible to identify where there might be improvements to the Model’s approaches. The main focus of the changes rested with the professional development for the Indigenous first language researchers, ensuring that research partnerships were formalised and budgets were adequate.

The following recommendations are the result of concentrated effort focussing on ‘where has the Model’s trial lead us?’ Realising that the Model was effective and adaptable to other language and cultural groups and that there is now a growing quantum of Indigenous researchers interested to continue it was considered that there should be a strong focus on possible solutions for Aboriginal people living public place lifestyles in Darwin and Palmerston. Further that Larrakia Nation should be centrally involved in the discussions. In further support Finnane (2006) reported that urban drift is already impacting negatively on existing town camps in Alice Springs through pressure on limited resources. If the predicted mass movement of people occurs, Waterford (2006) warns that Government would be responsible for providing decent housing proportionate to people’s needs, and that real money must be spent in upgrading local services to meet the extra burdens such an increase in population might cause.
Recommendations

1. That the Commonwealth and Northern Territory Governments initiate discussions with Larrakia Nation to establish a Transition Place for nurturing/training / mediation / counselling for Indigenous language and cultural groups to work with their people who are living public place dwelling life styles in Darwin and Palmerston. That the discussions also canvass the establishment of an Indigenous research consultancy unit with Larrakia Nation.

2. That the Transition Place on Larrakia Land might deliver services and programs such as:
   - Day outings collecting bush food, and planting bush trees (writing stories about experiences)
   - Cooking and sewing
   - Counselling using Indigenous Languages (art and craft, dancing)
   - Referral to CAAPS
   - Training - related to living in urban centre, literacy/numeracy, and basic computer
   - Language and cultural sharing nights (BBQ, camping, dancing, storytelling, singing, listening to stories about the land and history)
   - Arrange for people to renew relationships with their own family
   - Christian Fellowship nights
   - Raypiri Rom service to resolve “their problem”
   - Vocational experience and training

3. That a management committee is established comprising of representatives from Larrakia Nation, six language and cultural groups, CAAPS, Danila Dilba Health Service, Police, Indigenous housing, Community Harmony (Justice Department), and Aboriginal Interpreter Service. The purpose of this committee would be to investigate ways to develop the Transition Place; selections of site, financial assistance, establishing infrastructure, and coordination of in-kind services to support programs.

4. Management committee should engage the proposed Indigenous research consultancy unit with Larrakia Nation to help identity programs and services for delivery.
INTRODUCTION

This report outlines findings from the *Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project* (Hereafter referred to as: the Project). Field research for the Project was conducted between June 2005 and June 2006. Some of the locations included: the Greater Darwin and Palmerston area; Galiwin’ku; Maningrida; and Tiwi Islands. Other locations where engagement could only be achieved by telephone and emails included: Groote Eylandt; Ngukurr; and Wadeye.

The main aims of the Project were to:

(a) Evaluate the applicability of the Model through the application of the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model (Hereafter referred to as: the Model) with five additional Language and Cultural groups;

(b) Evaluate the effectiveness of the Model through assessment of quality of the information and range of complex data; and

(c) Adapt and further refine the Model.

The *Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project* extends on an earlier research project: *The First Language Research and Consultation Indigenous Itinerant Project* (also referred to as the ‘First Language Research Project’ Phase One). This earlier research was conducted in the Darwin area by the Yalu Marnghithinyaraw Research Group (between 2003 and 2004) and the findings were reported in ‘Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land’ (Maypilama, E, Garnggulkpuy, J, Christie, M., Greatorex, J. and Grace, J., 2004). Maypilama and her colleagues aimed to provide a better understanding of the underlying issues impacting on the lives of Yolngu from Galiwin’ku who were living a long-grass or itinerant lifestyle in the Darwin area. A unique feature of the adopted research approach was that field data was collected and analysed by fellow Yolngu (who had the authority of senior men and women) in collaboration with non-Indigenous anthropologists and linguists. Interviews were conducted in culturally appropriate ways and in appropriate Yolngu languages. Recommendations arising from this research were based on responses from people living a long-grass lifestyle and from members of their home communities.

Based on earlier research involving the issue of Indigenous public place dwelling in the Darwin and Palmerston area, Memmott et al (2003a) argued that it is fundamentally important for the proposal of official response strategies to be guided by ‘local analysis and a thorough consultation with all stakeholder groups, including Indigenous peoples (Memmott et al 2003a, p. 70).’ With the exception of research conducted by Maypilama et al (2004), no other research in the Darwin area has included participation by Indigenous researchers with cultural links to Indigenous
public place dwellers. Based on the results of their research, Maypilama et al (2004) suggested that it was important for their adopted model of research practice (Yolngu Matha Model) to be replicated with other language groups in the Northern Territory and that the Indigenous project researchers were in a position to share their knowledge and experience of conducting research.

The Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project aspired to take up this challenge and was positioned to provide additional insights to fulfil an identified need for (a) consultation with local Indigenous public place dwellers, (b) the achievement of broader Indigenous community involvement in the development of appropriate intervention strategies and public policies and (c) to evaluate the efficacy and effectiveness of the Yolngu Matha Model for research.

An important recommendation arising from The First Language Research and Consultation Indigenous Itinerant Project was that the process should be extended to include participation by researchers from an additional five Top End region language and cultural groups. Within this current project, these groups eventually comprised:

- Murrinh-Patha – Wadeye community and surrounding outstations
- Tiwi – Tiwi Islands: Bathurst and Melville Islands
- Burarra – Maningrida community
- Anindilyakwa – Groote Eylandt communities
- Kriol – Aboriginal English from the Top End region

Two elder Yolngu Matha Researchers (Elaine Maypilama and Joanne Garnggulkpuy) were included as key researchers in the current research Project. Their role enabled further cycles of conversation with people from their home communities who were still living in public places on Larrakia land in the Greater Darwin area.

The following report begins with an outline of the Project background and a summary overview of the literature detailing issues relating to Indigenous public place dwellers in Australia. The research findings are then presented and discussed in two main parts including:

(a) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the Research and Consultation Model with five additional cultural and language groups in the Top End of the Northern Territory, and

(b) Applicability of the Model to explore other complex social issues and its potential to establish a self-sustaining consultancy business for use in the government and non-government sectors.

Part Three of this Report provides a synopsis of suggested changes to the Yolngu Matha Model and an outline of proposed processes for broad implementation across sectors in the Northern Territory.
**Project Background**

The Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project was funded under the Commonwealth Government’s Family and Community Networks Initiative Program (FCNI) and auspiced by the Larrakia Nation Aboriginal Corporation (LNAC). Larrakia is the language group name for the traditional Aboriginal custodians of all land and waters of the Greater Darwin area. The Project is unique within the FCNI in that it seeks to gain insights into, and constructively address, the needs of Indigenous people living in public places. The Project reference group comprised representatives from: Larrakia Nation Aboriginal Corporation, FaCSIA (previously FaCS), SAIKS (School of Australian Indigenous Knowledge System), Faculty of Education, Health and Science (E, H&S) at Charles Darwin University (CDU), Northern Territory Community Harmony Strategy, Community Services (LNAC), and Linguists (SAIKS and E, H&S).

The research is positioned to indirectly fulfil key principles of the “Community Harmony Project” (previously referred to as the Northern Territory ‘Itinerants’ Strategy). The ‘Community Harmony Project’ is a Northern Territory Government funded initiative that aims to achieve:

- A significant reduction in the incidence of anti-social behaviour by “itinerants” in all major Territory centres; and

- The delivery of infrastructure, intervention programs and health services responding to identified needs of “itinerants” (First Language Research and Consultation Indigenous Itinerant Project proposal, 2003, p.1).

FaCSIA and LNAC agreed aims of the Project are to:

- Develop a first language research and consultation model with skilled Indigenous researchers that will provide meaningful results and outcomes for Indigenous people.

- Develop a level of understanding that is critical to devising, prioritising and evaluating strategies and initiatives for dealing with community concerns about Indigenous itinerants’ issues.

- Provide training and skills to a range of senior language speakers, which will facilitate similar exercises for other complex social and economic issues that need effective research and consultation to inform decision-makers.

- Develop a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business providing Indigenous Language research services to government, business and the non-government sector.
When the Project first commenced in 2004, implementation delays resulted in a need to readvertise the position of Project Manager. It was not until mid February 2005 that the new Project Manager was in place and project implementation commenced. This early implementation phase involved training of researchers, and networking with nominated home communities.

An adjustment to the agreed aim “to develop a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business providing Indigenous language research services to government, business and the non-government sector” was proposed by the Research Project Manager at a meeting between FaCSIA and LNAC on the 31st January 2006. The Research Project Manager suggested that the research team had the capability to only partially achieve this objective. Other agreed project variations included a reduction in the number of participating language groups (from six to four) and a change in the official project name. The Project name was changed from: the First Language Research and Consultation Indigenous Itinerant Project to the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project (effective from 8th April 2005).

The research questions that framed the Project’s activity to deliver evidence based findings are:

- Can this Yolngu Matha Model be used to train other first language speakers?
- What and how should that training occur?
- Effectiveness of the Model to explore Indigenous itinerants’ issues in Darwin and Palmerston?
- What is the potential usefulness of the Model for (a) exploring other complex Indigenous social and economic issues, and (b) informing Government policy and decision-makers?
- What is the potential for further developing the Yolngu Matha Model into a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business to provide Indigenous language research services to government, business and the non-government sector?

**Indigenous Public Place Dwellers in Australia: Summary Overview of the literature**

The following summary derives from a select Review of the literature completed as background to the research Project (refer to Appendix 1).

The academic research literature, government policy documents, and media and internet reports, demonstrate a lack of agreement over how Indigenous peoples inhabiting public spaces should be referred to. For example, terms such as ‘homeless’, ‘itinerant’, ‘public place dwellers’, ‘town campers’, ‘fringe dwellers’ and ‘long grassers’ are variously applied. Some commentators suggest that variations in the application of terminology are both politically and racially based. Instances have been identified where the style or content of news items in mainstream Northern Territory newspapers could be construed as contributing to racist stereotyping or demonisation of homeless Indigenous peoples (Dawson, 2002; Day, 2001).
Indigenous peoples in the Top End of Australia (also referred to collectively as ‘Yolngu’) currently number approximately 5000 (Christie and Greatorex, 2003). The majority of Yolngu live in communities (originally established by Methodist missionaries between 1925 and 1975 but no longer under missionary control), a small number live in homeland communities and a small number live in the Darwin area for varying periods of time and for various reasons.

For the purposes of this report the term ‘public place dwellers’ will be used as it appears to have the least amount of unnecessary overtones. Estimates of the number of ‘itinerant’ Indigenous people residing in the Darwin area vary, but there is broad agreement that the total number of Indigenous public place dwellers is on the increase and that total numbers are subject to seasonal variation (Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 6). According to the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project proposal (2003), Indigenous ‘itinerants’ in the Darwin and Palmerston area number between 200 and 700 people at any one time (2003, p.5). Christie and Greatorex (2003) reported that on any night there are up to 1,000 people sleeping under the stars in the Darwin area and that the number of Yolngu in this group fluctuates between 50 and 300. Lack of agreement over actual numbers of Indigenous public place dwellers (and who should be defined as an ‘itinerant’) plays out in public debates in the Northern Territory. It is not uncommon, for example, for estimations of Indigenous ‘itinerant’ numbers to be equated with estimations of the number of ‘Indigenous drunks’ in the Darwin area. Evidence of a lack of agreement of who should be considered as an ‘Indigenous itinerant’ in the Darwin area is contained in a recent and heated exchange between the Chief Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Northern Territory parliament. The number of Indigenous ‘itinerants’ in the Darwin area was assertively disputed by the Chief Minister noting that:

“When we have the Opposition saying there are 22,000 drunks and putting out press releases saying ‘thousands of drunks across the Territory’ is rubbish. It is rubbish. We know that our serious problem is one of a small group, of which we are talking about 150 to 200 repeat offenders.”

(N.T. News, 26th Feb, 2006)

In the main, the literature referring to Indigenous public place dwellers in Australia deals with issues associated with Primary homelessness. According to the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Homelessness (2000) the term ‘primary homelessness’ refers to people without conventional accommodation who commonly ‘sleep rough’ in improvised dwellings (2000, p.11). Memmott et al (2003b) emphasize the importance of considering the needs of Indigenous peoples defined as ‘homeless’ according to their particular situation and not as a homogenous group with generic needs. To assist in differentiating the issues associated with Indigenous homelessness, Memmott and Fantin (2001) suggest that when analysing the homeless status of Indigenous peoples at local levels, it is important to distinguish between both ‘homelessness and transient homelessness’ and ‘voluntary and involuntary homelessness’. To this end, they propose two categories of Indigenous public place dwellers as:

(1) Those who have come to town to have a good time socializing and drinking and who are prepared to do this in ‘long grass style’ (camping out); but whom intend to eventually return home.
2) Those who live a permanent long-grass lifestyle; have cut off their ties with home communities long ago, and who accept that their lifestyle will remain consistent.  
(Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 38)

There is evidence of a growing recognition that the interrelationships between a range of government policy areas must be understood if sustainable solutions to the ‘problems’ of Indigenous itinerancy are to be developed (Bell and Taylor, 2004; Memmott et al, 2003b). For example, Memmott, et al (2003b), argue that there is an increasing understanding that housing provision and management has to be strongly allied with other policy areas such as health, education, welfare and the criminal justice system in order for government strategies to adequately respond to all the factors affecting the lives of the homeless (2003b, p.35). The authors also make the point that previously unrelated policy areas such as regional planning, urban planning, native title and cultural heritage are also significant in addressing the full spectrum of need present for homeless Indigenous Australians (Memmott et al, 2003b, p.35).

Policies involving Indigenous: employment, welfare, education, land rights and community infrastructure, are apparently high on the current reform agenda of mainly conservative interests in Australia (Johns, 2006; Howson, 2004; Hughes and Warin, 2005). Of special concern to those with an interest in the welfare of public place dwellers and the urban communities they periodically reside in, is the reported high (and increasing) level of out-migration of Indigenous peoples from remote communities to urban areas such as Darwin and Alice Springs in the Northern Territory. It is too early to gauge the likely impact of this trend on the total number of Indigenous public place dwellers in urban areas, but commentators predict that downgrading of the CDEP scheme and reduction in support for remote outstation communities will fuel the movement of Indigenous people toward urban areas in search of employment, accommodation and access to essential services (Finnane, 2006; Evans, 2006).

The literature indicates a broad distinction between intervention and policy proposals which aim to: (a) address the underlying causes of Indigenous public place dwelling and the immediate needs of Indigenous peoples in this situation, and (b) address mainstream community concerns about the perceived negative impact of Indigenous public place dwellers on their interests. In the literature detailing issues relating to government response to Indigenous public place dwellers in Australia, this distinction is also referred to as the difference between law -and –order approaches and community development approaches (Memmott and Fantin, 2001) or the difference between reactive or proactive intervention strategies (Cooper and Morris, 2003).

Memmott et al (2003b) emphasize that the categories and associated interventions they propose in their analysis of Indigenous public place dwelling in Australia, should not be read as a ‘recipe’ for intervention, but as a guide to policy makers in their decisions about how best to intervene in local contexts. Intervention categories proposed by Memmott et al (2003b) include: Legislative and police approaches; Patrols and outreach services; Diversionary strategies; Addressing anti-social behaviour; Alcohol strategies; Emergency or crisis accommodation; Service centres and gathering places; Physical design of public places; Public education strategies, Training outreach workers (Memmott et al, 2003b p. iv)
Identified gaps in current understanding about issues relating to Indigenous public place dwellers in Australia generally, are identified from the literature as follows:

- The impact of predicted large-scale out-migration from rural and remote communities on urban centres has not been subject to detailed analysis. Commentators have identified a number of policy reform proposals with potential for substantially increasing patterns of urban drift (e.g. CDEP reforms; downgrading of community infrastructure; land rights reform and associated increase in mining activity). This situation is likely to impact significantly on short-term Government planning and infrastructure arrangements for Indigenous public place dwellers in the Darwin area.

- An understanding of the connections between certain categories of public place dwellers (i.e. long term or temporary and voluntary or involuntary) and interventions that will meet their various needs (Memmott et al. 2003b).

- Evaluation of intervention strategies previously implemented in the Darwin area and elsewhere in Australia. Memmott, et al (2003a) report that only one strategy included in a national survey of intervention strategies to address the needs of Indigenous public place dwellers in Australia has been formally evaluated.

- An understanding of the social reality and complex cultural living patterns (including cultural responsibilities associated with communal living) of Indigenous public place dwellers (Memmott et al., 2003a; Memmott et al. 2003b).

- The mobility aspirations of Indigenous peoples and the complex social and cultural factors underlying movements of Aboriginal peoples. Researchers have concentrated mainly on why Indigenous people have moved from rural and remote locations to urban areas and less on understanding where they really want to be. Some questions to fill this gap in understanding are proposed as follows:
  - Do people want to move?
  - Where do people want to move?
  - Who wants to move?
  - Who wants to stay?
  - How do people want to move?
  - What effects will these future movements have on source areas, destination areas, and other places in between? (Memmott et al 2004, p. 7)

It is important to fill these identified gaps in understanding if the appropriate response and planning strategies relating to Indigenous public place dwellers in the Darwin area are to be implemented by the Northern Territory Government into the future. Of particular relevance in the Darwin context are predicted and actual changes to Government policy regarding questions about ongoing support for remote Indigenous outstations and large-scale down-grading of the CDEP scheme. Some commentators have suggested that these changes will precipitate massive out-migration from remote to urban areas as people move to access employment, accommodation and essential services (Finnane, 2006; Waterford, 2006). If the predicted level of migration of Indigenous peoples from remote to urban areas eventuates, the identified problems currently associated with Indigenous public place dwellers are likely to be exacerbated. In light of recent policy proposals that seem to actively discourage people from living in their homelands, the currently supported option of repatriating Indigenous public place dwellers to their home communities may need to be revised.
Methodology

There is increasing awareness that the most effective way of representing Indigenous viewpoints on a range of issues is to involve Indigenous peoples as key players in the research process. Commenting on the importance of a joint research effort incorporating Balanda (Non-Indigenous) and Yolngu perspectives on the issue of Indigenous itinerancy in the Darwin area, Maypilama et al (2004) explained that this approach is needed to:

…bring about lasting solutions to the problems that people living in the long-grass experience. This project is an example of how Balanda and Yolngu can work cooperatively to achieve positive results
(Maypilama, 2004, p.19)

Hale (1996) recommends a community development approach to research involving Indigenous ‘itinerancy’ on the basis that it is important for itinerant peoples to be involved in defining and planning for their needs. A community development approach aims to:

a) Assist the group to clearly identify their problems and needs,
b) Informs the group about the relevant resources available to them,
c) Encourages the group to draw on their collective resources,
d) Creates an environment where the group can work out what to do about their problems,
e) Assists the itinerants to have a ‘voice’ e.g. through incorporations, meetings, workshops, representation on agency committee for itinerants,
f) The Community Development approach should emphasise empowering the itinerants to take their own initiatives, and

g) Recognizes citizen entitlements (public space access) for long-term itinerants.
(Hale 1996 p. 21 cited in Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 58)

The methodological approach adopted in this project is underpinned by a commitment to: putting in place Indigenous research principles (Lowell at al, 2003); identified best practice for cross-cultural research and associated policy development (Memmott et al 2003a, Henry et al 2002), and; community development principles (Hale, 996). In consideration of the need to incorporate the above principles and to use a complementary approach to that of the Model, the Phase Two Evaluation of the Model instituted a participatory action evaluation approach with some principles from Empowerment evaluation. (Fetterman & Wandersman, 2004)

Three empowerment evaluation steps were modified for application in this project evaluation process as follows: (1) Mapping and trialling training approaches of the Model with other cultural and language groups to understand best approach to build
flexible training for the Model’s implementation (2) Implementing the Model and taking stock of required changes to the Model for improvement. Observations, interviews, reflexive cycles to evaluate effectiveness in terms of impact and appropriateness of the research Model to achieve positive outcomes for public place dwellers in the Greater Darwin region (3) Consideration of the Model’s potential utility for other uses, and where to next. In Table 1 below these steps are reframed against the Project’s research questions and the evaluation measures.
### Table 1: Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Step &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mapping Process          | • Can this Yolngu Matha Model be used to train other first language speakers?      | 1. The Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model is transferable to five other language and cultural groups – participants able to re frame in their research story whilst remaining within the required methods of the Model.  
2. Participating language and cultural groups successfully complete at least four field data collection periods (each of one week duration) and provide English back-translation to the Project Manager. |
| Mapping Process          | • What and how should that training occur?                                         | 1. Language and cultural groups felt comfortable to engage and learn within the context of training approach.  
2. Able to demonstrate learning through effective implementation of the Model’s methods and production of English back-translation reports to the Project Manager. |
| Assessing Process        | • Effectiveness of the Model to explore Indigenous itinerants’ issues in Darwin and Palmerston? | 1. Phase Two data produced information to an equivalent depth and breadth as that produced in the Phase One project 2004 Report Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land.  
2. Model provides flexibility to accommodate the protocols and practices of language and cultural groups other than Yolngu Matha. |
| and Impact               |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Assessing Potential     | • What is the potential usefulness of the Model for (a) exploring other complex Indigenous social and economic issues, and (b) informing Government policy and decision-makers? | 1. Research processes supported Indigenous participants to engage in a trusting climate that generated quality data including possible solutions.  
2. Research processes were inclusive of all relevant key stakeholders to validate findings and possible solutions. |
| utility of the Model     |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Assessing Potential     | • What is the potential for further developing the Yolngu Matha Model into a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business to provide Indigenous language research services to government, business and the non-government sector? | 1. Reasonable quorum of Indigenous Researchers familiar with the Model.  
2. The Indigenous research group comprises a mix of skills - oral first language speakers, English literacy, Senior language & cultural people, and research experts.  
3. Indigenous Research Partnership Model includes commitment and processes for professional development. |
| utility of establishing   |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| infrastructure          |                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
Data Collection
Evaluation of the Model required assessment of its uptake and suitability with other language and cultural groups to better understand public place dwelling. To enhance the Evaluation data, and in keeping with the Model’s research methodologies, Indigenous people from each language group were engaged to undertake basic research training and operate as first language field researchers. These Indigenous field researchers complemented the existing research team of: Indigenous Research Manager, Indigenous Consultant Researcher, and Yolngu Matha Researchers. The process to introduce the Project and gain nominated senior Indigenous cultural and language people to be trained and to conduct the field work in Darwin was planned to demonstrate respect for differences in community processes. This process was initiated through kinship networks and it meant respectfully waiting and listening as to how this was to occur.

As noted by Williams, ‘...the goal of participatory research is to make every effort to ensure that methods complement rather than supplant local forms of expression, communication, discussion and decision-making” (1996, p. 1).

Evaluation data was gathered through (a) observing research training for, and implementation of the Model by culture and language groups(b) continual reflexive sessions with two Yolngu Matha Project members, and regular reflexive sessions with Indigenous first language field researchers (c) Observations (by Indigenous Project Manager) of project research staff at work in the field (d) semi-structured and unstructured interviews / meetings with relevant key stakeholders from each participating community, NT government Community Harmony Workers, Justice Department, key Larrakia Nation program staff and other key informants (e) Feedback from a public discussion at the Water Gardens 17 November 2005 (participants included public place dwellers, participating community representatives, key government stakeholders and Larrakia Nation representatives).

Primary data collection involved unstructured verbal interviews using the first language of the participant and open ended discussions with a broad range of informants including: people living in the long grass and their relatives; Elders from originating remote communities; and, Aboriginal people from Darwin representing a number of service providers. Some interviews were tape recorded with permission. When participants did not give permission to be recorded the interview field notes represented a summary of the discussion. The field research data was supplemented by commentary from: the mainstream literature; information (both qualitative and quantitative) supplied by various service providing agencies, and; written testimony supplied voluntarily to the Project researchers by a small number of Aboriginal people who held strong opinions about the issue of itinerancy and homelessness in the Darwin area. Any quotes from this research have been back translated from interview data with participants into English by the appropriate Indigenous first language field researchers and a member of the Research Team.

The fieldwork was conducted at various sites around the Darwin and Palmerston areas where the five identified language groups congregate. Locating members of different language groups was achieved by communicating through extended family and kinship systems and through opportunistic visits to sites including, for example, Kmart and the Darwin Mall.
Mentoring and Reflexive Cycles
The selection of suitable Indigenous persons to be trained in culturally appropriate first language research and consultation methods was negotiated through two Yalu Elders who consulted with Elders from the five main participating language groups. These included: Yolngu Matha (north-eastern Arnhem region), Murrinh-Patha (Wadeye community and surrounding outstations); Tiwi (Tiwi Islands - Bathurst and Melville Islands); Burarra (Maningrida community); Anindilyakwa (Groote Eylandt communities); and, Kriol (Aboriginal English from the Top End region).

Continuing mentoring occurred at different levels. Individuals were trained in the application of research ethics, research management and framing of the evaluation approach. Cultural and Language field researchers also received ongoing mentoring about the Yolngu Matha Model. Most of the Yolngu Matha Model mentoring was conducted by the two Yalu Elders (Elaine Maypilama and Joanne Garrnggulkpuy) and the Project Manager situated at the Charles Darwin University School for Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems (SAIKS).

Reflexive research cycles centrally revolved around a smaller team of four Indigenous researchers (Two key Yolngu Matha Researchers, Project Manager and as required the research consultant), with integrated larger cycles including the Indigenous language and cultural field researchers. In addition, this process checked emerging data with key stakeholder interviews / meetings with people from organisations responsible for provision of services to public place dwellers or potentially might be of help concerning the Project’s recommendations.

The Project methodology included the following key features:

- Inclusion of Larrakia Nation representatives in the research team and as members of the Reference Group in recognition of the research being conducted on Larrakia Nation land. Ethics approval was endorsed by the Board of Management Larrakia Nation on 29th June 2005 prior to the conduct of field research in the Greater Darwin region;
- Engagement of two Yolngu Matha Researchers from Phase One of the Model to be critical members of the research Project’s team for Phase Two;
- Participation by senior members (of five distinct Indigenous cultural and language groups) as primary Indigenous first language field researchers;
- Commitment to the development of collaborative research partnerships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples through the Project’s Reference Group and key stakeholder interviews and meetings;
- Commitment to the application of culturally appropriate research approaches to interviewing Indigenous informants (including the adoption of informant’s first language in primary interviews) and framing of the evaluation questions;
- Commitment to ongoing development of Indigenous research capability through ongoing engagement with participating communities, Indigenous researcher reflexive sessions with; and
- Flexible and appropriate training sessions about the research and research ethics processes that included other language groups adapting the information sheet and ethics process for their field work.

The reflexive nature of the evaluation processes involving the Project team members and other stakeholders has ensured that the evolving recommendations have credibility and ownership by the senior Indigenous first language field researchers and Larrakia Nation.
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Part One: Research and Consultation Model

A. Can the Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model be used to train other first language speakers?

Overview
To assess broadly whether the Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model could be conceptually translated from Yolngu Matha to other language and cultural groups and effectively used, the research team used the following process and impact measures:

1. The Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model is transferable to five other language and cultural groups – participants able to re frame in their research story whilst remaining within the required methods of the Model.

2. Participating language and cultural groups successfully complete at least four field data collection periods (each of one week duration) and provide English back translation to the Project Manager.

Following is a discussion of the findings against these two measures and an analysis comparing the varying areas of success and possible ways to improve the Model.

Discussion against the Evaluation Measures:

PROCESS MEASURE 1.
The Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model is transferable to five other language and cultural groups – participants able to re frame in their research story whilst remaining within the required methods of the Model.

Besides the Yolngu Matha language and cultural group, two other language and cultural groups were able to re frame the research approach to align with how they would appropriately undertake the research and consultation process with people from their community. The two additional language and cultural groups included Tiwi and Burarra. Each of these participating communities was able to provide field research teams to work in Darwin. There were five Tiwi members nominated to undertake the training program in Darwin. It should be noted during this Project that
some of the Tiwi first language field researchers were already involved in other programs in Nguiu and Pirlangimpi but made a commitment to participate in the project. The Burarra first language field researchers self nominated their team and they wanted a more flexible and practical mentoring approach to training. This training occurred both in Darwin and in their community.

Appendices 2, 3 and 4 provide translations of the Larrakia Nation Protocols, the research ethics information sheets/consent forms and the research process that were used to guide the first language field researchers for Yolngu Matha, Tiwi and Burarra. In the majority of cases the research ethics consent process was conducted orally, with a written record of time, place and what people were happy to agree to.

Most of the eight Indigenous first language field researchers were able to speak fluently in several of the identified languages for this research project. Following appropriate cultural introduction to initiate discussion with the remaining three language and cultural groups (Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha), agreement was reached about how these remaining communities might be able to have an input to the Project. For instance, some of the existing Indigenous first language field researchers were capable of speaking Anindilyakwa, Kriol, Murrinh-Patha or a language that was close and could be used to communicate well. Agreement was also reached concerning feedback and final checking of the draft Project Report. The team would like to acknowledge the other six Indigenous field research assistants who provided support to the eight Indigenous first language field researchers.

As discussed previously the adoption of a community development approach to research in this field (Hale (2001) and principles of the Indigenous Research Reform Agenda (Henry et al, 2002) is critically important for successful engagement with Indigenous communities. A community development approach includes processes that:

- a) Assist the group to clearly identify their problems and needs
- b) Inform the group about the relevant resources available to them
- c) Encourage the group to draw on their collective resources
- d) Create an environment where the group can work out what to do about their problems
- e) Assist the itinerants to have a ‘voice’ e.g. through incorporations, meetings, workshops, representation on agency committee for itinerants
- f) The Community Development approach should emphasise empowering the itinerants to take their own initiatives
- g) Recognition of citizen entitlements (public space access) for long-term itinerants.

(Hale 1996 p. 21 cited in Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 58)

The participating communities were aware of the Phase One Project through Larrakia Nation’s efforts to host several Mala Elders Group meetings that were sponsored by the Government. These meetings involved Indigenous Elders from various communities who considered, among other things, the issue of Indigenous public place dwelling in the Greater Darwin and Palmerston area. The timing of these Mala Elders’ meetings also coincided with the field work for the Phase One Project, the two Senior Yolngu Matha Researchers who were representatives for their community, opportunistically provided progress reports about the Phase One Project during 2003 and 2004. In late 2004 following the publication of the research findings in the Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (Maypilama et al, 2004) many
communities expressed an early desire to be involved in a similar process. One of the key recommendations of this Report noted that the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model should be trialled with peoples from other language and cultural groups living a public place life-style in Darwin.

This important ground work with the Mala Elders’ group allowed the Project’s research team to capitalise on the awareness of the Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land research findings. With the employment of the two senior Yolngu Matha researchers their first role included revisiting communities to identify those that were able to participate in the Project.

The Model was successfully repeated with the Yolngu Matha groups and successfully transferred for Tiwi and Burarra language and cultural groups. For the remaining language and cultural groups of Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha, there was partial transfer of the research Model concepts. The transfer was only partial due to capability and availability constraints for the researchers to engage at critical times for training and fieldwork. However, the research team negotiated for a flexible arrangement to still allow for their input. This meant that one of the senior Yolngu Matha researchers was required to be present and provide research guidance for nominated representatives from these language and cultural groups. Fortunately, this process allowed for both the perspectives of public place dwellers and community members to be incorporated into the final report.

It is our assessment that the application of principles aligned with the Indigenous Research Reform Agenda (Henry et al, 2002) and Community Development approach to research proved to be critical factors in maximising flexibility and creative solutions to perceived challenges that arose. We also consider that with more time and financial resources, the Model could have been successfully transferred to other Indigenous language and cultural groups.

**IMPACT MEASURE 2.**
Participating language and cultural groups successfully complete at least four field data collection periods (each of one week duration) and provide English back translation to the Project Manager.

After the initial community discussions (that mainly occurred face to face), there was a commitment from each community to participate in the project and to nominate male and female teams for training and working in the field in Darwin.

However, the language and cultural groups able to complete in total at least four weeks field work with the public place dwellers in the Greater Darwin region included only Yolngu Matha, Tiwi, and Burarra. For Murrinh-Patha, Anindilyakwa and Kriol there were extenuating circumstances for most of the nominated Elders to participate such as suffering personal illness or other circumstances related to cultural obligations and whole of community matters that required their presence in their home communities.

Further discussions with Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha Elders allowed for some of the trained Indigenous first language field researchers (who were able to speak these other languages, and had some cultural connections to Indigenous public place dwellers in the Darwin area) were given permission to conduct some interviews via telephone with other senior community people and also with consenting people from the community who were living in public places in Darwin.
These interviews were conducted with support from one of the Senior Yolngu Matha researchers.

A total of 148 participants were involved with the project. Of this number there were 109 participants who were people living in public places in the Greater Darwin regions, a further 22 people from participating home communities with the remainder in the category of key stakeholder interviews. This meant that 131 participants were involved with the project and were able to use their first language to express their input about issues connected with public place dwelling in Darwin. It needs to be emphasised that the data generated from 109 participants who were living in public places was provided from several contact meetings to allow the participant to feel comfortable with the discussion. Direct questioning was not appropriate for these participant groups and was avoided.

The first language researchers had varying degrees of written literacy in their first language and in English. However, as a group of eight Indigenous first language field researchers, six Indigenous research assistants combined with other Indigenous research team members with high levels of English literacy the process of back translation was possible. The process became more drawn out with a reliance on digital recordings from the field and at least two people involved in the back translation process; one in retelling the data orally in English with the other person typing in English. In retrospect this process worked well as it allowed for reflection of the day, and provided an opportunity to talk about methods and the evolving themes coming from the data.

Extremely rich data was collected and the process for back translation evolved to provide the thematic report in Part One, Section C.

B. What should research training involve and how should it occur?

Overview
The Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model did not include inbuilt processes for training. To test whether other language and cultural groups could use the Model it was essential to incorporate a training and capacity development phase to the Evaluation. However, considering another Evaluation objective of ‘developing a self sustaining consultancy business’ the research team considered trialling of building capability pathways for Indigenous first language researchers as critical.

An early assessment of the types of skills and knowledge required by the field researchers and the two senior Yolngu Matha researchers (who were recruited to train senior people from other nominated language groups about the Research and Consultation Model) suggested that researchers would need to be provided with a basic understanding of: action research, concept and purpose of evaluations, data integrity and research ethics. In addition, it was acknowledged that training to use technical equipment (digital recorders, computer and internet) would also be crucial for effectiveness in the field and maintaining good communication when researchers were back in their communities.

The delivery mode, context and content of training were trialled to establish a program suitable for future use as well as to meet the needs of the Evaluation. The
first training trialled a formal approach using a combination of units from the Customised Resource Management Certificate II Course (700099NT) coupled with sessions on the Yolngu Matha Research and Consultation Model. The following section of the report provides a summary of the challenges, and achievements associated with this formal training approach and how various training challenges were met. Suggestions for improvement to the processes are included in Part Three of this report. The discussion addresses the following process and impact measures:

1. **Language and cultural groups felt comfortable to engage and learn within the context of training approach**

2. **Able to demonstrate learning through effective implementation of the Model’s methods and production of English back-translation reports to the Project Manager**

**Discussion against the Evaluation Measures:**

**PROCESS MEASURE 1.**
Language and cultural groups felt comfortable to engage and learn within the context of training approach

As the assessment of training needs could not occur until first language researchers were recruited to the project, early thoughts around which training approach to use was informed by the needs of the two Yolngu Matha Researchers. Both researchers have had many years informal experience working on research projects and wanted to commence a process to gain some formal qualifications. Thus negotiations were undertaken to illicit in-kind support to run a formal Certificate 2 in Resource Management course. Considering the tasks of implementing the Model and providing professional development for the two Yolngu Matha Researchers the Certificate course comprised relevant units as described in Appendix 5.

The initial formal training approach (May 2005) included both Tiwi and Yolngu Matha Researchers and was conducted over a five day block period. Content was directly related to the collection of data and developing consent forms and information sheets relevant to the language and cultural group.

Delivery style was inclusive and interactive to provide concrete examples or to work through processes discussed. For example the discussion about the Model involved interactive class room sessions where cultural stories were exchanged to demonstrate the methods underpinning the Model. This first phase was backed up within a week by mentoring in the field by the two senior Yolngu Matha researchers. The ongoing mentoring and reflexive sessions were continual and additional professional development provided opportunistically. These opportunistic learnings occurred during everyday activities and other non-related interactions.

For the senior Yolngu Matha researchers and one Tiwi researcher, who had good English capabilities, the formal training to learn more about the Western approaches was well received. Not only did they complete and receive their Certificate II but they were also keen to gain further training in participatory action research, structuring research reports, and to gain heightened understanding of Western research principles. This process also provided further development for the Project Manager and Research Consultant.
With the growing skills of Yolngu Matha and Tiwi researchers the Burarra, Anindilyakwa and Kriol language and cultural groups were the next groups to receive training. For this introduction both Yolngu Matha and Tiwi researchers played important roles with the learning processes. Most of the session and mentoring was conducted in first language which provided important team building opportunities but also the ability for these new team members to commence in the field with close guidance within the first week. It was agreed that a whole week in a classroom was too long for most participants and that there needed to be a mixture of hands-on research practice as well as research theory.

For some of the field researchers who had limited English language skills, the formal approach seemed daunting. For these researchers a non-formal, field mentoring approach was implemented; this included the first day concentrating on arranging culturally appropriate informed consent paper work and gaining an overview of the Model. During the field work a process of checking, re-clarifying and retraining occurred to strengthen levels of understanding and skills. Following the first week of non-formal training there was frequent contact to maintain good rapport and an ongoing comfortable learning environment to engage within context.

It was noted that some might choose the non-formal pathway until their levels of confidence were higher before undertaking the formal approach. Some said they already had bad experiences with formal training and were not keen to go back there just yet.

As the project progressed, first language researchers continued to identify additional professional development needs that would improve their capacity to access future employment. Some of these development areas included: completing resumes, planning employment interests, forming linkages to other relevant community projects and assistance to complete work related to maintaining their standing in the Community.

External and internal circumstances were not conducive to members from the Murrinh-Patha language and cultural group to participate to the same degree. Alternative approaches to go through the existing Indigenous first language field researchers were employed to gain interviews in the field and via telephone with Community Elders.

IMPACT MEASURE 2.
Able to demonstrate learning through effective implementation of the Model’s methods and production of English back translation to the Project Manager

Excluding the Indigenous Project Manager and the Indigenous Consultant researcher, the eight Indigenous first language field researchers and six Indigenous first language research assistants were provided with mentoring and additional didactic instruction about the use of the Model, research ethics and use of a digital recorder. Three of the Indigenous researchers completed Certificate II in Resource Management (Refer to Appendix 5) that incorporated components such as: ICPMM63BA Access the Internet, RUHCORE6A Plan daily work routines; UAN016 Plan to Co-ordinate Resources; UDN003 Collect Data; UEL079 Understand the Legal Process; UEL097 Develop Understandings of Western Cultures.
To assess how effective the training and mentoring practices were each Indigenous first language researcher and research assistant was assessed against the criteria noted below. Assessment occurred through observations in the field, assessment of the quality of the interview data, reflexive sessions and interviews with the Project Manager.

**Assessment Criteria for testing effectiveness of the Training and Mentoring:**

**Criterion 1**  
Ability to confidently introduce the project and complete the informed ethics process.

**Criterion 2**  
Ability to conduct interview process using the semi-structured interview framework and record either digitally or in writing.

**Criterion 3**  
Ability to assist with the back translation of interviews into written English.

**Criterion 4**  
Demonstrated knowledge and practice to maintain security (confidentiality and privacy) of personal data obtained from research participants.

**Criterion 5**  
Ability to assist with the research translation process back to their Communities.

**The Assessment Scale comprised the following levels of:**
- Very proficient
- Proficient
- Capable
- Low competency
- Incompetent

In summary, two of the eight Indigenous first language researchers were very proficient and six were able to demonstrate that they were proficient across the range of skill and knowledge areas. For the Indigenous research assistants there were two assessed as proficient, three as having capable skills and two with low competency levels across the skill and knowledge areas.

**Suggestions for improvement to the Model**
- Incorporate various training / mentoring entry points and a formal training pathway for Indigenous first language researchers using the Model for research;

- The Formal and informal training should include a balance between praxis, reflexive sessions and didactic instruction;

- Limit the number of language groups to one at a time, per research training period; and

- The trainer(s) and mentor(s) should be qualified Certificate IV Training and Assessment Instructors or be experience researchers (with particular
skills working with Indigenous participants and in the field of qualitative research approaches).

Diagram 1: Suggested Training and Mentoring Pathways for the Improved Model

Each outer circle represents the various entry points while the top circle also provides a formal training pathway to having research skills and knowledge recognised.

C. Effectiveness of the Model to explore Indigenous itinerants’ issues in Darwin and Palmerston?

Overview

The Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (Maypilama et al, 2004) provided some important baseline information about the complex reasons why some Yolngu Matha language and cultural groups were living as Public Place Dwellers in the Greater Darwin area. This Report was the product of implementing Phase One of the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model (Hereafter referred to as: The Model). To assess whether the Model would be (a) appropriate for the investigation of other issues impacting on Indigenous peoples in the Top End region and (b) could be applied effectively by other language and cultural groups, the research team analysed the data collected from the Phase Two Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Project using the following impact measures:
1. Phase Two data produced information to an equivalent depth and breadth as that produced in the Phase One project 2004 Report *Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land*.

2. Model provides flexibility to accommodate the protocols and practices of language and cultural groups other than Yolngu Matha.

Following is a discussion of the findings against these two impact measures and an analysis comparing the varying areas of success and possible ways to improve *The Model*.

**Discussion against the Impact Measures:**

**IMPACT MEASURE 1.**
Phase Two data produced information to an equivalent depth and breadth as that produced in the Phase One project 2004 Report *Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land*.

This section overviews data from discussions (interviews and meetings), mainly involving people from Top End language and cultural groups including: Yolngu Matha, Tiwi and Burarra. The data also incorporates information provided from representatives of: Kriol, Anindilyakwa and Murrinh-Patha language and cultural groups.

Informants to the Project included: Indigenous peoples living a public place dwelling lifestyle in the Greater Darwin area; Elders and family members of Public Place Dwellers from remote Indigenous communities; family members of Public Place Dwellers from the Darwin area; Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples involved in service delivery involving Indigenous Public Place Dwellers in the Darwin area.

Where the data permits, reference will be made to specific issues common to separate language groups and where issues are identified as being generally common across language and community or clan groups, the discussion of issues will be collapsed into a more general overview.

Note: the term ‘long-grass’ is applied within the following discussion because it provides a shared term of reference understood by the many public place dwelling informants to this project. It is important to note, however, that the term is not universally accepted as appropriate and that there is considerable stigma attached to its application within and outside the Greater Darwin area. This is evidenced by local media reports equating ‘Aboriginal drunks’ with ‘long-grassers’ (see Appendix 1). During the conduct of this research an Aboriginal man questioned the use of the term as follows: ‘…long grass is place where snakes and kangaroos live, they shouldn’t call us this way.’ (Personal communication: anonymous Indigenous Informant, 8 March 2006)

In the following section, direct conversation quotes derived from discussions with research participants will be indicated with an ‘I’ for Informants and an ‘R’ for the Researcher.

The data is themed to demonstrate the scope and depth of the data collected and is presented under the following main headings:
Importance of Aboriginal language and culture; connections to land, song, dances, kinship, governance, sharing and caring.

Importance of valuing individual difference (behaviour, nature/disposition) whilst still valuing and maintaining respect for culture.

Evidence of developing erosion of cultural practice around relationships, and healthy living.

Family illness and the need to stay in Darwin for care management.

Not fitting in anymore due to loss of connection to family (death, unresolved issue(s) and running away from discipline action).

Importance of Aboriginal language and culture; connections to land, song, dances, kinship, governance, sharing and caring

Data provided by current remote community members will be discussed first in this section. This will be followed by insights from public place dwelling research participants from the Greater Darwin Area. The intention is to highlight some commonly reported tensions to demonstrate the level of complexity around issues including: (a) why some people leave their community to live in Darwin and (b) the range of reasons given for people deciding to stay in Darwin or wanting to return to their community. A particular focus will be the identification of challenges or perceived barriers confronted by people returning to their home communities.

Interviews with Elders and other Indigenous community members from remote communities revealed an overwhelming sense of sadness and loss about those who had left their community to live elsewhere, especially those who were currently living an itinerant lifestyle in the Greater Darwin area. For example, two Yolŋu Elders commented that: ‘…When people leave the community they leave with Yolŋu values and identity…carry in their mind and heart what they have learnt from Yolŋu and how they have grown up…How they have been related to other Yolŋu from different communities.’

Some informants expressed grief about the absence of people from their community and a strong sense of wanting to help them return home. Aboriginal informants from remote communities repeatedly suggested that their relatives currently living a long-grass lifestyle in the Darwin area should return home. Concern about the physical health and welfare of family members was often raised, and many people stressed the importance of their relatives returning home to maintain important cultural traditions, to strengthen family ties and to heal the spirit. One informant expressed the view that some long-grass people invent so-called ‘problems’ in home communities as a way of justifying their decision to stay in Darwin.

One participating community focussed on preparations that should be made for returnees from the long grass in Darwin. An informant expressed the view that:

_We need to clean up our own backyard before we bring people back home. There need to be activities for people returning to X, these activities need funding._

The same informant also suggested that a vehicle could be hired to take returnees out to outstations or hunting places to camp for two week periods. During this time
people could join in activities such as eating bush tucker/medicine and hunting for crayfish, oyster, fish, crab, mussel, kangaroo and geese. It was also suggested that Drugs and alcohol should not be allowed, that food should be provided to make them strong, exercise should be encouraged to reinvigorate them and that it is important to ‘talk to them to help them heal the spirit and the body.’ According to the informant, the local health centre also needs to be involved in the re-integration process to deal with ‘fits’ and other detoxification issues.

A number of community members also stressed the importance of taking account of the social and emotional (healing) needs of people returning home from Darwin before steps are taken to help people recover from drug and alcohol addiction. Many of the Communities reportedly do not have infrastructure and human resources to provide services such as detoxification programs. The lack of infrastructure and support to provide rehabilitation programs emerged as a strong and continuing message throughout the research process. The importance of nurturing and helping people through the ‘returning home’ process was also commonly emphasised.

A suggestion was made by one community-based elder for the development of a training school for the education of those who had ‘…been on the drugs for a long time.’ This same informant enquired about how ‘we get rupee from government to sort out this problem’.

An informant (originally from a remote community and now employed in Darwin) linked the problem of inadequate employment options for young people in home communities with their decision to drift toward Darwin. He explained that:

…with the CDEP projects and when the funding runs out it disheartens them. When I was young kid the old people they were on CDEP and twenty years on and I go back there and they are still on CDEP. I can't understand that, it is very sad.

Another community informant pointed out that ‘…people are turning to kava as alcohol is not allowed in the community. But kava is not a traditional Aboriginal drink and shouldn’t be allowed.’

The problem of ‘missing grog’ was mentioned by an informant as a reason for not returning to his home community:

R: Can you go back home to X?
I: don't know, otherwise I might think of beer, and wine.

Other informants were less specific about their reasons for not wanting to return home and suggested reasons such as ‘… I don't like going back…It's too boring.’

Summary:
Several informants who were members of participating communities strongly suggested that they had some understanding of why many younger people might choose to go to Darwin. Informants suggested that with little opportunity for jobs and training in their home communities, the younger people do not currently see a great future other than working for CDEP. For some children who might have undertaken secondary training or Vocational Education in School, there might be a desire to find work in Darwin or other towns like Katherine. Other informants pointed to the situation where some individuals requiring a greater in-take of alcohol or other
substances than was available to them in remote communities. Many of the communities considered within this Report do not have adequate infrastructure and human resources to provide services such as detoxification programs. With many communities now restricting availability times and amounts of alcohol for purchase, those who are alcohol addicted are reportedly finding the measures too hard. Many of these people who go into town have been ‘...raised in their culture...’ and participant interviews supported the argument that ‘they still remember’; few Public Place Dwellers in the Greater Darwin area reported that they would never go back to their communities while others confided that they will go home ‘when they are ready.’

**Importance of valuing individual difference (behaviour, nature/disposition) whilst still valuing and maintaining respect for culture.**

The importance of valuing individual difference (behaviour, nature/disposition) whilst still valuing and maintaining respect for culture, has several dimensions. Firstly, the appreciation and valuing of peoples difference and secondly the need to not only value one's own culture but the cultures of those around you. This sentiment was expressed by a Yolngu Elder as follows:

> ...they have learnt so much from the Yolngu way and some do not want to mix in too much with the Western practice or way of living. Because of alcohol giving more courage to be confident they can talk freely with other cultures and mix in with other cultures; too shame, it lowers inhibitions. There are Yolngu values that are not being recognised in the urban centre and the Yolngu not understanding or knowing the Western values in the urban centre. When Balanda go to remote communities they are bringing their own values without understanding and respecting Yolngu values that are there.

The sentiments expressed by the Elder in the quote above, are further emphasised in the following section. The discussion is grouped under headings including: Attitudes and motivations of Public Place Dwellers; Government changes; Accommodation; Culture to draw out the nuances under this general theme of respecting and valuing difference and culture.

- **Attitudes and motivations of public place dwelling people**

Public Place Dwellers expressed widely varying views about their level of satisfaction at living in the long grass in the Darwin area. Some people reported being very happy in their current situation and expressed no intention of returning to their home communities. Other people were clearly dissatisfied and sad, but not sure what to do about their situation. A small group registered indifference to their situation.

It was common for informants to refer to unresolved ‘problems’ they had back in their home communities, but not being willing to elaborate on the nature of problems preventing their return.

In a discussion about whether one informant missed his family back in his home community he replied as follows:

> R: Do you miss your family like Mother, father grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother and uncle etc.  
> I: Me, myself I think about my family but I have problems
An Indigenous first language field researcher reported that a number of people from one language group were happy living a long-grass lifestyle in Darwin. In their view, ‘They didn’t have problems going back to Community for ceremony/funeral. But they didn’t want to stay there.’ It was also common for people to refer to the feeling of freedom gained by living a public place dwelling lifestyle. Freedom from family pressures was also cited as a reason to stay in Darwin. After talking with a number of public place dwelling people a researcher summarised their position as follows:

Life in Darwin is freer – no ear bashing. Can do what ever they want and go wherever. Not just family but community Elders. Not just because they were drinking- also just family /community pressure.

Some informants pointed to some specific advantages of living a long-grass lifestyle. These included: no stress about paying electricity bills or rent and it gave them the chance to live as their ancestors lived before them. Access to health services was also cited as a positive side of living in Darwin when compared to living in home communities. For example, an informant posed the following question:

‘…Why go home where there is no medical treatment when you go back to XX?’

When asked by a researcher to talk about her home, one participant responded:

You haven’t got a home. They tell me well, I’m a long-grass person I want to live where I really want to. I really don’t care if I die in long-grass it doesn’t worry me.

■ Government changes

The recent changes (in September 2006) to public place drinking in Alice Springs, Katherine and Darwin were common topic of discussion with some of the Elders from various participating communities. One Elder suggested that:

This change will affect everyone non-Indigenous and Indigenous and people will need to drink alcohol either in a licensed bar or at home. People caught drinking alcohol in public places will be fined… Yes Indigenous and non-Indigenous they won’t like it but they have to give it a fair go. This is doing it properly.

Another Elder felt that there needed to be more reforms such as;

…an order that people not allow to live in long-grass has to come from top man. They (long-grassers) won’t listen to me. They listen, then when I walk away, they forget about you and me. Has to be a law at government law carried out by Darwin City Council? We can only take to that person to tell them that this is an order from government.

Another community Elder thought that a more effective model would be to re-engage people with their culture to:

‘…be doing it with other people. Storyline, song line, hunting and collecting. Action should be doing.’
Many informants living a long grass lifestyle explained how they are moved on from public places when there are special events being held in Darwin. This commentary links to other research and commentary that indicates policies on public place dwelling commonly take into account the negative impacts of homeless people on the tourism trade or local business activity. (Refer to Appendix 1)

Some key informants provided the following insights;

In Cairns the same thing happens they move people that live on the street on for political and economic reasons. They move them on to places that no one wants to live where there is dengue fever.

They (Darwin City Council) have removed chairs at Casuarina shopping centre and from the airports and parks so that long-grassers can’t gather. We want to light fires to cook chops, once at Waratah Oval a group of us lit a fire and people from the DCC came and fined us $50.00.

- **Accommodation**

Information from participants regarding accommodation concurs with the data reported in the Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (Maypilama et al 2004). Basically, it is reported that it is difficult for people from a low socioeconomic group to obtain affordable and safe accommodation in the Darwin area. Many people with children who are Public Place Dwellers and who are not heavy drinkers do not have many safe accommodation options.

Usage of the Intervention and Referral Office, Larrakia Nation to access available and affordable accommodation for Aboriginal Peoples coming into Darwin and Palmerston are noted in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Average length of stay and cost during April and May 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ave. Length of stay (days)</th>
<th>Ave. daily cost</th>
<th>April 2006</th>
<th>May 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Outreach</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>$24.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Yamirr Hostel</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>$25.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galawu Hostel</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>$21.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knuckey’s Lagoon Village</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>$6.79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Smith Guest House</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>$17.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Roberts Hostel</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>$24.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Centre</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$16.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>$16.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Table information is extrapolated from Data from the Larrakia Nation “Itinerants” Project April and May 2006 Monthly Statistical Reports for Darwin and Palmerston
Several Key Informants from service delivery agencies based in Darwin advised that referrals to accommodation sites were undertaken in accordance with agreement with the management looking after the sites. For example, St Vinnies and Salvation Army offer breakfast and lunch. Sunrise is for single men only and they offer lunch and dinner. Knuckey’s Lagoon is mainly for men, and those couples that are heavy into drinking. Women and children generally are not referred to this site. Ross Smith Guest House is for single men; however they do not provide food. Both the Christian Outreach and Silas Roberts Hostel are for women and children and provide food.

In summary, from Table 2 it appears that people stay between 11 to 12 days in accommodation with financial assistance from Centrelink. The average cost to the individual on a daily basis is around $19 to $20 ($240 for 12 days). Some of the research participants raised issues about the need to buy presents for the family, to buy food and alcohol or to give money to family members. They talked about the amount of money from Centrelink and how they could not stay in accommodation for very long. Living under the stars does become a better option when you do not have much money and when the available options are unclean. As indicated in the table most referrals in this time period is to Knuckey’s Lagoon Village but it is not clear whether the referral is made based on a need to drink or whether it is based on financial reasons; as it is also the cheapest place to stay. However, this cheaper option is not a safe alternative for women and children due to the high levels of drinking at this site.

Sometimes there is good reason for people to stay longer in Darwin - such as a sick relative who is in hospital or on dialysis or who has another chronic disease that requires close care management. Participants indicated that is important to be with their family. When they have exhausted their money on hostels or have been requested to leave due to disturbances, the only other option is to live with others in public places. Sometimes people have other relatives with a housing commission house but if there are disturbances reported there is a high likelihood that the family member will lose the house. Recent (July, 2006) Northern Territory Anti-social Behaviour legislation provides powers to Territory Housing Managers to work with tenants who have had a complaint made about them by a neighbour. There is potential for the tenant to agree to the premises being deemed as a ‘dry house’ or alcohol free zone. This has only been in operation for a short time and it is difficult to comment on social implications at this stage.

Culture
 Discussions between the first language field researchers and participants all touched on the topic of the importance of culture and continuing to observe obligations. There were also comments around the need to respect and live by the cultural protocols of the Larrakia Nation People as well as the culture and laws of the government in the Greater Darwin area. Following is a sample of some of the comments by participants.

I still follow my culture; I go to market and make up songs.
R. What about funerals?
I. I go.

R. What about funerals and ceremonies at X?
I (a) There’s no money to fly and no truck to go by overland
I (b) Other people let us know about it.
I (c) Sometimes when we call the community council they let us know when something special is on

Sleeping in public and begging not Yolngu culture

Move from one place to another because of ROM [Aboriginal Law]
...it is family protocol to ask for money it is not seen as humbugging.

...because my families don’t want me around. They only use me to sing songs for ceremonies and other Yolngu activities.

Summary:
This section emphasises the urgent challenges for people living in public places. Some are caught up in the ‘alcohol way of living’ while some are aware of improved access to a range of services (like health) whilst they live in town. Ironically, the Public Place Dwellers do not see that they are a ‘problem’ but the subtle shifts in the official government ‘community harmony urban strategies’ to deal with Public Place Dwellers indicate a shift from social approaches more towards law and order remedies. Community members recognise there is a problem for their people to live in ways that do not respect Larrakia Nation Protocols and the Western way of living in Greater Darwin. They fear for the safety of family living as Public Place Dwellers in Darwin. Community members have also clearly stated the severe lack of necessary infrastructure to help people to detoxify and provide opportunities for an economic future in their communities.

Evidence of developing erosion of cultural practice around relationships, and healthy living.

The first language field researchers noted that there was a high level of concern raised by informants about issues relating to the erosion of cultural practices as these applied to relationships and healthy living. Cultural rules around relationships and living a healthy lifestyle are seen as critically important for the survival of the Indigenous communities. To witness the erosion of long-held practices through for example, wrong way marriages, no commitment to relationships (marriage) and Gurrutu (kinship), was reported as being very disturbing. The daily reality of life for Indigenous Public Place Dwellers (including the application of cultural practices) has not been subject to detailed research and remains under-reported in the literature. It is commonly proposed, however, that the social structures governing the lives of Indigenous Public Place Dwellers are both complex and highly structured (Tomlinson, 2005; Spencer, 2005; Day, 2001; Langton, 1997; Sansom, 1980). Reporting on research he conducted in Aboriginal fringe camps in the Darwin area during the 1970’s, Tomlinson (2005) observed that:

…there is very much a sense of our place shared by the people in each camp and that there is a structure and system of rules which control activities in the camp.
(Tomlinson, 2005)

To provide a level of understanding about the social organisation and cultural practices associated with a long-grass or public place dwelling lifestyle, data from informants is reported under key headings as follows: social organisation and daily life patterns, alcohol addictions, relationships and, religion and culture.
Social organisation and daily life patterns

Interviews and observations revealed a widely variable profile of the public place dwelling population. Project researchers noted the small number of children living this lifestyle in Darwin and some informants speculated that the children were ‘back in the community with family’. An Aboriginal man from another state who was living in the long grass reported that he had met 8-10 other people (like himself) in the long-grass who had formal education qualifications.

Some discussion about the relationship with and roles of the Police and the Night Patrol resulted in comments such as:

…Police drove up to look around. They just come to warn people not to fight or make noise. They only take trouble makers away to sober up. These people come back in the morning. The Night Patrol come and ask questions about health and if there are any worries. The Night Patrol will arrange for the Danila Dilba bus to collect people for medical assistance. Other contact sometimes made for help with Centrelink payments.

There is no apparent leadership structure within the extended long-grass community. An informant explained that:

Each day it is very different….Always different groups hanging around with each other and the leaders change… I know there is lot of Aboriginal people living long-grass and they actually all walk around in groups as a collection of people and if you sit down and talk to them maybe he can actually translate it back to his people

The issue of ‘different groups hanging around with each other’ was explored by researchers who asked specific questions about the extent of interaction between people originating from different locations. Some of the responses were as follows:

Like all different Clans and different skin groups and stuff walk around together…we don’t get people from one language group like X, so there would be people from lots of other places all together…

People from different communities, language groups and different age groups are all together.

In response to questions about the extent of sharing of financial and other resources, there was a consensus response from participants that resources, were generally shared where possible. It was unclear, however, the extent of this sharing across language and clan groups or whether responsibilities for clan folk directed sharing patterns. A key informant described a process to share resources as follows:

‘…One boy put his shirt on the floor and everyone put what money they had on the shirt. This money is used to buy grog. This happened when people were not feeling well and had the shakes. Everything is shared.’

In contrast, a minority of respondents offered a different view of ‘sharing’ that reflected a greater degree of autonomy or self-reliance. A different approach to spending patterns is indicated in the following responses from Public Place Dwellers. In this instance the informants were asked how they spent/organised their money:
a. I buy little food and 1 box of coolibah for myself
b. Sometimes I buy shirt and top and dress for me
c. Some of us save money in the bank
d. Me, I sometimes waste money all for grog

When it rains in Darwin most informants reported that they shelter in shopping centres, toilet blocks and at relatives and friends houses in places such as Kulaluk and Bagot.

- Alcohol addiction

The issue of alcohol dependence was raised many times by informants who identified access to alcohol as a common reason why people opted to live in public places in the Greater Darwin area.

One Community-based informant put forward the following perspective:

‘…long-grass people still the same. They say they don’t want to go back because of their problem but I think that’s just an excuse and we have no liquor on island. Pretty hard to stop a person from going to the club…He is an alcoholic he wants to live in Darwin not only that because they smoking (gunja) too. It is very hard when person goes back to X he got to have that thing daily.’

Some other informants indicated that they felt that alcohol should only be available from the pubs and restaurants. That it can be used at home but there should be restrictions on the amount that people can buy to take home. An informant argued that:

‘…Government to think about wives and children, wives trying to get children to school.’

Some community members noted that they have put alcohol restrictions in place and suggest that:

‘… this is why a lot of people come into Darwin.’

When another informant expressed the view that ‘…I’d rather die drinking lot of alcohol…’ rather than going home, the Yolngu field researcher commented that ‘…X is depressed and he needs help from members of the extended family.’

A community informant expressed concern that the news (TV and paper) only targets the Aboriginal long-grass people not other long-grass people and not other people who drink and make noise in their homes, at parties and in pubs. She stated that:

…Sleeping in public and begging is not good and we want Balanda people to think that we are different. We have pride and this is not Yolngu culture. When you drink in public that means you got no respect for this land and for people…bring shame to Balanda and Aboriginal people too. I don’t do balanda stuff its good for them but not me.

When the question ‘what makes you happy’ was explored with Public Place Dwellers, some informants noted that;
‘…Alcohol/grog when we drink, we are happy…Everyone drinking around us is safe, telling history stories and sharing together make us happy.’

‘…When people start drinking they forget everything. Sometimes, when they drunk they might talk about what hurt they have inside. When people are not drinking the hurt is bad and people do not want to talk about it. When they talk about the hurt they get really angry.’

Some Indigenous first language field researchers queried the personal life choices of informants in statements such as;

‘…it’s up to you to stop drinking and doing what you are doing, to get a more good life, you already lost your kids, your wife is gone and your kids are all grown up, you don’t really know who they are.’

### Relationships

Many of the informants (who were Public Place Dwellers) noted that they missed their family and a few indicated that they felt that their family was not missing them. For example, a male informant stated that:

‘…Yes, me nobody loves me’

Some informants (who were Public Place Dwellers) were happy to discuss their relationships. In this context, a male informant spoke of the problem of domestic violence as follows;

‘…Sometimes I fight my girlfriend I hit her and other (drunks) family help separate us till we cool down.’

Other informants referred to short term relationships, where people come into Darwin for several months, form a relationship and then leave again. An informant felt this was a problem as;

…they leave one or two months and they separated. He goes with another women and his wife go with another man. That situation is really hard for their children, and they (the children) ask, where’s my mother and father? And people tell them their mother does not live with their father, they are separated. It’s happened three times this year so they don’t live together anymore.

Another informant described the situation as follows:

Not thinking about the rest of their family? How does this fit in when they marry white skins in Darwin? Here in Darwin when we see other people’s men of different culture altogether. Man can go that way and women can go that other way. Can’t do that with own countryman because we already got mixed law at X and X, doesn’t appreciate where they live whether sister to cousin to daughter; they go anywhere … they are destroying ancestry. Destroying their culture, they haven’t done it but their leaders here done it. So they still carry on.
Religion and Culture

‘Galka’ is a term that refers to a belief system that some commentators have referred to as being about ‘the politics of control through sorcery’ (Maypilama et al, 2004). In a detailed discussion of the role of ‘Galka’ in the lives of Yolngu, an Informant explained that;

Many people believe those in powerful positions abuse their authority through using threats and accusations of sorcery, and failure to thoroughly investigate and disclose the reasons for deaths. Innocent people can be afraid of being giving ‘contracts’ (gorrwuma) for the death of others with the threat of their own ensorcellement if they fail to comply with orders. This fear of being contracted to kill is given as a reason for people choosing to live in Darwin. This works in two ways: Some are threatened with sorcery if they do not use violence against others. Others are threatened with violence if they don't use sorcery against others. The fear of sorcery also impacts on innocent people who are called to account for their behaviour in contexts surrounding untimely deaths. To be a witness to any accompanying behaviours always brings a threat of implication in the murder. People are not as afraid of galka’ when living outside the main settlement, because people can hear a vehicle coming before it arrives, and so know who is around and what they are doing. Much of the galka’ business in large settlements is about the politics of control.

Another Informant stated that there are:

‘...Lots of mosquitoes (describing young people doing the work of galka’ as mosquitoes - blood suckers, draining - blood and life)...The young people... all of them are too clever, all the kids. The young people have taken over galka’ business... The old people are sending the young ones (to do galka’ business). Yes, that’s true (now there are) too many galka’.

Informants also pointed out that they might not agree with directions and decisions being made in their communities, but they have no power and feel alienated. They do not feel safe and prefer to move to Darwin. A small number of informants talked openly about the role Galka had to play in the decision they made to live in Darwin and away from their home community. In contrast, others prefer not to talk about Galka and instead ‘...Lots of people say it’s about alcohol.’

Another side to the ‘not wanting to return to home community’ discussion notes one informant explaining that:

‘...I'm in Darwin because every time I go back to the community . The people back there say that I'm a Galka and people start insulting me.’

The situation surrounding the role of ‘Galka’ in people’s lives is complex. This complexity was referred to by one Elder as follows:

‘...can't do action without help, if he starts doing action by himself he might get blamed if someone dies.’

Some of the participating communities have experienced varying degrees of influence from Western religions. One of the key community informants (who is
connected to the local church) provided the following comments to explain about Galka.

…you know about this galka business for me I don't believe it. Linking now stronger and stronger because marijuana affects their body. I don't believe it myself, it’s nothing really except a lot of imagination, seeing things. They say that old people use to do this but I don't believe this. Aboriginal people in those days and until now from not looking after our soul, body, especially our heart and we take too many drugs and our body is sick and that’s a galka…I never seen anything like that all my life healing people anything like that.

When people talk about galka – Galka it means people die, someone galka(ed) that person. They killed that person. It’s hard to say. I grew up with Aboriginal people and lived in places like…and I never see such things myself and maybe it’s very hard. We got to blame anything when somebody dies I got to get the blame. Our people just running away even though I think they won’t tell you, I think they can’t tell you. What it’s all about just message from wrong time till today. They gone back and people believe like something like a bible story, back in history about old times from Old Testament and New Testament.

Summary:
While substance misuse allows some Public Place Dwellers to forget their ‘worries’ it is suggested by community stakeholders that this diminishes their judgements about; respectful relationships; remembering their own culture and, obligation to respect others’ culture. It appears that this issue along with sorcery (Galka) fears creates a desire by some individuals to continue to live away from the community.

Commenting on the social organisation of Public Place Dwellers in the Darwin area, Tomlinson (2005) reported that there was ‘…a sense of our place shared by the people in each camp and that there is a structure and system of rules which control activities in the camp.’ Participant data collected as part of this current Report did not clearly support Tomlinson’s observations. Responses such as: ‘… Each day it is very different….Always different groups hanging around with each other and the leaders change’ indicates an absence of social organisation among Public Place Dwellers or a sense of changing social organisation depending on situations. This finding is also different to the data collected in the Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (Maypilama, 2004), which indicated a degree of social organisation. This raises questions about whether there is a shift occurring in the way Indigenous Public Place Dwellers are currently living and relating to each other in the Darwin area. It might also mean that the informants who provided information for this report were going through a time of readjustment or that movement cycles between home communities and Darwin are changing and having an impact on local patterns of social organisation.

Family illness and the need to stay in Darwin for health care management.

Not all communities in the Top End of the Northern Territory have well resourced comprehensive primary care services that are able to provide the required health care management of some chronic illnesses. People from some participating communities expressed the view that the availability of health services results in the creation of tensions over whether extended family members should travel to Darwin to support relatives who are undergoing necessary medical treatment. Firstly, sick people who need to temporarily relocate to the Greater Darwin area for medical
Family Care and illness

Some informants reported that their reason for being in Darwin was to support sick relatives. A common story was reported as follows:

‘…Been in Darwin for about a year or two because Aunty X is a renal patient…Why go home where there is no medical treatment when you go back to XX.’

Another Community Elder reported that he had just come back into Darwin after dropping people off at X and X. He said that he paid out of his own pocket but he felt happy he had done that as ‘…he had lost fingers but now fingers are whole.’

Another informant said he was having health problems so he decided to come to Darwin but added that:

‘…my reason for being here is to get back my son (to X). The day I came in I looked for him and took him out from long-grass and he is staying with me in a good shelter.’

The problem of insufficient funds to maintain a supporting role for sick relatives while living in Darwin was also mentioned by a number of informants. A male informant who reportedly came to Darwin to visit his mother and his wife who were both receiving treatment for renal problems, gave the following account of how his money was spent and how this impacts on his decision to move to the long-grass periodically:

When I come into Darwin I sleeping in the long-grass because my mother hasn’t got enough room for me at the place where she is staying and I don’t have enough money to pay for place to stay… My mother is staying in house in Rapid Creek with cousin’s sisters and my wife is staying at Christian Outreach and she is paying $40 per night out of her money to stay there. When I come in I have a small amount of money for the hostel which is about $20 per night. It works out to be $240.00 for two week’s accommodation and we only get $300 or $400 unemployment benefit. Some of the money is given to our children. We go out to drink and when we come if we make too much noise at the hostel they kicked us out. When our money runs out we move to the long-grass and that’s when we get stuck.

Not fitting in anymore due to loss of connection to family (eg. death, unresolved issue(s) and running away from cultural discipline)

This section will consider data about movement between communities and the Greater Darwin area and the difficulties people encounter when they no longer see a place for themselves in their home communities. Interestingly, a few informants also expressed a sense of not fitting in with City life whilst a core group of Public Place Dwellers felt they were happy and did not recognise that there was a ‘problem’.
These issues are discussed under the headings of: Mobility between Darwin and home communities; Transition from community-life to town-life; and, Length of time living in public places.

- **Mobility between the Greater Darwin area and home communities**
  The extent of movement by Public Place Dwellers between Darwin and their home communities is difficult to track. Informants regularly suggested that they planned to return home ‘soon’ but a time frame for return was not stated. Answers provided during discussions about the intention of informants to return home included for example:

  *I sleep at long-grass X with other group of Yolngu from X and X. We live there sometimes, sometimes I stay at X two-three weeks then I go back to my mother’s house….So don’t you worry I won’t be here a long time.*

An Indigenous man and Darwin-based service provider involved with the extended Indigenous long-grass community, expressed frustration at the regular turnover of people from remote communities to the Darwin area as follows:

*The problem is re-occurring as new people come to Darwin while old people (long-grassers) go back to community.*

Another informant indicated that while long-grass people are supported to return to their home communities, they sometimes return to Darwin soon after. In one reported instance there were two plane loads of people who returned to X and then went back to Darwin soon after. On this particular occasion the reason for returning home related to attendance for a cultural ceremony.

Statistics supplied by the Larrakia Nation on the supported return of individuals from Darwin to home communities for the last two months prior to the conclusion of the Project’s field work is represented in the following graphs. This data is utilised merely to indicate potential of the current data collected as well as some of the areas that require further follow up work. For example, Larrakia Nation is providing an important social and emotional, and economic service in a culturally competent manner in assisting people to return home for funerals, or to gain assistance to return home permanently. However, there is only data on the movement in one direction (Darwin to home communities). If Larrakia Nation were able to track movements of people from remote communities to the Greater Darwin area, the organisation might be better placed to plan for services and provide timely advice to the Government to meet the predicted growing needs. In addition, information about the needs of itinerant people and their motivation for living in Darwin would provide a more comprehensive picture of the current situation and trends.
NOTE: This Graph is based on Data from the Larrakia Nation “Itinerants” Project April and May 2006 Monthly Statistical Reports for Darwin and Palmerston.

For the two months (April-May 2006) there appears to be a higher rate of Burarra, Tiwi and Anindilyakwa people who returned to home communities. There are more questions raised from this information than answers. For example: Are these the same people returning to Darwin after a short time; Did they go back to fulfil cultural obligations such as sorry business; Are there seasonal trends to mobility rates?

Participant data indicated that people from across language and cultural groups come to Darwin for short stays of several months as a holiday break from their Community. Other people indicated a choice to live in Darwin and that ‘living under the stars is a good life-style choice’. A few participants spoke of a recognised trend for older people who had been living in public places in Darwin going back to their Community to live out their remaining years but that there is still a greater number of people between the years of 18 to 40 coming into Darwin (refer to Graph 2 below).
Graph 2: Summary of Public Place Dwellers Returning to Community by Age April to May 2006

Summary Public Place Dwellers Returning to Community by Age April to May 2006

NOTE: This Graph is based on Data from the Larrakia Nation “Itinerants” Project April and May 2006 Monthly Statistical Reports for Darwin and Palmerston.

Graph 3: Summary of Public Place Dwellers Returning to Community by Gender April to May 2006

Summary Public Place Dwellers Returning to Community by Gender April to May 2006

NOTE: This Graph is based on Data from the Larrakia Nation “Itinerants” Project April and May 2006 Monthly Statistical Reports for Darwin and Palmerston.
The graph depicts an even distribution - based on gender - of people returning to home communities. The number of people under 18 years of age formally reported through this process was not significant.

The participant data collected for this Report, however, indicated that a small number of children moved between the Greater Darwin area and home communities. For short periods, some of these children lived in public places in Darwin. Other children were reported to be in the care of relatives who had secure and safe housing commission homes in Darwin or had been sent back to communities to be cared for by relatives.

- Transition from community-life to town-life (Why do people have problems in town/ What are the problems)

A relative of some Public Place Dwellers from X community (who owns a house in Darwin) explained the problems experienced by his countrymen as a problem of adaptation to white society:

... they are only human beings like us but they don't understand white man's society cos they're not use to living in this society cos it very difficult society to live in because got to adapt to different changes and changes are very difficult at heart to understand.

I think one way of doing that is talking straight; tell them they have to find way to live in proper home, but people still making excuse. They have plenty of time to get a house to go and see housing commission to ask permission to get a house. There is no other way. That's the only thing I see that we should be talking to them about. A lot of them long-grassers lost their families especially their children.

Tolerance and responsibility (expressed in terms of looking after kin and sharing resources) characterised the response of several Darwin-based Indigenous people to the accommodation they provided on occasion to relatives from out of town (who also occasionally lived a long-grass lifestyle). This attitude was summed up by an informant as follows:

We're happy to see them and they are happy to see us... Sometimes we can get up to ten people we don't complain we're happy to see them and they are happy to see us.

In contrast, Elders from home communities indicated an overall lesser tolerance of the decision by family members to stay in Darwin and to live a long-grass lifestyle. The autonomy of individuals to make personal decisions is obviously respected, but not necessarily condoned by a community elder who described his position on kin who were living a long-grass lifestyle in Darwin as follows:

We always tell them it's their problem and they try and give us their problem but we tell them that it is their problem. We give them back their problem, that person has to decide that himself. And no-one force him and no-one trying to stop him, that's his life. We always talking to those young people, they not listening to the Elders and their family, what will happen? You die and family don't think about you. You die and die...it's up to you to stop drinking and doing what you are doing, to get a more good life, you already lost your kids,
your wife is gone and your kids are all grown up, you don’t really know who they are… don’t do balanda stuff its good for them but not me.

Some Elders from communities indicated why it is important for people to remember cultural practices and how important it is for Elders across language and cultural groups to provide leadership. However, some informants noted that some members of the younger generation are ‘not listening’ and acting upon advice from Elders. These issues are explained by one Elder as follows;

… What is really causing this problem they go dreamtime but they’re (dreamtime) did wrong thing, the people in those days - the leaders shouldn’t take it. They should have been thinking about the future involving ceremony. If the person (if that kid) is not right for ceremony or person not grown up, they will not end up with Duhwhi or Yiddhia ceremony…Something like that but we need to see leaders from other places, to share this because they have to tell us about that area. We can always tell our area too…What we should look into the older leaders, people with grey hairs….We are leaders but we need somebody, someone to be more of a leader than us. That does that rule. That’s what I strongly believe. If questions come back to leaders and why we don’t do this and that and we just enjoying ourselves, we tell them it just that he’s more leader than us. He’s protecting us.

R: Which leader are you referring to? Mal Brough?
I: The government, yes.

The role of support services such as the Night Patrol was also referred to during interviews with informants. For example, a Public Place Dweller considered that the Police and the Night Patrol people are helpful because:

‘…Night patrol is the big help, they check Indigenous people now and then…and Police only come and get us to take us to sobering centre, where people there treat us good.’

- Long-Grass population statistics and length of time in public places

There is only sparse data to indicate the number of Indigenous Public Place Dwellers and the length of time individuals stay in public places around the Greater Darwin areas. Estimates of the number of ‘itinerant’ Indigenous people residing in the Greater Darwin area vary, although there is a view that this number is on the increase and that the total number is subject to seasonal variation (Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 6). According to the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model Project proposal (2003), Indigenous ‘itinerants’ in the Darwin and Palmerston area currently number between 200 and 700 people at any one time (2003, p.5). Christie and Greatorex (2003) report that on any night there are up to 1,000 people sleeping under the stars in the Darwin area and that the number of Yolngu in this group fluctuates between 50 and 300. In a survey they conducted in the Darwin area in early 2001, Memmott and Fantin (2001) reported that 150-200 Indigenous ‘itinerants’ could be classified as ‘sleeping out’ but that this figure transformed overnight and from month to month as short-term itinerants came and went. The authors pointed out that this figure did not include visitors to town who stay with other Aboriginal rental tenants and further noted that:

Other agencies have at times made much higher estimates. But these may include, in addition to the core groups of individuals who sleep out overnight, those permanent town residents and their visitors who go into parks and semi-
bush areas to drink either for comradeship or because such behaviour is unacceptable in their community flats and houses.  
(Memmott and Fantin, 2001, p. 6)

1996 census statistics showed that the Northern Territory had by far the greatest rate of homelessness on a per capita basis in Australia, being 523.1 people per 10 000 people compared to the lowest rate in Victoria with 41.0 per 10 000. The census also revealed that 89% of the homeless people in the Northern Territory were Indigenous (Goldie, 2002b p.1).

Lack of agreement over actual numbers of Indigenous public place dwellers and who should be defined as ‘itinerant’, plays out in public debates in the Northern Territory.

Some informants said that they were aware of a group of people who had been in Darwin living in public places for around twenty years and that these people were ‘…more in tune with Darwin than Community.’ It was further reported that some of these previously known long-term Public Place Dwellers are currently living successfully in public housing.

Other informants spoke of groups who have been in Darwin for three to seven years. It appeared from the data that there were also those people who were in Darwin for shorter times ranging from months to a year. These shorter periods (several months) were sometimes described as ‘holidays’ from their community.

**Summary:**
Remote Indigenous community members reported that there is a need to: build infrastructure; appropriate detoxification services; and, develop employment opportunities to help meet the growing needs of the younger generations. However, there does appear to be a growing tension between generations about the importance of continuing some forms of cultural practice along with staying on country to look after self and the community holistically. The movement of people from remote communities into urban centres in the Northern Territory such as Darwin has not apparently been planned for by Government. Some informants to this Report expressed concern that this movement is not necessarily welcomed. This view is commonly based on the reported lack of Government willingness to fund programs to integrate Indigenous people into housing and employment in the Greater Darwin area in respectful ways.

A number of complex social and cultural issues were raised by both Indigenous community and public place dwelling informants to this Report. This data has corroborated the findings of the *Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report* (Maypilama et al, 2004). This Report pointed to the importance of supporting Yolngu lifestyle choices that are respectful of cultural responsibilities. New information gathered from language and cultural groups not previously interviewed by Maypilama and her colleagues, indicate some similarity in the range of issues impacting on the choices made by Indigenous public place dwellers in the Greater Darwin area.

In an earlier Report involving Indigenous Public place dwellers in the Greater Darwin area, Memmott et al (2004) suggested that researchers have concentrated mainly on *why* Indigenous people have moved from rural and remote locations to urban areas and less on understanding *where* they really want to be. On the basis of this finding, they posed some questions to fill this gap in understanding as follows:

*Do people want to move?*
Where do people want to move?
Who wants to move?
Who wants to stay?
How do people want to move?
What effects will these future movements have on source areas, destination areas, and other places in between?
(Memmott et al 2004, p. 7)

These questions raised by Memmott were canvassed during interviews for this current Report. In some cases people from remote communities who had moved to Darwin reported that they had been successful in gaining public accommodation but decided to live in public places. These tenancies were either given up or not renewed. Some informants cited the pressures and stresses of meeting both family and Territory Housing requirements as reasons why they returned to back to public place dwelling.

PROCESS MEASURE 2.
Model provides flexibility to accommodate the protocols and practices of language and cultural groups other than Yolngu Matha

As mentioned in the Training section of this Report, an additional two language and cultural groups - Tiwi and Burarra - were successful in fully adapting the Model’s processes to accommodate their own cultural processes. Appendices 2, 3 and 4 provide examples of documents translated into Indigenous languages as part of the field research processes for this Report. In these documents the research story has been reframed to suit the cultural approaches adopted by members of each Indigenous field-research team.

Implementation of the Model occurred to varying degrees by representatives of Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha groups; Elders’ groups representing each of these groups had provided support for community members to participate in the research. Some of the reasons for the staggered success of the Model’s implementation by the Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha language groups included: illness of the nominated senior people to be trained and to conduct the field work in Darwin; and, lack of available people to make up the male and female research teams. Contingency plans to send in other senior people from representative communities, sometimes stalled due to community obligations requiring these senior people to return back to their communities before they could fulfil their planned research and training.

A total of 148 people were interviewed for this project. These participant numbers comprised 109 people living in public places in Greater Darwin, six key service provider informants from the Greater Darwin area, five from government service providing agencies, 28 from participating communities (including the eight Indigenous fist language field researchers ). Burarra and Tiwi participants each comprised 30% of the total interviews. Yolngu Matha comprised 24.4% of the total interviews. Of the 8.7% Anindilyakwa participants, seven were community-based participants and four were Public Place Dwellers from the Greater Darwin area. Murrinh-Patha comprised 4.7% of the project participants including one community member and five Public Place Dwellers. Kriol language speakers comprised three public place dwelling participants.
The considerable groundwork to initiate a project such as this should be noted. For instance lengthy and iterative consultation processes were adopted to secure the appropriate senior people who could be involved in the implementation of the Project. This process caused delays to the initiation of field research. There were several instances where the research team recognised the heavy workloads that some of the nominated senior people were confronted with. For example, many people were already undertaking other work for organisations such Menzies School of Health Research, and generally implementation of other government service programs in their home communities.

Successful elements of the Model
By involving Indigenous peoples as primary first language field researchers, research assistants and data analysts, it was intended that the quality and reliability of the data would lead greater understanding of the complex social and cultural factors impacting on the lives of Indigenous Public Place Dwellers. The Model proved flexible enough to adjust to the challenges associated with working with Indigenous peoples who were either remotely located or living as public place dwellers. This flexibility is demonstrated by the capacity to find solutions to the problem of incorporating three nominated communities that, at the time, were not in a position to provide senior people to work on the Project. The early and sustained consultation processes throughout the Project facilitated the identification and subsequent mentoring of seniors from alternative participating communities, who were able to speak Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha. These researchers had sufficient cultural and linguistic knowledge to conduct sample interviews with informants from language and cultural groups that were not their own. Tiwi and Burarra language and cultural group field- researchers found it easy to apply their own cultural perspectives to adjust the Model to interview Anindilyakwa, Kriol and Murrinh-Patha informants and at the same time remain within the proscribed methods of the Research and Consultation Model.

Implementation challenges of the Model
The Mala Elders Group that had been established in 2003 (following the Indigenous Economic Forum in March at Alice Springs) would have proved an important group to help facilitate recruitment of senior people for the Project. This Group was, however, disbanded in late 2004. Members of the group initiated many conversations about the problems of substance misuse, public place dwelling and identified ‘trouble makers’ in Darwin. They also worked hard to identify how to best help Indigenous people return to their home communities.

The logistics and expense of having people travel to Darwin for training, data gathering, data interpretation processes and finalising a draft Report for clearance of content, all added to the complexity and cost of the Project.

Creative solutions and fostering of research partnerships for the Project were vital to secure necessary infrastructure and in-kind support. This was a difficult task with limited financial resources.

Suggestions for Improvement to the Model
• Incorporate training options, feedback, monitoring and mentoring (training and capacity development for Indigenous researchers) in future iterations of the Model.
• Develop a formal partnership agreement with the key stakeholder groups to establish provision of in-kind resources (such as access to assistance for the preparation of the Project newsletters, travel administration, financial services).
• Develop a realistic Project budget. Budget constraints reduced the level of flexibility to work with some of the challenges associated with conducting research in Indigenous community contexts; particularly for training, travel and accommodation for the two Yolngu Matha researchers, payment of appropriate salaries for Indigenous first language field researchers, cross-cultural data analysis and report preparation.
Part Two: Potential versatility of the Model

A. What is the potential usefulness of the Model for: (a) exploring other complex Indigenous social and economic issues, and (b) informing Government policy and decision-makers?

Overview

Evaluation of the Model was predominantly aimed at assessing: effectiveness; flexibility to include participation by varied language and cultural groups; and, capacity to generate new knowledge.

The semi-structured interview guide used by the Indigenous first language field researchers allowed for conversations to be respectfully interactive. For example, a topic is raised and general discussion around the topic allows the participant to determine the breadth and depth of the detail given. In 2003, Spencer et al (2003, p.37) acknowledged that in general terms, Qualitative approaches support the collaborative and educative goals of projects with community development objectives. Indigenous people and communities in Australia have reportedly resisted some forms of research conducted by outsider researchers. This resistance can be related to suspicions concerning the purpose for research and the lack of respect for the rights of Indigenous peoples and communities some researchers have demonstrated. Concern has also been raised about the insufficient account that has been taken of the unique historical, political, social and economic factors that impact on the lives of Indigenous peoples (Walker et al 2003; Sharp 1997; Tsey and Every 2000).

The following two measures were used to determine potential usefulness of the Model:

1. Research processes supported Indigenous participants to engage in a trusting climate that generated quality data including possible solutions.

2. Research processes were inclusive of all relevant key stakeholders to validate findings and possible solutions.

Upon examining data against these measures it became apparent that it would be better to address the measures together.

Discussion against the Evaluation Measures:

PROCESS MEASURES 1 and 2
1. Research processes supported Indigenous participants to engage in a trusting climate that generated quality data including possible solutions.

And

2. Research processes were inclusive of all relevant key stakeholders to validate findings and possible solutions.

The methodological approach of the Model derives from the Participative Action Research approach; including methods such as individual interviewing, focus group sessions and iterative reflexive cycles for analysis and professional development. Further, the Model considered language and cultural aspects to overlay all research processes. The early translation of language and culture across the methods undertaken by the Yolngu Matha Elders paved an easy to understand pathway for the other language and cultural groups. This was demonstrated during the training and development of Information Sheets, Consent Forms and diagrams in language describing the research process.

Specifically the Model used built-in respectful cultural iterative cycles that necessitated involvement by key stakeholders from across participating Indigenous communities. On first assessment these principles might not be observable to people outside of the particular Indigenous language and cultural group due to their implicit nature. For example, the use of Indigenous Research principles refers to the need to be respectful, to value your own culture and the culture of other people. Another important principle includes speaking with people in their first language when possible. St. Dennis (1992) points out that participatory research methodologies are promoted for application within Indigenous community contexts because these methodologies “…emphasize respect for the individual and a commitment to social change” (St. Dennis, 1992, p. 51). Henry et al (2002, p. 6) and Gale (1998, p. 2) respectively expand on these notions referring to the intertwined ‘…reasoning that informs particular ways of doing research, or the principles underlying the organisation of research’ and that the ‘…system of principles upon which a researcher’s preferred methodology is based is neither a value-free nor culturally pure abstraction somehow floating above the ideological terrain of human activity. These principles are interactive with our life experiences and with the ways in which we have come to understand the world; that is, with our world view.’

This position is strongly supported by Tuhisai Smith when she refers to what the critical underlying principles are; ‘…Indigenous framing of the research questions, first language, can have all Indigenous teams with experts assisting as a reference group, Central to her position is that culturally sensitive research methodologies must be adopted’. (1999, p. 177).

Data from the Model’s application across the six language and cultural groups has agreed with previous study findings concerning the level of social and cultural complexity as to why Indigenous people were living in public places in Darwin and Palmerston. However, the study did find that participants were prepared to express more detail in areas like relationships, sharing of resources and reasons for not returning to their community. A striking point was that Public Place Dwellers were very capable of expressing the dearth of facilities in their communities; particularly relating to health care facilities, employment and addiction rehabilitation services.
With a broad range of skills across the Indigenous research team it was possible to interview informants in an environment and atmosphere that they felt comfortable in. This included non-Indigenous and Government stakeholders as well as Indigenous people currently living in public places.

The Evaluation found that some information such as the mobility of Indigenous people between remote, rural and urban centres is not strategically collected. This was concerning given the subsequent lack of necessary information to plan appropriately for services and programs (both in remote and urban centres). There is also little information available about the accessibility and tenancy rates of public and private housing to Indigenous people seeking accommodation. Other gaps in knowledge concern best practice programs to help Aboriginal people gain and sustain public housing tenancies. Evidence in these types of planning areas might prove very useful to Government for future resource allocations.

A unique feature of the Model consistently followed during this Phase Two evaluation is that Aboriginal people collected and analysed field data. The iterative validation of findings and possible ways forward was worked through by senior Aboriginal researchers. Interviews were conducted in culturally appropriate ways and in appropriate languages. Report writing was undertaken by Aboriginal senior researchers. The Reference Group members provided important feedback on the draft report.

The Model, with inclusion of the suggested improvements, would provide a suitable vehicle for Aboriginal researchers to explore social and economic issues. As described above, the methods are amendable to providing important information for policy and the planning of infrastructure/services.

**B. What is the potential for further developing the Yolngu Matha Model into a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business to provide Indigenous language research services to government, business and the non-government sector?**

**Overview**

Unpacking such a complex question raised a sequential flow of logical questions to support reasoning to answer the primary question. These questions were not unlike the Evaluation questions and were;

1. Does this methodology provide important new information and use processes that encourage high Indigenous participation levels?
2. Is this new information and/or option for Action research useful for government, business and the non-government sector?
3. Does the methodology provide scope to be applied across a range of Indigenous language and cultural groups?
4. What level of support is required for this research approach to operate best?
5. Could this research model form the basis of a reputable self-sustaining consultancy business?

In short, the answer to questions 1 to 3 is yes. Question 4 importantly seeks suggestions about the level of support required to successfully actualise this
research approach. There is a set of suggestions noted in Part Three (refer to page 58) of this Report. A response to question 5 will be established with the given that the level of support recommended for question 4 is realistic.

It would be fair to state that there is now a small but growing body of research considering life style issues and mobility of Indigenous people living in public places in Darwin and Palmerston. The last of these projects reported findings in the ‘Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report’ (Maypilama et al 2004). This report identified a range of motivators for movements by Indigenous peoples between communities in the Top End of the Northern Territory and the Greater Darwin area. This research also provided important new insights into the reality of the day-to-day lives of Indigenous Public Place Dwellers in the Greater Darwin area. In summary, recommendations included proposals to: increase support for homeland centres and outstations; the provision of counselling services; re-assessment of existing substance abuse and rehabilitation programs in Darwin and in remote communities; education program for Indigenous Department of Territory Housing tenants in Darwin; the provision of temporary accommodation for visitors to Darwin; establishing a place in Darwin where long grassers can meet; establishment of a healthy-lifestyle program for Indigenous Public Place Dwellers in Darwin; information campaign to advise Indigenous peoples of their responsibilities when flying back to home communities (Maypilama et al.2004, p.17).

A previous Report completed in 2003, Categories of Indigenous ‘Homeless’ People and Good Practice Responses to Their Needs, conducted by Memmott et al draws extensively on research conducted in the Darwin/Palmerston area and at other sites throughout Australia, to propose a framework for assessing specific categories of Indigenous homeless peoples and a ‘divergent set of reactive and proactive strategies’ designed to meet their needs. The report represents a refinement of earlier research conducted by Memmott and Fantin (2001) and Memmott et al (2003a).

Commenting on their findings, the authors state that:

The categorisation of Indigenous homelessness and the profiling of responses to it, demonstrate the need for partnerships between Indigenous organizations and multiple levels and areas of governments in order to address all aspects of Indigenous homelessness. The analysis provides a basic model of what these interactions might entail, and provides valuable insights into what they might effectively achieve. By profiling the range of responses to Indigenous place dwelling and public homelessness as well as some good practice examples of same, it is expected that Indigenous and government agencies will have some useful models that might be adapted or used as benchmarks in the design of other local policies and programs.

(Memmott et al 2003 p iv)

The authors also emphasize the importance of Indigenous community control over the planning and delivery of response strategies.

…..to effectively plan and implement this divergent set of reactive and proactive strategies, it would seem to be essential that a peak body (preferably with majority Indigenous community control) take responsibility for co-ordination of the traditional police and local authority roles, and those of
Indigenous service organisations, charitable bodies, traditional owner groups, urban design authorities and crisis accommodation agencies. (Memmott et al 2003, p. iv)

The following three measures were used to determine whether there is a realistic possibility for an Indigenous self-sustaining consultancy business to be established in Darwin. These measures were:

1. Reasonable quorum of Indigenous Researchers familiar with the Model.

2. The Indigenous research group comprises a mix of skills - oral first language speakers, English literacy, Senior Cultural & Language people, and research experts. and

3. Indigenous Research Partnership Model includes commitment and processes for professional development.

Discussion against the Evaluation Measures:

MEASURE 1.
Reasonable quorum of Indigenous Researchers familiar with the Model.

Implementation of the Model with a further five language and cultural groups during this Evaluation Project gave professional development opportunities to eight Indigenous first language researchers and six Indigenous research assistants. These research staff members were trained in the use of the Model’s methods in addition to basic training in research ethics. The Indigenous Project Manager and Indigenous Research Consultant are also not conversant with the Model’s approach. Various public seminars, about the Model’s approach, have been received well and there have been advances by other Indigenous researchers who would be interested in applying this research approach. This was an early indication that people external to this Project might be keen to collaborate to form a strong research workforce.

MEASURE 2.
The Indigenous research group comprises a mix of skills - oral first language speakers, English literacy, Senior Cultural & Language people, and research experts.

The eight Indigenous first language researchers are all senior people from their Community and speak several Indigenous languages and English. All these researchers were assessed as proficient in the application of the Model during this Evaluation Project. The six Indigenous research assistants all speak several Indigenous languages and were assessed as capable to express issues in English. Both the Indigenous Project Manager and the Indigenous Research Consultant collectively have extensive research management, research ethics and research experience. Both also have a wide network of experts covering fields such as anthropology, linguistics and Indigenous education who have already indicated a willingness to engage as need be.

MEASURE 3.
Indigenous Research Partnership Model includes commitment and processes for professional development.
Where research is about investigating social issues to either inform policy or to actualise social change actions, the literature supports research approaches that fully engage with research participants. In this case the emerging body of literature around the issues of public place dwelling lifestyles in Darwin and Palmerston this Evaluation Project has provided a useful Model to engage first language researchers for mutual benefits to both the funder and the research participants. An important improvement to the Model has been the focus on professional development for the Indigenous first language researchers.

This aspect is critical to continue to grow Indigenous researchers but importantly this approach is critical as it respectfully provides positive and real ways that Indigenous research participants can engage with the research. Memmott and Fantin (2001) also note Hale's (1996) argument for homeless and itinerant peoples to be involved in ‘defining and planning for their needs and represented on committees, either personally or by persons who know them well and are trusted to put forward their views and interests (Hale 1996, cited in Memmott and Fantin, 2001 p.58). Memmott et al (2003a) also stress that those designing response strategies for Indigenous homelessness and public place dwelling situations should be ‘guided by local analysis and a thorough consultation with all stakeholder groups (Memmott et al 2003a, p. 70).’

This type of best practice in the research approach must be considered as a critical element of the research funding budget.
Part Three: Modification of the Research and Consultation Model

Following completion of the field work, the Research Team (comprising the two Yolngu Matha Researchers, Project Manager and the Research Consultant) considered the implementation lessons to distil improvements to the Model for easier use by other Indigenous language and cultural groups. The broad fields for improvement were identified as including: formalising supporting partnerships; processes; professional development that was flexible and available on a needs basis; and, realistic Project budgets.

A. Partnerships – formal partnership memorandums with the key stakeholder groups to establish in-kind resources.

This Project commenced amidst an external environment that was positively collaborating around the issues of Community Harmony. The main stakeholders included Larrakia Nation, Community Harmony Strategy Government stakeholders and Mala Elders Group. However, it was not until 12 months into the project (early 2005) that some of the important in-kind support structures were semi-formally put in place. This lapse in time unfortunately also coincided with the demise of the Mala Elders Group and some government policy changes that impacted on the Community Harmony Strategy. As noted earlier, despite these set-backs the Project Manager was able to establish informal arrangements for conduct of the proposed research with: (a) the School for Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems at Charles Darwin University and the (b) The School of Education at Charles Darwin University. The support of these groups was necessary to ensure much needed support for development of: research and ethics; Vocational Training and Education; and, access to infrastructure to set up the Management arrangements for the Project. Project Funding was provided through the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

One of the Critical Success Factors for this Model was the commitment of the semi-formal in-kind arrangements to allow access to human and physical resources as required. This level of support proved essential to meet the contingency plans for implementation. These at hand resources were also invaluable to assist with the mentoring, training and higher level research tasks.

For future research projects it is recommended that Larrakia Nation should remain the auspicing organisation with formal research partnerships aligned with Charles Darwin University (School Of Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems), NT Community Harmony Strategy stakeholders, and other relevant organisations as determined by the subject and context of the next study.

It is recommended that in-kind formal memorandums of understanding between participating research partner organisations should be finalised before the project commences and should detail a matrix of support required, expected benefits and proposed timelines. These memorandums should have primary contact people within each organisation.
B. **Processes** – Indigenous first language researcher: training; mentoring in the field; recruitment; and, infrastructure.

The current Project operated without the support of administrative assistance for: travel and accommodation; arranging training and meeting venues; and, handling general queries about the Project. This placed a heavy burden on the Project Manager and often created time constraints preventing more mentoring of Indigenous researchers in the field.

It is recommended that in the future, the Model should be supported with funding for a full time Project Manager and half time Administrative Assistant. This would allow more time for the Research Team to undertake the lengthy consultation process to engage Indigenous first language field researchers, to conduct a needs assessment for professional development and to establish training diaries for the provision of the mentoring and training throughout the Project.

C. **Professional Development** – provided at level and according to a needs assessment (development in areas such as maintaining project diaries, developing skills to engage in reflexive research circles, English writing, management of research data, writing journal articles public speaking and research interviewing)

A great lesson from this Project came early with insights into the varied ways that Indigenous first language field researchers wanted to learn and more importantly, where they wanted to start their research experience. As mentioned in the Training Section (see above) some researchers were happy to commence with the formal approach at the VT&E Certificate II level and then continue with practical mentoring in the field. This was followed up with reflection conversations about the Project’s progress and their own learning. Other researchers were happy to start their training in the field by working along side one of the more experienced researchers. It was demonstrated through reflection conversations that people in both these learning contexts were learning and seeking further information about appropriate research methods.

It is recommended that the Model should provide for various entry points but have an articulated pathway that Indigenous researchers might aim for. For example, the earliest entry point might allow for an Indigenous first language speaker to receive mentoring in the field with regular descriptions of observed competence. The next entry point might be at the VE&T Certificate levels and then moving through to the Certificate IV level and onward.

D. **Realistic Project Budget** - Budget constraints reduced the level of flexibility to work with some of the Project challenges; particularly for training, travel and accommodation for the two Yolngu Matha Researchers, and payment of appropriate salaries for Indigenous first language field researchers

If it were not for the generosity of several people who provided their time and expertise for no monetary compensation, it would have been difficult to complete this Project. Many of the Indigenous first language field researchers were only paid $246 daily (which comprised $53.35 for meals and $196 for interpreter’s rates). The two Yolngu Matha senior Researchers were provided some monetary top up to their
CDEP wages. The only person who received a full wage was the Project Manager. However, with the budget shortcomings towards the end of the Project, the Project Manager decided to work reduced hours to leave sufficient funds for preparation of the Project Report, Community Report and some travel to communities to undertake the Report clearance process.

It is recommended that Indigenous first language field researchers should be paid casual hours as researchers (rates negotiated based on skill levels and Project tasks). There was high interest expressed by the eight Indigenous field researchers and six Indigenous research assistants to continue working in the research field. They found the work challenging and very interesting. Unfortunately, the budget constraints meant that the Project Manager needed to be strategic about the allocation of the number of field research days based on available Project funds.

As noted under the Partnership heading it would be good for the research budget to cover for contingency planning; including salary for the Indigenous first language field researchers.

Diagram 2 below provides a conceptual mapping of the modifications to the Model to incorporate the professional development, reflexive sessions and re-emphasising the language and cultural overlays on research processes. Importantly this diagram attempts to show the iterative flow cycles of information, energy and spiritual relationships.
We sit under the shade and talk about the problems and issues. Remind each other of lawful ways of doing things. Do we continue with the same action?

Sharing and supporting one another. Agree on who should be the People to take the action further.

Sorting through problems in meaningful Indigenous ways. We all go and collect food to share.

Sharing food, telling stories and working through right way to take action. Agree on processes to sort out the problems and bring back what we must share.

Action and listening to what has been done. Review, evaluate, change and keep going. Put what we have produced in place. Tell our story to other important decision-makers.

Cycles of Indigenous research processes: feedback, mentoring, training, analysis, validation of information & research translation.
Additional elements to describe sound support structures for the Model include recognition of the team skills and knowledge sets, a structured plan for professional development and mechanism such reference groups and types of initial tasks.

The Indigenous research consultancy team should comprise people with the following types of skill and knowledge sets:

- Proficient first language oral with reasonable written or oral skills (needs to cover a wide range of Indigenous languages of use in the Top End);
- Demonstrated experience working across Indigenous language and cultural groups;
- Understanding of Indigenous Research Reform and Community Development principles;
- Knowledge of, or capacity to learn, the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model;
- Research expertise in qualitative, quantitative and evaluation research methods;
- High level research management skills;
- High level written and oral English skills (research report writing, issues papers, journal articles, grant applications);
- General technical skills for computer, digital recorder, telephone, emails, digital camera; and
- Good conceptual and analytical skills.

Professional Development
Defined entry levels that articulate to the next level:

- Structured informal learning pathways on-the-job;
- Certificate II Resource Management with additional units specifically targeting research, research ethics and Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model;
- Certificate IV Indigenous Research Training (Consider the James Cook University Cert IV Course);
- Certificate IV Workplace Assessor and Trainer Course; and
- Practical and theoretical mentoring through reflexive learning circles.

Reference Group
Selected academic, Mala Elders and subject or methodology experts from research partnership group.

Initial tasks of the Consultancy
Develop papers on suggested areas of need or gaps in knowledge based on interviews with potential partners. This process would also canvass potential funding sources for these emerging areas.
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is anticipated that this process and Research Report might help Project research staff members and participating communities determine where they want to go in the future, with an explicit emphasis on seeking funding for further work with Public Place Dwellers and advocating approaches by Larrakia Nation, Darwin and Palmerston City Councils and NT Government to implement strategies for mutual positive outcomes.

Various commentators point out that ‘homeless’ or ‘itinerant’ Indigenous peoples in any given area do not necessarily represent a homogenous group (Day, 2001; Memmott and Fantin, 2001; Memmott et al 2003a; Spencer, 2005). The data collected as part of this project reinforces this position. Information supplied by informants from the five representative language groups combines to provide a very complex picture of the various issues impacting on Aboriginal people who are currently living a long-grass lifestyle in the Darwin and Palmerston area.

There were strong commonalities between many of the issues raised by people from different language or clan groups and from different home communities. But distinct differences were also revealed. The history and pattern of contact between different groups of Aboriginal people and mainstream European society varies significantly across the Northern Territory. For this reason, it is important to be clear from the outset that each remote community represented in this project has a different profile and that unique historically-based issues impact directly or indirectly on the life choices made by individuals from these various places. The analysis throughout this Report has been informed by this reality.

Previous research conducted in the Darwin area has shown that there are a wide range of motivations for Indigenous peoples to adopt an itinerant lifestyle and that some people are forced into this situation by circumstances beyond their control. For example, Indigenous peoples from outlying areas report the need to stay temporarily in Darwin to: access Darwin-based services (especially health services under the patient-assisted travel scheme); fulfill family and cultural obligations; escape deeper problems relating to social breakdown in home communities; and reduce the impact of ‘grief and loss’ experienced in home communities (Memmott and Fantin, 2001; Maypilama et al 2004). These findings bring into question the common view that Indigenous Public Place Dwellers represent a homogeneous group with similar motivations, needs and aspirations (Day, 2001; Memmott and Fantin, 2001; Memmott et al 2003a; Spencer, 2005).

Key recommendations from the Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (Maypilama et al, 2004) included proposals for: (a) more suitable accommodation for homeless and itinerant Indigenous peoples in the Darwin area (b) an extension and upgrade of existing alcohol misuse rehabilitation programs (c) more outreach programs to encourage healthy living and to reduce serious health risks for
Indigenous Public Place Dwellers (d) more support for people to receive detoxification and rehabilitation support when they return to their home communities.

Recommendations are:

1. That the Commonwealth and Northern Territory Governments initiate discussions with Larrakia Nation to establish a Transition Place for nurturing/training / mediation / counselling for Indigenous language and cultural groups to work with their people who are living public place dwelling life styles in Darwin and Palmerston. That the discussions also canvass the establishment of an Indigenous research consultancy unit with Larrakia Nation.

2. That the Transition Place on Larrakia Land might deliver services and programs such as:
   - Day outings collecting bush food, and planting bush trees (writing stories about experiences)
   - Cooking and sewing
   - Counselling using Indigenous Languages (art and craft, dancing)
   - Referral to CAAPS
   - Training - related to living in urban centre, literacy/numeracy, and basic computer
   - Language and cultural sharing nights (BBQ, camping, dancing, story telling, singing, listening to stories about the land and history)
   - Arrange for people to renew relationships with their own family
   - Christian Fellowship nights
   - Raypiri Rom service to resolve “their problem”
   - Vocational experience and training

3. That a management committee is established comprising of representatives from Larrakia Nation, 6 language and cultural groups, CAAPS, DDHS, Police, Ind housing, Community Harmony (Justice Department), and Aboriginal Interpreter Service. The purpose of this committee would be to investigate ways to develop the Transition Place; selections of site, financial assistance, establishing infrastructure, and coordination of in-kind services to support programs.

4. Management committee should engage the proposed Indigenous research consultancy unit with Larrakia Nation to help identity programs and services for delivery.
GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

Some definitions are quoted directly from Yolngu Longgrassers on Larrakia Land Report (2004)

Bayarra’ is commonly translated as ‘payback’ but can also refer to atonement, propitiation, or compensation. Innocent people can become caught up in the economies of bayarra where there are accusations of galka business circulating. They may be wrongfully accused and punished (bayarra’), or be a risk of being sent (gorrwuma) to achieve bayarra’.

Galka’ is sometimes translated as ‘witchdoctor’, sorcerer or assassin. It is common for people to be held responsible for deaths, which Balanda would attribute to natural causes. In places where there is considerable social dislocation, and large numbers of untimely deaths (like Galiwin’ku), people have become deeply concerned about galka’ and there are high rates of suspicion and accusations among individuals and family groups. Even suicides and fatal accidents are attributed to galka’ business. Many people believe those in powerful positions abuse their authority through using threats and accusations of sorcery, and failure to thoroughly investigate and disclose the reasons for deaths. Innocent people can be afraid of being giving ‘contracts’ (gorrwuma) for the death of others with the threat of their own ensorcellment if they fail to comply with orders. This fear of being contracted to kill is given as a reason for people choosing to live in Darwin. This works in two ways: Some are threatened with sorcery if they do not use violence against others. Others are threatened with violence if they don’t use sorcery against others. The fear of sorcery also impacts on innocent people who are called to account for their behaviour in contexts surrounding untimely deaths. To be a witness to any accompanying behaviours always brings a threat of implication in the murder. People are not as afraid of galka’ when living outside the main settlement, because people can hear a vehicle coming before it arrives, and so know who is around and what they are doing. Much of the galka’ business in large settlements is about the politics of control.

Gurrutu: kinship

Märr can be translated as ‘properly generated and directed spiritual power’. It is achieved through proper contact with land, history and spirituality.

Märrmirr means possessing Märr, märrmiriw means lacking märr. The concept has a wide range of applications, but in the context of what the Yalu Marnggithinyaraw researchers have to say, the solution to a great deal of psychological and personal distress of long-grassers lies in the involvement of senior people who have the märr to deal sensitively and productively with people in their care.

Njayangu refers to the seat of the emotions, the part of the individual which feels and which links to Yolŋu identity. Jayawumir r refers to people who are sympathetic and concerned to help and comfort those in distress.

Duhwhi or Yiddhia ceremony.
Raypirri', sometimes translated ‘discipline’, refers to a particular hortative practice in which responsible usually senior people admonish, advise and encourage others, usually younger people. It is important to note that it is not simply a form of rebuke - as it is often misrepresented. It is an honourable and honouring practice. It is done in the spirit of mutual obligation and of support and in reference to the subject’s marr and ringitj.

Only the right people can successfully deliver raypirri' - people who are respected and trusted and in an appropriate relation to those who are being advised. It could be contrasted with the verb 'arrtjun which means to speak overbearingly, roughly, to reprove, and implies anger, and acting outside acceptable protocols of authority and encouragement. It could also be contrasted with djabarrkthun, which implies haranguing without active participation of the hearer.

**Ringgitj** are the links between clan groups through ancestral and totemic connections. For example, people who dance the same totem have inner feelings of recognition amongst themselves, and this signals to them their responsibility toward each other.

**Yothu-Yindi:** Yothu refers to child; Yindi refers to the big or great (mother). Yothu-Yindi denotes the bond between two different entities, the bond characterised as a mother-child relationship may be between two lands, people, songs, or ceremonies. For example a Djambarrpuynugu woman’s children will refer to not only her brothers and sisters as ‘mother’, but also to the Djambarrpuynugu clan as ‘mother’. The members of the Djambarrpuynugu clan will refer to these children as 'yothu'. Hence the term Yothu-Yindi. The 'Yothu' is the caretaker or 'djunggaya' of the mothers’ land, ceremonies, and so on. This relationship is an important political reality and the basis for social organisation in Yolngu life.
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APPENDIX 1: Larrakia Nation Cultural Protocols

(English, Yolngu Matha and Tiwi)

1. The Larrakia People are the Aboriginal traditional owners of all land and waters of the greater Darwin area including identified Aboriginal living areas.

Yolngu Matha
Larrakia- puyndja Yo\ulu huwal Yolngu wanga watangumirr bukmakku wangawngarakaw ga gapu mala dhuwalatjan liwimarmaram Darwin –ngurr.

Tiwi
Wuta Larrakia awarra murrakupuni Jiligarti. Awunganiwanga winga amitnya kukuni.

2. Aboriginal law requires respect for the cultural authority of the traditional owners.

Yolngu Matha
Yolngu rom dhu ga lakaram marr-gurrum dhum ga marr-mirriyi Ramgu malanguw rom watangumirr.

Tiwi
Ngawatu nginingawula tuwurniwiyi ngini kuwa ngarimi kapi wuta murrakupuni ngawamamanta.

3. Larrakia speak for Larrakia country; other traditional owners speak for their traditional lands.

Yolngu Matha
Larrakia ga wanga walaanggiyingalagaw wanga wiripuwurruy yolnguy nguli gungga’yun.

Tiwi
Wutatu Larrakia api waya juwa wupangiraga ngini wutamiyala amukutakamini. Wutatu yingwampa api wutamiya kapi wutatu murrakupuni yangorri.

4. We have a mutual obligation to care for our country with our neighbours.

Yolngu Matha
Ngorra limurrung ga rom djagaw wangaw rrambayi yan gurrutumirriw walalang.

Tiwi
Ngawatu ngimpamangi nginingawula murrakupuni amitnya awunganwanga ngawa mamanta.

5. Visitors should be aware that we have a body of knowledge in our land and waters, which includes sites of significance.

Yolngu Matha
Yuuhi uhe nguli anmurr-guwatjwan nhe marnggiyi ngunhi limurr dhuwal rumbal ga nurru ngorra ga wanga-ngarakangu gapungur ga madayui limumung.

Tiwi
Kapi wunuwuriyi yingwampa api pimatayamungurumi ngini ngawa ngirramini tayikwani ngini murrakupuni winga amitiya makatinga.

6. Larrakia people expect visitors and service providers to be aware of Larrakia cultural obligations and to respect and acknowledge them.

Yolngu Matha
Larrkia-ny Yolngu ga marr-gatjpuyun limurrung bukmakku marr-tharanganaraw ga marr-mangmangthunaraw walalang romggu.

Tiwi
Kapi wuta Larrakia api wutimarti ngini manya kapi yinwampa tuwurniwi murruntawu yangorri api kuwa pimatami ngini nginiwutawa.

7. Visitors have the right to be treated with respect and understanding.

Yolngu Matha
Bukmak yolnggu nhungguwuy romnydja dhuwal nhaltjan nhe dhu nhungguwuy nhe djaga ga nhina ga marr-mangmangthuna romggu Government-gu ga wirpunguw yolngguw.

Tiwi
Wutatu kapi yingwanmpa api pimatayamangi amitiya pupuni pimatamuajirri.

8. All visitors are responsible for their behaviour and should respect guidance of Larrakia.

Yolngu Matha
Marnngithi dihyak wangaw, bukmakku limurrung wangaw.

Tiwi
Wutatu kapi yingwampa amuka awungana wurima api wutatu wangatamiya awarra waya juwa ngini ngimpirtimarti api wumantuwan Larrakia.

9. Learning about country is everybody’s responsibility and it is also the responsibility of government and non-government agencies.

Yolngu Matha
Ngunhi nhe nguli wurrangatjarriyirrnydja nheny nguli yakuny yatjkurruguman larrkianhan .ga dhiyangun napurruny nguli gora gurrupandja bala napurr ngulidjamamirir,yirrnydja.

Tiwi
Nginingajingawila arikitumumwoi api ngamatayamungurumi, ngawurrayamangi murrakupuni.
10. Inappropriate behaviour reflects badly on Larrakia people and we do not accept it.

Yolngu Matha
ngunhi nhe nguli wurarrngatjarayirryndja nheny nguli larrkia-yanhan yolnguny ykun yatjkurr- gum ga dhiyak napurr yakany djal.

Tiwi
Ngini amukutakamini jirti ngimpirima api wuta ngirramini wunga Larrakia nguwa karlu ngimpirtimarti awarra.
We sit under the shade and talk about the problems and issues. Sharing and supporting one another. Share our stories. Sort through Problems. Sorting through Problems in meaningful TIWI way. We all go and collect food in TIWI ways. Sharing food, telling stories and working through right way to sort out the problems and issues. Action and listening to what has been done. Review, evaluate, change and keep going.

APPENDIX 2: Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model
TIWI Process

Sacred Site Meeting Ground

Cycles of TIWI process to work on the Indigenous First Language Research
APPENDIX 3 : Information Sheet and Consent Form

Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model

Information Sheet

This is the guide for Yolngu Matha researchers to use to tell people about the project and to get their consent to be involved. This document will be read to participants before the informed consent is read.

Background

We are a group of Yolngu Matha people working with Larrakia Nation in Darwin, on the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model. This project has come from the concerns about people living in Darwin, away from Country and in an unsafe way. Before us there were two Galiwin’ku ladies, Elaine Maypilama and Joanne Garnggulkpuy, who first worked on this project for their people from Galiwin’ku. Elaine and Joanne developed a First Language Research Model that was based on Yolngu processes. We have been trained by Elaine and Joanne about their processes. This process will happen for other language groups so they can work with their own people. During the training by Elaine and Joanne they helped us adapt the process and tools. This process (or storyline) and documents will be checked by Yolngu Matha Elders group before they are used in Darwin for the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model. The language groups that are involved are:

- Yolngu Matha – northeast Arnhem Region
- Murrinh-Patha – Wadeye community and surrounding outstations
- Tiwi – Tiwi Islands: Bathurst and Melville Islands
- Burarra – Maningrida community
- Anindilyakwa – Groote Eylandt communities
- Kriol – Aboriginal English from the Top End region

Process

- We have come to talk to you about any problems and to see if we can help.
- We want to talk to you in Yolngu Matha language
- We want to talk to you about home, family and culture
- We want to keep talking to you about these things
- We want to record our talks on video and tape, are you happy with this?
- Are you happy for us to tell others back home on Yolngu Matha about our talk?
- The government and Larrakia Nation are helping us to run this research and we need to give them written reports about what we have done.
- We will not mention your name in our talks back home or in the report
- We want to keep talking and sharing our food with you

IF YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THIS RESEARCH YOU CAN CONTACT THE RESEARCH COORDINATOR IN DARWIN, MS LORNA MURAKAMI-GOLD ON 89467756 AT THE CHARLES DARWIN UNIVERSITY. YOU CAN ALSO CONTACT THE CEO OF THE LARRAKIA NATION ABORIGINAL CORPORATION MR KELVIN COSTELLO ON 89275577.
Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model

Record of Oral Informed Consent Form

This is the guide for Yolngu Matha Researchers to use to tell people about the project and to get their consent to be involved. This document will be read to participants after the Information Sheet is read.

- We are a group of Yolngu Matha speakers working with Larrakia Nation in Darwin, on the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model. This project has come from the concerns about people living in Darwin, away from Country and in an unsafe way. Before us there were two Galiwin’ku ladies, Elaine Maypilama and Joanne Garnggulkpuy, who first worked on this project for their people from Galiwin’ku. Elaine and Joanne developed a First Language Research Model that was based on Yolngu processes. We have been trained by Elaine and Joanne about their processes. This process will happen for other language groups so they can work with their own people. During the training by Elaine and Joanne they helped us adapt the process and tools. This process (or storyline) and documents will be checked by Yolngu Matha Elders group before they are used in Darwin for the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model. The language groups that are involved are:

- Yolngu Matha – northeast Arnhem Region
- Murrinh-Patha – Wadeye community and surrounding outstations
- Tiwi – Tiwi Islands: Bathurst and Melville Islands
- Burarra – Maningrida community
- Anindilyakwa – Groote Eylandt communities
- Kriol – Aboriginal English from the Top End region

We need to record information about you, to show that you have consented to this Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model.

Name __________________________________________________________

Female / Male_______________________________________________________

Age____________________________________________________________

Tribe___________________________________________________________

Skin Group______________________________________________________

This Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model has been explained to me and I understand. I have been given time to ask questions about any concerns. I am happy to voluntarily consent to be a part of this project.

1. I agree to keep talking with you, the Yolngu Matha Research Group, about this project
   Yes □ No □

2. I agree to be video and voice recorded.
   Yes □ No □
3. I agree that you can talk to Yolngu Matha Community about the general comments from the project.

   Yes □    No □

4. I agree that name will not be used when talking to Yolngu Matha people about the project or in the written progress and final reports.

   Yes □    No □

I understand that the research information will be kept confidential and in a secure place.

I understand that this information is only for the Indigenous First Language Research and Consultation Model project.

I understand that I can withdraw my consent from this project at any time.

I understand that the video and voice recordings of me will not be used for other purposes than to transcribing my discussion.

I understand that the voice and image recording will be destroyed after the project is complete.

I ________________________ have interpreted the Information Sheet and Consent Form in Yolngu Matha Language.

I have given the participant time to ask questions about this project.

I satisfied that the participant understands the information we have discussed about this project.

_________________________________    ____________________________
Interpreter’s Name                  Signature

_________________________________    ____________________________
Researcher’s Name                   Signature

_________________________________    ____________________________
Participant’s Name                   Signature

_______________ _____________  ____________________________
Date   Time     Where

IF YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THIS RESEARCH YOU CAN CONTACT THE RESEARCH COORDINATOR IN DARWIN, MS LORNA MURAKAMI-GOLD ON 89467756 AT THE CHARLES DARWIN UNIVERSITY. YOU CAN ALSO CONTACT THE CEO OF THE LARRAKIA NATION ABORIGINAL CORPORATION MR KELVIN COSTELLO ON 89483733.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate II in Resource Management</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ICPMM63BA Access the Internet        | ICPMM63BA/01 Identify and use local resources | • Competent  
• Not competent |
| ICPMM63BA/02 Identify and use remote resources |
| RUHCORE6A Plan daily work routines   | RUHCORE6A/01 Interpret work schedules  
RUHCORE6A/02 Organise materials and equipment  
RUHCORE6A/03 Respond to problems as they arise | • Competent  
• Not competent |
| UAN016 Plan to Coordinate Resources  | UAN016/1 Demonstrate understandings of current health status of resources in the local area  
UAN016/2 Identify current issues impacting upon resources in the local area  
UAN016/3 Outline possible and likely threats to current resources  
UAN016/4 Identify major aspects of intellectual property  
UAN016/5 Participate in the planning of management strategies for current resources | • Competent  
• Not competent |
| UDN003 Collect Data                  | UDN003/1 Understand the role of counting in resource management planning  
UDN003/2 Collect base line data  
UDN003/3 Represent base line data  
UDN003/4 Interpret base line data | • Competent  
• Not competent |
| UEL079 Undertake the Legal Process   | UEL079/1 Understand the roles and nature of criminal law  
UEL079/2 Understand the separation of powers as it applies to the criminal law system  
UEL079/3 Understand the function of the courts  
UEL079/4 Identify the role of personnel in the criminal law system | • Competent  
• Not competent |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UEL079/5 Understand the notions of ‘mandatory’ sentencing</th>
<th>UEL097 Develop Understandings of Western Cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UEL097/1 Identify social structures in Western European cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEL097/2 Understand different Western perceptions of ‘Family’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEL097/3 Understand different Western perceptions of ‘Money’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEL097/4 Understand different Western perceptions of ‘Work’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formal/ Non Formal/ Mentoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria for testing effectiveness of the Training and Mentoring</th>
<th>Assessment Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Very proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to confidently introduce the project and complete the informed ethics process</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge and practice to maintain security (confidentiality and privacy) of personal data from research participants.</td>
<td>Low competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to assist with the research translation process back to their Communities.</td>
<td>Very proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to conduct interview process using the semi-structured interview framework and record either digitally or in writing.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>Low competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to assist with the back translation of interviews into written English</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>Very proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge and practice to maintain security (confidentiality and privacy) of personal data from research participants.</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to assist with the research translation process back to their Communities.</td>
<td>Low competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to conduct interview process using the semi-structured interview framework and record either digitally or in writing.</td>
<td>Very proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge and practice to maintain security (confidentiality and privacy) of personal data from research participants.</td>
<td>Capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>Low competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to assist with the research translation process back to their Communities.</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>