

PAPERS ON TEACHER TRAINING AND
MULTICULTURAL/INTERCULTURAL
EDUCATION

IBE/1994/ST/TTME/05

5

***"Soft and hard domain theory for bicultural
education in indigenous groups"***

Stephen Harris

JUNE 1994

**PROJECT: BASIC EDUCATION FOR PARTICIPATION AND DEMOCRACY:
KEY ISSUES IN HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT (TEACHERS AND
MULTICULTURAL/INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION)**

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF EDUCATION - UNESCO

DRAFT

"Soft" and "hard" domain theory bicultural education in indigenous groups.

Stephen Harris
American Anthropological Association Conference,
San Francisco,
2-6 December 1992

Bicultural education is seriously under theorised. To many cross-cultural educators it is presumed, wrongly, to be an automatic extension of bilingual education: hence the common term "bilingual- bicultural" in reference to bilingual programs. This paper continues theoretical development of the notion of bicultural schooling beyond my earlier attempts (e.g. Harris 1990). This paper is both a constructive response to criticisms of those attempts and to observations made during study leave in North America in the second half of 1992.

This domain-separation theory of bicultural schooling has its origins in experience in the Aboriginal bilingual education program in the Northern Territory (N.T.). The N.T., the central northern section of Australia, is large and largely desert, mostly covered by 1000 square mile cattle stations (ranches) and Aboriginal reserves, with a monsoon strip across the far north. The population is 150,000, half of it in the only large town, Darwin. There are 25,000 Aboriginal people living mostly in Aboriginal communities on reserved lands remote from towns. There are as well probably half that number of "urban" Aboriginal people living in towns. Most of the former people speak Aboriginal languages and live by a traditional kinship system and world view. There are something like 50 Aboriginal languages in the N.T. with the dozen or so largest having from 500-3,000 speakers. Most are under serious threat of language death within the next decade.

In December 1972 a Federal Labour (socialist) government was elected for the first time in 24 years. It introduced a major educational reform into Aboriginal schools in the N.T.: bilingual education. The program now operates in 17 languages in 22 schools. It was a major change to schooling, involving Aboriginal teacher education, extensive vernacular reading schemes and other curriculum development, and team teaching. (Harris & Jones 1991)

The N.T. bilingual program was introduced for a variety of purposes but mainly for academic gain, and in these terms has been partially successful. Its main achievement in my view has been its promotion of Aboriginal teacher education and the resultant increased control of schools by Aboriginal staff. In any case it was introduced by White idealists from the top down, and consistent attempts were made to use Aboriginal languages for the same academic purposes for which English is used in schools: the reasons for using Aboriginal languages in schools, the ways of using them and the approaches to Aboriginal language literacy were often Western. The Territory had what was in important ways a maintenance model of bilingual education but not a strong model of bicultural education.

During the life of the bilingual program Aboriginal parents began to be heard saying in various ways: "We have two goals for school; that our children become competent in the 3R's and grow up to be Aboriginal." Some of those engaged in the program began to see these two goals, in terms of how bilingual schools were currently structured, as mutually exclusive.

No school system is culturally neutral. And no vernacular language program is strong enough to overrule the dominant cultural impact of Western-schooling-ways of doing things, the reasons for doing them and the whole Western "hidden curriculum" message carried by the source of

authority, classroom management, timetabling, and organisational structure of the school. For example, the three-times table is not culturally neutral and innocent: it has behind it the belief that it is appropriate for humans to measure and quantify the environment, to build dams and irrigate crops, or turn ore into metals, in attempts to control cause and effect in the world. Also, when individual, as opposed to group, performance is required as part of reading and writing, or when it is assumed that linear and largely decontextualised text is the received way to use literacy skills in school (even in the vernacular) or when hypothetical problem posing and the question-and-answer teaching techniques invade Aboriginal teacher practice as if they are self-evident universals, then the potential gulf between bilingual and bicultural education become clearer. The danger here lies in lack of awareness on the part of some Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal staff of which culture and world view generates these practices.

In this context in which I worked for a decade I came to believe that Aboriginal world view and Western industrial world view are largely incompatible. That is a crucial reality on which this theory of bicultural schooling is based. Examples, very briefly and in oversimplified form, of fundamental incompatibilities include the fact that Aboriginal people hold a religious explanatory system about how the world works in contrast to industrial society's scientific/positivistic cause-and-effect system of explanation. Motivated by a religious cause-and-effect system, Aboriginal people do not expect to intervene in major ways in what happens in the physical world, whereas the positivistic view leads Westerners to try to intervene in major ways. Also, within Aboriginal society there is a high inter-relationship between people, the environment and social institutions, versus the Western compartmentalised system. For example, an Aboriginal person could not discuss land ownership, kinship affiliations or religious practice without simultaneously discussing all three. But a Westerner could

do so easily. Also, within Aboriginal society there is an emphasis on "being" rather than "doing" in terms of personal identity. In Aboriginal society people are identified by the people and land to whom they are related, whereas in Western society personal identity is often related to one's job. Also, there are very different perceptions of time and the related notion of "progress" and "development". (See chapter 2 of Harris, 1990, for a more detailed discussion.)

During this time in the NT the phrase "two-way schooling" began to be heard frequently. Aboriginal people had invented a solution to schooling which recognised two incompatible world views. Basically they seemed to be saying that if the two worlds are so different then the job of schooling was not to try to teach only the dominant world, or to merely teach in two languages for that matter, but to teach children how to maintain their primary identity in the Aboriginal world but to become competent and confident in both worlds. The main sites where this theory for living and learning was articulated within schools were the two independent Aboriginal schools Strelley in Western Australia, Yipirinya in Alice Springs in southern N.T., and to some extent bilingual schools in N.E. Arnhem Land in northern N.T. and by the whole outstation or homeland centre movement. (This account glosses over a good deal of variation between communities. For example, Yirrkala in N.E. Arnhem Land seems to prefer a complex of separated domains and an Aboriginal controlled amalgam of the two cultures. See Wunungmurra, 1988, Yunupingu 1991 and Marika 1991). In any case my work tried to draw out some possible implications and applications of two-way schooling for White teachers to think about so that they could be more responsive to Aboriginal initiatives and more aware of the long term effects of the schooling system of which they were a part. This is one White male educator's view: an interpretive combination of varying

Aboriginal views and relevant theory: it is not an endorsed "Aboriginal view".

The model of domain theory adapted here for bicultural schooling comes from one branch of sociolinguistic theory about how bilinguals decide which language to use (Fishman 1971). I believe that the relatively small numbers of the groups concerned, the degree of cultural difference which exists in relation to the dominant society in which they are embedded, and the strength and pervasiveness of the influence from Western Society warrants this somewhat drastic culture domain separation strategy. I developed five key principles as part of a bicultural schooling model which I thought could be implemented with a variety of local adaptations. In Australia the theory has been seen as controversial. (See McTaggart, 1988, Wunungmurra, 1988, Cataldi, in press, McConvell, 1991, and Walton 1992.)

Of all the verbal and published criticisms of the theory, one seems most important and prompts the expansion in the latter part of this paper. That is that culture domain separation in fairly strict form may only be practicable in geographically isolated places and where contact with the outside world has not yet fostered extensive social change and a wide variety of adaptations. Because so many indigenous people are now in urban settings and in various stages of integration, the theory needs to be re-formed to include as well what is possible for them.

Listed below are the five principles and some of the criticisms of them

While serious notice has been taken of many of the criticisms and the theory has been modified accordingly, I note that all the criticisms have been piecemeal, with none of them offering a comprehensive alternative model.

The paper which comes closest to offering an alternative model is Wunungmurra, 1988. The five key principles (see Harris, 1990) are:

1. That bicultural schools in small indigenous societies be organised along two fairly strictly separated cultural domains: a Western domain and an Aboriginal domain. The Western domain would allow students to adapt to Western school content and teaching process. The Aboriginal domain would embody Aboriginal content and learning contexts, including old and new, dynamic, changing, overlapping Aboriginal culture, as parents and Aboriginal staff saw as appropriate. Hopefully students would come to see themselves as Aboriginal people with bicultural skills; having a strengthening and primary Aboriginal identity, but competent and confident in two social worlds. (A domain is like a kingdom, where a particular system rules.) Critics have said that: (a) life for those in culture contact is much more complex and there are more grey areas than I imply. Also there may be two social worlds but there can only be one psychological reality; (b) the view of culture behind the domains principle is too rigid and needs to be more strongly influenced by the notion of the social construction of reality, of culture and of identity; (c) there is an unacceptable fundamentalism and tone of religious fervour, almost of fanaticism, in the two domain vision; and (d) there is the assumption that "culture" is something to be idolised, that it is always good to hold onto, but that a preferable view of culture is that if it does not produce happiness and economic security, then it should be "lost".

2. That a bicultural Aboriginal school should be controlled by local Aboriginal people in both domains. This principle drew no criticisms. However, the view has been expressed (e.g. Stairs p.c. 1992) that the notion of "control" needs to be refined away from the view that if Aboriginal people fill all the previously held White roles, and exercise leadership in the same ways, working through the same administrative structures, that this is Aboriginal control: it is not.

3. That an Aboriginal bicultural school be administered in Aboriginal ways, because the ways of doing things are as important to cultural expression as language and culture content. There was no strong objection to this principle except that it was pointed out (e.g. Stairs, p.c., 1992) that any school, even a bicultural school, is a new socially constructed sub-culture, or third culture, and not entirely representative of either source culture.

4. That the Western domain of a bicultural school be taught as a giant role play. This would allow students to become conscious of the difference between identifying with what is taught from the Western world and being confident in playing out the roles and applying skills and knowledge gained. There have been no substantial objections to this principle except that there will always be some conflicting values which run too deep to be resolved by a role play. The giant role play seems to be a hopeful teaching strategy against assimilation.

5. That the teaching of both domains be strongly contextualised in terms of respective cultural contexts and content; i.e. schools as far as possible should do Aboriginal things in Aboriginal ways in Aboriginal contexts for Aboriginal reasons. For example, if a public dance section of a circumcision ceremony is performed on the school verandah as part of the Aboriginal cultural studies program this may not in the long term be supportive of culture maintenance. There is an objection to this principle on the grounds of the social construction of reality; i.e. if an Aboriginal elder makes a deliberate and free decision to perform a public aspect of a circumcision ceremony at the school, then that over time will embody the reconstruction of a new and authentic Aboriginal reality.

It can be seen from the above that the most serious reservations about the theory centre on the concept of culture, i.e. points 1 and 5. A 'soft' version of this theory not only needs to be developed to accommodate those many indigenous groups in intensive contact with Western Society for whom circumstance or inclination render a 'hard' domains approach impractical, but it needs to be developed to accommodate a wider perception of what culture is and what it is for.

Two experienced Navajo educators recently put this more in perspective for me. What is important is not so much "culture", but happiness, economic freedom and independence. If "culture" enables that, well and good, but if it doesn't then new ways need to be followed that will. There was in these two educators a lack of pining after the "good old days": buying corn meal at the supermarket is preferred to laboriously grinding it by hand by those who have had to do it. While these Navajo educators had a strong commitment to the maintenance of Navajo language and culture there was a higher commitment to whatever socially constructed system produces happiness, independence and economic freedom.

James Clifford's account of the attempt of Indians at Mashpee on Cape Cod through the courts to be classified as an Indian tribe so that they could then lodge a land claim (1988, chapter 12) is an enlightening analysis of the nature of culture. Mashpee people had maintained an organised Indian presence connected to their Cape Cod land since White contact in 1620, but this maintenance had not been in the form acceptable to the commonsense notions about culture held by a Western jury. The Indian's contact with the area had not been physically and historically continuous; some had performed typically Western type work on the land (restauranting, real estate broking); others performed dances learned from other Indians in the army; intermarriage with Blacks and Whites was obvious, and others were

members of Christian churches. Cultural innovation, defeat, renewal, negotiation, sometimes separation, sometimes integration did not impress the White jury. The jury's members seemed to have an all-or-nothing perception of culture: a 'body' which had lost one of its vital 'organs' (e.g. language) could not remain 'alive'. And yet the Indians at Mashpee are alive and continuing. (p336-42).

Nowadays it is unpopular in some academic circles to talk about cultural difference or any binary relationships such as 'Black-White, Men-Women, about something being 'authentically' part of a culture or not, and even sometimes it is argued that there are no cultural 'essences' or 'absolutes': all is socially constructed; all is meaningful only to that limited situation where it is occurring. There is good reason for these objections against oversimplified views of cultural identity and difference because such oversimplifications have tended to produce negative stereotypes which justify low academic expectations by teachers, encourage members of different cultures to be seen as representatives of their culture rather than as individuals, and so on. However, as useful as the principle of the social construction of reality and of culture is, there seems to me to be a danger of throwing out the baby with the bathwater. Does, for example, the notion of social construction work as well for language as for culture? The principle of social construction argues that cultures are not 'lost' (unless a member chooses deliberately to change identity); cultures only evolve and change. But languages, while they do adapt and change, can be clearly lost. Also, the notion of social construction can be very unfulfilling to members of a culture actually living it. For example, several Mohawk people said recently that the Mohawk language had been given by the Creator, and that speaking Mohawk was essential to being fully Mohawk. The social science issue of whether or not cultural identity can be maintained in a new language is not as important as the issue of what the people feel and what type of schooling

will support their goals. So, while the principle of the social construction of reality, of culture and identity is important and true, so is the need people have for roots, symbols, and ideals: hence the felt need to strive to retain something of the old; hence the subjective and in my view legitimate perception that there are cultural essences which have to be fought for.

This is not a matter of confusing the pristine with contemporary reality, but of acknowledging people's subjective perceptions and priorities. It is also a matter of placing effort where the need is greatest. The emphasis of language immersion/survival programs illustrates this point. At the Akwesasne Mohawk Survival School, putting the vast majority of the school's effort into learning of and through Mohawk during the first five or six years of schooling has not only produced fluency in Mohawk for many students, but has not disadvantaged those students in English or in later English school (pc Brenda La France, 1992). English is all around them: it is hard for them to do other than learn English. Here is an illustration of the value of domain separation (or at least a safe haven), in this case a Mohawk domain where they spend most of their elementary years of schooling. All the objections raised in 1-5 above are true and reasonable, but there needs to be some clear, symbolically powerful, consistent and repeatable vision and structure to harness the resources needed to maintain a vulnerable language or culture. A Chilean linguist now working in Mexico said recently: "I used to oppose this notion of domains . . . , but now I support it in special situations because you just have to drive your stake in somewhere" (Enrique Hamel, p.c. 1992). The following quotation summarises this emphasis and strategy:

"The function of cultures is to be different. All cultures compromise, minority cultures more than most, but minority cultures lack safe havens for indigenusness and schools must provide at least one of these . . . and may, therefore, opt to leave integration to the

stronger sociocultural forces that swirl round about it." (Joshua Fishman, p.c. 1987, in Harris, 1990, 122).

My reaction now to the five major principles and to their criticisms discussed earlier, in the light of the discussion of culture immediately above, is that in various times, places and with various groups, in a complex way, all those principles and the criticisms of them need to be included in theorising about bicultural schooling. This is not a weak retreat into eclecticism, but a recognition of the complexity and variation of indigenous people's aspirations and experiences. Following are some of the components which might be included in a broadened domain theory of bicultural schooling in such groups:

1. Bicultural schooling theory probably needs 'hard' domain and 'soft' domain versions of language and culture teaching. The hard version would aim at the school complementing strict domain separation between the home culture/family life and the Western world. The main language of the home would need to be the indigenous language. Parents would need to modify their approach to child rearing enough to put clever pressure on their children to speak the first language in the home. Living in isolated areas would help but it would be possible in cities provided a number of families supported each other to give the **group** dimension necessary for any such language and culture maintenance. The English T.V. would need to be off for substantial periods of time, with that time replaced by meaningful alternative activities in the threatened language. In a hard domain version, in my view language **revival** has a slight chance (where the first language is no longer used in spontaneous conversation by all age groups) and language **maintenance** has a reasonable chance where the first language is still spoken in the home. The whole system would only work if the parents were

unembarrassed about being fairly fanatical and fundamentalist, or about acting with religious-like fervour.

Some academics seem to shy away from what appears to be extremism in this view, so it probably warrants a few comments in its defence: (a) The theory does not originate in any desire to be extreme, but from observation of those few groups who have maintained their language in the face of overwhelming odds. Outside Australia Amish, Hassidic Jews, some Pueblo Indians, Gypsies, and the parents of the more recent Mohawk immersion/survival schools, and inside Australia, Strelley, Yipirinya and many homeland centre Aborigines, do manifest these kinds of "extreme" determination. They are not anti-social or unreasonable people. They simply have to hold to their goals passionately or they get nowhere against the tide. I suspect that Western social scientists who are not themselves religious or deeply involved personally in a nationalistic movement or political cause find it difficult to identify with these kinds of 'extremes'. (b) The content of the Aboriginal domain is not the "pristine" and the "old" and the "traditional" (that is a major misunderstanding of the critics), but what the group concerned intuitively should be included. The Aboriginal domain is not static: it is evolving like the other domain(s) but has continuing aspects of the old to provide strong symbolic, identity-forming images and ideals.

The soft version domain school would aim to have school as one of several culture and language havens or safe harbours. Basically a safe haven is a site of unambiguous culture expression such as a ^{parent language} immersion school, a religious organisation or an adult language learning class. The soft domain school is not complemented by mother tongue language use in the home. In my view the soft version has no chance of sustaining language revival; has only a limited chance of enabling language maintenance (i.e. social use

in the home), but has a reasonable chance of enabling L1 competence at least to where it is a language of identity. This latter is likely to grow in importance in the future. An elderly Mohawk man at Six Nations in southern Ontario said recently that speaking Mohawk had healing properties. He was keen to get out of hospital to be home with his wife to speak Mohawk with her. His children and grandchildren in that situation believed in the healing power of language. Jewish Sunday Schools for Hebrew language learning probably fit into this safe haven model (whereas the all-week Hebrew or Yiddish schools in New York probably fall into the hard domain model).⁴ The Kaurua language revival workshops in Adelaide probably fit into the beginnings of a soft domain model. Small groups of Adelaide Aborigines are now beginning to imply that they want two Aboriginal languages: Aboriginal English for daily interaction with other Aborigines and their old Aboriginal language as a language of identity (see Amery, in press).

2. A bicultural model of schooling probably needs to recognise that all bicultural people actually live in three shifting social worlds: (a) elements of an old or "traditional" world - their first culture of identity; (b) a middle culture/third culture/creole culture - the strongly evolving culture of mixture, amalgam, compromise and give and take, and (c) the national, mass culture. It is suggested that the distinction between hard and soft domain models of bicultural schooling, or the distinction between Yipirinya's and Strelley's more strict vision of domain separation versus Yirrkala's vision of both-ways or an Aboriginal controlled amalgam (expressed, for example by the image of *ganma*, where the salt water mixes with the fresh water spring to produce brackish water) lies in the weight or proportion of emphasis placed on (a), (b) or (c). While Yirrkala school seems to operate much in (b) (see Wunungumurra, 1988, Yunupingu 1991 and Marika 1991), the 'world' of (a) is still very strong there as demonstrated by

the fact that the major curriculum drive has been on old/contemporary or 'traditional' topics such as how to prepare cycad bread and its ceremonial significance; the origin and significance of people's and clan names, and so on, all recorded in a number of reports on these multi-age workshops. Another example of a contemporary Aboriginal institution operating in three shifting social worlds is Batchelor College, a tertiary institution in the NT. While most of the courses are in English and focused on contemporary topics which would fall into social "world" (b) brackish water, or (c); some of the most salient college experiences draw on 'world' (a), such as the very powerful traditional dancing-in of graduates at their graduation ceremony. This has great symbolic power, has an unambiguous message about source of identity, and declares solidarity with the past-continuous of the dreamtime. Also, Keeffe's account of Canberra's urban Aboriginal people's culture having elements of a culture of persistence and of a culture of resistance fall into (a) and (b) consecutively (1992,45-61.) And of course all Aborigines operate some of the time in (c) as well. All types of serious bicultural schools would have various proportions of these three elements of (a), (b) and (c). Whether they are 'hard' or 'soft' versions would partly depend on the relative emphasis on each element and the degree to which (a) is complemented by the home.

3. A bicultural model of schooling needs to be formed anew in each location, either by a body of qualified Aboriginal teachers who are politically conscious - i.e. highly aware that nothing that happens in schools is culturally or politically neutral, or by a body of determined parents. While some two-way schools (e.g. Strelley, Yipirinya, Aboriginal outstation schools and the Mohawk immersion schools) were formed more by the stubborn action of parents and elders than by the action of Aboriginal teachers, schools such as Yirrkala, Galiwin'ku and Milingimbi in the NT were formed more by a critical mass of local qualified teachers. The latter

formation is likely to become more common, at least within Australia, because it has a stronger funding base (because they stay within the state system). However, some Mohawk and Navajo experience (see Arviso and Holm,1990) perhaps indicates that it is possibly only through direct parent control that the wishes of the pro-language parents will be met (see 7 below).

4. A successful model of bicultural schooling, where one measure of success is the enthusiastic participation by pre-teens and teens in language and culture learning activities, will need to have a high proportion of Aboriginal Staff of high status, able if they so choose, to work in both domains of the school. The complex issue of language and culture status could defeat a bicultural school at that point where young teens become highly sensitive to issues of status. (See Harris 1990: 82-83.)

5. A successful bicultural school, whether it be within the state system or not, will need the ongoing involvement of parents who have become confident judges of what is good and bad schooling in terms of their own priorities. (See Holm and Holm 1990) Unless parents are aware of the various options, possibilities and limitations of schools they will not be able to provide the school with their ongoing authority and impetus and will not be willing to make those adaptations to home life that will increase the likelihood of their goals being achieved through the school.

6. The language teaching methodology of language immersion probably needs to be a central tool of language maintenance within a bicultural school. The immersion approach fits comfortably with the notion of domain separation, in both domains, and involves giving the language real learning work, on real content, in settings which are as strongly contextualised as possible.

The language teaching methodology needs to be chosen on grounds other than only those of what seems to be the most effective approach to language teaching or to academic growth. For example, recently I observed an Indian controlled school in Arizona where the language teaching methodology was the concurrent method. Apparently one of the main principles behind this approach is that teachers and students can both work towards clear understanding and concept development by communication in whatever language - the local Indian language or English - will make the concept clear. The top priority for this school was academic gain, with a close second priority language and culture maintenance. However, it seemed to an outsider that while the first aim could be well met by the concurrent method, the second aim could not. In practice the teachers seemed to be using two concurrent languages but the students seemed to be responding mostly in English, and virtually no interactive use of L1 between students and teachers was observed.

7. Many larger indigenous communities may need more than one type of school to meet the different priorities of the parents. These days, unlike pre-contact days, indigenous people are able to exercise individual choice about what identity they wish to become. (For example I met an Ojibway man who had one daughter who had "chosen to assimilate" and another who had chosen to work in Indian performing arts and who identified strongly as Ojibway. I also met a young woman who, through the pan-Indian influence of University life, identified as 'Indian' rather than only as a member of her mother's "tribe".) Most parents following, say, the Mohawk pattern, prefer their children to attend an Indian - controlled provincial/state school where most of the curriculum is mainstream and in English, but where there are Mohawk language classes. (They have decided that happiness, economic freedom and independence lie in this direction.). A small minority of parents desire a much stronger Mohawk presence in

school and have opted for Mohawk immersion or survival schools. This may form a predictable pattern for other groups in the future. The pattern of these survival schools is not only of language immersion but one of relative smallness. Consistent Aboriginal domain schooling may not be workable in large impersonal bureaucratic state institutions, even if Aborigines are in control, either because their control is not complete or because the majority of the parents think a mainstream type schooling is the safest bet.

8. Biculturalism or bicultural schooling may be achieved in a relay or sequential experience of living in two worlds of schooling, rather than living in two social worlds of schooling concurrently. This would involve immersion in L1 for several years followed by immersion in L2 for several years. The period of initial immersion in L1 would need to be substantial: in my view preferably until age 10-12.

Conclusion

The main purpose behind the strategy of either hard or soft versions of domain separation in bicultural schools is to create curricula space for a less powerful language and culture which is in danger of being colonised by a dominant, pervasive and invasive culture. The strategy helps a school draw lines, even as a land rights claim stakes out a territory. Within this territory the first culture - far from remaining static - expands, innovates, evolves and re-enacts the old, the inherited and the source of roots, claims and identity. It may even reify some of the old. The always renewing, commemorating and reconstructing Aboriginal domain skills, knowledge and understandings should as far as possible complement those of the Western domain so the two are not in competition. Of course there is overlap and borrowing between the domains but the value of the model lies not so much in its 'accuracy' but in its capacity to help articulate ideals, provide focus for action and provide powerful symbolic images, decision-

making foundations and a problem-solving theory about what are the Aboriginal ways of doing, being and going to school Paulston (1990) makes a persuasive case for why language maintenance among threatened languages may only be viable under the impetus of something like a nationalistic movement. The successful working of either 'soft' or 'hard' domain two-way schools will require similar intensity of support. The intensity of commitment to French among the 6.5 million French speakers in Quebec, and the "extremes" to which that language majority (in terms of nine million people in Quebec) went to ensure institutional support for French, is an illustration of the kinds of commitment required even by groups of people much more powerful than those being discussed here. That many indigenous people have higher priorities than language and culture maintenance is neither surprising nor a criticism of either hard or soft domain bicultural schooling. It is not suggested that all, or even a majority, of indigenous parents will support such schooling, but it is suggested that to be successful as a medium of long term language and/or culture maintenance any form of bicultural schooling requires the intensity of commitment discussed in this paper.

Non-indigenous people do have a role in all of this, not in the centre of the Aboriginal bi-cultural schooling enterprise but at the supportive periphery, as informed specialists in some Western skills, available on request to Aboriginal people while they are constructing their own ways (note 1) to go to school.

Note1 This phrase is taken from Holm and Holm 1990, without implying that their paper supports the notion of domain separation.

References

- Amery, R. (In press) It's ours to keep and call our own: Revival of the Nunga languages in the Adelaide region, South Australia. IJSL
- Arviso, M. and Holm, W. (1990) Native American language immersion programs: Can there be bilingual education when the language is going (or gone) as a child language. Journal of Navajo Education. Vol VIII No 1, pp39-47, Fall.
- Cataldi, L. (in press) Review of Two-way Aboriginal schooling: Education and Cultural Survival. Northern Perspectives, Darwin, N.T.
- Clifford, J. (1988) The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art. Harvard U. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fishman, J. (1971) Advances in the Sociology of Language 1, Mouton, The Hague.
- Harris, S. (1990) Two-Way Aboriginal Schooling: Education and Cultural Survival. Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Harris, S and Jones, P (1991) The changing face of bilingual education in the Northern Territory: A 1990 update. The Aboriginal Child at School. 19:2 May. p29-53.
- Holm, A. and Holm, W. (1990) Rock Point, a Navajo way to go to school: A valediction. In English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education. (special eds.) C. Cazden and C. Snow. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. March. p170-184
- Keeffe, K. (1992) From the Centre to the City: Aboriginal Education, Culture and Power. Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Marika-Mununggiritj, R. (1991) How can Balanda (White Australians) learn more about the Aboriginal world? Ngoonjook: Batchelor Journal of Aboriginal Education, 5:17-25.
- McConvell, P. (1991) Cultural domain separation: Two-way street or blind alley? Stephen Harris and the neo-Whorfians on Aboriginal education. Australian Aboriginal Studies, 1:13-24.
 - McTaggart, R. (1988) Aboriginal pedagogy versus colonisation of the mind. Curriculum Perspectives, Vol 8 No 2:83-93.
 - Paulston, C.B. (1990) Understanding educational policies in multilingual states. In English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education, special eds C Cazden and C Snow, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March. p38-47
 - Walton, C. (In press) Gender and ethnicity: Constructions of difference. Paper submitted to ALAA Series S on Language and Gender.

- Wunungmurra, W. (1988) 'Dhawurrpunaramirra' Finding the common ground for a new Aboriginal curriculum. Curriculum Perspectives, Vol 8 No 2:69-70.
- Yunupingu, B. (1991) A plan for Ganma research. (eds.) R. Bunbury, W. Hastings, J. Henry and R. McTaggart, Aboriginal Pedagogy: Aboriginal Teachers Speak Out. Deakin Univ. Press, Geelong, Vic.p98-106
- Folds. R. (1992) " " TACAS.