From principle to practice: community consultation regarding access to Indigenous language material in archival records at the State Library of New South Wales

Sophie Nicholls, Lauren Booker, Kirsten Thorpe, Melissa Jackson, Clement Girault, Ronald Briggs & Caroline Jones

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

From principle to practice: community consultation regarding access to Indigenous language material in archival records at the State Library of New South Wales

Sophie Nicholls[a], Lauren Booker[a], Kirsten Thorpe[b], Melissa Jackson[b], Clement Girault[b], Ronald Briggs[b] and Caroline Jones[a]

[a]Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language & MARCS Institute, Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia; [b]Indigenous Services Branch, Division of Mitchell Librarian and Education & Scholarship, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

In the context of Indigenous languages, archival science in Australia continues to move from a theoretical framework of considering record subjects as third parties to a 'participants model'. In a participants model framework record subjects are considered co-creators and custodians of the intellectual property of the record. However, the shift from theory to practice is still an under-described challenge currently facing archival professionals. This article reports on an experience of applying guidelines developed by First Languages Australia (FLA) and National and State Libraries of Australasia (NSLA) aimed at enhancing the rights of Indigenous Australians over records that contain Indigenous language material. A team of researchers from the State Library of New South Wales (SLNSW) Indigenous Services branch and Western Sydney University engaged with four Indigenous language groups to evaluate records containing Indigenous language material held at the SLNSW. On viewing the archival records of Indigenous language material members of community groups expressed a diversity of opinions and suggestions. This feedback was grouped by the authors into the following themes: painful remembrance of the provenance of the archival record, evaluations of the value of the documents, custodianship and use of the language material, and access to the SLNSW records. The authors found that participants in the study substantially shaped the process of implementing the protocols.

Background

Recent studies have indicated that there is a move in archival sciences to recognise the importance of engaging with Australian Indigenous communities in order to properly interpret and contextualise archival documents that include Indigenous language material.[1] The emerging literature on the development of 'community archives' examines ways in which marginalised or under-represented community histories can be developed and linked

to archival records.[2] Literature focused on the role of archives in social justice notes the importance of community archives in providing an alternative narrative to official archives.[3]

Some studies argue that copyright and ownership issues are central in addressing the role of Indigenous communities in the custodianship of the language material found in these records.[4] The importance of community-specific protocols and management practices in relation to language material found in these documents has been repeatedly highlighted in these studies, and distinctly formalised in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library, Information and Resource Network (ATSILIRN) protocols.[5] These protocols outline an approach to managing archives to ensure inclusion and participation of Indigenous voice, thus creating a participatory archive. A participatory archive allows individuals and communities to co-curate or co-manage archival collections according to their own specific cultural or community protocols.[6] Although this practice is encouraged, participatory methodologies are most commonly applied throughout the sector as projects rather than core operations of institutions.[7]

The Australian Society of Archivists has endorsed the ATSILIRN protocols as part of their 'Policy Statement on Archival Services and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples'.[8] Similarly, the peak body for national and state archives, the Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities (CAARA), adopted a policy statement in 2004 regarding 'access to records of Indigenous Australians affected by past separation policies'.[9] This statement includes guidelines for considering the rights of Indigenous Australians in relation to archival material. More recently, National and State Libraries Australasia (NSLA), a peak body that functions as the shared voice of Australian (and New Zealand) libraries, collaborated with First Languages Australia (FLA). Together they developed a set of guidelines and policies for progressive action in library institutions in 'the collection and preservation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander language materials and resources'. These guidelines were presented to the Australian archival body in a paper presented at the 2015 Australian Society of Archivists conference (presented at NSLA and FLA in 2014).[10]

The issues outlined in the above sets of guidelines and protocols are particularly significant where Indigenous community groups are seeking to revitalise their traditional language utilising archival records as sources of language material. In New South Wales (NSW) there are many flourishing Indigenous language revitalisation projects that combine current resources with material from archival records.[11]

The *Rediscovering Indigenous Languages* project at SLNSW

The State Library of NSW houses an extensive collection of Australian records dating from initial contact times, the colonial period and the modern era. Coinciding with the development of the NSLA and FLA guidelines, SLNSW launched the *Rediscovering Indigenous Languages* (*RDIL*) website (<*http://indigenous.sl.nsw.gov.au*>). The project website provides access to archival records relating to Indigenous Australian languages from SLNSW's collections. Community consultation and engagement were guiding principles of the project. SLNSW utilised the NSLA 'Working with Community' guidelines as a tool for community engagement.[12] In particular the Indigenous Services Branch of SLNSW aimed to put into practice the two following guidelines from NSLA and FLA:

1. The right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to be informed about language materials relating to their own culture and heritage.
2. The role of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities as custodians of language as central to the development of policy and practice.[13]

The role of the Indigenous Services Branch at SLNSW is to build trust and long-term relationships with Indigenous people and communities. Indigenous staff at SLNSW have extensive experience in undertaking community consultation in regards to access to collections.[14] Staff are actively involved in community outreach, and in building collaborative practices. They seek to provide context and information on the nature of the collections that are held at SLNSW and in other archival and cultural institutions.

The *RDIL* project aimed to locate, preserve, digitise and further enhance metadata and contextual information related to these language records. Discussions on the power relationships that exist in records, and the complex interactions that come into play in record creation, are a constant theme and discussion point with community engagement. Staff were aware of the potential distress and mixed emotions that community may feel in accessing the historic records in the *RDIL* project, and this was discussed with the WSU team. During the development of the project a high-level reference committee, chaired by project patron Mick Gooda (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission), provided guidance and advice to the project to ensure continuous adherence to best-practice cultural protocol. SLNSW also utilised 'Special Care Notices' as a way to provide introductory context and warnings before entering the website. This advisory role is now provided by SLNSW's Indigenous Advisory Board, which held its first meeting in 2015.

Consultation and research

Previously, many of the records found on the *RDIL* project website had not been identified as containing Australian Indigenous language material and thus were not easily discoverable in the SLNSW catalogue. A team of researchers from SLNSW Indigenous Services and WSU engaged with four Indigenous language communities from June to December 2015. The Western Sydney University (WSU) team consisted of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers. The team had a wide experience working in both community-based language revitalisation efforts, and across other institutions of the galleries, libraries, archives and museums (GLAM) sector where custodianship is a key issue, such as in a museum context. The SLNSW and WSU team set out to achieve two main goals:

1. to provide each relevant Indigenous community with hard copies of the archival documents that included language material;
2. to gather feedback using a semi-structured interview about community views regarding access to these archival records.

These goals were designed to address the two NSLA and FLA guidelines listed in the discussion above and to explore the issues and challenges of moving the guidelines into practice. The research also aimed at assisting SLNSW in developing digital spaces that can accommodate principles of co-curation and right of reply to records. The team wanted to encourage community knowledge-holders to respond to collections, whether to enhance or critique

them, and to provide advice on cultural protocols or potential sensitivities that might exist in relation to the collections. The SLNSW and WSU team's initial research questions were:

1. What does good 'access' to language documentation mean in different Aboriginal communities, and across different age groups?
2. What do users want? What kind of information do they want, and how do they want to access it?

However, as detailed in the discussion below, the feedback the researchers received from community members addressed an additional key question:

3. How can SLNSW build strong relationships with Aboriginal communities, and best address the concerns of those people who currently work with Indigenous languages and the custodians of Indigenous languages?

Community engagement

With the above considerations in mind, the research team developed a set of questions about 'access'. The team undertook a number of semi-structured interviews with Indigenous language groups. The participants in these groups included Elders and community members working in language revitalisation projects. This included individuals from Bundjalung, Gumbayngirr, Anaiwan and Worimi Indigenous language communities. As mentioned above the primary aim of the visits was to proactively engage communities with their cultural heritage items held at SLNSW.

On each of the site visits the team brought high-quality copies of archival documents to discuss and to leave with the community groups. The documents consisted mainly of word lists, such as the Royal Anthropological Society of Australasia (RASA) files, or word lists made by explorers or cartographers. Some documents contained more detail than a word list, for example Curr's list from 1884.[15] Each set of documents was carefully selected as relevant to the Indigenous language community visited. Figure 1 below is an example of a RASA file that includes Gumbayngirr language data. The team brought a high-quality copy of this document to the Muurrbay site visit.

The team presented the copies and then engaged in conversation over tea with the participants. After asking for consent, the team asked for feedback in informal discussions. The majority of the responses were recorded (via written or audio recordings) on two site visits. The first visit was to Muurrbay Aboriginal Language Centre (Nambucca Heads, NSW). In this visit three language groups came together to meet with the SLNSW Indigenous Services team and the WSU research team (22–23 October 2015). In the second visit, the teams were invited to Murrook Cultural Centre at Worimi Land Council, Williamtown (18 February 2016). Both groups consisted of approximately 20 participants.

The teams focused specifically on presenting communities with records that included substantial Indigenous language material. The documents did not generally include any descriptive, photographic or administrative records. In the next section we discuss the results of these site visits in detail. However, to summarise, the following four themes emerged from the interviews and discussions with focus groups:

*   'Painful remembrance of provenance of archival documents'
*   'Evaluations of the value of the archival documents'

Figure 1. Royal Anthropological Society of Australasia file; Clarence River – Mitchell Library State Library of NSW (used with permission from Gumbayngirr community).

- 'Ownership and use of language material found on archival documents'
- 'Access to archival documents held at the State Library of NSW'

Project development

In the initial planning of this research project, the intention was to ask individuals some questions about access to these documents. The team aimed to ask these questions shortly after the group had first viewed the archival documents. However, on the first site visit, informal feedback from community groups indicated that the project's methodology and research questions needed to be reconsidered. Even though all of the team members had previous experience working with Indigenous communities and individuals, once the project had started, the problematic project planning became apparent. It appeared that to ask individuals to engage in feedback on archival documents without first developing an ongoing relationship was deeply inappropriate. It placed participants in a situation of greater emotional risk than anticipated. It also revealed the assumption that people would want to or should have to provide a feedback response. The team recognised the project's context of evaluating on behalf of a larger institution meant that project planning centred around immediate return of results. Thus, for the subsequent site visits research team focused specifically on the following goals:

- Working with groups which already had positive ongoing relationships with members of the team.
- Adjusting methods of data-gathering to be more flexible (for example, some participants requested not to be recorded, but were happy to have their comments written down, where participants could immediately check and alter them).
- Adding discussion of custodianship and provenance at participants' request.
- Creating an online survey that can be answered at a much later date, anonymously if the participant wishes, without researchers present.
- Adaptation of research questions to adequately address resulting data. For example, not many participants wished to discuss 'access' in the first instance, but many participants wished to discuss the provenance of the documents and issues related to custodianship.

The research team cannot overstate the importance of allowing flexibility in the process of community engagement on such issues. Without making these changes, the team would not only have gathered only marginally important data, but also have overlooked a significant opportunity to build meaningful relationships with the community groups throughout the process.

Community feedback and results

The research questions eventuated into three areas of inquiry. The first research question 'What does "good access" to archival records mean?' was reinterpreted by participants as: What does good access involve as a lived experience? Two themes emerged from answers to this question, which are discussed below under the subsections *Painful remembrance of provenance of archival documents* and *Access to archival documents held at the State Library of NSW*.

The second research question 'What do users want from interaction with the archives?' was initially formulated to discuss what tools and services are needed for users' intended outcomes. However, in response to this question many community members discussed the value of material and its ability to join the past to the future. For example, the value of language data in reviving Indigenous language is discussed below under the heading

Assessment of value of the archival documents; and the importance of issues related to custodianship is discussed under the heading *Custodianship and use of language material.*

As mentioned above, the process of the project also made evident an implicit question: 'How can SLNSW build and maintain trusting relationships with Indigenous community members accessing the records?' This is discussed in the Discussion section below.

Below are the verbatim responses from interviews and focus groups divided into the themes that emerged from the data; in most cases participants led these discussions. These results have also been collated into a report for SLNSW.

Painful remembrance of provenance of archival documents

Quotes in this theme indicate the importance of acknowledging the context in which these records were created. Elder participants in particular were reminded of the painful, traumatic events of the colonial era when viewing documents from that time. These were often the first responses to the documents:

> They took this language and wrote it down [at a time] when we were not allowed to speak it. (Bundjalung Elder)

> [regarding RASA files] It shouldn't be used, this stuff from the police [magistrate]. (Bundjalung Elder)

> Blackfellas [*sic*] got their names from police, my father got his name, they gave him someone else's name. (Bundjalung Elder)

> Stuff from managers from reserves. I lived that life, we know what it was like, living with the managers [painful, sad facial expression looking away]. (Bundjalung Elder)

> This is the first time for me to see this, [it sure has] taken a lot of time for me to see it. Young people might say it is wonderful, but we [the Elders] have questions. (Bundjalung Elder)

The quotes express a diversity of opinions and provide direct insight into the experience of community members on encountering archival documents for the first time. As mentioned above, a number of variables were considered, including the age of participants, the amount of resources available to the community group, and the region. However, only age was found to have an effect in this small dataset. Elders generally expressed more painful emotional responses on engaging with the documents. Younger participants spent more time evaluating the documents relative to language revitalisation efforts.

Access to archival documents held at the State Library of NSW

The second theme emerged in answer to the question 'What does good access involve as a lived experience for different ages and communities?' There were a number of discussions regarding physical access to the material from the records, and the significance of having access to the material:

> I can go to the town library, and print it out, [we need] hard copies, if you have a piece of paper, you can read it. Now I know this is here, I will look further. (Gumbayngirr community member)

I would like it if the library had more of a language centre, and create recordings of some things so people can hear it. Library visits that's what I would like, the library needs to tell people they can visit. (Gumbayngirr community member)

In some places people are at each other's necks over who owns what, and which part of the country – but we all come from the same place in the end. People can't close doors on each other [on free digital access]. Eventually it won't matter as much when we all have more [language material]. (Worimi community member)

[In regards to the visit from SLNSW] We don't have to leave country to see this material – **it's coming home.** (Worimi community member, emphasis in original)

Libraries are changing, the work that's being done for Aboriginal people and by Aboriginal people being included – this is a big change. The library used to be alien, we felt we had no ownership over information. I remember that from 20 years ago. What is happening here [this visit from SLNSW to country with archival documents] now is appropriate and very important change. (Worimi Senior community member)

Now, [finally] is a time for us to say something, not a lot of times you get that chance. (Bundjalung Elder)

Assessment of value of the archival documents

Following on from discussion about the importance of having access to the archival material, the second research question was reinterpreted by participants as 'What value do you see in these documents, and why are they important?' In the quotes below, participants express their opinions of the value of the material, and explain why Indigenous language material in the records is particularly significant:

You don't get it until you see these documents, that awareness of what was taken. (Bundjalung community member)

These documents are valuable, history is important. (Bundjalung community member)

It is interesting to hear the stories [Cedar Getters] this would be good for tourist information, we need to know how they got it [the story] this ties it all together. I feel a lot of negativity, [but] I enjoy telling the story. (Bundjalung community member)

[What value do these documents have in your opinion?] They [can] assist with the process of creating signage [for example] for the Worimi National Park. And talking language on country – that's powerful, as an Aboriginal person – to be physically and mentally connected. Also for future generations, as well as stolen generation to connect to family history, as well as teaching kids language. By using language – accepting one's Aboriginal identity. This affects change in the next generation – for example, children from dysfunctional families, stolen generations, foster kids. (Worimi community member)

Custodianship and use of language material

Another theme that arose from discussion of 'what users wanted' was that of custodianship and the use of the language material found in the records. There was a wide diversity of opinions on this topic. However, almost all participants raised this issue. This is a very important theme that would benefit from ongoing consultation with community groups

and individuals.[16] We request that there be information stating: 'that this language material can't be used and reproduced for teaching without letting the Elders Council know, or Aboriginal Corporation, like Land Council'. (Bundjalung Elder)

> We don't want [this language material] used for profit. (Bundjalung community member)

> People can use the language, make some stories. (Gumbayngirr Elder)

> We want people to know that these documents are not the authority [on the language]. (Bundjalung Elder)

> We need to have it set up, so that when you click on a particular language a set of protocols pops up relevant to that particular language group. (Worimi community member)

> [On restricting access] We're in the game of [language] reclamation we've got to take everything you can get. Everyone will make their own interpretations, you can't take away from education [professionals] they have a right to make their own interpretations. (Worimi Senior community member)

> No-one owns language, but after time there are custodians, and we need to give them the power, it is powerful to them [people working in language revitalisation] to say: 'we own this, we control where it goes', we need to respect the voice of those people. (Worimi community member)

Discussion

This project marks one of the first systematic research efforts to capture the views of Indigenous peoples in New South Wales regarding access to archival records held at SLNSW in the context of language revitalisation. In asking about what 'good access' means and 'what users want', community members effectively reframed the focus of the project onto the lived experience of access (painful remembrance), what value participants see in access and how the material found in the records should be used and contextualised.

The research project highlighted the need for archivists and institutions to consider integrating and prioritising community engagement – particularly visiting communities with copies of records. However, it is essential that the librarians and archivists involved in this activity are highly sensitive to the history of the relationship between large government institutions and Indigenous communities.

Putting the guidelines mentioned above into practice also highlighted the importance of relationship development over data-gathering. The shift from the traditional model of creating records from colonial times to recognising current Indigenous groups and individuals as custodians and co-creators of records is a slow process made up of many small steps. These points are highlighted in the documents created by ATSILIRN, and NSLA and FLA.[17] Janke and Iacovino reflect on this process:

> This is a shift of the power relationship to one that is more collaborative as archivists and their institutions work in true partnerships with Indigenous communities, in observation of free, prior and informed consent and empowering Indigenous people to use their cultural assets for reclaiming culture, and economic benefits.[18]

Key steps that can lead to the development of genuine partnerships, as evidenced by the SLNSW and WSU project, include the following four suggestions: firstly, acknowledging

the possibility of strong emotional responses from individuals and groups arising from the viewing of records. Secondly, to continue to identify relevant materials and provide communities with access to materials as a first priority, in whatever form best suited to that community group. Thirdly, to follow up and maintain relationships with language and community groups, and finally, where possible, to ensure consent of community groups before digital use of archival documents.

Below are suggestions based on the experience of researchers in this study. The digitisation of manuscripts and the online presentation of language materials held in an archive is not a sufficient action to warrant notions of 'good access' or user-oriented design. On its own, digitisation of manuscripts does little to assist with relationship-building with Indigenous communities. It is face-to-face visitation, hands-on access to materials and digital platform training that foster the actuality of participatory archives through a genuine commitment to building personal relationships with people in Indigenous communities. In terms of moving from principles to practice in this instance, the team recommends the following practices for continuation of this project and others like it.

Acknowledgement of community sensibilities in engaging with archival documents that contain Indigenous language material

As articulated in NSLA and FLA, it is imperative that community members have the opportunity to become aware of the documents, to meet relevant archival staff, and have the material on the documents contextualised in an emotionally responsible way.[19]

It is not surprising that some participants expressed considerable emotion when viewing the archival documents for the first time. Participants reported a number of reasons for this response including: the sensitive nature of the provenance of many of the documents, that they previously did not know the documents exist, that the documents are currently available online and that the documents might be held as the 'authority' on the people or language orthography.

To build relationships to a point that individuals may wish to provide feedback to an institution, the team recommends sharing experiences over a prolonged period of time, perhaps three or four visits over one or two years, as a minimum. This allows the possibility for clients to reframe the historical relationship between collecting institutions in New South Wales and Indigenous communities, if necessary. Archival practice needs to accommodate and consider the emotional and spiritual connections that community members may have with these records.

Acknowledgement of the diversity of opinions and wishes of community groups, and the differences within those groups

In practice, this may include gathering feedback from diverse sources such as across different age groups. It also means recognising those people that the community considers authorities on language revitalisation and engagement.

To implement a long-term system for each community to provide feedback/visit SLNSW and create connections with the physical space, the online site and catalogue interface

In practice, this may include integrating aspects of feedback from the community, such as entering discussion about restricting access to some language material if a community so wishes, or adding contextualising or introductory information about the current language context to some catalogue entries. Nakata and Langton assert that the relationship built in the archival process,

> … is a circular process. It is not about simple consultation with Indigenous people, although consultation must be part of the process. It is about dialogue, conversation, education, and working through things together.[20]

Limitations and future directions

In this initial pilot project, only those groups and individuals with previously established relationships to the WSU researchers or SLNSW Indigenous Services were interested in engaging with the documents and providing feedback. The project team hope to continue to foster relationships between SLNSW and Indigenous community groups across New South Wales. In time, this work acts to renew the role SLNSW plays in these communities, and bring into practice the protocols recommended in NSLA and FLA.[21]

Endnotes

1.   Susan McKemmish, Shannon Faulkhead, Livia Iacovino and Kirsten Thorpe, 'Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Embracing Multiple Ways of Knowing and Keeping', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2010, pp. 27–50. See also Livia Iacovino, 'Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities', *Archival Science*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2010, pp. 353–72; Fiona Ross, Susan McKemmish and Shannon Faulkhead, 'Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2006, pp. 112–51. National and State Libraries of Australasia (NSLA) and First Languages Australia (FLA), 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Language Services and Collections in NSLA Libraries', 2014, available at <*http://www.nsla.org. au/sites/www.nsla.org.au/files/publications/NSLA.Indigenous_languages_statement_2014.pdf*>, accessed 22 June 2015. Martin Nakata and Marcia Langton, 'Introduction', in Martin Nakata and Marcia Langton (eds), *Australian Indigenous Knowledge and Libraries*, UTS Press, Sydney, 2006, pp. 3–6; Lyndon Ormond-Parker and Robyn Sloggett, 'Local Archives and Community Collecting in the Digital Age', *Archival Science*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2011, pp. 191–212; Iacovino; Shannon Faulkhead, 'Connecting Through Records: Narratives of Koorie Victoria', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2009, pp. 60–88.
2.   Andrew Flinn, 'Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges 1', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2007, pp. 151–76; see also Jeannette Bastian and Ben Alexander (eds), 'Introduction: Communities and Archives – A Symbiotic Relationship', in *Community Archives: The Shaping of Memory*, Facet, London, 2009; Andrew Flinn, 'Archival Activism: Independent and Community-Led Archives, Radical Public History and the Heritage Professions', *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, Article 6, 2011.
3.   Michelle Caswell, 'Toward a Survivor-Centered Approach to Records Documenting Human Rights Abuse: Lessons from Community Archives', *Archival Science*, vol. 14, nos 3–4, 2014,

pp. 307–22. See also Ricardo L Punzalan and Michelle Caswell, 'Critical Directions for Archival Approaches to Social Justice', *The Library*, vol. 86, no. 1, 2016, pp. 25–42.

4. Mick Gooda, 'The Practical Power of Human Rights: How International Human Rights Standards Can Inform Archival and Record Keeping Practices', *Archival Science*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2012, pp. 141–50. See also Terri Janke and Livia Iacovino, 'Keeping Cultures Alive: Archives and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights', *Archival Science*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2012, pp. 151–71.

5. Kirsten Thorpe, 'Protocols for Libraries and Archives in Australia: Incorporating Indigenous Perspectives in the Information Field', 2013, available at <*http://library.ifla.org/99/*>, accessed 21 August 2016. See also Alana Garwood-Houng and Fiona Blackburn, 'The ATSILIRN Protocols: A Twenty-First Century Guide to Appropriate Library Services for and about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples', *Australian Library Journal*, vol. 63, no. 1, 2014, pp. 4–15.

6. Isto Huvila, 'Participatory Archive: Towards Decentralised Curation, Radical User Orientation, and Broader Contextualisation of Records Management', *Archival Science*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2008, pp. 15–36. See also Anne Gilliland and Sue McKemmish, 'The Role of Participatory Archives in Furthering Human Rights, Reconciliation and Recovery', *Atlanti: Review for Modern Archival Theory and Practice*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2014, pp. 79–88; Kate Theimer, 'The Future of Archives is Participatory: Archives as Platform, or A New Mission for Archives', *ArchivesNext*, 2014, available at <*http://www.archivesnext.com*>, accessed 21 August 2016.

7. Jon Newman, 'Revisiting Archive Collections: Developing Models for Participatory Cataloguing', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2012, pp. 57–73.

8. The ATSILIRN Protocols were first published in 1995 and then reviewed in 2005 and 2014. The Australian Society of Archivists also endorsed them as part of their 'Policy Statement on Archival Services and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples', available at <*https://www.archivists.org.au/documents/item/32*>, accessed 17 September 2016.

9. Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities (CAARA), 'CAARA Policy 14 – Statement of Principle – Access to Records of Indigenous Australians Affected by Past Separation Policies', 2004, available at <*http://www.caara.org.au/index.php/policy-statements/statement-of-principle-access-to-records-of-indigenous-australians-affected-by-past-separation-policies/*>, accessed 21 October 2015.

10. FLA presented a paper at the 2015 Australian Society of Archivists conference in Hobart to bring the discussion from NSLA and FLA to the archival profession. See session 13, available at <*https://www.archivists.org.au/learning-publications/2015-conference/speaker-abstracts*>, accessed 17 September 2016.

11. Sarah Verdon and Sharynne McLeod, 'Indigenous Language Learning and Maintenance Among Young Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children', *International Journal of Early Childhood*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2015, pp. 153–70; Troy, Jaky, and Michael Walsh, 'Embracing Babel: The Framework for Australian languages,' *Babel* vol. 48, no. 2/3, 2013, pp. 14–19; See also Glenn Auld, Ilana Snyder and Michael Henderson, 'Using Mobile Phones as Placed Resources for Literacy Learning in a Remote Indigenous Community in Australia', *Language and Education*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2012, pp. 279–96; Jim Wafer, Amanda Lissarrague and Jean Harkins, *A Handbook of Aboriginal Languages of New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory*, Muurrbay Aboriginal Language and Culture Co-operative, Nambucca Heads, NSW, 2008; Caroline Jones, *Darkinyung Grammar and Dictionary: Revitalising a Language from Historical Sources*, Muurrbay Aboriginal Language and Culture Co-operative, Nambucca Heads, NSW, 2008; see also Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale (eds), *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, Academic Press, San Diego and New York, 2001, for discussion of language revitalisation.

12. NSLA, 'Working with Community: Guidelines for Collaborative Practice Between Libraries and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities', 2013, available at <*http://www.nsla.org.au/publication/working-community-guidelines-collaborative-practice-between-libraries-and-aboriginal-and*>, accessed 21 August 2016.

13. NSLA and FLA. SLNSW has a policy of public ownership and does not repatriate items. However, the guidelines aim to empower Indigenous communities to act as custodians of the Indigenous language material found in the archival items. This is an issue that is regularly under discussion in the Indigenous Services Branch.

14. Kirsten Thorpe, 'Indigenous Records: Connecting, Critiquing and Diversifying Collections', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 211–14; see also Kirsten Thorpe and Monica Galassi, 'Rediscovering Indigenous Languages: The Role and Impact of Libraries and Archives in Cultural Revitalisation', *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2014, pp. 81–100; Kirsten Thorpe and Alex Byrne, 'Indigenous Voices in the State Library of New South Wales', *Australian Library Journal*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2016, pp. 17–29.

15. State Library of NSW: MLMSS 7603 / Boxes 4–5, Survey forms and correspondence received by the Royal Anthropological Society of Australasia regarding Aboriginal place names, 1899–1903, 1921–1926; MLMSS 2286 / Box 3X / vol. 2. Box 3X Volume 2: Comparative Vocabulary of Australian Languages by Edward M Curr, 1884.

16. Gooda. See also Janke and Iacovino.

17. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library, Information and Resource Network (ATSILIRN), 'ATSILIRN Protocols for Libraries, Archives and Information Services', 2012, available at <*http://aiatsis.gov.au/atsilim/protocols.php*>, accessed 29 May 2015. See also NSLA and FLA.

18. Janke and Iacovino, p. 168.

19. NSLA and FLA.

20. Nakata and Langton, pp. 4–5.

21. NSLA and FLA.

Acknowledgements

Disclosure statement

Funding

Notes on Contributors

Sophie Nicholls is a postdoctoral fellow in language learning funded by the ARC Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language at the MARCS Institute, Western Sydney University. She has previously worked as a community-based linguist on language revitalisation projects in NT and NSW, Australia.

Lauren Booker is currently working as a project assistant for PARADISEC – University of Sydney. She completed her master's in Museum and Heritage Studies with a dissertation 'Dismantling the colonial artefact: Discussing Decolonisation Theory in praxis within the Australian museum sector'. Lauren's professional experience and areas of interest include repatriation, participatory archives, First Nation representation within the museum and the psychology of collecting.

Kirsten Thorpe is the manager, Indigenous Services at the State Library of New South Wales. Her professional and research interests relate to the return of archival sources of material to Aboriginal

and Torres Strait Islander communities. Kirsten is also interested in the opportunities that the digital domain present for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to be actively involved in managing their cultural heritage resources. Kirsten is a descendant of the Worimi people of Port Stephens New South Wales.

Melissa Jackson is of Bundjalung descent with family links to the Baryulgil area near Grafton. Born in Crown Street Women's Hospital she spent all of her life to date in Sydney. Melissa worked in various government departments, including Department of Housing and Attorney Generals Department before starting work at the State Library of New South Wales in 1991. One of two Indigenous Services Librarians, she has a background in teaching and obtained her librarianship qualifications from University of Technology Sydney. Melissa is the president of ATSILIRN, the national body representing Indigenous library workers.

Clément Girault is a Sociology and Social Policy researcher and media professional with a background working in remote communities on Indigenous-led initiatives. He is a passionate believer in the importance of preserving and promoting cultural practices.

Ronald Briggs (Gamilaroi) is originally from Moree in central north-western NSW. Trained as a schoolteacher before beginning work as Indigenous Services Librarian at the State Library of New South Wales since 1991, Ronald is a keen family historian and has also worked with the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

Caroline Jones is an Australian Research Council future fellow and associate professor at the MARCS Institute for Brain, Behaviour and Development at Western Sydney University. Her research is centred on understanding the patterns of human languages and how children learn to talk, and she has collaborated for more than 20 years with Indigenous people on projects relating to language documentation, language revitalisation and language learning.