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i) Abstract
This Indigenous-led project focuses on the meanings of home. Well-rehearsed in the housing literature are the challenges of providing houses for Indigenous Australians. To address these challenges this research is part of larger project to design houses for elderly Indigenous Australians to return to Country that are underpinned by Indigenous principles. What makes a house a home for Indigenous Australians? To help answer this question this project—led by the Jerrinja community—explored the meaning of home drawing on mixed-qualitative methods. With a focus on establishing design principles this thesis conceives of home in relation to house, kinship and Country. The thesis points to what it means to do Indigenous-led research and the ambivalent understanding of house-as-home for Jerrinja people. Important methodological findings were produced through a process of learning that occurred through the ‘doing’ of Indigenous-led research in practice, which highlighted a need for cross-cultural researchers to remain sensitive and flexible to the local social terrain. In this research, flexibility required working within the context of local Indigenous housing politics, social mobility practices and adhering to important cultural protocols. Key empirical contributions include elderly Jerrinja people’s discussions of embodied knowledges of the material house-as-home. In particular, I demonstrate Jerrinja people were consciously alert to the relationships between bodies, spaces, materials and affective flows of light, wind, warmth and sound. Additionally, I provide an empirical discussion of the productive tensions between objective, aesthetic and relational aspects of the material house-as-home, as shown through elderly Jerrinja people’s discussions of home. To conclude, the thesis offers four design principles: adaptability, sustainability, permeability and spaces between houses.
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Chapter 1: More-Than-Symbolic Acknowledgment

1.1 Introducing the 'Small House; Big Living' Project

I was invited to participate in the 'Small House Project' at the request of the Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC) (Appendix A: Invitation to Research). The Small House Project is being jointly conducted by the Jerrinja LALC, not-for-profit social enterprise ALL Sustainable Futures (ASF) and the University of Technology Sydney’s (UTS’s) Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF). Additionally, there are a range of multi-locale solidarities who are invested in the ‘Small House; Big Living’ project (See Figure 1.1). The aim of the wider housing project is to facilitate the return of elderly Jerrinja people to Country at Orient Point, NSW, via the development of co-designed ‘small houses’. In the Jerrinja community a person may be considered elderly when they are 55 years of age. This is largely because Indigenous people are often affected by health conditions associated with ageing at a younger age than non-Indigenous Australians (Department of Health, 2016b). My honours project is situated in a pre-project phase of the wider project and stands to integrate elderly Jerrinja people’s senses of home into the design process. The research findings will inform an architectural design competition to be judged by the Jerrinja community.

The Jerrinja LALC and ASF jointly conducted a series of Community Land and Business Plan (CLBP) meetings over the 2016-17 periods to identify the aims of the LALC and action strategies (New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council, 2009). Housing in the Jerrinja community was identified as a priority aim. More specifically, two immediate housing issues were identified. First, at least 12 elders who wished to return to back to Country, but couldn’t due to the housing shortage at Orient Point. Second, a need to diversify the current community housing stock on-Country at Orient Point, which consists mainly of large 3-4 bedroom houses (Miller, 2016). Therefore, the small house concept emerged to: (i) facilitate elderly Jerrinja people to return to Country by providing culturally and age appropriate housing; and (ii) provide the Jerrinja community a broader suite of housing options.
Figure 1.1- Multi-locale Solidarities of Small House: Big Living Project

Acronyms: **OEH**- Office of Environment and Heritage, **UOW**- University of Wollongong, **FACS**- Family and Community Services, **UTS**- University of Technology Sydney, **PM&C**- Prime Minister and Cabinet, **LAL**- Local Aboriginal Land, **LALC**- Local Aboriginal Land Council, **CEO**- Chief Executive
1.2 Positionality: Why I got involved?
Indigenous affairs always resonated with my personal politics. Hence, when I was first introduced to the Small House Project by Gordon Waitt, one of my supervisors, I was immediately excited by how well the project married the issues of sustainability and social justice in the context of an Indigenous research project. Throughout my life I have always a deep respect for Indigenous cultures. Box 1.1 explains how my understanding of Indigenous culture changed throughout my childhood and early adolescence years.

Box 1.1- Childhood Positionalities

My education at Grays Point Public School—referred to as ‘The School in the Bush’—in Sydney, NSW, connected me to the local Indigenous history of the Gweagal peoples of the Dharawal (or Thurawal) tribe. However, my early education of Indigenous culture was limited to a pre-invasion representation of Indigenous people as ‘ecological angels’ and ‘noble savages’ (Waitt, 1999). Nevertheless, these romanticized imaginings of Indigenous life inspired me to undertake a personal journey of learning about Indigenous culture, a journey that continues today.

This romanticized view of Indigenous culture was brought into question through a pivotal moment in my life. I recollect this moment through the following story:

I was around 6-8 years old, I had paddled my canoe across the Port Hacking River to the local waterfall and after following the stream of water all the way to the top I reached a large, pristine waterhole. Upon arrival I remember feeling confused because there were no Aboriginal people there. I was confused because at primary school I was always been taught that Aboriginal people socialized at waterholes.

However, I wasn’t taught the ‘ugly truth’ behind colonisation until my early teenage years, where I learnt about mass killings, and the spread of fatal diseases, slave labour, rape and more. This knowledge led to sincere feelings of grief and shame about my own English heritage, which only encouraged me to think more critically about what constitutes as “truth” when it comes to Indigenous histories, knowledges and affairs.
However, it wasn’t until a reading of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) during my Bachelors of Human Geography degree that the full extent of the colonial lies became clear. She explained in some detail how Indigenous histories, knowledges and affairs have been obscured by a colonial lens. Accordingly, I viewed the opportunity of engaging with the Jerrinja community as a unique and rare privilege, which would enable me to listen to Indigenous stories and to 'give voice' to Indigenous perspectives. Whilst, I recognise that Indigenous culture is not a static thing that should be wholly preserved, I also recognise the existence of contemporary forms of assimilation and oppression that constrain Indigenous people’s freedom of cultural expression.

1.3 Acknowledgment of Country

Upon thinking about my own positionality and the people who made this research possible, I consider what it means to acknowledge Indigenous people and Country. Typically, acknowledgments of Indigenous peoples and Country in research have been limited to an ‘Acknowledgment of Country’, which have become de rigueur in academic practice and virtually a pre-requisite for doing Indigenous research. Everett (2009: 53) suggests these modes of acknowledging have become a type of “… ‘safe’ inclusive gesture of recognition all the time knowing that such claims are not legally enforceable.” Therefore, I consider a different type of acknowledgment, which is more than a ‘symbolic’ and ‘inclusive’ gesture (Everett, 2008; Kowal, 2015). Rather than being a type of ethical pre-requisite of Indigenous research, I suggest that an acknowledgment of Indigenous people and Country should occur whilst ‘doing’ research. Whereby, I argue for a ‘more-than-symbolic’ acknowledgment, which privileges the authority of Indigenous participants, co-researchers, elders—past, present and future— and Country in research.

This research acknowledges the authority of Indigenous people and Country in four key ways. First, the 'Author-ity' of Jerrinja LALC CEO, Alfred Wellington, is acknowledged through recognising him as a co-researcher and co-author of any published work. Chapter 7 explains that Alfred was the primary Indigenous research collaborator, who shaped the focus and language of the thesis. Notably, Alfred drew upon his social networks in the Jerrinja community to assist recruitment and our relationship was also crucial to building rapport and trust with others. Second, I acknowledge that local community interests, needs and agendas take authority over academic agendas, in regards to meeting research timelines and the overall focus of the research. Accordingly, the research interpretations are the property of the Jerrinja community to be stored and accessed through the Jerrinja LALC and dissemination of findings will be determined in further consultation with the Jerrinja community. Third,
through following procedures that uphold Indigenous-led research principles this research acknowledges the authority of the people who shared their stories, knowledges and understandings. 

Fourth, I acknowledge the agency of Jerrinja Country in shaping my experiences of being in ‘the field’ with Jerrinja elders, and also—as I will come to show in Chapter 8—elderly Jerrinja people sense of home. Jerrinja Country holds immeasurable cultural and spiritual significance to the Jerrinja people. In the following chapter, I provide some context for understanding the relationship between Indigenous structural inequalities and Indigenous housing, and explain the impetus for undertaking this project.
Chapter 2: Introduction

©Photo by Hilton Penfold, 2017 - Roseby Park, Jerrinja Mission Sign

Alfred Wellington

…the main reason they have moved off the community is housing and jobs, simple as that, and they might have married and moved away because of those reasons.

~March, 2017~
Context matters. To provide context for an Indigenous project seeking to better understanding Indigenous understandings of house-as-home for an architectural design competition this chapter is divided in four parts. First I outline how Indigenous housing challenges are always embedded within the wider structural inequalities. Second, I discuss how these structural inequalities play out within the Jerrinja community of which housing is key. Third, I explain the connections between housing and cultural assimilation of Indigenous people. Moreover, I explain that the current Australian housing system is dominated by housing designs that are based on White-Australian understandings of home. Fourth, in light of the above discussions, provide my thesis aims, which seek to address the questions of what home means for Indigenous Australians and how Indigenous-led research might be conducted in an honours research project.

2.1 Indigenous Inequality and ‘The Housing Challenge’
Structural inequalities arising from settler colonialism is a characteristic of many Indigenous communities, throughout Australia and the world (Young, 2008; Mitrou et al, 2014). Key structural inequalities that continue to affect Indigenous communities include health, education, employment and housing (Mitrou et al, 2014; Grant et al, 2016; Maddison, 2013). Indigenous housing is but one of many structural inequalities facing Indigenous communities. Indigenous structural inequality may helpfully be conceived as a ‘marginalisation cycle’ (Drakakis-Smith, 1980) or ‘poverty cycle’ (Memmott, 1988). These framings of structural inequality as a ‘cycle’ is useful insofar as it helps to frame Indigenous inequality as something that requires sustained progress across multiple indictors of inequality (Moran, 2016).

Nevertheless, the issue of Indigenous housing appears to be particularly central as the house is a key arena where social reproduction occurs (Blunt & Dowling, 2006; Penman, 2008) and connects to key Indigenous issues of health (Bailie & Wayte, 2006; Lea & Torzillo, 2016; AIHW, 2013) and employment (Penman, 2008; Beer et al, 2016). However, Indigenous housing design is often overshadowed by what are viewed as more pressing issues, such as access to stable employment (Altman, 2009). Instead, this research sidelines the economic indicators of housing in order to consider whether or not Indigenous people want something in a house that might not be easily accessible in the mainstream housing market. The following section, outlines how the Jerrinja community brought the issue of housing design to the fore, in their discussions about housing challenges.
2.2 Local Housing Challenge: Orient Point, NSW
This section considers the local housing challenges facing the Jerrinja community, and identifies that the issue of housing design was considered to be a culturally significant issue. I begin, by providing a brief sketch of who the Jerrinja people are, and where they are located after being displaced by settler colonialism and socio-economic drivers.

2.2.1 Who are the Jerrinja people?
The Jerrinja community is a sub-group of the Wandian clan, known as the ‘Saltwater people of the Shoalhaven’. Many Jerrinja people are located at Orient Point, which is commonly referred to as the ‘mission’ – in reference to Roseby Park Mission (See Figure 2.1- in Red). However, ‘Jerrinja Country’ is a much broader term, which refers to land claimed by the Jerrinja community under the Aboriginal Land Rights ACT 1976. The Jerrinja community have various land titles held throughout the South Coast via the Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC). This research focuses on community housing at Orient Point, NSW (See Figure 2.1- marked in red). Adjacent to the Roseby Park Mission site are Indigenous ancestral burial grounds (See Figure 2.1- marked in blue). The ancient burial grounds are of immense cultural and spiritual significance, and was a significant factor drawing elderly Jerrinja people back to Country.

The wider Jerrinja community is spread throughout NSW and experiences similar housing and social challenges and inequalities to many other Indigenous communities in Australia. Housing challenges and inequalities include high rates of homelessness, housing shortages on-Country, unequal access to the private housing market and barriers in accessing forms of public housing (Miller, 2016). The displacement of Jerrinja community from Country is in part due to housing and employment shortages and in some instances health related issues, such as alcoholism and drug use. In the following section, I explain the significance of social and cultural drivers influencing elderly Jerrinja people to return to Country and kin.
2.2.2 Returning to Country
The primary aim of the wider Small House; Big Living project is to facilitate the return of elderly Jerrinja people back to Jerrinja Country at Orient Point, NSW, via building Small Houses. This section outlines why returning to Country is cultural significant for elderly Jerrinja people. At least 12 elderly Jerrinja people were identified at the CLBP meetings as living off-Country who wished to return. In particular, many of these elderly Jerrinja people were at an age where they could no longer maintain employment due to issues of health and physical mobility. The shortage of age-appropriate housing on-Country inhibited elderly Jerrinja people from returning to Country. Isolation is one of the greatest contributors to poor health for elderly Indigenous people, whereby maintaining family and kinship networks often functions a key social support system (Grant et al, 2016). In Chapter 5, I identify that for Indigenous
people a disconnection from Country and kinship can also result in a feeling of ‘spiritual homelessness’. According to Memmott (2015: 59) defined spiritual homelessness as “…a disrupted and unfulfilled state of ‘relational’ personhood with severe diminishment of connection to both kin and Country.” Accordingly, returning to housing on-Country is particularly important for elderly Jerrinja people who wish to reconnect with Country and traditional cultural knowledges and practices before passing away on-Country and being buried on the ancient Jerrinja burial grounds at Orient Point, NSW. The strong cultural desire for Aboriginal people to pass away on-Country has been well documented (Willis 1999; Sullivan et al, 2003; McGrath, 2006; 2007).

The ‘Small House; Big Living’ project arose from the NSW Family and Community Services ‘2016-17 Liveable Communities grants’ (FACS, 2016). The Liveable Communities Grants program was established to improve the lives of older people living in NSW. In particular, the Liveable Communities ethos was derived from the World Heath Organisations report on ‘Global Age-friendly Cities’ (2007), which outlined the need for public services and infrastructure to remain accessible to and inclusive of older people with varying needs and capacities. The Small House idea was proposed by Jerrinja community as a way to provide their elderly people aged care housing on-Country, which connects them to kinship support networks and Jerrinja Country. Additionally, the Small Houses will be nearby to Jerrinja community’s medical centre at Orient Point, NSW (See Figure 2.1). In the following section, I explain how housing is conventionally argued to be a form of cultural assimilation of Indigenous people into White-European norms and behaviours of homemaking.

2.3 Housing & Cultural Assimilation
In this section I discuss how housing may be conceived as a vehicle for assimilating Indigenous people towards European/Western values and behaviours of home (Read, 2000). As Read (2000: v) identified, historically “housing was used as a cultural form of domination to force assimilation of Indigenous people”. A key example of this was the formation of government missions, reserves and stations in the late 19th century was collectively aimed to ‘civilise’ Indigenous people to Christian/European norms and behaviours of home (Memmott, 2012). Similarly, Morgan (1999: 70-1) described early social housing in NSW as “Social Laboratories”, in Indigenous people were provided housing that were “designed for ‘respectable’ nuclear families and weaken(ed) ties to their ties to their extended family and community networks” Crucially, Indigenous people resisted these pressures through exerting an agency against the colonisers and state (Morgan, 1999; Habibis et al, 2013).
The Australian housing market is dominated by Western/European understandings and values of what home means in regard to: notions of homeownership, the size of houses and properties, housing design, cost, location, and neighbourhood organisation (Memmott, 2003; Habibis, 2015). In addition to this cultural disjuncture, Indigenous Australians experience unequal access to the housing market compared to non-Indigenous Australians. Grant et al (2016) identified that, relative to non-Indigenous population, Indigenous Australians are half as likely to own their own house, twice as likely to rent privately, and six times as likely to rely on social housing. According to Grant et al (2016), high rates of private rental and public housing means that Indigenous people often have little choice in the design and location of their home. This discussion utilizes an Indigenous/non-Indigenous dichotomy in order to illuminate the significant cultural and socio-economic inequalities facing Indigenous people in regards to housing. Although a study by Black & Richards (2009) showed that this comparing Indigenous people to a non-Indigenous baseline can have harmful social effects. Public and private housing tenures made available to Indigenous people reflect dominant settler-community understandings of home, nuclear families and privatism that do not fully reflect Indigenous community norms and practices around home and home-making. Therefore, a key challenge for Indigenous housing is how to accommodate the cultural differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, in the context of a housing system that is based on Western/European notions of home (Habibis et al, 2013).

2.4 Aims & Thesis Structure
The aims of this are fourfold:

1. To contribute to understandings of Indigenous senses of house-as-home.
2. To engage qualitative and participatory methods as a framework for Indigenous-led research.
3. To engage with the Jerrinja people’s understandings of house-as-home and its creation through everyday practices and processes of meaning making.
4. To co-produce an Indigenous-led contribution to the geographies of house-as-home literature.

To address these aims the thesis is structured into 10 chapters. Chapter 1 introduced my involvement in the Indigenous-led project. Chapter 2 outlined the wider political context of the project. Chapter 3 provides an overview of historical geographies of the Jerrinja people and their ancestors at Orient Point, NSW. A telling of historical geographies is particularly important in Indigenous research as time within
an Indigenous ontology is often understood as a relationship between events, rather than a linear progression (Memmott & Long, 2002).

Chapter 4 outlines the changes and continuities of Indigenous housing policies with a focus on NSW. More specifically, a current gap in housing policy is identified relating to elderly Indigenous aged-care, which the wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project seeks to address. I conclude with a discussion of the tiny house literature and consider how various affordances speak to the housing needs of elderly Jerrinj people wishing to return to Country.

In Chapter 5 presents a literature review of geographies of home. I identify a gap surrounding Indigenous geographies of home. I offer an argument that Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies of home are expressed through discussions of house-as-home, kinship-as-home and Country-as-Home.

Chapter 6 turns to methods and a theoretical discussion of what it means to do Indigenous-led research. Particularly, what I recognise that qualitative Indigenous research necessitates a specific set of ethical and methodological considerations. As an Indigenous-led project, the thesis draws upon a range of methodologies including participatory, collaborative and experimental research. Chapter 7 reflects upon how Indigenous-led research played out in practice I illustrate how almost every element of the initially co-produced research design slowly unravelled due to emergent local politics, cultural protocols and important social mobility practices. As an Indigenous-led research project, I detail how co-researcher, Alfred Wellington, and Jerrinja participants became co-producers of the research design and methods. I conclude that Indigenous-led research require flexibility and sensitivity on the behalf of the researcher, and cannot be separated from the wider social terrain which comprises the everyday lives of Indigenous Australians.

A theoretically inflected interpretation of Jerrinja meanings of home are provided in Chapters 8 and 9. Chapter 8 discusses kinship-as-home and Country-as-home. In particular, I argue that Indigenous notions of kinship and Country contain ambivalent meaning, which may contribute simultaneously towards the making and unmaking of home for elderly Jerrinja people. Chapter 9 turns to material house-as-home. I filter this chapter through three definitions of the material house-as-home: objective, aesthetic and relational (Bissell, 2008). I illustrate how Indigenous understandings of the material house-as-home are characterized by productive tensions (Mallet, 2003) arising from the need to accommodate and live with family and also to provide a felt connection to Jerrinja Country.
Chapter 10 offers a summary of the key findings, and provides four design principles that were derived from this research to inform the wider projects architectural competition. I conclude by questioning whether or not this research was able to produce a more-than-symbolic acknowledgment of Jerrinja people and Country throughout the process of the research.
Aunt Jenny

We used to love those first houses and they were real small. We used to have a couple of families in each and we all used to sleep outside and stuff. We didn’t have much but we used to love it.

~ February, 2017~
3.1 Introduction
What is known about Indigenous housing at Orient Point? The aim of this chapter is to answer this question. However, this is not a straightforward task. I was confronted by a range of challenges in regards to the representation of knowledge held in the libraries of the Shoalhaven. Libraries are places where knowledge is stored, managed and shared, either publicly or privately. Libraries have a long running legacy born out of privileged claims of truth and aspirations of knowledge growth (Budd, 2004), in which dominant national historiographies often render invisible Indigenous people and their histories (Johnson, 2008; Whiteley, 2002). A visit to the Nowra library confirmed this process. Indeed, there is very little written “history” about the Jerrinja community: a fact confirmed by both employees of the Jerrinja LALC and All Sustainable Futures (ASF). Official Jerrinja historical geographies at Orient Point are embedded in colonial representations of the past. The silences within these official versions were reinforced during my conversations with Jerrinja elders. Specifically, Jerrinja elders identified that Indigenous people’s role in Australia’s history is often rendered invisible through colonial accounts, including written historical geographies at Orient Point, NSW.

Therefore, in order to reconcile this representational imbalance, I draw upon oral histories. According to Nakata et al (2005) oral histories engage with narratives of the past that help to challenge privileged claims of truth and knowledge. Therefore, I draw upon oral histories that were told through storytelling practices during my situated conversations and talking circles (See Section 7.4 for definitions of methods). Moreover, this is supplemented by Jerrinja oral histories told for the documentary film “We come from the land, Orient Point, NSW” (1988), which was made by the Jerrinja Community Council and the nearby Wreck Bay Community, and Common Films. Additionally, I draw upon oral histories told by Uncle Ivan Wellington through the University of Western Sydney’s ‘Elders on Campus’ program (Wellington, 2016). This brief historical geography provides context and an understanding of settler colonialism as experienced by the Jerrinja people and their ancestors. These historical geographies of Jerrinja housing at Orient Point were central aspects of storytelling practices throughout this research. Accordingly, I begin with a telling of pre-invasion life and Indigenous houses, post-invasion
leading up to the establishment of the Jerrinja mission, and the transition from the Jerrinja mission to suburban enclave.

3.2 Pre-Invasion: Pre-1770

According to non-Indigenous written histories by the Havergal (1996), prior to European invasion, Shoalhaven River was occupied by related tribes, divided into family groups each containing around 20 to 30 people with well-defined boundaries. These groups would associate into larger groups of 70 to 100 people (Havergal, 1996). This is thought to be the case particularly around river drainages such as Shoalhaven River (Waters & Moon, 2013). As described by Havergal (1996: 56) “a large area of land was shared by the whole tribe and was their undisputed home”. However, due to the people's expert knowledge and ontological connections to land and Country, home was not defined by boundaries, white picket fences, or a legal document connoting ownership to be recognized and respected (Havergal, 1996; Moreton-Robinson, 2006). During the talking circles (See Section 7.4.5- for definition) Aunt Mary—a strong and passionate Jerrinja elder and traditional knowledge holder—explained how before settler colonialism the Jerrinja people had homes everywhere for every season of the year (See Figure 3.1 and 3.2). Figure 3.1 illustrates a large ‘Gunyah’, which was a pre-invasion form of housing constructed by the Jerrinja people and surrounding tribes. Figure 3.2 shows a contemporary construction of a smaller ‘Gunyah’ and highlights the continuity of pre-invasion Indigenous knowledges and practices in the Shoalhaven region. In pre-invasion times, houses were home insofar as they connected Jerrinja people to a vast cultural landscape and supported semi-nomadic practices. Country and family were not only integral aspects of home, but also sustained Indigenous livelihoods (Memmott, 2015). Central to the hunt-gatherer lifestyle were values of sharing and reciprocity between family, kin and tribal groupings (Memmott, 2015). In the following sections, I consider how European invasion disrupted these relationships between gunyah’s, kinship structures and connections to Country, through the widespread death and enslavement of Jerrinja people. Moreover, I illustrate how death and displacement impacted on Jerrinja people’s understandings of home, belonging and identity.
Figure 3.1- "the Gunyah" Shoalhaven, 1860s-90's (Samuel Elyard)

©Source- Waters & Moon, 2013, page 213

Figure 3.2- "The Gunyah" Shoalhaven 2017 (Gunyah- Celebrating South Coast Koori Culture)

© Source- Facebook Page- ‘Gunyah- Celebrating South Coast Koori Culture’ (2017)
3.3 Post-Invasion: 1770 to 1879
The first Europeans reached Jervis Bay in the 1790's. First was Lieutenant Bowen of the transport vessel Atlantic, and later that year came Mathew Weatherhead of the Whaling vessel Matilda. Both parties noted large Indigenous populations covering large swaths of land (Organ, 1990; Phelps, 1989). The descriptions of the Indigenous people of Jervis Bay were repeatedly referenced their physical strength. For instance, Charles Throsby remarked they were the most robust and healthy looking natives I have ever seen in the colony (Organ, 1990). Similarly, Governor Macquarie stated that many Aboriginal people were very stout, well made and good looking men, and seemed perfectly at their ease and void of fear (Organ, 1990). It was not until 1821 that Shoalhaven was significantly affected by colonisation, when Alexander Berry took up a 10 000 acre grant adjacent to the Shoalhaven River. According to Brenchley (1982), Alexander Berry was noted for looking after the Aboriginal people on his estate. Although, this account is firmly challenged by Aunt Mary, who stated that: “Our people that lived and moved around in our area, hunting and fishing, were taken away and used as slave labour by the Berry’s" (We come from the land, 1988). Moreover, Berry’s estate set a precedent for other entrepreneurs who soon realized the profitability of the region for logging, farming and mining. These capitalist enterprises further operated to dispossess, enslave and displace Jerrinja and other Wandi Wandian tribes from Country. Organ (1990: 134) identified the vast disjuncture between traditional Aboriginal and European worldviews, as he noted: “The [a]borigines appear to pity the Europeans, as persons under self-imposed slavery to toil, holding themselves as quite their superiors”. Similarly, Havergal (1996: 19) stated that the: "European possessiveness was morally obnoxious to the Aborigine [Aboriginal person]". It was this cultural difference according to George Brown (We come from the land, 1998) that led to Alexander Berry’s decision to move the local Aboriginal people to the southern side of the Shoalhaven River. This land is now referred to as Orient Point and Crookhaven Heads. This was one of the earliest colonial actions of displacement and isolation of the Wandi Wandian tribes from Country. Extensive farming and logging practices in the Shoalhaven region from then onwards resulted in a significant loss of Jerrinja Country, for instance in my conversations with Aunt Mary, she explained the devastating impact that the logging of red cedar trees had on the Jerrinja and
surrounding Indigenous peoples (See also Mills, 1988). She noted that the sun's reflection on the leaves of the red cedar trees in the afternoon created an important cultural spectacle, which her ancestors referred to as ‘Fire Mountain’.

Later in 1826, those images of Jerrinja people as “strong” and “healthy” changed drastically. For example, John Harper— a Wesleyan missionary— noted the decline in the Aboriginal population around Jervis Bay, counting a mere 96 Aboriginal people (Egloff, 1981). This decline was caused primarily by the introduction of diseases, such as Smallpox which spread out from the epicentre of Sydney, as well as gunfire, which is noted in multiple colonial accounts (See Organ, 1990). Egloff (1981) cites a horrific account by John Harper who describes hundreds of weak or deceased Aboriginal people throughout Jervis Bay. Later, in 1840 this decrease in population led John Harper to state, "...in twenty years there will scarcely be one genuine Aboriginal left within it [Jervis Bay]" (Phelps, 1989).

This discussion has outlined the significant impact of settler colonialism on the Jerrinja community, through the death and displacement of their people from Country. In the following section, I discuss how the establishment of Aboriginal Reserves was intended to act as an asylum for the remaining 'full blood' Aboriginal people, and where 'half-castes' would become a cheap source of labour (Barwick, 1972). Whilst these actions may have been understood as well-intentioned at the time— such as the establishment of the protectors of Aborigines throughout Australia (Rae-Ellis, 1996)— they were undergirded by scientific racism and economic interests, which viewed Aboriginal people as a distinct species whose natural fate was extinction (Haebich, 2001).
Figure 3.3 - Map of known Aboriginal Reserves in the Nowra Region

© Source: Waters and Moon, 2013
3.4 Mission to Suburban Enclave: 1879-Present
In the Nowra region the two most populated reserves were Wreck Bay and Roseby Park (See Figure 3.3). In 1879, the ‘Roseby Park Aboriginal Reserve’ at Orient Point, NSW was declared by the NSW Aboriginal Protection Board on what was previously referred to by colonizers as a ‘recreation area’ (See Figure 3.3- Sourced from Waters & Moon, 2013). Aunt Mary established during our conversations together that prior to the establishment Roseby Park mission, Jerrinja people were already living on the site referred to as mission or “the Mish”. The site has a long running historical significance for all Jerrinja people because it is nearby to their ancestral burial grounds (See Figure 2.1). However, this fact was not acknowledged by the non-Indigenous historical accounts by Havergal (1996) and Waters & Moon (2013). By November of 1901 there were a total of 12 households, many of which had moved from the nearby Cullunghutti camp (Aborigines Protection Board, 1901). The establishment of the Aborigines Protection Board led to the systematic removal of Aboriginal children from their families (Read, 2000). Waters & Moon (2013) identified that Aboriginal children in the Nowra region were frequently moved to the Bombaderry Children’s home.

Those Aboriginal people living on reserves were given rations of food and were initially governed by the police. When managers replaced policemen, the living conditions were no less paternalistic (Waters & Moon, 2013). Aunt Mary in our conversations together told me a story about a Scottish manager at the Jerrinja mission who wore a whip around his waist, and used to whip her people. Restrictions were imposed on mobility. Permission was required by the manager to move in and out of the reserves (Havergal, 1996). In Kwok's (2012: 32) research with the Jerrinja community she quotes an older Jerrinja man, who recalls:

I can remember the managers coming around the houses, I don’t know, I used to get scared, I don’t know why. Like he wasn’t looking for me or anything, but I was just thinking to myself, wonder what’s the whitefella man doing walking around.

These visits were commonplace on the Shoalhaven reserves, in which houses were inspected for cleanliness and signs of ‘deviant’ behaviour. For Aboriginal residents, these inspections quickly became a source of anxiety and humiliation (Kwok, 2012). In Havergal’s (1996) history of
the Shoalhaven region, housing at the Orient Point reserve is described as consisting of tin sheds with open fire places, where tin cans were sometimes used as toilets. This was later confirmed through my research conversation with Aunt Betty, who is a Jerrinja elder who is currently living on-Country.

According to Havergal (1996), many residents relied on a self-build model of housing, using improvisational materials and structures to reduce building costs. Organ (1990) identified that in 1974 the Orient Point Aboriginal settlement contained 113 people who were living in only 11 Houses. Moreover, my engagement with Jerrinja oral histories identified that at least 5 of these houses were only 2 bedroom houses, in which many people slept on verandas. Alfred Wellington informed me that the construction of 21 large houses in 1975-76 was the result of lobbying by the Jerrinja tribal council. The build was intended to stop the increasing numbers of Jerrinja people moving off Country, due to this lack of appropriate housing. Housing has long been identified as a key factor in facilitating connections to Jerrinja Country. The 21 houses that were developed in 1975-76 improved living conditions somewhat. My interviews with Alfred and Lisa Miller revealed that there are currently over 1200 Jerrinja people, most of whom have no way to return to permanent housing on-Country. Aunt Mary also explained to me that the original mission was located to the South of where the current 28 houses lie (Figure 3.4-in green). However, she noted that the development of Park Row (Figure 3.4-in Yellow) created a feeling of isolation between the two areas.
Figure 3.4- Old and New Jerrinja Mission Sites

© Source: Waters and Moon, 2013 and Hilton Penfold, 2017 - Adapted from Google Maps

3.5 Conclusion
The past is an integral part of the present Indigenous housing context in the Shoalhaven. The present displacement of Jerrinja people from Country began with the actions of Alexander Berry, who displaced the local Aboriginal tribes from their traditional land and forced them onto the southern side of the Shoalhaven River, where Orient Point is today. This forced isolation was later reinforced through the NSW government’s establishment of the Roseby Park mission, which restricted Jerrinja people’s movements and forced Jerrinja people to conform to European norms and behaviours. These historical geographies must be considered in relation to current socio-economic inequalities and cultural practices of the Jerrinja community. In the following section, I deepen an understanding of this past by providing the context of Indigenous housing policy in Australia.
Aunt Mary

“We [Indigenous People] invented Tiny Houses... We have been waiting for the rest of the world to catch up.”

~February 2017~
This chapter has two parts. First, I provide a brief overview of Indigenous housing policies, with a focus on NSW between 1960’s through to a policy shift following the 2007 Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER) and the later COAG agreements, which cumulatively initiated the ‘Closing the Gap’ era of housing policy (Habibis, 2015). Furthermore, I bring into focus Indigenous policies of health and housing, which deal with the provision of Indigenous aged care services. Moreover, I provide an overview of Indigenous housing and health policies, which relate specifically to the provision of Indigenous aged care in NSW, and identify how the wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project arises within a policy gap identified by both the Commonwealth and NSW Government. Second, I then explain the emergence of the tiny house movement. The Tiny Houses creates a range of affordances offering a range of political possibilities. Moreover, I consider the how the affordances of Tiny Houses aligns with a range of Indigenous housing issues, and more specifically those relating to elderly Indigenous people.

### 4.1 Indigenous Housing Policy

In this section, I outline some of the key housing policies, which have either forced or coerced Indigenous Australians to conform to Western notions norms and behaviours of home. First, I begin by providing an overview of Indigenous housing policy in NSW, from the 1960’s through to 2007. Additionally, I outline key policies that have encouraged Indigenous Australians to take up permanent residence away from traditional home places. Second, I illustrate that there has been a policy shift following the 2007 NTER and the later COAG agreements of 2008, which initiate the ‘closing the gap era’. However, I recognised that despite a range of effects and critiques of the early initiative, there is a growing recognition of the importance of creating housing pathways for elderly Indigenous Australians to return to Country.

#### 4.1.1 1960’s-2007: Staying, Leaving and Returning to Missions

The 1960’s and 1970’s were important decades for Indigenous Australians through the eruption of rights discourse, which challenged established norms, values and social conventions (Moreton-Robinson, 1998). The Commonwealth State Housing Agreement of 1945 led to the development of an unprecedented number of houses for public housing leading up to the 1960’s, by which time one third of dwellings built during this period were financed by the...
federal and state governments (Greig, 1995). Morgan (1999) identified that although theoretically Indigenous Australians were eligible to apply for public housing since the inception of the Housing Commission in 1942, it wasn’t until the change of public discourse in the 1960’s that Indigenous Australians became successful in their applications (Morgan, 2000). Crucially, Morgan’s (1999; 2000) analysis of social housing in NSW throughout the 1960’s and 1970’s identified the continuation of government-driven assimilation policies. He identified a range of ways that Indigenous people were pressured into conforming to Western nuclear family norms and behaviours, such as by housing inspectors placing limitations on the numbers of visitors and enforcing dress codes on Indigenous women (Morgan, 1999; 2000).

The 1972 Aboriginal Family Resettlement Scheme, NSW was established to provide pathways from Aboriginal family in rural or regional areas to migrate into areas that permitted greater economic opportunities (Mitchell & Cawte, 1977). This according to Morgan (1999: 75) “clearly served to further weaken attachment to traditional land.” Nevertheless, as Ross (2000: 7) identified, the resettlement scheme “underestimated the attachment people had to these reserves, and the reluctance of many to leave”. The establishment of Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALCs) under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 enabled Land Councils to manage housing services on ex-reserve lands. LALC can now apply to become registered Aboriginal Housing Organisations (AHOs) under the meaning of the NSW Aboriginal Housing Act 1998 (NSWALC, 2009). Read (2000) identified that following from a peak of national Indigenous housing policies and programs in the early 1980’s, funding and self-management of Indigenous housing has declined. In the following section, I illustrate that following from the 2007 Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER), Indigenous housing was reinstated as a key national policy concern via the ‘Closing the Gap’ era (Habibis, 2015).

4.1.2 Post 2007: ‘Closing the Gap’ on Housing Inequality

Addressing the poor housing of Indigenous people has been a policy focus of successive Australian Governments since 2007 (Habibis, 2015)

The 2007 Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER), which was initiated in response to concerns of high levels of child abuse in remote Indigenous communities in the Northern
Territory. Habibis (2015) recognised that the NTER created a significant shift in housing policy, whereby much of the responsibility of housing was transferred to the later National Partnership Agreements (NPAs). The NPAs identified Indigenous housing challenges as a key policy priority at national, state and regional levels. Key agreements affecting Indigenous housing include the ‘National Indigenous Reform Agreement’ also known as ‘closing the gap’ policy agreement (COAG, 2009a) and the ‘National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing’ (NPARIH) (COAG, 2009b). Under the Closing the Gap strategy, Indigenous housing was identified as one of five key areas that required immediate improvements in order to improving Indigenous health and wellbeing (Habibis, 2015). However, under the terms of the 2008 COAG agreements that management of remote Indigenous housing was shifted from the Indigenous Community Housing Organisation (ICHO) sector to the State and Territory governments, via State Housing Authorities (SHA) (Habibis et al, 2013). The justification was to mainstream housing delivery standards (Habibis et al, 2013). According to Hudson (2016) these NPA concentrate on very few social indicators. Instead, priority is given to economic indicators such as, “...the life cycle of housing, improved housing conditions and expanded housing options in remote Indigenous communities” (Habibis et al, 2016). This emphasis on economic indicators underplays of the role of social and cultural factors in housing outcomes for Indigenous communities.

Moreover, research by Habibis et al (2013) identified increasing pressures of housing conditionality, in which "state benefits are tied to demands that recipients conform to a range of behavioural requirements" (Habibis et al, 2013: 7). Therefore, the provision of housing for Indigenous people continues to be based on the Western model of the nuclear family (Habibis, 2015). Moreover, a shift towards housing conditionality continues to ignore important Indigenous household formations, which involve maintaining kinship obligations and differential uses of external and internal living spaces (Habibis, 2015; Long et al, 2007). The ‘closing the gap’ report of 2008 drew upon housing tenure as a primary measure of Indigenous housing outcomes (COAG, 2009a; COAG, 2009b). This comes despite a significant body of research that has problematized housing tenure as a measure of Indigenous housing outcomes (Sanders, 2005; Hulse, 2008; Crabtree, 2013- hybrid tenures). In contrast, this research adopts
the concept of home as a conceptual tool for understanding Indigenous people lived experience of housing. Meanwhile, the recent ‘closing the gap’ by Prime Minister Report (PMC) (2017) identified the importance of “The connection to country and family lies at the heart of Indigenous wellbeing” (PMC, 2017). Furthermore, this report highlights an intergovernmental need to create more housing pathways for Indigenous people to access housing on-Country. More specifically, this recent report recognizes the need to provide age appropriate housing for elderly Indigenous people to return to Country and kin. In the following section, I discuss a range of housing policies and programs that seek to provide culturally appropriate Indigenous aged care housing. I identify the need for Indigenous housing policy to create pathways for elderly Indigenous people to live on-country.

4.1.3 Indigenous Australian in Aged Care

The average life expectancy of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Australia is around 11 years younger than the non-Indigenous population (Moran, 2016) and conditions associated with ageing frequently begin at an earlier age (AIHW, 2017). Because of health, Indigenous Australians access aged care services at 50 years-of-age and over, as opposed non-Indigenous that must be 70 years-of-age and over (AIHW, 2017). A policy shift from the Australian Government in 2012 in regards to aged care resulted in the ‘Residential and Flexible Care Program’, which designated 43.1 million dollars to improving aged care facilities in remote communities (Department of Health, 2016a: 8). The ‘Residential and Flexible Care’ Program consists of several sub-programs, of which elderly Indigenous people most commonly access the ‘Multi-Purpose Services program’ (MPS) and the ‘National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Flexible Aged Care Program’ (NATSIFACP) (AIHW, 2017). The NATSIFACP identified the national governments aim “to provide quality aged care services that meet the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a culturally appropriate setting, close to home and community” (Department of Health, 2016: 6). However, these programs often do not provide housing directly on-Country. The wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project arose from a NSW government initiative, via the Family and Communities Services (FACS) ‘Liveable Communities Grants program’ to explore new possibilities and innovative approaches to creating more liveable communities (FACS, 2016). More specifically, this state initiative asks:
What it will mean to age well in the 21st century? This initiative is situated within a broader policy concern in Indigenous aged care services, which was identified by the Commonwealth governments ‘Innovative Care Program’. This program identified the need to test more flexible models of service delivery in areas where mainstream aged care services are inappropriate to meeting the needs of the location or target group. Therefore, the Small House concept emerged because it offers increased locational choice for elderly Jerrinja people. In other words, Small Houses—as aged care dwellings—can be situated on-Country nearby to family and kinship support structures (Birdsall-Jones & Shaw, 2008).

The wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project emerged from the Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALC) Community Land and Business Plan (CLBP), which was produced in partnership with ALL Sustainable Futures (ASF). In the development of the CLBP the Jerrinja community identified the Tiny House as an age and culturally appropriate form of housing. The wider project is the first known project of its kind to apply the Tiny House concept to Indigenous housing in Australia. Moreover, the projects application of the tiny house concept as a form of Indigenous aged care housing is particularly unique. In this thesis, references to ‘Tiny’ houses relate specifically to the wider social movement, and references to ‘Small’ houses relate to the Jerrinja communities application of the Tiny House concept.

4.2 What is a Tiny House?
The Tiny House concept is underpinned by the notion that ‘small is beautiful’ by the possibilities to attain a range of social, environmental, economic and political goals (Schumacher, 1973; Wilson & Boehland, 2005). A Tiny House is characterized by its reduced scale, efficient use of space and space saving technologies (Harris, 2015). The Tiny House concept is increasingly becoming a socially and culturally recognizable form of dwelling arising from multi-use and eco-
design housing design principles (Susanka, 1998; Shafer, 2009). There are key three types of tiny houses:

(i) Those on permanent foundations,

(ii) Those that lack foundations but are easily transportable (i.e. pre-fabricated or shipping containers) and,

(iii) Those on wheels, (i.e. on flatbed trailers, semi-trailers, trucks or Ute’s).

The reduced scale of Tiny House often increases the quality of the building materials that are used, and often increases the life-span of houses (Shafer, 2009). This contrasts with much of the housing provided to Indigenous communities, which frequently prioritized quantity over quality, and lacked effective consultation (Ross, 2000). Additionally, the reduced scale of housing provides a range of affordances (See Table 4.1), many of which align with elderly Indigenous needs in housing as well as broader Indigenous housing challenges.

Table 4.1: Affordances of Small Houses for elderly Indigenous (Adapted from Wilson et al, 2005 and Mutter, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental benefits include reductions in:</th>
<th>Financial savings include reductions in:</th>
<th>Lifestyle benefits include in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resources for construction</td>
<td>• Mortgage size (if any)</td>
<td>• Opportunity to work less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land occupation</td>
<td>• Property cost (if any)</td>
<td>• Housing &amp; Employment Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Household consumption</td>
<td>• Land rates (if any)</td>
<td>• Less maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal consumption</td>
<td>• Building costs</td>
<td>• Increased leisure time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy use</td>
<td>• Household Consumption</td>
<td>• Money can be allocated to enhance lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water use</td>
<td>• Personal Consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storm water run-off</td>
<td>• Utility bills (if any)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The reduced environmental footprint that results from having a tiny house reflects all important Indigenous cultural values of ‘caring for Country’ (Rusch & Best, 2014). In contrast, ‘Caring for Country’ in a large house is often deemed unaffordable, as sustainable materials and technologies are costly (Dowling & Power, 2012). The issue of affordability is further problematized for Indigenous people who, on average, suffer from higher rates of unemployment and lower levels of income compared to other Australians (Grant et al, 2016). More specifically, elderly Indigenous people are likely to benefit from the lower amount of household maintenance and ease of physical mobility required to live in a tiny house. Downsizing housing for elderly people is a well-known housing trend, which enables independence (Leach, 2012). The application of the tiny house idea to the policy gap in Indigenous aged care services is particularly sound.

4.2.1 Tiny House Movement(s)
The ‘Tiny House Movement’ refers to a global social movement, which collectively describes a broad range of micro-social movements, which all converge upon the Tiny House idea. These micro-social movements are listed in Table 4.2- below. Therefore, the Tiny House idea is embraced by various social movements. The reduced scale of housing provides a range of possibilities to these movements including a reduced environmental footprint, reduced financial costs, and more leisure time. The Tiny House concept is not new. It was Henry David Thoreau (1854) who lived in a tiny house as a form of protest towards the issue of housing affordability in the 1800s. Thoreau famously observed that:

*In the savage state every family owns a shelter as good as the best, and sufficient for its courser and simpler wants; but I think that I speak within bounds when I say that, though the birds of the air have their nests, and the foxes their holes, and the savages their wigwams, in modern civilized society not more than half the families own a shelter… The rest pay an annual tax for this outside garment of all… which would buy a village of Indian wigwams, but now keeps them poor as long as they live (Thoreau, 1854: 22).*

Thoreau’s description of housing affordability has been revalorized following the 2008 global financial crisis (Anson, 2014). However, the notion that the Tiny House concept is simply a
contemporary incarnation of more traditional forms of Indigenous housing has yet to be discussed. This was reflected by Aunt Mary’s quote on the cover page of this chapter, who—in referring traditional Indigenous forms of housing—said “We [Indigenous People] invented Tiny Houses... We have been waiting for the rest of the world to catch up.” In fact, there are currently very few discussions considering how the Tiny House concept might be applied to the issue of Indigenous housing. In the context of this research the Tiny House concept has been identified primarily for its potential to fill a policy gap in regards to Indigenous aged care. However, additional applications of the concept have been identified in regards to providing emergency housing to address high rates of homelessness in the Jerrinja community and for providing holiday accommodation for an eco-tourism enterprise.

Table 4.2- Tiny House Micro-Social Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Social Movements</th>
<th>Key References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>Shafer, 2009; Anson, 2014;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimalism/Simplicity of Living</td>
<td>Thoreau, 1854; Carlin, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Shafer, 2009; Carlin, 2014; Bartlett, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Affordability</td>
<td>Vail, 2014;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Mingoya, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees/Elderly</td>
<td>Mutter, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radical Social Movements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capitalism</td>
<td>Šulskutė, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarco-Primitivism</td>
<td>Kaczynski, 2008; Tucker, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Conclusion
This discussion of housing policy has provided necessary context for understanding the current housing challenges at Orient Point, NSW. The housing challenges identified during the Jerrinjia CLBP meetings, which relate to Indigenous aged care policy included the need to provide age and culturally appropriate housing on-Country. However, this housing need was shown to exist outside of the current ‘mainstream’ provision of aged care housing. Most specifically, this chapter has identified the need for current Indigenous housing policies and programs to create more pathways for elderly Indigenous people to live on-country, so as to facilitate important relationships to family and kin. In the following section, I build upon this discussion by illustrating that Indigenous senses of home arise at the intersection between Indigenous notions of house, kinship and Country. This discussion reiterates the significance of the findings from this section by recognising that Indigenous housing policy must take into consideration important Indigenous relationships and obligations to Country and kinship.
Chapter 5: Towards an Indigenous Geographies of Home
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Alfred Wellington

There was more like a connected feeling between everything, there was no such thing as fencing...It was like a fluid landscape.

~March, 2017~
The aim of this Chapter is to provide a contribution to the Indigenous geographies of home literature. The chapter is divided into six sections. First, I identify a gap in the Indigenous geographies of home literature. Second, I review the geographies of home literature specifically that which is alive to lived experience. I introduce the concept of embodiment to argue for a relational definition of home that is alive to how materials of home work alongside social and cultural elements. Third, to offer a conceptual framework I discuss Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies of home. Specifically, the discussion focuses on three key concepts: Country-as-home, kinship-as-home and house-as-home. I argue that for all Indigenous people a sense of home is understood relationally according to the ability to maintain connections to Country and kin. I discuss the notion of ‘spiritual homelessness’ to illustrate instances where these connections to Country and kin have been either diminished or severed completely. From this, I conclude that due to issues of physical impairment, a sense of home for elderly Indigenous people would benefit from housing that is on-Country and nearby to kin.

5.1 Literature Gap
The research aim is to develop an understanding of Indigenous senses of home as part of an Indigenous-led tiny house project. Therefore, this research is situated at the intersection of three strands of literature: Indigenous geographies, geographies of home, and Indigenous housing studies. This chapter establishes an intermediary ground between the three strands by developing a framework for understanding Indigenous geographies of home. At present, there is a paucity of literature discussing Indigenous geographies of home. The literature that does exist has a tendency towards discussions of home-as-nation (Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Slater, 2007; Blunt & Dowling, 2006). While, I acknowledge the importance of this broader discussion, this research considers the less often discussed contemporary Indigenous house-as-home.

Indigenous geographies emphasize notions of relationality, mobility and fluidity of Indigenous space/place relationships. The ideas are illustrated through discussions of Indigenous notions of Country (Wright et al, 2016), place/space relationships (Memmott & Long, 2012; Bawaka Country, 2016), experiences of migration/diaspora (Butler, 2001; Moreton-Robinson, 2003) and
translocalism (Castree, 2004). This work illustrates how these spatial relationships are integral to understanding Indigenous notions of belonging, identity and home. Similarly, following Panelli (2008) I suggest that Indigenous geographies of home are constituted through relational, mobile and fluid processes and practices (Fien & Charlesworth, 2012). Furthermore, Panelli (2008) argues that Indigenous geographies of home, place and Country provide key points of dialogue from which to critique contemporary White/Anglo geographies. She goes on to argue that an engagement with more-than-White/Anglo geographies will help to position modernist geography as a particular form of knowledge. Like Panelli (2008), I am interested in establishing a conceptual framework of how Indigenous senses of home are understood in relation to house, kinship and Country. And, like Panelli (2008), I argue that this framework can provide key points of dialogue from which to critique White/Anglo geographies of home. In the following section, I introduce the different ways that home is conceptualized.

5.2 Introducing the Concept of Home

Mallett (2003) argued there is no singular theory of home and suggested that contradictory theoretical approaches should be engaged in productive tension. The definitions of home expressed in the literature are shaped by a range of different schools of thought across several disciplines; specifically human geography (Blunt & Varley, 2004; Easthope, 2004; Blunt & Dowling, 2006; Brickell, 2012), sociology (Mallet, 2004; Stets & Turner, 2008), domestic architecture (Memmott et al, 2003; Cieraad, 1999; Fincher, 2004; Pilkey et al, 2015) and psychology (Moore, 2000; Gustafson, 2001; Seager, 2011). More specifically, studies of home within human geography are informed by a range of research paradigms including: humanism (Heidegger, 1954); Marxism (Kemeny, 1987; Harvey, 1978; 2005); socialist feminism (Haraway, 1990; Fortunati, 1995); and, more recently, strands of post-structuralism (Waitt, 2005), most notably post-humanism (Power, 2005; Sundburg, 2014). Despite this abundance of literature on geographies of home, there is yet to be any comprehensive theoretical discussion of Indigenous geographies of home. Accordingly, in the following section, I review the geographies of home literature that are alert to the sensuous or embodied dimensions of home to help understand the underlying social and material entities which shape and reshape home for Indigenous
people. I argue that humanism and post-humanism provide the most detailed discussion about the meanings of home through engaging with people’s everyday lived experiences of home.

5.3 Geographies of Home Attentive to Lived Experiences
In this section, I suggest that scholars working within the paradigms of humanism and post-humanism provide the most comprehensive discussions about different meanings of home. This work is alive to the multiplicity of the lived experiences of home by drawing upon a range of different perspectives across gendered, ethnic, classed, sexed and human/non-human differences. For instances, attention is given to lived experiences of *homelessness* (Dovey, 1985; Somerville, 1992); *migration* (Ahmed et al, 2003; Ahmed, 1999; Tolia-Kelly, 2004; Wiles, 2008); *colonisation* (Read, 2000; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Panelli, 2008); and *sexuality* (Gorman-Murray, 2007; Waitt & Gorman-Murray, 2011). This stands in contrast to both positivist and Marxist paradigms, which overlooked home as a place of profound social and cultural significance (Blunt & Dowling, 2006). A positivist ontology views the house-as-house according to objective dimensions, such it co-ordinate on a map, sizes of spaces and types of materials. However, this renders invisible all of the ways that these dimension become troubled by human/non-human life. Within Marxism the notion of social reproduction was emphasized and home was viewed as a hindrance towards social change (Blunt & Dowling, 2006). This section is structured as follows. First, I discuss how a project aimed to represent Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies resonates with a humanist paradigm. Second, I illustrate the relevance of post-humanism. In particular, I illustrate how both Indigenous and post-humanist ontologies acknowledge the agency of more-than-human entities in shaping people’s experiences of home.

5.3.1 Humanist Ontology of Home
A humanistic ontology maintains that ‘being in the world’ is affected by people’s ability to experience and create their own subjectivities. Indigenous ontologies of “relationality” (Moreton-Robinson, 2003), “connectedness” (Martin & Mirraboopa, 2003: 210) and “becoming” (Smith, 1999) critique humanism for privileging human consciousness over the
non-human and more-than-human world. The humanist geographer would ask existential
questions about how people ‘experience’ their home (Blunt & Dowling, 2006). From a
humanist’s worldview, the non-human elements of the home are only significant insofar as they
are consciously imbued with meaning by people (Rose, 1993; Blunt & Dowling, 2006). Emotion
or memories thus becomes contained in a thing; an affective sensibility (Bissell, 2008). This goes
against an Indigenous ontology, which understands that being-in-the-world is not controlled
and determined by human consciousness, but may be affected by non-human elements
(Bawaka Country, 2015). Moreover, I suggest that adopting lessons from a post-humanist
ontology may help develop a more meaningful discussion around how a house may be designed
to become a home for elderly Indigenous people. However, I take caution of Sundberg’s (2014)
critique that post-humanism has a tendency to subordinate other ontologies and
epistemologies through universalizing claims of being an all-encompassing research paradigm.

5.3.2 Post-Humanist Ontology of Home
Post-humanism posits that how we exist in the world is shaped through relational and
embodied processes of being and becoming. As Clapham (2013) noted, in the geographies of
home, post-humanism ontologies gained momentum to counter thinking of home as simply a
carrier of symbolic meanings. Blunt & Dowling (2006) drew upon a post-humanist ontology to
demonstrate how understandings of home are both symbolic and material. Hence, home is
conceived as a ‘thoroughly embodied’ that involves social and material elements. The concept
of embodiment considers the body as an integral component of human agency. After Shilling
(1993: 9), “it is impossible to have an adequate theory of human agency without taking into
account the body. In a very important sense, acting people are acting bodies.” Accordingly, an
embodied framework attends to Thrift’s (2004) call for non-representational geographies, by
challenging the epistemological priority of representations as the grounds of sense-making
(Hayes-Conroy & Hayes-Conroy, 2010) and instead prioritizes affect and sensation. Thrift (2004:
13) accepts ‘minimal humanism’, which asserts that humans retain partial agency despite “our
self-evidently more-than-human and more-than-textual and multisensual worlds” (Lorimer,
2005: 85). Therefore, in post-humanist ontologies, home is understood through relationships
between human and non-human agents, which undergo constant subconscious spatial interactions (Jacobs and Malpas, 2013). Thus, in addition to conscious meaning making processes, these subconscious interactions between human and non-human agents might similarly produce home-making properties. Moreover, I suggest that in the current intercultural setting, the house is a key site or space in which these interactions between human and non-human agents are situated. Non-human agents include both biotic and abiotic agents. Biotic agents in the home include domestic animals, wild animals, pests and microorganisms (Power, 2005; 2012; Cook et al, 2016). Abiotic agents in the home include the materials and stuff that makes up people’s home, including objects, memorabilia, furnishings, decorations, consumer goods and products (Reimer et al, 2015; Gram-Hanssen & Bech-Danielsen, 2004).

Given the research focus on housing design, this research is particularly interested in understanding the extent to which human agency is subdued by house design. In particular, I draw upon Imrie’s (1996; 2004; 2005) research on disability, which provides a stark example of how people’s bodies can be oppressed by their material home. He notes that “impaired bodies have rarely featured in design conceptions or practices in relation to dwelling”, which “renders the body disabled” (2004: 686). This is what Blunt (2005) described as a disjuncture between design and dwelling, which results in a conscious awareness and embodiment of housing design. Disability scholars discuss this disjuncture as a form of oppression and alienation for disabled people (Miller, 2001; Clapham, 2011). Clapham (2013: 370) in citing Imrie (1996) notes, "'modern' architecture had a model of an 'ideal man' who was 6 foot tall, muscular and healthy, around whom buildings were designed." Similarly, oppressive processes are evident through the houses provided to Indigenous communities (Memmott, 2003). In considering the elderly Indigenous focus I bring into question throughout this research whether or not this ‘ideal man’ was also non-Indigenous and young. Next, I argue that Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies of home have implicitly been articulated through three discussions about Country-as-home, kinship-as-home and house-as-home.
5.4 Indigenous Geographies of Home
In this section I show how Indigenous understandings and meanings of home are distinct from White/Anglo notions of home. I consider this through developing a theoretical framework for understanding Indigenous senses of home as constituted through intersecting relationships between houses, Country and kinship. First, I discuss how in the current intercultural setting the Indigenous house-as-home sits alongside a sense of home as underpinned by connections to Country and kin (See Memmott, 2007; Pascoe, 2014). Second, I demonstrate how maintaining connections to Country remains an important part of contemporary Indigenous culture and identity throughout Australia, and consider how these connections are important for maintaining a sense of identity and home. Third, I discuss how maintaining connections and upholding cultural obligations to extended family and kin also remain an important element of contemporary Indigenous identity and function to create a sense of home.

5.4.1. House-as-Home
The notion of house-as-home implies a central socio-cultural connection between the house and home, which according to various scholars did not exist before colonization (Memmott, 2003; Fien et al, 2011; Memmott, 2015). For instance, Fien et al (2011: 345) identify that "Australian Indigenous families traditionally perceive and use housing for conducting the business of living". This is reflected by Memmott (2015):

> Individual shelters were too impermanent to be remembered in this way. "Home" was thus comprised of the campsites and other places in one’s Country, but not any particular architectural residence. This is an example of "home" being predicated on country and sociability rather than privacy. (Memmott, 2015: 64)

In taking from this, I contend that for some Indigenous people a sense of home is now ‘intercultural’. In particular, I suggest that Indigenous understandings of home involve important socio-cultural connections to ‘architectural residence’, in addition to relationships to Country and kin (Memmott, 2015). Nevertheless, this statement insists that notions of an Indigenous 'house-as-home' must be addressed with a degree of caution. Blunt & Dowling (2006) noted as researchers we must prove the connections between house and home rather
than assume them. This is particularly crucially given that in Australia “housing was a strong vehicle for assimilation policies from the 1940s to the 1960s.” (Read, 2000: 4). Memmott & Go-Sam (2003: 13) noted that it is important to “identify those aspects of their customary domiciliary behaviours that have been retained”. Similarly, Birdsall-Jones et al (2013) identified the need to consider the importance of ‘Indigenous agency’ in retaining important cultural practices and behaviours despite the efforts of the state to assimilate Indigenous people in mainstream housing practices and behaviours. These policies sought to assimilate Indigenous people into what Waitt & Murray (2007: 574) identified as “the conventional heteronormative ideal of a nuclear family as a house-as-home.” Morgan (1999; 2000) illustrated how, despite housing policies, Indigenous people effectively resisted changes in order to maintain important cultural practices and traditions. Thus, Indigenous senses of home continue to be predicated on connections to Country and kin, or what Memmott (2015) called ‘sociability’. In the next section, I discuss the concept of Country-as-home to illustrate how Indigenous senses of home are always associated with more than the house as a structure or dwelling.

5.4.2 Country-as-Home
The term Country relates to an Indigenous ontological and spiritual connection to the land and more-than-human entities (Rose, 1996; Wright, 2014). As Rose (1996: 7) famously wrote:

...Country is a living entity with a yesterday, today and tomorrow, with a consciousness, and a will toward life. Because of this richness, country is home, and peace; nourishment for body, mind and spirit; heart’s ease.

Indigenous people’s ontological relationship to Country emphasizes material agency, knowledge and life (Bawaka Country, 2015; Braun, 2005; Panelli, 2008). Thus, the notion of Country enriches geographical concepts of space/place, relationality and home (Bawaka Country, 2016). Country is frequently referred to as being a place that Indigenous people call home, which is most clearly recognizable through references to "Home Country”, which is often used interchangeably with the term “Homeland” (Rose, 1996; Moreton-Robinson, 2003; Morgan, 2006; Panelli, 2008; Grant, 2016). However, this conflation between home and Country is by no means straightforward, as Stanner (1969: 230-1) explained:
No English words are good enough to give a sense of the links between an Aboriginal group and its homeland. Our word ‘home’, as warm and suggestive though it may be, does not match the Aboriginal word that may mean ‘camp’, ‘heart’, ‘country’, ‘everlasting home’, ‘totem place’, ‘life source’, ‘spirit centre’ and much else in one.

Panelli (2008: 805) noted that “notions of ‘country’ complement the potency associated with meanings of home”. The intersection between housing and Country is highlighted by the breadth of literature, which considers the importance of providing housing for Indigenous people on-Country (Moran et al, 2010; Memmott et al, 2009; Porter, 2009; Crabtree et al, 2012; 2014: 2015). Thus, notions of ‘Country-as-home’ may have a particularly central role in determining whether Indigenous people feel at home in their house or not. Perhaps this dynamic was put most succinctly by Moreton-Robinson (2003: 13) as she noted:

*Indigenous people can be out of place in another’s Country, but through cultural protocols and the commonality of our ontological relationship to country we can be in place but away from our home country.*

Similarly, Grant (2016) recently wrote, “Strong cultural and social attachment may mean many Aboriginal people will be reluctant to move from their home Country.” (Grant, 2016: 64). These statements are a testament to the potency that Panelli (2008) discussed, but also identifies how Indigenous experiences of Country-as-home may be best conceived in terms of a deeply embodied feeling. Memmott & Long (2002: 44) referred to the embodied dimensions of Country has having a distinctive “high density of Indigenous place properties”, or what Memmott & Stacy (1997) described as “physical-psychological complexes”. In the next section, I consider the importance of maintaining relationships and obligations of care and reciprocity to family and kinship, and how this connects to an Indigenous sense of home. This discussion illustrates how an Indigenous sense of home extends beyond the physical structure of the house.
5.4.3 Kinship-as-Home

Here, I consider the role of Indigenous extended family and kinship networks in constructing or nurturing a sense of home for Indigenous people. Extended family and kinship structures are one of the most important features of Indigenous cultures and identity, which necessitates that kinship or ‘kinfolk’ look after one another (Birdsall-Jones & Shaw, 2008: 14). Indigenous obligations to family and kin differ from White/Anglo relationships to family and friends, due to a range of socio-spatial behaviors. These socio-spatial behaviors span from largescale behavioral movements of social mobility to more local and household avoidance behaviors. An extensive literature theorizes how Indigenous mobility practices work to maintain connections to home places (Taylor & Bell, 2004; Prout & Howitt, 2009; and Prout, 2009). Memmott & Moran (2001; cited in Fien & Charlesworth, 2012) noted that Indigenous social mobility practices amount to ‘constant circulation’ as opposed to migration or displacement. Crucially, Prout (2009) distinguished between three types of transient movements of Indigenous people, which maintain a sense of home. First, Prout described a group of Indigenous people who were ‘homeless’ in a technical sense. However, she notes that a technical view of homelessness became troubled as many Indigenous people were shown to feel “…at home with family members within a network of towns throughout the region” (2009: 412). Second, she discussed a type of transient Indigenous movement, which “involves continual returns to a ‘home-base’ after frequent journeys away” (2009: 412). Third, she identified another transient movement that “involves the production of multiple ‘home places’ by individuals who migrate to one place for part of the year” (2009: 412). Therefore, Indigenous social mobility practices do not necessarily produce feelings of diaspora, as is often framed through migrants’ experiences of home (Moreton-Robinson, 2003).

For Indigenous people a disconnection from Country and kin cannot be reduced to a feeling of isolation, but rather amounts to ‘spiritual homelessness’ (Christensen, 2013; Memmott, 2015). Memmott (2015: 59) defined spiritual homelessness as:

…a disrupted and unfulfilled state of ‘relational’ personhood with severe diminishment of connection to both kin and Country
As Daphne Nash (quoted in Memmott, 2015: 70) reminded us:

*In non-Indigenous ontology/sociality a person can remain physically/spiritually connected to place by themselves, alone, in ways that an Indigenous person cannot attempt/maintain. For Indigenous Australians the connection to place is mediated through relationships with others, so a break in social relationships comes before/predicates a break with (C)ountry (whereas a “break” with (C)ountry is not as severe in consequences if relationships with people are maintained or not completely broken. And increasingly Aboriginal people do not know their traditional connections to (C)ountry...reconstruction of people-land relationships are socially culturally/politically important but people-people relationships are primary.*

I suggest that the converse of spiritual homelessness is “spiritual homeliness”, in which these connections to kin and Country are maintained. Typically, if Indigenous people live off-Country this spiritual homeliness is maintained through social mobility practices (Memmott, 2015). However, I suggest that elderly people are often more susceptible to experiencing spiritual homelessness than younger Indigenous people more physical mobile and healthy. Poor physical health makes it increasingly difficult for many elderly Indigenous people to engage in social mobility practices, thereby preventing them from maintaining a sense of spiritual homeliness. An understanding of Indigenous homemaking practices must take into account how social mobility practices function to renew connections to Country, kin and a multiple houses. Therefore, I argue that elderly Indigenous people are often impaired from maintaining these important connections to kin and Country due to limitations of both physical and social mobility.

### 5.5 Conclusion

This chapter provided an Indigenous-based contribution to the geographies of house-as-home literature. In particular, this chapter revealed the paucity of literature exploring Indigenous people’s lived experiences of the house-as-home. Moreover, a review of the literature suggests that in order to develop a greater understanding of Indigenous senses of home, research would benefit from a focus on lived experiences of social and material elements of the house-as-
home. Furthermore, I have demonstrated how the social and material elements of home are brought to the fore by the notions of house-as-home, Country-as-home, kinship-as-home. A discussion of spiritual homelessness has provided impetus for this research to consider the notions of spiritual homeliness. A key element of this discussion has been the notion that due to issues of physical mobility, a sense of home for elderly Indigenous people would benefit from housing that is on-Country and nearby to kin. The next chapters turn to methodological implications of an Indigenous-led project.
Chapter 6: Methodologies: Designing Indigenous-Led Research in Principle
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Alex

But this is paradise I would never move away. Like I’d never move away no matter if I stayed in that caravan for the rest of my life

~February 2017~
6.1 Introduction
In this chapter, I provide a theoretically informed discussion of Indigenous-led research in principle, as a prelude to my discussion in Chapter 6 about how my Indigenous-led research played out in practice. Indigenous-led research practice is consistent with the wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project, which seeks to co-design Small Houses with and for the Jerrinja community. This is expected to occur through a series of co-design workshops and an architectural competition that will be judged by members of the Jerrinja community.

Dealing with my Honours research, in the context of this wider project, first, I establish that this research is a cross-cultural Indigenous project and consider the ethical and methodological considerations given the colonizing legacy of research and specifically geographical research. Moreover, I explain why it is important that cross-cultural Indigenous researchers should attempt to engage in decolonizing research practices. Second, I outline the key principles of Indigenous-led research. More specifically, I argue that Indigenous-led research provides a mechanism not simply to decentre the authority of knowledge production away from researchers, but also to decentre the authority from humans in general (Bawaka Country, 2015). Third, I enter the long-running debate about the issue of social power in cross-cultural Indigenous research, whereby I employ three methodological tactics aimed to engage with power dynamics: critical reflexivity, positionality and biography. Finally, I discuss specific methods of data collection/knowledge gathering that were co-designed with the Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC) and ALL Sustainable Futures (ASF). I argue that the research methods presented in this section are consistent with Indigenous-led research principles on two accounts. First, these methods were co-produced with the Jerrinja LALC. Second, they allow Indigenous people to lead the knowledge gathering process.
6.2 Cross-Cultural Indigenous Research

...in effect, all research is "cross-cultural". All research involves both researchers and subjects, who always bring very different intellectual frameworks to a project (King et al, 1999: 1)

Howitt & Stevens (2016: 46) note that “much of geographical research is cross-cultural” as geographers are constantly drawn to think about other people’s ontologies and epistemologies. Thus, my usage of the term ‘cross-cultural’ retains an awareness of the ways in which people of different cultures are able to share common spaces and cultural landscapes. This research is cross-cultural in the sense that I am a non-Indigenous person who began this research without any existing relationships or knowledges of the Jerrinja community. Cross-cultural Indigenous research practice requires additional ethical and methodological considerations than other forms of cross-cultural research, due to the ongoing effects of colonialism and settler colonialism. In this context, the non-Indigenous researcher is required to answer important ethical questions in regards to why research is necessary, how research will be conducted and in what ways will research benefits Indigenous people. However, as this research has arisen from an invitation the key question for this research is how research will be conducted. This chapter attempts to answer this question.

In this section, I explain that cross-cultural Indigenous research practices have taken two main forms: colonizing and decolonizing. First, I provide an overview of the past examples of colonizing research practices, which rendered Indigenous as non-human and less-than-human via Western objectivist science. Moreover, I conclude that an important element of cross-cultural Indigenous research is recognising and remaining sensitive to a history colonizing research practices that have been conducted ‘on’ rather than ‘with’ Indigenous people. Second, I explain the importance for cross-cultural researcher working with Indigenous people to engage in decolonizing research practices. Third, I suggest that engaging in decolonizing research requires adopting Indigenous methodologies, which are methodologies that have been specifically designed for and by Indigenous people (Rigney, 1999). Nevertheless, I
conclude that cross-cultural researches must always remain cautious of colonizing reflexes that may persist despite concerted efforts to decolonize Indigenous research.

6.2.1 Colonizing Research

By colonizing research, I mean those western paradigms or practices which overlooked or silenced Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies. Howitt and Stevens (2016) defined colonial research as that, which "reflects and reinforces domination and exploitation through the attitudes and differential power embodied in its research relationship with 'others'..." (Howitt & Stevens, 2016: 47). Colonial research practices have historically accompanied a range of colonializing government practices and policies, which functioned both to oppress and assimilate Indigenous people (Smith, 1999). In particular, Indigenous researchers extensively critiqued and condemned positivism for having 'dehumanized' Indigenous people by "classifying Indigenous people alongside the flora and fauna" (Smith, 1999: 119). Colonial research is inevitably power laden through its maintenance of ethnocentric values, which most commonly privileged what we know as 'Western science' (Watson & Huntington, 2008).

Smith (1999) remarked on the implications arising from the research practices arising from Western scientific approach to research on Indigenous peoples:

> Just knowing that someone measured our 'faculties' by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds and compared the amount of millet seed to the capacity for mental thought offends our sense of who we are and what we are. (Smith, 1999: 30)

Such research practices positioned Indigenous people as “less than human” (Nakata et al, 2012) and functioned to justify colonial policies of extermination or the later policies of assimilation (Smith, 1999). More broadly, Howitt & Stevens (2016: 51) identified that “Western science and scholarship have (mis) represented non-Western, Indigenous and subaltern people and groups.” Harrison and Livingstone (1980) observed that research methods within human geography were prefigured by a positivist legacy in the discipline. In response, Howitt and Jackson (1998: 166) identified that “the discipline remains hobbled to, and troubled by, antecedent colonial ideologies”. That said; strands of humanism helped to 're-humanize'
Indigenous people through belatedly recognizing the "universal human subject" (Smith, 1999: 68). Nevertheless, the humanist paradigm fails to acknowledge or take seriously the Indigenous ontology of relationality by over-stating the centrality of human consciousness (Jacobs & Malpas, 2013).

In thinking about the colonial past, I considered the words of the philosopher Santayana (cited in Grant, 2016: 13) who questioned, “Are those who do not remember the past condemned to repeat it?” In response, Grant (2016: 13) stated that: “Far too often those who remember the past also repeat it, and memory hardens hatred”. Therefore, Howitt & Jackson’s (1998: 166) suggestion for researchers to increase our awareness and ownership of the past should only be thought of as a small first step towards addressing that past. Colonizing research practices are not simply historical, but rather are ongoing and continue to pervade research (Smith, 1999). However, in order to address contemporary colonizing reflexes in geography, the cross-cultural researcher must recognise the past as a first step towards being able to address it. In the next section, I argue that contemporary research practices must also follow a process of decolonising knowledge in order to redress the colonizing research practices conducted ‘on’ Indigenous people.

6.2.2 Decolonising Research

Indigenous peoples must set the agenda for change themselves, not simply react to an agenda that has been laid out for us by others. (Smith, 1999: 210)

Decolonizing research is that which privileges Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies (Smith, 1999; Rigney, 2001; Wilson, 2005) to align the research agenda with Indigenous interests and the reclamation of Indigenous lands and culture (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Zavala, 2013). Sundberg (2014: 34) defined the broader decolonization agenda as “exposing ontological violence authorized by Eurocentric epistemologies both in scholarship and everyday life.” In geography, Howitt & Jackson (1998: 166) observed that “however anti-colonial some geographers' work might be, the discipline itself is yet to be effectively decolonised”. Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) seminal book “Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples” set a precedent for scholars to further question the ongoing nature of colonialism. According to Swadener &
Mutua (2008), postcolonial research practices still fail to take seriously the decolonising agenda in Indigenous research, citing Moana Jackson's (cited in Swadener & Mutua, 2008: 31) suggestion that “Colonial leopards rarely change their spots. They just hunt in different ways”. Accordingly, it is important that colonizing and decolonizing research practices are understood as working along an undecided continuum, rather than following a linear historical progression towards decolonization (Howitt & Stevens, 2016). Following from this, I discuss the importance of utilizing Indigenous methodologies to engage more fully in decolonizing Indigenous research.

6.2.3 Indigenous Methodologies

Western paradigms now have to shift to fit in with Indigenous world views and paradigms. Whereas in the past Indigenous peoples had to fit with Western research approaches, now we have Indigenous methodologies developed by Indigenous people for use with Indigenous people (Geia et al, 2013).

The above quotation helped me understand ‘Indigenist methodologies’ (Rigney, 1999) or ‘Indigenous methodologies’ (Wilson, 2001), which refers to range of methodologies founded on Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies, and designed or adapted by Indigenous people in order to privilege Indigenous understandings in research practices. Indigenous methodologies are thought to ‘give voice’ to Indigenous understandings and experiences of the world (Smith, 1999). Such methodologies necessarily contribute towards the decolonizing agenda (Kurtz, 2013) or what Smith (1999) describes as “researching back”. However, this set of methodologies is neither static nor fixed. No singular research paradigm or Indigenous methodology is advocated (Rigney, 1999; Fletcher, 2003; Wilson, 2008). Rather Indigenous methodologies are diverse and divergent from one another (Graham, 2012) and open to constant change, much like the Indigenous peoples and cultures which they hope to represent (Wilson, 2001; Louis, 2007). Engaging Indigenous research methodologies thus requires context-specific methodological approaches to suit specific cultural protocols and needs. From this discussion, it is possible to deduce that cross-cultural researches must always remain cautious of colonizing reflexes that may persist despite concerted efforts to decolonize Indigenous research. In the following section, I illustrate that Indigenous-led research principles...
allow Indigenous people to develop or choose the Indigenist methodologies which suit local cultural protocols and needs. Moreover, I outline a range of methodological approaches that allow Indigenous people to lead research.

6.3 Principles of Indigenous-Led Research

In a very broad sense Indigenous-led research is a style of qualitative research practice, where Indigenous people are involved at every stage of the research process. Accordingly, in Indigenous-led research it is Indigenous people rather than academics who to determine the research agenda, questions, design and outcomes (Goulding et al, 2015). Moreover, Indigenous-led research also necessitates that Indigenous people lead the production, interpretation and dissemination of research knowledges, wherever possible and appropriate (Bird et al, 2009). There is a wide range of Indigenous-led methodological approaches that work towards decolonising research, including Indigenous participation (Nicholls, 2009); collaboration (Somerville & Perkins, 2003); experimentation (Leeuw et al, 2017); co-research (Maclean, 2015); Participatory Action Research (PAR) (Coombes et al, 2014); action research (Coghalan & Brannick, 2005) and more. Each approach is characterized by a potential to contribute towards decolonizing knowledge and the repatriation of Indigenous land and life (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Many of these Indigenous-led methodological approaches seek to engage in decolonizing research practice by decentring the authority of knowledge production away from non-Indigenous researchers. In doing so, the primary responsibility for authorizing what constitutes relevant knowledge for the research is given to Indigenous participants, co-researchers and co-authors (Suchet-Pearson et al, 2013). Accordingly, the Indigenous knowledges that are gathered throughout the research process may also become decolonized.

More radical Indigenous-led methodologies call to decentre the authority of research away from humans more generally, to attend to Indigenous ontologies of 'co-becoming', which "sees everything as knowledgeable, vital and interconnected" (Bawaka Country, 2014: 269). This research questions what this might mean for how academics 'do' research (See also Bawaka Country, 2015; 2016). I use the word 'radical' because I suggest that allowing Indigenous people to lead the research process simultaneously recognizes the importance and "authority" of
Country in shaping the research process, whilst also ensuring that research is open to more "intercultural" Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies (Bawaka Country, 2014; Memmott & Greenop, 2013). However, within any Indigenous-led research process or practice there remains a potential for knowledge to become colonized (Coombes et al, 2014). Accordingly, Gaudry (2011: 114) warned that:

…the bulk of research on Indigenous peoples works from within an extraction model. In this model, outsider academics conduct research on Indigenous peoples for the purpose of learning about certain aspects of their lives that they find personally interesting or intriguing or that may serve colonial processes

In the context of the current research, this colonizing potential was mitigated through having been invited to participate in a pre-existing housing project. For this reason, Goulding et al (2015) identified invitation to research as a key component of engaging in research that is Indigenous-led. Accordingly, the agenda of this research was pre-set by the Jerrinja community during a range of Community Land and Business plan (CLBP) meetings. Notwithstanding this, I discuss in the following section the ongoing need to address the question of social power in Indigenous-led research.

6.4 Social Power in Indigenous-led Research
Despite concerted efforts to decolonize geographical research practices and knowledge production, the issue of social power in Indigenous-led research is impossible to avoid. Following Foucault, Kesby (2005) noted that social power is most effective and insidious when it is normalized. I suggest that methodological practices of reflexivity, positionality and biography will help to destabilize the normalized power relationship that is inherent when undertaking the role of researcher. I take the view of Kesby (2005: 2040) who said that: “Because I take seriously the claim that power cannot be avoided, I suggest that it must be worked with.” I consider the issue of power and knowledge production through three methodological strategies. First, I argue that reflexive practice is an important element of decolonizing research because it seeks to address the issue of power that is inherent in the cross-cultural research context. Second, I suggest that decolonising research also requires the researcher to consider
how their positionality is implicated in and affected by engaging in fieldwork. Moreover, I explain how the performativity of doing the research in specific spaces, my body made me aware of my positionality, and ‘Otherness’. Third, I provide a brief autobiography, as revealed through the emplaced performativity of doing research. I provide an autobiography of my home to help explain my position on social, cultural and political issues. In particular, I note that my everyday engagement with anti-racist politics with my father and through my experiences of the “the shire”.

6.4.1 Critical Reflexivity in Indigenous-led Research
Critical reflexivity emerged from feminist research debates concerned with the relationship between research power and the knowledge that is produced through research practices (Kesby, 2005). In the Indigenous context, reflexive practice goes some way towards decolonizing research, through bringing into question the notion of non-Indigenous researcher as a knowing and powerful subject (Smith, 1999). Dowling (2005: 12) defined critical reflexivity as the "process of constant, self-conscious, scrutiny of the self as researcher and of the research process." In a cross-cultural Indigenous research project, this self-scrutiny contributes towards the decolonizing research agenda through bringing into question the balance of power in research interactions and process. Ongoing reflexive thinking is an important element of decolonising research, as England (1994) identified:

> We need to locate ourselves in our work and to reflect on how our location influences the questions we ask, how we conduct our research, and how we write our research.
> (England, 1994: 87)

Work by Valentine (2006) exploring the concept of ‘intersectionality’ urged geographers to bring into question our own subjective formation arising between social categories such as gender, race, sexuality, age and so forth.

In this research, self-scrutiny required a constant reminding that, as a non-Indigenous and non-Jerrinja person, I have no way of knowing on my own accord what Jerrinja people’s epistemologies and ontologies of home might be. Moreover, it was important to keep at the
fore of my thinking and writing the diversity of Indigenous cultures throughout in Australia. In particular, each have a unique experience of colonization and settler colonialism, and have distinct ways of knowing and being that are both time and place-specific. Furthermore, scrutiny of the research process was enabled through upholding a commitment to Indigenous-led research practices, which enabled participants and co-researcher, Alfred Wellington, to scrutinize and change various aspects of the research process (See Section 7.4- for these changes).

6.4.2 Positionality
Positionality is another important qualitative research tactic in cross-cultural research, which is a way of identifying that the researcher’s subjectivities influence, and are influenced by, ‘fieldwork’ (England, 1994; Chacko, 2004). Ivanitz (1999) suggested that positionalities expose and embody subjectivities that are central to cross-cultural research. Gregory et al (2009) argued that discussions of positionalities should outline the predispositions of the researcher, including any underlying personal agendas, as well as any theories that they are drawn to. Most notably, England (1994: 80) identified that research is always a “dialogical process which is structured by the researcher and participants.” This dialogical process necessitates that positionalities undergo changes over the course of research. Accordingly, Waitt (2010) identified the importance of a research diary to record how the researcher’s positionality changes through the experience of engaging in research. In this research, I frequently draw upon a personal research diary. My use of a research diary became useful in allowing me to frame my changing understanding of the “insider/outside” and “Indigenous/non-Indigenous” binaries and, in particular, how these binaries became troubled through meeting the Jerrinja community in practice. In order to illustrate this transition, I provide two positionality statements. First, in Box 6.1 I explain how prior to meeting the Jerrinja community I had perceived myself as an ‘outsider’ and ‘invader’ as a result of reading the cross-cultural Indigenous literature. Second, in Box 6.2 I discuss how ‘fieldwork’ positioned me in a state of “betweenness”, in which I felt welcomed by the Jerrinja community in a way that was not entirely consistent with the Indigenous research literature, which often presents non-Indigenous researchers as unwanted interlopers (Smith, 1999).
Box 6.1 Positionality before Meeting the Jerrinja Community

Prior to commencing ‘fieldwork’ I understood myself— in an uncomplicated way— as a good person, who had a deep respect for Indigenous Australian cultures and wanted to learn from Indigenous people and elders. Moreover, I understood myself as having a mixed ethnic background including Indian, Irish, Portuguese and English heritages. However, upon reading the Indigenous research literature I became overwhelmed by the breadth of language, which seemed to render invisible all these complexities of myself. This language included frequent references to the fact of being ‘White’ and notions of ‘Whiteness’ (Kobayashi & Peake, 2000; Shaw, 2006), ‘Invader’ and ‘Migrant’ (Moreton-Robinson, 2003). This language altered my perception of myself and when it came to meeting the Jerrinja community I had built up a range of fears in regard to whether I would fit in or not. It was my body that made me aware of my positionality. Specifically, I became highly conscious of every aspect of myself, including my appearance, my smell and perspiration, my body language and so forth. Unknowingly, this encouraged me to frame my own appearance according to implicit racial stereotypes in regard to what an Indigenous person is supposed to look like. Therefore, I suggest that my experiences of reading the cross-cultural Indigenous research literature had a negative impact on how I understood myself in the initial stages of engaging in fieldwork. In particular, I was initially very shy and afraid to share my opinions about local housing and employment challenges at the risk they might be considered to be ‘White’.

Box 6.2 Positionality after meeting the Jerrinja Community

In Box 6.1 I explained how a reading of the Indigenous research literature had positioned my understanding of myself as an ‘outsider’ through constant references to ‘invader’, ‘migrant’ and ‘Whiteness’. However, upon meeting members of the Jerrinja community it became clear that my identity was not reduced to such broad stereotypes. Indeed, I shared a range of identities with Jerrinja people, including surfing, fishing, food enthusiast, university student and bird watcher. These mutual identities became a shared language throughout the ‘fieldwork’ and enabled me to develop trust and rapport with Jerrinja people. Moreover, my Indian heritage became a point of connection with Jerrinja participants love for Indian cuisine and became a central talking point. This contrasted with my assumption in Box 6.1 where I had thought that my Indian heritage would reduce me to the category of non-Indigenous ‘outsider’. In my experiences of ‘doing’ research I was constantly in a state of “betweenness” of Jerrinja people’s world and my own (England, 1994).
The ‘insider/outsider’ research relationship in cross-cultural research is well documented (Smith, 1999; Martin & Mirraboopa, 2003). However, I suggest that my ‘outsider’ position was not simply changed through engaging in fieldwork, as is discussed by Olesen (2011), but was in fact figuratively constructed prior to meeting the Jerrinja community. Therefore, I suggest that the ‘insider/outsider’ dichotomy in my experience was simultaneously reinforced and unsettled in the ‘field’ (England, 1994- for a definition of ‘field’). The field that reinforced this dichotomy was my engagement with the Indigenous research literature at the University of Wollongong. The field that unsettled the dichotomy was getting to know and share experiences with Jerrinja people at Orient Point, NSW. This discussion emerged through considering my personal vulnerabilities that emerged from the ‘field’ and simply adds to existing ‘insider/outsider’ debate (Innes, 2003). Following from this, I provide a biography of the place where I consider home to be, and discuss my family life and my background, in light of the research.

6.4.3 Biography
I was raised in the glaringly White/Anglo suburban enclave of Sutherland known as "The Shire". Perera (2014: 4) described ‘The Shire’ as both "haven of whiteness" and "a white, Anglo-Celtic, Christian heartland". The Shire can be distinguished from other parts of Sydney by its racialized white discourse, which was most clearly showcased during the race riots that took place in Cronulla in 2005 (Giannacopoulos, 2006; Due and Riggs, 2008; Perera, 2014). Due and Riggs (2008: 211) noted that "images of white nuclear families in front of white picket fences" have become a criterion for who is able to belong in The Shire. Thus, I grew up in an environment, which is saturated in racism and ignorance towards ‘Others’ who do not fit the ‘white nuclear family’ stereotype (Due and Riggs, 2008). My worst experience of racism in The Shire was listening to an adult scream racist profanities at African men, who according to this person didn’t belong in The Shire, purely on the basis of their skin colour. I consider myself an ‘anti-racist’ in the sense that I am constantly attempting to educate people about the negative impacts of racism. Most notably, I try to educate my father who is a retired policeman, and who circulates race hatred within a group of retired policemen who share his views. Although this
research is not focused on anti-racism praxis, my emplaced upbringing in a racist suburban enclave has ultimately shaped how I was able to engage with Jerrinja people. In particular, in order to uphold a commitment to Indigenous-led research I was required to not shy away from negative representations, which I believed might reinforce racist views of Indigenous people. For example, Chapter 8 I provide a discussion of the simultaneous process of homemaking and home unmaking that arose through Jerrinja people’s discussions of home. This discussion has shown how my positionality and biography directly affected the process of doing of research.

6.5 Designing Indigenous-led Methods

Collaborative and participatory methodologies—respectively approaches which engage with community members and key stakeholders throughout the research process and those which to decentre the authority of researcher—are complementary research styles that are often used in combination with one another to address issues of power inherent in qualitative research (Berg et al, 2004). Collaborative and participatory methodologies were accordingly adopted and adapted to Indigenous social research to engage in decolonizing research practice (Leeuw et al, 2012; Nicholls, 2009). However, recent discussions question the extent to which collaborative and participatory methodologies can claim to be decolonizing (Coombes et al, 2014) and empowering (Kesby, 2005). Coombes et al (2014) finds that participatory methodologies are at risk of a ‘lingering imperialism’. Crucially, these critiques point towards the ongoing pervasiveness of power in Indigenous research practices. Notwithstanding these critiques, I argue that participatory and methodological provide an important process through, which to hand over power to participants and coResearchers. In particular, I adopted Cahill et al’s (2007: 305) suggestion:

As participatory researchers... We try to engage in all aspects of research - research questions, the choice and design of methods, the analysis of data, the presentation of findings, and the pursuit of follow up action - as collaborative projects which require negotiation between the different parties.

Recent Indigenous research has effectively integrated participatory and collaborative methodologies to facilitate more effective cross-cultural dialogues (Bird et al, 2009; Geia et al,
2013; Caxaj, 2015). For instance, Bird et al (2009) recognised the importance for participatory research to base itself from principles of equity. Crucially, Lloyd et al (2013: 1075) noted that in Indigenous research collaboration should be guided by “collective priorities that are held as paramount: trust, reciprocity, relationships and sharing goals”. Therefore, I suggest that participatory and collaborative methodologies provide a ‘rigorous’ framework through which decolonizing knowledge production may take place. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 1, decentring power in the knowledge production process may provide an acknowledgement of Indigenous people and Country that is more than symbolic a symbolic gesture.

The research methods presented in this section—situated conversations, talking points, living diaries and follow up conversations— are consistent with Indigenous-led research principles on two accounts. First, the research design and methods were co-produced with members of the Jerrinja community. This co-production took place initially through a meeting that I attended with my co-supervisor Pauline McGuirk on the 24/08/2016. In addition to Pauline and myself, attendance included two employees of the Jerrinja LALC and two ASF consultants. Second, these methods also allow Indigenous people to lead the knowledge gathering process. Nonetheless, in Chapter 7, I discuss how many of these methods were challenged, modified and replaced in practice. This section also argues that, alongside collaborative and participatory methods that are co-produced and theoretically informed to trouble privileging western thinking, Indigenous research requires a firm commitment to a dynamic and flexible research process.

6.5.1 Situated Conversations
Howes et al (1998) suggested that all people affected by a plan will inadvertently hold ‘design knowledge’: hence, the important role of consultation in contributing towards improving the design. Situated conversations, aimed to gather design knowledges, involved my speaking with participants about what they like, dislike and would like to change about their home. Kovach (2010: 42) recognised the informal nature of the conversation method as a “culturally organic means to gather knowledge” through Indigenous storytelling and yarning practices. Ideally, this conversation was expected to occur in the participant’s house or backyard and aimed to
generate narratives led by the participant in line with their interests, experiences and traditions of learning through storytelling and yarning (Wright et al, 2012). In-home interviews are often proposed as a way of assuring a comfortable and casual conversation, whilst also providing a range of visual prompts (Parr, 1998; Pilkey, 2013). In the context of this research, visual prompts were expected to help to navigate the conversation towards essential aspects of the design of a house, in regards to what elderly people like, dislike and might like to change about their current house. Furthermore, the ‘in-home’ setting was anticipated to accentuate the participants’ sense of power and control in the conversation. The focus on likes and dislikes was proposed as a way engage with types of knowledge that can only be accessed by one’s lived experience of being in the home. This was expected to position the participant as the key knowledge holder and teacher, and the researcher as both learner and listener. Moreover, asking participants what they would like to change about their home was proposed to directly ask how their homes could support themselves, families and friends.

6.5.2 Talking Points
Talking points was thought of as an additional Indigenous-led stage, whereby following from the situated conversations Indigenous participants would be asked to walk the researcher to key areas in their house to further narrate key themes that arose from the conversation. The Indigenous participant would also be provided a camera to take photos of important aspects of their home, which they like, dislike or wanted to change. Photographic methodologies are commonly used in ethnographic and social research as a way to enable the participant investigator to “gain perceptual access to the world from the viewpoint of individuals who have not traditionally held control over the means of imaging the world” (Berg, 2004: 205). Wang (2000) argued that in order to uphold participatory principles the research should provide a justification of a photographs’ significance through following three steps, (i) selecting the most relevant photographs, (ii) contextualizing the stories of that photograph and (iii) codifying the themes or theories within the photograph. This research sought to ensure that all three steps were determined by the Indigenous participants, through allowing participants to take the photo and guide the researcher to significant sites, and asking the participant to narrate the process with stories. Furthermore, following from the transcription process a full copy of the
interviews (transcript or audio as appropriate) and deidentified photographs were to be given to the participant at their request for review, so that they might change anything they may wish to edit in the transcript. This relates to the ethos of inclusion in knowledge production, ensuring that participants are enabled to be reflexive and self-critical (Kindon et al, 2007).

6.5.3 Living Diary (Audio/Photographic) & Follow-up Conversation
The theoretical basis for the planned use of audio-photographic diaries or ‘living diaries’ was aimed to further explore the everyday practices, activities and experiences through which a house is made a home, which are often overlooked in narrative accounts (Latham, 2003). The diary method was proposed as an in-depth way to capture elderly Jerrinja people’s subconscious embodied relationships and practices in and around their material house-as-home (Gabriel & Jacobs, 2008). These diaries aimed to document people’s everyday practices and experiences of living in their home for 5 days over a period of 3 weeks, allowing a greater degree of flexibility for the participants, while still capturing everyday practices in sufficient depth and scope. This method allowed participants an added layer of control through providing them with cameras and audio recorders to undertake the role of investigator on their own terms. A study by Wilkin and Liamputtong (2012) found that the photovoice method in the context of Indigenous-led research complimented Aboriginal oral and visual cultural practices. Moreover, the photovoice method was deemed by the Indigenous community as culturally appropriate and useful for conveying Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies (Wilkin and Liamputtong, 2012). A summary of the themes arising from the living diaries was to be used to structure a follow-up conversation and enable further clarification, explanation and interpretation as led by the participant.

The Indigenous-led methods discussed above are consistent with the decolonisation agenda through enabling Indigenous people the power to produce and share research knowledges according to local Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies. The participatory and collaborative methods employed in this research have been informed by a range of cross-cultural Indigenous research projects (Bird et al, 2009; Geia et al, 2013; Cajax, 2015). Moreover, as these methods were co-produced with members of the Jerrinja community they are also
consistent with Rigney’s (1999) call for ‘Indigenous methodologies’ that are designed by Indigenous people, in line with Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies.

6.6 Conclusion
More broadly, this chapter has outlined a theoretical discussion of Indigenous-led research. Indigenous-led research in principle has been shown to require attentiveness to the relationship between power and knowledge production. This attention to power has been shown to be particularly important for cross-cultural Indigenous research given the ongoing effects of colonialism and settler colonialism on Indigenous people. Indigenous-led research principles have been shown to be an effective way to decenre the authority of knowledge production away from the researcher. A discussion of social power has also identified Indigenous-led research as a way to enable Indigenous participants and co-researchers to scrutinize the research process, thereby diverting some responsibility away from reflexive practice. However, important critiques by Kesby (2005) and Coombes et al (2014) of participatory methods, act as important reminders that social power can never be entirely diverted away from researchers. In the next section, I discuss how Indigenous-led research ‘in practice’ enabled Jerrinja people to further scrutinize the ‘Indigenous methodologies’ that came out of the initial co-production meeting.
Uncle Neville

I always wanted to come back home, and in saying that too, I want to get away from the mortality of mission life as well.

~February, 2017~
7.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to reflect on ‘doing’ Indigenous-led research. Indigenous-led research centres upon the notion of the decolonisation of knowledge. Accordingly, the ‘doing’ of this research engages in a decolonizing politics that seeks to undermine the colonizing legacy of Indigenous research practices discussed in Chapter 6 and, more specifically, geographical research practices (Harrison and Livingstone, 1980; Howitt & Jackson, 1996). For this project doing Indigenous-led research meant conducting and implementing research not only with Jerrinja community protocols, ontologies and epistemologies but also priorities and timelines. In this chapter, I refer to all Jerrinja participants using pseudonyms at their request and I refer to co-researcher Alfred Wellington and All Sustainable Futures (ASF) collaborators, Alex McNeilly and Lisa Miller, by their real names.

I begin, by outlining the significance of building trust and rapport with co-researcher Alfred Wellington and the Jerrinja community. Second, I discuss the wider social terrain—that is the uneven social relationships—within which this research, the wider ‘Small House; Big Living’ project and the Jerrinja LALC are all embedded. I discuss implications arising from the local housing politics, the importance of maintaining relationships to kin and Country and the politics of the Jerrinja LALC and the LALC system. Third, I illustrate how the ‘doing’ of Indigenous-led research in practice was shaped and reshaped by the social terrain, which embedded the everyday lives of Jerrinja people and indeed of Indigenous Australians. I conclude that Indigenous-led research cannot be seperated from this wider social terrain. Furthermore, this research demonstrates the importance of the researcher remaining flexible and adaptable, in order to uphold an ethos of respect towards the wider social terrain. I take from Kitchin & Tate (2013: ix) when I say that this chapter provides only “advice that can be given” and that “the best source of understanding and learning is though actually doing research.”
7.2 Developing Trust through Relationships

In this section, I discuss how trust and rapport was built. Given the colonializing forms of research practice described in section 6.2, trust and rapport was particularly important in the cross-cultural research context. Uncle Ivan Wellington (2017) – a male Jerrinja elder living off-Country – explained the importance of trust and how building relationships takes time. In his words:

\[
I\ \text{believe that when you're working with Aboriginal people you don't rush things, you have to take the time to up build up trust and build up respect. You do it steady. You make it grow, it's like planting a seed and seeing it grow, watching it grow.}
\]

This was also explained by Lisa Miller—director of ALL Sustainable Futures (ASF)—who has significant engagement experience with the Jerrinja community through the wider Small House; Big Living project. In my interview with Lisa, she explained to me the importance of building relationships from her perspective as a non-Indigenous woman and ASF director. In her words:

\[
\text{Trust is about relationships. You don’t just do a project and walk away. To do a project takes trust and to build trust takes time, and relationship building and so on. And you know, sometimes you have to do a few things that are completely unrelated to the project.}
\]

My working relationship with Jerrinja LALC CEO, Alfred Wellington, was essential in building rapport and trust in the community. To acknowledge Alfred’s pivotal role as collaborator and cultural liaison he is recognized as a co-researcher on this honours research and co-author of any published work. Maintaining regular contact with Alfred throughout this research project provided me a form of regular and ongoing feedback from the inception of this research. One of my supervisors Pauline M’Guirk met with members of the Jerrinja community during one of our co-production meetings where she had the opportunity to introduce herself, her background and her role in this research. Additionally, co-researcher Alfred Wellington had completed a University subject run by my supervisor Gordon Waitt. He remembered Gordon fondly. These elements were all important to establishing a basis of trust from which the research could proceed.
Alfred was critical in providing me an understanding of cultural protocols and complex politics within the Jerrinja community. More importantly, was how Alfred was able to “navigate the cultural norms and rules so as to create relatively safe spaces for community members to participate” (Mistry & Berardi, 2012: 115). He frequently introduced me to members of the community, in particular during the Community and Land Business Plan (CLBP) meeting and at a community gatherings known as ‘Cuppa Consultations’. Attending the Jerrinja LALC CLBP meeting on the 24/11/2016 was critical in enabling me to the opportunity to introduce myself to members of the Jerrinja community and also to develop rapport with people outside of the Jerrinja LALC. During this CLBP meeting that I attended the Small House: Big Living Project was on the agenda Alfred Wellington suggested that I formally introduce myself and my role in the wider project. In this talk, I established that I have lived and grown up on Gweagal Country and Sea, which is now referred to as the Royal National Park and Port Hacking River. I explained that I have spent most of my childhood and adolescence fishing, surfing and bushwalking. I explained how I arrived at this project as a Geography honours student at the University of Wollongong and my personal interests in pursuit of environmental and social justice. Furthermore, I noted that in this project I hope to talk with Jerrinja people about what how the understand and creat meanings of home, with a view towards guiding the small

7.3 Social Terrain: The Jerrinja Community

Indigenous-led research practice cannot be isolated from the wider social terrain that comprises the lives of Indigenous Australians. Nast (1994) identified that “…‘the field’ is a social terrain”, in which the doing of research is understood as something that is always embedded in local context, which is often highly political. The socio-cultural pressures and responsibilites that are part of this social terrain include the need to uphold values of sharing and reciprocity to kin as well as responsibilites relating to ceremonial and religious practices (Birdsall-Jones et al, 2009). At the same time, the social terrain of the Jerrinja community is deeply entangled in a history of colonisation and ongoing forces of settler colonialism (Veracini, 2010; 2011). This is evidenced by high rates of homelessness, particularly for males, high rates of unemployment and housing shortages on-Country and housing instability both on-Country and off-Country (Miller, 2016). In order to outlines the multiple elements of the social terrain I divide this
discussion into three sections. First, I outline the local housing politics, which this research—being attached to a wider housing project—became embedded within. Second, I discuss the important social and cultural practices that shaped the ‘doing’ of research, most notably altered research timelines. Third, I explain how engaging in Indigenous-led research in collaboration with the Jerrinja LALC presented significant benefits and challenges.

7.3.1 Local Housing Politics
Lucy—a younger Jerrinja single mother raising two children in a caravan on-Country—identified that both this project and the wider Small House; Big Living project are situated within pressing social and housing priorities. Yet Lucy was hesitant to participate in this research despite later identifying that a Small House would suit her needs (see section 7.4 where I explain including non-elderly community members in the research). In her words:

But so many of our people who are worse off than me who need housing, that is really why I don’t really like to talk about all of this stuff. I honestly don’t know how I feel about this whole thing... I think it is important to think about the whole picture and to consider all of the other people who are worse off.

Generally, people who were concerned with local housing politics were more hesitant to lead the conversations around lived experiences of their home, and therefore unsettled the ‘doing’ Indigenous-led research in practice. An important deduction from this was that, in order to give participants power to lead the research, participants first had to believe in that power. A hesitance that nothing would come of the project was also noted, as Alfred said:

There's a feeling in the community that its just another project that won’t go anywhere.

Additionally, warnings of eviction notices to be served by the Aboriginal Land Council at Orient Point brought to the fore other complexities and the tenuous qualities of indigenous housing. In my research diary from the ‘Consultation’ day, I wrote:

There was mention of eviction warnings being handed out to households who have not been paying rent. It was also noted that there are people who wish to move back to Country and who would regularly pay rent.
Poor maintenance was one of the key justifications for why some Jerrinja people were not paying rent. For the Land Council, lack of rental income meant it was impossible to uphold routine maintenance of the existing houses, built with “cheap materials” (Alex- Participant). This dilemma was reflected upon by Lisa Miller (ASF, Director), as she said:

*The thing is if no one pays rent then they have got no money for maintenance, and then some Jerrinja people have said well I am not paying rent until they do some maintenance, and I said well I don’t think they can do maintenance until you pay your rent. The thing is that there are 28 homes [on-Country] and 1200 Jerrinja, how can one family occupy a house and not pay any rent? When all of the rent money should go to the welfare of all of the Jerrinja.*

The threat of eviction meant that many people refused to participate in both the wider housing project and this research, due to the local political angst. Furthermore, this tension also led a general decline in participation at the ‘Cuppa consultation’ meetings, which—as I discuss in section 7.4—this research came to rely upon for recruitment. Furthermore, for some Jerrinja people, current rental payment was tied to a enhanced promised of accessing a Small House. For instance, Alex—a young adult Jerrinja man living on-Country—said:

...*a lot of these houses are not even paying rent now, let alone moving into these little houses.*

...*that’ll be the answer to them to not having a house, because you’re not paying rent so you’re not getting one of these small homes.*

Additionally, when asking Alfred Wellington—co-researcher and Jerrinja LALC CEO—about the local politics surrounding the payment of rent, he said:

*It’s a reality, but I think it’s detrimental [collecting rent] there is no question about it, it is detrimental to achieving other things, because one of the reasons why we haven’t been able to build anymore homes, it got to be 15 years, is because of the lack of funding. So if you don’t have money coming in to cover bills and rates, council rates and that, well yeah it does stop you from building more houses.*
Aboriginal housing can not be separated from questions of higher under- and unemployment of Indigenous Australians. For this project, this played out in terms of the Land Council being unable to maintain housing or develop new housing due to lack of rental income, and tenants unwilling to pay rent because of poorly maintained housing. The politics of housing thus played out in terms of not only willingness of current tenants to participate, but in understandings that those who could afford to pay rent may be given privilege access to Small Houses.

7.3.2 Maintaining Relationships to Kin and Country
Cultural obligations and the importance of maintaining relationships to kin and Country was a key aspect of the social terrain, which shaped the doing of research and, especially, its timelines. A key example was the social mobility of Jerrinja people—both to and from Jerrinja Country. Many Jerrinja people on-Country travelled to visit family off-Country between November (when UOW Human Research Ethics was achieved) and February when School resumed. Simultaneously, the summer period was also an important time for Jerrinja people living off-Country, as Alfred identified that people usually maintain connections to Country by going camping. In his words:

Most of the time when they [Jerrinja people living off-Country] want to come back to Country, is mostly in the warmer months, the days are longer and they get more out of weekends, and plus holidays, that’s probably the most busiest time. And a lot of our Jerrinja mob they go camping in summer, so off on Country, its not too far away but just out around the bay and that.

Therefore, this element of the social terrain also speaks directly to the ongoing significance for Jerrinja people to maintain connections to kin and Country, which has been identified in Chapter 5 as key element of homemaking. Moreover, as an Indigenous-led research project, it is befitting that Indigenous homemaking practices ultimately encroached on the ‘doing’ of research.
7.3.3 Aboriginal Land Council Politics

Participation in the wider Small House; Big Living project produced a range of challenges, which shaped participation in this research project. In particular, participation in this research was also shaped by Aboriginal land Council Politics. The question of who would, who might and who would not participate in the wider Small House; Big Living project as a result of Aboriginal Land Council Politics was discussed at length during the CLBP meeting that I attended on the 23/11/16. The question of participation of people at this CLBP meeting was discussed extensively as a result of only 5 people being in attendance. In this CLBP meeting, only 5 people attended, and people’s views about the low attendance were mixed, ranging from anger to indifference, and from pragmatic to optimistic. Some people appeared to be angry. They remarked about how other people should be at the CLBP meeting. They noted that people would turn up if they knew more about the possibilities of the Small House: Big Living project. Others seemed unsurprised and indifferent, reflecting that people will do what they want to do and that community meetings were often not well attended. These participants spoke of a lack of trust in the LALC system, for instance Alex mentioned that:

*There has just been some bad governance in the past. On a board level and a staff level, to an extent, and I think that has disengaged people*

Barriers of engagement in this project are in part due to past decisions of the Jerrinja LALC or, as it was previously referred, the Jerrinja Community Council. Alfred attributed the poor track record of the Jerrinja LALC to resource scarcity. In his words:

*It's capacity pure and simply capacity. There is so much stuff here to do in the LALC office that you know we spend an hour or longer talking about cultural heritage and that cultural heritage matter was only one part of the cultural landscape, so the cultural matters take up a lot of our time, and then there is also a lot of administration stuff, just like compliance, continuing our good governance. Then we have got these projects that have come through our CLBP.*

For Alfred, trust with the community has also been lost due to the complex range of pressing issues in the community, ranging from illegal rubbish dumping on Jerrinja land, to more
pressing housing challenges, such issues of maintenance and homelessness. Therefore, in order to regain trust between the Jerrinja LALC and the Jerrinja community, priority has been given initially to less pressing issues before attempting to tackle larger more pressing challenges. This reflects Uncle Ivan’s (2017) notion that trust requires steady progress. This discussion has illustrated how Indigenous-led research being conducted in collaboration with a LALC may simultaneously present a range of benefits and challenges.

In particular, the research challenges that emerged from the local political social terrain are a testament to the importance of having Alfred as co-researcher. Key to this research was how Alfred was able to navigate through various challenges that emerged by drawing upon his expert knowledge of the local political and social climate. In the following section I demonstrate some of the various ways that Alfred and myself were required to adapt the research design and methods to suit the local social terrain.

7.4 Co-production of Research Design and Methods

Co-production of the research design occurred with the help of co-researcher Alfred Wellington, and other members of the Jerrinja community. This was to be facilitated by a short presentation. Intended to occur during a meeting at the Jerrinja medical/community centre with members of the Jerrinja community, on the 24/08/2016. This was prior to applying for ethics approval. Here it was intended that members of the Jerrinja community could review and amend a proposed research design and methods wherever the saw fit. However, in practice this meeting was comprised of members of the Jerrinja LALC, Lisa Miller (ASF director) and my supervisor Pauline McGuirk. The lack of attendance by wider community members must be understood in the context of the wider social terrain, which illustrated how the Jerrinja community face a range of more pressing issues than co-producing research design and methods. At this co-production meeting, Pauline and I jointly presented the draft research design to the Jerrinja LALC and ASF employees. Through our discussions a number of key amendments were made including the replacement of the words “research” with “project”, “student researcher” with “student volunteer” and “data” with “knowledge gathering”. These modifications were important. On the one hand, they reflect the importance of avoiding
language that may be associated with past colonizing research practices that have been conducted ‘on’ Jerrinja people. On the other hand, this language suggests a discursive shift towards research becoming viewed as a community-university partnership, which is in solidarity with local Indigenous agendas (Koster et al, 2012). Lisa Miller—director of ASF—proposed that the question “What else people would like to have in their home?” . The inclusion of this question was to generate a discussion about the ‘stuff’ that makes a place home, such as objects, technologies and sporting or gardening equipment. The basic approach of including in-home situated conversations, talking points, living diaries and follow up conversations was presented to the Jerrinja LALC and ASF employees in attendance and was given approval. The co-produced research design and methods was approved by the University of Wollongong Human Ethics Committee on the 23rd of November (Ethics Number: HE16/390).

In practice, the research design and methods underwent a second phase of co-production. This phase occurred throughout the ‘doing’ of the project. Table 7.1 summarises the shifts in design and methods that occurred as the project unfolded. Each is discussed in detail below.

**Table 7.1- From Theory to Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Indigenous Contacting Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to Research</td>
<td>Invitation to Community Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Off-Country</td>
<td>Participants On-Country (excluding Neville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Focus</td>
<td>Inter-generational Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanied Conversations</td>
<td>Cuppa Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Home Setting</td>
<td>Veranda Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Structured Conversations</td>
<td>Unstructured Yarning &amp; Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Diaries</td>
<td>Sharing Circles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.1 Recruitment
Recruitment was one of the key elements that did not play out as anticipated. The initial recruitment strategy was an ‘open invitation’ to Jerrinja community members, issued by LALC CEO Alfred Wellington in person on Country and by mailout to Jerrinja resident’s off-Country (Appendix D: Draft Invitation). Lisa Miller (2016) notes in the FACS grant application that Alfred Wellington had identified “Twelve elders want to come back to country and we need these houses for them.” The initial recruitment strategy included 12 elders Jerrinja people living off Country who had expressed an interest to return to Country. The need to adhere to Indigenous contacting protocols made it difficult to organise meetings with Jerrinja elders living off-Country. Lisa Miller identified that there are a range of cultural protocols to which Alfred and Jerrinja community must adhere. These cultural protocols shape who can and who cannot contact whom, in regards to participating in both the wider Small House; Big Living project and this research project. Lisa explained:

“...like giving us contacts for our one-on-ones, like I would just give you a contact list, but they [Jerrinja people] are completely offended if that is going to happen.”

Thus, Alfred identified that the most culturally appropriate way to invite people to engage in this research project was to send an open invitation to the Jerrinja community— via Jerrinja LALC Facebook page, email and in-person— asking people to attend a community gathering referred to as a ‘Cuppa Consultation’ day. The people who attended these ‘cuppa consultation’ days were predominantly elderly Jerrinja people living on-Country in large 3-4 bedroom houses. It was these large houses that were identified during the Community Land and Business Plan (CLBP) meetings as being too large for some elderly people, some of whom are living by themselves for most of the year. Therefore, whilst the research remains focused on elderly Jerrinja people’s lived experiences of housing, there is less attention paid to lived experiences of housing off-Country. This remains an important field of inquiry. Nevertheless, this shift provided an opportunity to engage with elderly Jerrinja peoples lived experinces of the Roseby Park site, which I demonstrate in Chapter 8 and 9, produced important findings in regards to the local social and environmental climate.
Intergenerational relationships were an important emergent theme. Many Jerrinja participants suggested that housing is always intergenerational and that younger generations should be consulted in the research. This was reflected in my research diary, following from a meeting to work on the CLBP that I attended on November 24th. Following from the meeting, I wrote in my research diary:

*Aunt Jenny and Aunt Mary said that I should interview some of the younger mob to find out what they would like to see in these new houses. Because they will be living in them too*

Thus, a focus only on elderly people became positioned as a White/Anglo approach to doing research, which was not sufficiently attentive to Jerrinja people’s cultural mobility and kinship living practices.

For the reasons detailed above, the planned open invitation to participate in situated conversations was replaced by an invitation by the Jerirnja LALC and ASF to come along to a community gathering. At this community gathering people were informed that there would be food and beverages, and that they could come to have ‘yarn’ about the Small House; Big Living project and be invited to have a ‘private yarn’ to provide their input into the design of the small houses.

*7.4.2 From In-Home Conversations to Unstructured Storytelling and Yarning on the Veranda*

A situated conversation conducted in participants’ home was proposed as a way of assuring a comfortable and casual conversation, and providing a range of visual prompts (talking points) to help reveal situated and embedded knowledges (Parr, 1998; Pilkey, 2013). However, in practice many Jerrinja people preferred to sit on the medical centre veranda, where they could feel the sun’s warmth and the wind. Additionally, as many of the participants were elderly it was not considered appropriate to walk down to people’s houses due to issues of physical mobility.

The conversations that were initially proposed were anticipated to be relatively casual, whilst also following the structure of the methodological process that had been co-produced with the
Jerrinja LALC and ASF. The plan was to ask participants, broadly, what they like, dislike and would like to change about their current house. Whilst I had read the literature on Indigenous methods of storytelling and yarning (Bird et al, 2009; Geia et al, 2013; Caxaj, 2015), it was not until engaging with these methods in practice that I came to understand their intricacies. A key methodological finding was how Indigenous storytelling practices were able to do much of the work intended by living diaries, as elderly Jerrinja people were able to accurately recount—through storytelling— their consciously-embodied experiences of everyday life spent in and around the material house-as-home (See Chapter 9). For example, when I asked Alfred to provide feedback on my initial interpretation of findings, in regards to the significance of family and kinship, he explained to me a story of what it was like growing on the Roseby Park mission. In his words:

...down the road would be your Aunty and the next house would be your cousin or whatever, it would just be, go next door whenever you run out of milk or run out of sugar, or whatever. It was like that, and whenever someone was out of something it was not an issue to say that you were in need. So as far as design goes, that feeling of fluidity is a really connective, connected sort of feeling.

This story provided me with not only an answer to the question “what is the significance of family and kinship?” but also, provided me with a greater sense of what it felt like for Alfred growing-up with the support of family and kinship. The key challenge and pedagogical practice was the task of differentiating between what was seemingly ‘off-topic’ story, but which was in fact taking the research to “deeper, more surprising places” (Wright, 2014: 15) and what was in fact ‘off-topic’. Additionally, it was also important to remain attentive to whether stories were going off-topic as a result of storytelling or in order to avoid a particular topic for cultural or personal reasons. Therefore, upon engaging in Indigenous storytelling practices two things became clear: first, as Hitchings (2011: title) noted “People can talk about their practices” and, second, elderly Indigenous people in fact consciously understand the material house-as-home through their embodied knowledges. Therefore, Indigenous storytelling practices were
effective in providing a depth of understanding of Jerrinja peoples lived experiences of their current houses.

**7.4.3 Living Diaries to Indigenous Sharing Circle**

In the theoretical discussion I explained that the ‘living diary’ was proposed as an in-depth way to explore two key things: first, people’s everyday ‘routine’ and ‘mundane’ practices and meanings of home that often go unnoticed in narrative accounts (Latham, 2003) and, second, subconscious embodied relationships between people and their material house-as-home (Gabriel & Jacobs, 2008). The prospect of using ‘living diaries’ became impossible in part due to what was described by the Jerrinja LALC and ASF as ‘consultation fatigue’ or ‘burn out’ associated with a history of community engagement and consultation on a host of community issues. For instance Lisa Miller said:

*...the thing that Jessica [Jerrinja LALC employee] said the other day was consultation burn out, and after only one workshop.*

The living diaries were replaced in practice by two Indigenous sharing circles that were based on Small House: Big Living project. The sharing circle method involved key differences from conventional focus groups (Lavallée, 2009). These differences included speaking and unspeaking protocols, listening etiquettes and often included very solemn discussions of the effects of settler colonialism (Veracini, 2010). The listening etiquettes were particularly important when Jerrinja elders began to speak. Particularly, when elders spoke with a commanding or solemn tone every conversation in the room would stop and everyone listened attentively to the elder without interuption. At other times the sharing circle was more informal and involved having a yarn and a laugh.

**7.5 Conclusion**

This chapter has illustrated how the doing of Indigenous-led research is always embedded in the local context and the particular social terrain that comprises the lives of Indigenous Australians. Moreover, this research has illustrated how handing over power in the context of this social terrain requires the researcher to remain flexible, adaptable and resilient to changes. Table 7.1 clearly outlined a range of methodological changes which occurred during this process.
of handing over power. More specifically, this discussion has shown that Indigenous-led research being conducted in collaboration with a Local Aboriginal Land Council may simultaneously present a range of benefits and challenges. A key challenge was shown through how this research became entrenched in both pre-existing and ongoing Land Council politics between the Jerinja LALC and the Jerrinja community. In this context, the involvement of co-researcher Alfred Wellington, became essential through enabling the non-Indigenous researcher to develop rapport within the Indigenous co-researchers’ close social networks. Crucially, the people within these social networks later volunteered to be participants of this research. Moreover, Alfred’s central involvement as co-researcher enabled this research to “navigate the cultural norms and rules so as to create relatively safe spaces for community members to participate” (Mistry & Berardi, 2012: 115).

In Chapters 8 and 9, I present the co-produced findings from my 10-month engagement process with the Jerrinja community, which commenced in July 2016 and is ongoing at the time of writing. In these chapters, I utilize the concept of home as my framework for analysis, informed by my previous framing of ‘Indigenous Geographies of Home’ (Chapter 3), in which I offered a conceptual framework that defined home as at the intersection between ‘house-as-home’, ‘kinship-as-home’ and ‘Country-as-home’. Additionally, in these chapters I take the advice of Bird et al (2009) who suggest that cross-cultural Indigenous research might be enriched by presenting narratives rather than only interpreting them through the co-production of knowledge with Jerrinja people. Furthermore, presenting narratives also contributes to a ‘more-than-symbolic’ acknowledgement of the Jerrinja participants. Key points of interpretation and conclusions from the findings sections have been presented to co-researcher Alfred Wellington both during a follow-up interview and by providing Alfred the opportunity to give input on all aspects of the thesis, specifically Chapters 8 and 9.
Chapter 8: Senses of home for Jerrinja people
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Alex

Oh it’s a powerful place when it comes to memories cos this is your childhood. It’s the best place to grow up as a kid...

~February, 2017~
8.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to explore Jerrinja people’s senses of home, which I demonstrate is configured in relationships between houses-as-home, kinship-as-home and Country-as-home. In doing so, this chapter aims to expose any existing cleavages in the literature’s framing of these concepts (Chapter 4). A discussion of Country and kinship provide key points of dialogue through which to critique and position White/Anglo geographies of home as a culturally particular form of knowledge (Panelli, 2008). Traditionally, in Australian Indigenous cultures the house or shelter was “perceived and used for conducting the business of living” (Fien et al, 2011: 345). In comparison, relationships to Country and kin held a strong social and cultural significance (See Memmott, 2015). More recently, Indigenous culture has undergone a transition towards “an intercultural setting” (Merlan, 1998: 4) in which the house is now considered undisputedly to be home for many Indigenous people. In this intercultural setting, however, Indigenous relationships and obligations to kin and Country remain vital elements in shaping Indigenous senses of home. In this chapter, I illustrate that for Jerrinja people the notion of home was not contained within or by the house but rather was dependent on maintaining relationships to kin and Country.

First, I explain how maintaining connections to family and kin remains an important aspect of homemaking for elderly Indigenous people, as demonstrated through notions of togetherness and connectedness. However, I also give voice to the feeling of various Jerrinja people that living with family and kin may also contribute towards unmaking home. Second, I demonstrate how elderly Jerrinja people referred to Country-as-home through contradictory representations and connotations: both positive connotations associated with a return to ‘community’ and ‘nature’ and negative connotations associated with the return to ‘mission’ and settler colonialism. Housing on-Country is still sought after for elderly Jerrinja people, despite these conflicting representations of returning to community. Lastly, I conclude by suggesting that a sense of home for elderly Jerrinja people was characterized by fluidity. ‘Home’ is movable, multiple and mobile for Jerrinja people due to a range of cultural and socio-economic factors.
8.2 Family/Kinship as Home

Kinship relationships and obligations remain a vital element of Indigenous identity and belonging (Birdsall-Jones et al, 2009). In my conversations with Jerrinja people, family and kin were central to their narratives of how a house became a home. I refer in this section to ‘family/kinship’ as a way of acknowledging the intercultural setting in which this discussion of Jerrinja senses of home emerged. Alfred identified this intercultural setting in the Jerrinja community through his explanation of a cultural shift from living together in large family groupings towards smaller family groups. The latter are more independent and closely resemble White/Anglo notions of family. In his words:

*I think back in those days you know 50’s, 60’s, 70’s it was a necessity thing, of actually all being together as family clan groups because it was interdependency. But now I think it’s a different era. It’s more about being independent. Our society’s moved on. Now people work and they can provide for their own family and there’s welfare payments and everyone looks after themselves sort of thing. That’s the way it is, but there is still the element of you know if someone is down on their luck or something and they need help, well that will happen too. But I don’t think it happens as much as it used too... It was the times dictated things too.* (April, 2017)

Notwithstanding the shift that Alfred narrates from interdependent to independent relationships within the community, the notion of kinship-as-home was a recurrent theme of this research. For instance, understanding social relationships, and how social relationships reconnected people to shared memories of places was integral to how a house became a home. And, crucially, connections to family and kin were central to maintaining a sense of house-as-home. Participants often referred to kinship structures through collective terms such as ‘extended family’, ‘relatives’ and ‘mob’. Individuals were referred to by kinship names such as ‘uncle’, ‘aunty’, ‘cousin’, ‘brother’ and ‘sister’.

Exploring the themes of family and kinship as home in what follows, first, I provide examples of the centrality of relationships to family and kin in maintaining a Jerrinja sense of home. These examples include instances of people living with kin for extended periods of time due to
housing instability. Second, and in contrast I show how close family and kin connections affected the spatiality and temporality of home for elderly Jerrinja people (Duffy & Waitt, 2013). Some elderly Jerrinja people living with members of kin were suffering from sleep deprivation as a result of noise which permeated through the material house-as-home. Together these discussions speak to the co-presence of home making and home unmaking practices relating to family and kin. A discussion of Indigenous senses of home as both positive and negative avoids a romanticised representation of home as solely a place of comfort, belonging and security (Blunt & Dowling, 2006). Third, I explain how avoiding a romantic view of home has revealed important requirements of creating a Small House-as-Home for elderly Jerrinja people, which may mitigate or control some of the unhomely aspects of home.

8.2.1 Family/Kinship & Homemaking

Elderly Jerrinja participants identified that Indigenous relationships to family and kin differ from White/Anglo relationships to nuclear family and extended family. This was particularly expressed by participants through notions of connectedness and togetherness. For example, participants: explained that in the Jerrinja community: “we like to be together” (Aunt Mary); “we always have family around us” (Aunt Mary); and, that “family stays together no matter what” (Uncle Neville). Aunt Mary explained the importance of family and kin in nurturing a sense of home for elderly Jerrinja people particularly. She said:

You can’t put us in the same box as retirement villages because we come from a different culture, we like to be together you know, that is what you would have to try and provide for, to get that cultural place and that going there

Aunt Mary illustrates the divergence from White-Anglo notions of aged care. Connections to kin featured as one of the key reasons why it was important for elderly Jerrinja people to return to Country. For instance, this was reflected upon by Jenny, a Jerrinja elder, who is currently living on-Country, as she stated:

Being on-Country is very important for our people, I think because we have lots of family here you know.
In particular, the return of elderly Jerrinja people to Country would allow younger generations to reconnect with traditional Jerrinja knowledge through spending time with elderly relatives. This notion of connectedness and togetherness was reflected upon by Lisa, the director of ASF, who has significant engagement experience with elderly Jerrinja people on housing issues (Miller, 2016). Lisa recollected from her research engagements with the Jerrinja community, that:

A lot of people have said to me that “we respect our elders”, and it’s not just the elders saying that it but the Alex’s of the world too, saying: ‘We’re absolutely different to White culture in Australia. We respect our elders and the reason why we have become disconnected from our culture is because we have been disconnected from our elders, and we understand that. We don’t want that to happen, and the reason why they have been disconnected is because “we can’t all afford to live together, we don’t have the housing” and all that sort of stuff. You know the old saying it takes a village to raise a child and Aboriginal culture of family is so different to ours.

Here, attention is drawn to the lack of housing and issues of housing affordability, which have caused a cultural disconnect and lack of togetherness of family and kin. Accordingly, the Small House idea was viewed as an opportunity to reconnect younger Jerrinja people not simply to their Jerrinja elders, but to Jerrinja knowledges and culture.

For elderly Jerrinja people to maintain a sense of home through connectedness and togetherness with family and kin, necessitated ‘extending’, ‘expanding’ or ‘opening up’ space. In particular, elderly Jerrinja participants commonly expressed the importance of remaining connected to younger Jerrinja people. In order for the Small Houses to become a home, they must be able to accommodate family and kin temporarily. For instance, Aunt Mary said:

Yeah I talked to Betty about having a dwelling, a place that you can expand ‘cos we have always got family around us. Even when you get old.
For Aunt Mary togetherness was about ‘having people around which necessitated that a house-as-home is able to expand to create additional space to accommodate visiting family. Likewise, Alfred, said:

*Having that option of extending the capacity of the smaller place and accommodate the extended family when they wanna come over*

The need to extend spaces for capacity was directly related to Indigenous cultural mobility practices. As previously noted in Chapter 5, Indigenous mobility practices may be seen to maintain a sense of ‘spiritual homeliness’ by maintaining what Memmott (2015: 59) referred to as a state of ‘relational personhood’, which is maintained through connections to both kin and Country. The importance of family and kin in homemaking practices for elderly Jerrinja people has been evidenced by cultural mobility practices and the consequent need for the Small Houses to accommodate kin.

In light of the importance of kin, various elders identified, both prior to and during our situated conversations, that I should have a yarn to some of the younger mob to get their views on housing. Accordingly, I had a yarn with three young adult Jerrinja people, who all had been living in informal housing nearby to family and kin. They drew attention to the ways mobility between the houses of family and kin also shaped participants’ sense of home. This relationship between mobile living and home was discussed at some length by Alex and Kelly, a young adult Jerrinja couple living on-Country. They were living with their four children in a caravan with a newly-extended granny flat, beside Alex’s Dad’s house. Alex explained how living semi-permanently with members of kin shaped his understanding of home. Alex said:

*When I was little, them houses weren’t built, the ones that my dad lives in. I was living in my Aunty Cathy’s house, and I still class that as home as well, ‘cos that was my grandfather’s house, which my mother lived there,’ cos they used to live in this house [Aunty Cathy’s] and they moved over there [Dad’s house]. And my mother was born, I think it was this [Aunty Cathy’s] house, but she grew up in that [Aunty Cathy’s] house and I grew up a lot of years in that [Aunty Cathy’s] house. Then we moved into my Dad’s*
Alex considers multiple houses to be his home because of residential mobility. He still classes his relative's houses as his home. Kelly agreed with this notion of having multiple houses-as-home. Kelly said:

*See my parents’ house is the same, I always say that I am going home and it will always be my home where my parents are. And, you see that’s what you got to do with your kids now, they will always class wherever you are (as) home, so it’s the same thing.*

Alex and Kelly illustrate the idea that home is “always” attached to family and kin. This attachment was strengthened when houses were passed down in the family. Whilst, White/Anglo house-as-home usually involves a single household, Jerrinja people identified multiple houses as their home due to complex kinship relationships and living arrangements. According to the conventional set of ideas, home ownership is thought to maintain a sense of ‘ontological security’ through ‘permanent residency’ within a singular house-as-home (Dupuis and Thorns, 2002). The permanence of home ownership is thought to create the ‘secure base’ from which to undertaking homemaking practices (Mee, 2007). In contrast, this discussion has identified that Indigenous homemaking for Jerrinja people occurs through ‘residential mobility’ between rented forms of community housing by family and kin at the mission. In the Jerrinja community the importance of kin in homemaking meant that this research was required to move beyond a focus of elderly Jerrinja people to consider the housing as an intergenerational concern.

8.2.2 Family/Kinship and Home Unmaking
Although maintaining connections to family and kin contributes towards a sense of home, various participants identified ways that family and kin may work against a sense of home. A key example was single elderly Jerrinja people living with kin who expressed a need for privacy. In particular, noisy living environments, which led to sleep deprivation, worked against homeyness. The Small House idea was thought of as a means of separating people from the
unhomely elements of living in the same house as family and kin, whilst simultaneously allowing elderly Jerrinja people to maintain connections to family and kin.

Neville, a Jerrinja elder living off-Country, wishes to return to Country when he becomes less physically mobile with age. Neville identified that in the Jerrinja community there are a range of elderly people who are currently living with kin, for whom the Small House idea would be appropriate, as he said:

*We’ve got elderly people that have been on their own living with their uncles or aunties or cousins and a small apartment 1 or 2 bedrooms would actually suit them... as they had their own little space*

Here, Neville is referring to single elderly Jerrinja people who, despite living with kin, are still perceived as being ‘on their own’ and would like a house-as-home for themselves. This provides an important critique of the notion of kinship-as-home, through identifying that ‘permanent residency’ in extended family households may in fact not configure a full sense of home for single elderly Jerrinja people.

Many elderly Jerrinja people identified a need to have their own space, often to provide a sense of isolation and privacy away from the noise and drama on the mission, or what Betty—a female Jerrinja elder living on-Country—describes as ‘noise pollution’, as she says:

*...but you see you also want privacy as well. I think as well they need to be placed away from all the noise and also to have them sound proof... it makes it difficult to sleep sometimes when they are up late drinking and all that... I haven’t been sleeping properly because of the noise pollution around the place.*

Here, Betty identifies the issue of placement of the Small Houses and noise. She suggests the Small Houses needs to be located away from the mission’s “noise pollution”. Similarly, Aunt Mary identified that:

*It's a good for us to be talking about where, but I think we need to take into consideration is the noise from a football field.*
In particular, the need for elderly Jerrinja people to sleep earlier than younger people created a need for elderly Jerrinja people to have their own space. This relationship between living relationships of kinship and noise was also discussed at a household scale by Lisa (ASF Director):

> A couple of [Elderly Jerrinja people] have said to me, oh you know when the mob, comes around everyone... you can't go to bed, because everyone’s up... So, it would be nice to have a separate kind of accommodation.

These representations of family and kin as causing sleep deprivation and various forms of disruption highlights that kinship-as-home may simultaneously contribute towards homemaking or home unmaking. Neville explained that a solution to this would be to either have the Small Houses sound proofed or place them away from other houses and other noisy areas on the mission, such as the football field, as he said:

> ...you would definitely need that [sound proofing] if you were putting them close together and stuff like that. My thoughts were that we would have to start off small. So I thought having them apart, away from each other having them here and there, rather than having them each other’s pocket sort of thing.

This represents how living with or in close proximity to members of kin contributed towards home unmaking for elderly Jerrinja people. Accordingly, homemaking for elderly Jerrinja people requires a sense of isolation and privacy away from noise.

Neville later described his ideal house-as-home ‘out bush’. Neville said:

> I'd love to come back home, even a two-bedroom house out the bush somewhere, as long as I had enough room to do me artwork I'd be right. I would have thought that I'd died and went to heaven. (Neville- Male Jerrinja Elder Living Off-Country)

Furthermore, this description recognises that placing houses away from family and kin, is much more significant than simply functioning as an escape from raised voices. This juxtaposes with Neville’s descriptions of ‘mission life’ as being characterized by notions of ‘mortality’, which I
discuss in detail in section 7.3 where I discuss the contradictory connotations that are associated with a return to Country-as-home.

8.2.3 Connecting to Family/Kinship through a Small House

In contrast, to the previous examples of home unmaking, this section identifies how the Small House concept was identified as a way to nurture a homemaking practices. Participants saw the potential of the Small House to reconcile these contradictory processes of home making and unmaking. Neville suggested that a two-bedroom Small House would simultaneously provide single elderly Jerrinja people a sense of privacy and isolation, whilst also allowing them to accommodate kinship. Neville said:

*I think there needs to be, whether it’s done in stages or not, some catering for some of our old people who are on their own and who want their own space. And there needs to be two bedrooms with that because there would be times where there would be nieces or nephews or whatever coming over and staying with them, so you would have to look at two bedroom. Even for a one guy, one old guy.*

The Small House was understood by participants, and by co-researcher Alfred Wellington, as a way of allowing elderly Jerrinja people to regulate their time spent with family and kinship. Similarly, Lisa Miller engagements with the Jerrinja community led her to suggest that the wider Small House; Big Living project will provide a multi-directional social support network, as she said:

*...it means that they can go on living in their homes instead of going to a nursing home, because someone is checking them every day, and brings the whole cost of that societal care down. And the other [reason] is the reverse of that, is because everyone is in nursing homes, no one is there to look after the kids, so we’ve got to put them in after school care or preschool when in Aboriginal communities you know the elders tend to look after the kids.*

The Small House idea offers a form of separate accommodation, which is nearby to and integrated with family and kinship structures. Nevertheless, the Small Houses may also be
placed far enough away to avoid the home _unmaking_ that results from elderly Jerrinja people living near or with family and kinship. In the next section, I discuss the notion of Country-as-home, suggesting that a return to County and being on-Country is expressed through contradictory representations of Country as heaven/mortality and paradise/doom. I consider what this means for elderly Jerrinja people’s senses of home.

### 8.3 Country: Making and Unmaking home

Jerrinja participants frequently referred to Country as being the place that they call home. Participants said things like: “I always wanted to come back home”; “I’d love to come back home”; or, “she has been thinking about it for years, coming home.” In this section, I begin by first explaining the significance of Country-as-home for Jerrinja, specifically for those elderly Jerrinja people seeking to return to Country at Orient Point, NSW. Then, I turn to the contradictory connotations associated with Jerrinja Country. Positive connotations included notions of returning to ‘Heaven’ (Neville) and ‘Paradise’ (Alex and Alfred), and in the negative included notions of returning to a life of ‘mortality’ (Neville) and ‘doom’ (Alex). This highlights how Indigenous understandings of home remain embedded in setter colonialism. Therefore, this discussion problematizes a depiction of returning to Country as romanticised or idyllic notions, in order to open a discussion about the co-presence homemaking and home _unmaking_ practices associated with living on-Country.

Country is important because it provides a spatial anchor for Indigenous senses of home that brings the past and present together in a way that houses and people often cannot. This notion of a spatial anchor for Indigenous senses of home was captured by Alex as he stated:

> _I’d never move away no matter if I stayed in that caravan for the rest of my life._

This, when considering Indigenous sense of home, it is important to recognise that being on-Country may take priority over the type of dwelling. In the Jerrinja community this was evidenced by a range of people who were living on-Country in caravans, three of which were participants of this research (Alex, Kelly and Lucy). Indeed, for elderly Jerrinja people, the location of an ancient burial site at Orient Point provides the most culturally significant point of
reference. As discussed in Chapter 2, this burial site was a significant reason why many elderly Jerrinja people wanted to return to Country. Crucially, in building upon the previous framing of the importance of family and kinship, Jenny identified that, in her view:

*Being on-Country is very important for our people, because we have lots of family here you know*

This reflects the notion that returning Country is also about returning to family and kinship, as well as connecting to Country through traditional practices. This is what Taylor and Bell (2004: 151) referred to as a return to ‘cultural hearth’, through which they explained returning provides connections to “a critical mass of family and friends, cultural activities, and culturally appropriate services…”. Neville was the only participant in this research who, at the time of research, was living off-Country. He explained to me the importance of being on-Country from his perspective, as he said:

*Being on-Country is very important to all of our Aboriginal people I think, mainly because I think our ancestors survived off the sea. We are Saltwater People, and we have always practiced the likes of getting oysters, or mussels, or fishing and stuff like that. And when you have got to travel it gets a bit much, yeah. Yeah we shouldn’t be forced off to live elsewhere other than where our ancestors came from.*

For Neville, being on-Country facilitated a connection to the past through allowing connection to both his ancestors and ancestral lands. He further explains that engaging in traditional Jerrinja practices is an important way that Jerrinja people are able to connect to this past. Being on-Country connects Jerrinja people to a sense of identity as ‘Saltwater people’. Alfred explained that many Jerrinja people living off-Country return during the holiday periods, particularly over summer. In his words:

*And most of the time when they want to come back to Country, mostly in the warmer months. The days are longer and they get more out of weekends and plus holidays, that’s probably the most busiest time… a lot of our Jerrinja mob they go camping in summer, so off on Country, it’s not too far away but just out around the bay and that*
This demonstrates the significance of maintaining physical connections to Country, as opposed to what Memmott & Long (2012) describe as ‘passive’ place maintenance, which implies a non-physical connectedness through memory and thought. For people living off-Country, temporarily returning to Country functions as a form of home-maintenance in two ways: first, through connecting people to family and kinship and, second, through connecting people physically to Country. This notion of a physical connection to Country is discussed in greater detail in chapter 9 where I consider designing a home for elderly Jerrinja people.

Notwithstanding the centrality of Country to Indigenous senses of home, Jerrinja participants also made clear that being on Country is in no way idealistic because of colonialism. My discussion with Neville illustrated a profound contradiction in the notion of Country, as he said:

_I always wanted to come back home, and in saying that too, I want to get away from the mortality of mission life as well._

On the one hand, benefits arise from elderly Indigenous people returning to and making home on-Country, and reconnecting to land, family and upholding cultural obligations to Country and kinship. On the other hand, Orient Point raised hurtful memories of mission-as-home. For Neville, to decide to return to Country was a highly conflicted decision. Alex explained this juxtaposition between positive and negative qualities of living at the mission at Orient Point, as he explained:

_Oh it’s a powerful place when it comes to memories ‘cos this is your childhood. It’s the best place to grow up as a kid, but once you're an adult, if you can’t stay away from drugs and alcohol you’re doomed... And that’s what happens when you are compressed into a little place like this. And you grow up seeing your aunties, uncles, parents drinking and you don’t leave the mission until you're 16-17 and then you have a real reality check of what the outside of the place is, and you know, and it’s not about drinking and not about smoking dope. There is more to life than that. That’s what I’m saying like, also like back then my schooling wasn’t as strict as what it is now. But the kids these days are getting a better look ‘cos they are so strict about them going to school. So when they do_
go to school they get to see what it’s like on the outside of this place as well...people get out more now.

Alex points to the significance for Jerrinja people of leaving the mission, at least temporarily, in order to expose them to a wider range of values. Furthermore, he explains that at the fore of his memories of growing up on Country is an understanding of this place as being characterized by socio-economic disadvantage, which plays out through drug and alcohol addictions. This statement identifies how the Jerrinja ‘mission’ induces socio-cultural isolation, which further constructs understanding of there being an ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of mission-as-home. Jerrinja participants identified that there are two powerful opposing forces, which simultaneously draw Jerrinja people to and deter them from the idea of living on-Country.

However, the social, cultural and spiritual significance for elderly Jerrinja people to reconnect with kinship and Country before they pass away was shown to outweigh the negative aspects of returning to Country. Additionally, many elderly Jerrinja people also wished to die on-Country and to be buried at the ancient burial grounds at Orient Point. This is supported by breadth of research that has similarly identified the importance of provided aged and palliative care services on-Country for Indigenous Australians (Willis 1999; Sullivan et al, 2003; McGrath, 2006; 2007).

8.4 Conclusion
In applying the conceptual framework of house-as-home, kinship-as-home and Country-as-home, this chapter has exposed vital cleavages in the literature review’s framing of these concepts. In particular, the literature presented the concepts of Country-as-home and kinship-as-home as idealistic. The maintaining of connections to kinship and Country was positioned as a form of home-making that occurs through mobility, which would necessarily contribute towards a positive sense of home or, as discussed in chapter 4, a sense of ‘spiritual homeliness’. However, this research has demonstrated that maintaining these connections can also be associated with negative connotations when it comes to home-making; positioned here as a kind of home-unmaking produced, for examples, through elderly Jerrinja people’s experiences of sleep deprivation due to noise at both a household and community scale. This has significant
implications for the concept of the Small House. The Small House—if designed and positioned appropriately—might provide elderly Jerrinja people a sense of isolation and privacy away from noise, whilst also nurturing home making through being able to accommodate kinship.

Similarly, the notion of Country-as-home was shown to bring together both idyllic and non-idyllic strands of home making/unmaking through contradictory representations of ‘community’ and ‘mission’, which were shown to underpin a return of elderly Jerrinja to Country-as-home. The term ‘community’ was invoked with positive connotations of Jerrinja Country as being a cultural hearth where there are lots of family and kinship, and where Jerrinja culture can be revitalised through the return of elderly Jerrinja people. ‘Mission’ on the other hand had negative connotations and depicted a non-idyllic return to Country-as-home, as constituting home-unmaking through notions of ‘doom’ and ‘mortality’, which emerged in reference to people ‘drinking’, taking ‘drugs’ and ‘gambling’. The Small House equally has potential here to provide a sense of isolation away from the home unmaking elements associated with ‘mission’, and yet remain connected to positive homemaking elements of ‘community’. This discussion of ambivalent notions of home reflects White/Anglo geographies of home literature in the sense that home is similarly understood through contradictory notions of belonging and alienation, security and insecurity, safety and fear (Blunt & Varley, 2004; Blunt & Dowling, 2006). However, the contradictory homemaking and home unmaking qualities of Country and kinship have been poorly conceptualized in the Indigenous geographies of home literature.

Opening up the positive and negative qualities of homemaking and home unmaking reflects the history of colonisation and ongoing forces of settler colonialism which continue to affect Indigenous lives, families, social practices and the meaning and practices involved in homemaking. Indeed, this research has demonstrated how Jerrinja people’s understanding and everyday lived experiences of home were in no way romanticised or idyllic. The chapter has identified the importance of acknowledging the historic and ongoing effects of colonialism as a key part to addressing and changing this reality, beginning at home. The Small House idea, framed in this way, can be seen as a way to contribute towards homemaking that can
simultaneously afford elderly Jerrinja people a sense of privacy and seclusion, as well as connection to family and community.
Aunt Mary

We have to bring the cultural component into any design we come up with and that’s the thing that has been missing in housing that has been provided in Aboriginal communities.

~February, 2017~
This chapter focuses on the third dimension of the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 4, the material house-as-home. I begin by discussing three definitions of the material dimensions of a house-as-home: as *objective*, *aesthetic* and *relational* (Bissell, 2008). These different definitions of home echo the ontologies of broad schools of thought that are found in the geographies of home literature. These three dimensions provide the chapter structure.

First, an objective lens on the material house-as-home considers how participants framed the material house-as-home in terms of fixed features and characteristics of the house, for example its size, number or configuration of rooms, facilities, shapes and distances. Through this lens, the material house-as-home becomes viewed as something that is inherently rigid and pre-given (Gieryn, 2002). Second, an aesthetic lens on house-as-home points to the importance of how “stuff”—material objects—become the location to store emotions that work both towards and against calling a place ‘home’. This connects to the humanist literature that views emotions as being imbued and locked into places, objects and relationships (Pile, 2010). In our discussions together, elderly Jerrinja participants spoke about how material stuff became viewed as clutter (Dowling, 2008). Accordingly, the Small House idea was understood by as a way of decluttering and nurturing a sense of order and tidiness in the material home. Third, an Indigenous relational lens of the material house-as-home reveals the relationships between bodies, spaces, affects and materials. A relational understanding of the material home often meant that the objective and aesthetic dimensions of housing design became positioned as having a conscious effect on Jerrinja people’s bodies. Accordingly, the focus of embodiment becomes crucial in order to frame how affects circulate in and through bodies and things, which are in close proximity to one another (Bissell, 2008). These flows in and through people’s bodies and things simultaneously sustained and disrupted a feeling of home for Jerrinja people.
9.2 Objective Dimensions of the House-as-Home

Discussion of the house-as-home in objective terms revealed how the house came to be understood and experienced as homely or unhomely, livable or unlivable, functional or dysfunctional. Objective dimensions included things like size of facilities like sinks and showers, the size and number of rooms, the size of backyards, distance between houses and orientation. In what follows, first, I discuss how the fixed configuration of rooms comes into tension with the need for like ‘extending’, ‘expanding’ and ‘opening up’ spaces, temporarily, to accommodate family. Second, I turn to how sharing the home with family and kin created pressures on the material facilities of the home—sinks, water tanks, showers, sleeping space—and how this could disrupt a sense of home.

9.2.1 Room Configuration and Accommodating Kinship

The configuration and number of bedrooms to accommodate family and kin is one key objective dimension of the house-as-home brought to the fore in conversations about the meaning of home. Accommodating kin was identified by Alfred as being a key consideration for designing a house-as-home. Alfred asked, “…where do you fit relatives?” Referring to configuration, Aunt Mary identified the issue of having a fixed size of bedrooms and long narrow corridors, as she explained during a talking circle:

...this is where mainstream housing design have let Aboriginal people down, not just here in Australia but anywhere in the world where they live. They have let us down because they have got us living in houses that European people... suited their needs, they have long corridors, tiny block bedrooms, whatever else!

During a later ‘cuppa consultation’ day on the 31/05/2017, Aunt Mary invited me to show me around her home to take some photos, which illustrate the long narrow corridors (See Figure 9.1-below). Aunt Mary explained that the long narrow corridors created a feeling of physical and spiritual confinement. Additionally, she described the configuration of bedrooms as “little rabbit dens”, and explained through hand gestures and laughter that having bedrooms lined up one after another was culturally inappropriate, as it impacts upon a sense of individual privacy.
This explanation by Aunt Mary highlighted that Indigenous and European objective dimensions of the material house-as-home are distinct from one another. The fixed size and number of bedrooms was then picked up by Jill—a young Jerrinja woman living on-Country—as she said:

*I really don’t know how my mother managed 5 kids, in a 4-bedroom house with matchbox rooms.*

Similarly, Lucy—a Jerrinja single mother living on-Country with 3 children— in our conversation together noted the tension between the number of bedrooms and the numbers of children, as she recalled:

*You see back in the 70’s my parents were given a 2-bedroom house because at the time they only had the 3 kids, but told the government that they wanted to have more kids, and they just didn’t listen to them.*

Lucy identified how the fixed dimensions of the house-as-home may become troubled by the growing size of families and, more broadly, the size of Indigenous households. In contrast, various elderly Jerrinja people explained that their large houses are unused for most of the year, except for when family stay over. This notion of excess or unused rooms resonated with Uncle Jack who is a male Jerrinja elder living off-Country in Wollongong (Miller, 2016). His wife died some years ago and he is currently living alone in a 3 bedroom house, which he explained is too large for his needs. In his words:

*It’s too big, except when the family stay... One of these Tiny Houses would do me, close to family.*

However, other elderly Jerrinja people troubled the notion of a two-bedroom house by suggesting that spaces should be able to ‘extend’, ‘expand’ and ‘opened up’, in order to configure and reconfigure spaces according to kinship living practices. In participants’ existing houses the configuration of spaces in the home were bounded by permanent walls, which fixed the size and layout of the material house-as-home in place.
Figure 9.1 - ‘Long’ ‘Narrow’ Corridors and ‘Tiny Block’ Bedrooms

© Photo by Hilton Penfold, 2017- Aunt Mary’s Long European Style Corridors
In thinking about the configuration of spaces Alfred told me a story about his sister’s two-bedroom terrace house in Glebe, in Inner Sydney, which explained was “...not even 4 meters wide, 5 meters wide if that, if that! Probably 5 meters wide”. In this story, Alfred explained the importance for the Small Houses to be able to be configured and reconfigured, as he said:

There would be times when there would be like ten extra like extended family there. All just put your mattresses out and she’d probably had half a dozen.

He further noted that, for his sister, extending for capacity was made practical through storing the mattresses in the basement, saying:

The basement was really good because it had all the spare mattresses and that so you just pull them out and people sleep in the living room and that’s important, you know, having that mobility in the design and to be able to extend the capacity of it somehow.

This statement troubles the notion that spaces in the Indigenous house-as-home should have a fixed use, and instead should remain flexible to kinship sleeping arrangements. This is reflected by Memmott (2003: 31) who identified, in his research with Indigenous communities in central Australia, that:

If bedrooms are too small or too few, regular household members or visitors will sleep and live in the 'living room' of the house. Living rooms need to be designed to accommodate mattresses and people sitting on the ground facing one another in conversation. This differs from the typical Australian, living room, which features a couch and television

This discussion brings into question the Western notion of bedrooms as private space where one can find escape. Furthermore, it brings into question the Western notions of the living room as a place where family come together to watch television.

Indigenous kinship living practices—as previously discussed by Kelly, Alex and Alex’s Father—requires spaces in the home to remain flexible so that they can be configured and reconfigured to suit a range needs. These needs are not fixed in time or space, but rather are open to
ongoing change as a result of complex cultural living and homemaking practices. Meanwhile, the material house-as-home retains what Gieryn (2000) referred to as “relative fixity”. In general, Jerrinja people expressed in various ways that whilst the objective spaces of the material house-as-home remain fixed, the size of families and households change over time. Therefore, it was suggested that the objective dimensions should have the flexibility to accommodate kinship and also to remain open to changes in family size and composition.

9.2.2 Sharing things with family and kin
Jerrinja participants, young and old, spoke of the material implications of sharing house-as-home, which often created a need to have larger things and utilities, such as double sinks, showers, and hot water tanks. There was unanimous agreement that Small Houses should not compromise on the size of these facilities. For example, Alex said:

...in the kitchen you have only got single sinks, you need a double...Another thing about these houses is that they need a big hot water tank, none of these little pissy ones.

In discussing ‘big’ sinks and showers with Uncle Neville, he agreed saying:

...well you can’t have it too small anyway ‘cos of elderly people ... they don’t want to be going in and walking into a small shower

Enabling the sense of comfort and functionality that allows a house to be experienced as ‘home’ required having the capacity to accommodate expanded numbers people to be showered and fed. The topic of sharing also raised questions about privacy. For example, after asking what Alex and Kelly disliked about their current home, Kelly immediately said:

Toilet and the shower being in the same room.

Kelly explained that sharing a bathroom with Alex’s father was dysfunctional, let alone when larger numbers of relatives visited. Alex shared a story in a talking circle about the lack of privacy when sharing a bathroom with his father. Alfred proposed a solution:
I’d just have beams and like an open... something like you just grab a curtain or like a divider and when it’s time, and you’ve got people over, you can just pull it across and, bang, it has got privacy there.

Aunt Betty identified another objective concern as she explained a need to separate the bathroom from the kitchen, due to Indigenous health concerns. In her words:

*Indigenous people have a rule to separate the cooking areas from rubbish areas. Sewage is sometimes a problem as well... With these tiny houses, I don’t know about having the kitchen and the bathroom right next to each other, I think they need to be separated.*

This is similarly reflected by Fien et al (2011: 347) who identified in their research with three remote Indigenous settlements that, “Often there were concerns that toilets were too close to kitchens, could be seen from the living rooms or that people (especially women) could be seen entering them.” However, Aunt Betty’s concern lay in the reduced scale of the Small House.

Two key considerations to make a house feel homelier for Jerrinja people arise from thinking about objective dimensions of the material house-as-home. First, the material house-as-home requires an objective configuration that is attentive to the relationships generated through multiple people using material spaces and things in the home. In particular, having a fixed number of bedrooms became less important than having a flexible design that could both configure and reconfigure spaces according to changing sizes and composition of households. The reasons for the changing sizes and composition of households were multi-temporal ranging from temporary visits from kin to long-term increases of household size as a result of having children. A discussion of the configuration of spaces simultaneously relates to the need for the material house-as-home to consider Indigenous socio-spatial behaviours, which often requires Indigenous people to be in different rooms from particular members of kin (Memmott, 2003). Memmott (2003: 29) explained that, for Indigenous people “feelings of tension and stress can be created by poorly designed room layouts and lines of vision”. Second, sharing the material house-as-home with members of kin also drew attention to objective dimensions of home. In particular, having to share material facilities —sinks, water tanks, bathrooms—became a source
of tension between people’s feelings of home and the objective dimensions of home. These discussions have highlighted how size and configuration of materials both of and within the house are important factors shaping whether or not a house may become a home for Jerrinja people.

9.3 Aesthetic Aspects of the Material House-as-Home
In this section, I discuss how people locate meaning and emotions within material objects, and how this entails generational difference, with implications for homes that accommodation multiple generations. Material objects are integral to the making and unmaking of house-as-home in terms of how they are understood to contain memories and emotions (Cieraad, 2010). For some elderly Jerrinja people, material stuff that no longer contained meaning that enhanced a sense of belonging became ‘clutter’ and evoked feelings of untidiness, which worked against a sense of home (Dowling, 2008). For instance, when I asked Betty about the issue of reduced storage associated with living in a Small House, she noted that:

_I don’t think [reduced storage] would be an issue at all; I would love to get rid of most of the clutter in my house at the moment. You wouldn’t believe the amount of clutter I have at the moment._

Moreover, elderly Jerrinja people viewed the Small House idea as a way of decluttering and nurturing a sense of order and tidiness, and therefore a sense of homeliness. Elderly Jerrinja people were far more concerned with creating space for family and kinship than they were about creating space for material objects and stuff.

In contrast, younger generations spoke about how material stuff contained meanings and emotions that made house-a-home. Oftentimes, the things that Jerrinja people spoke about in the context of Small Houses were objects that were not required for everyday use. For example, Alfred asked:

_...where does my kayak go? 5.2 meters, where do my, you know, 10 surfboards where do I pack them? You know and my fishing gear? Where does my camping gear go? ... And_
then you got to consider your tools, the tools that you use, and the like outdoor, just like gardening tools, lawnmowers, whipper snipper.

Material stuff contained attachments to people’s identities relating to water sports and camping practices, which enabled younger Jerrinja people to connect to their cultural identity as ‘Salt Water People’. Additionally, the need to store ‘outdoor’ maintenance and gardening equipment became central for how younger Jerrinja men understood themselves and their roles and responsibilities as fathers. In particular, these ‘outdoor’ things allowed men to engage in homemaking practices, such as gardening and fixing things around the house.

The participants suggested a range of ways that things could be stored outside of the house, including a garage for cars, outdoor shed for gardening equipment and tools, or having storage compartments underneath the veranda of the house for utilities. Additionally, Alfred discussed the importance of security:

_I suppose security too, you can’t leave everything outside, if we got a small place. Is my neighbour going to look after it while I’m not around? Is it going to be fine when I’m not around? There is that element too, how do you create space too for belongings?_

The intergenerational nature of the material house-as-home, as discussed in Section 7.4.1, meant that having a secure place for younger generations to store their things became important for older generations.

In particular, the elderly Jerrinja people placed less emphasis on the significance of material things as source of meaning and emotional support. In contrast, the younger generations cherished a range of material things, which nurtured a range of identities, many of which related to water sport identities. Accordingly, it can be assumed that when younger people visit elderly relatives they will bring with them material stuff, which necessitates that Small Houses have secure storage space, in addition to elderly resident’s storage needs. If the Small House cannot provide secure storage for younger visitors it is likely to work against elderly Jerrinja people’s understandings of home as a tidy and decluttered space.
9.4 Relationality and the Material House-as-Home
An Indigenous relational ontology is evident in participants’ discussion of the material entities of the house-as-home. An Indigenous relational ontology reveals the relationships between bodies, spaces, affects and materials (Bawaka Country, 2016). For elderly Jerrinja people in particular, a feeling of home or homeyness was sustained in places that connected their bodies to Country (Bawaka Country, 2015; 2016). More specifically, elderly Jerrinja people attained a sense of home through a felt connection to the agency of Country via wind, light and warmth. However, this felt connection was often disrupted by poor housing design and orientation of the material house, which often made internal spaces feel affectually unhomely, and thus making outdoor spaces feel homelier.

9.4.1 Agency of Country: Embodiment in the Material Home
The agency of Country in the process of making a house a home was brought to the fore when Elderly Jerrinja people shared stories of their embodied knowledge. For a house to become home required an embodied or felt connection to Country. Country provided a key role in making this connection to home possible, for example through sunlight and air movement. This builds upon recent research by Bawaka Country et al (2015; 2016), which identified the agency of Bawaka Country in order to attend to the more-than human becoming of agents within space/place. Aunt Mary referred to the more-than-human agency of Jerrinja Country as a physical and spiritual feeling (Dei, 2000), which required a sense of space or a spatial freedom in the material home. This sense of space shaped elderly Jerrinja peoples lived experiences of the material house-as-home. In Aunt Mary’s words:

*Wherever we live we’ve got to have this freedom of our spirit and it’s a strong spiritual feeling but it’s also a physical feeling, we have to have that space.*

In my research engagements, elderly Jerrinja participants identified that in order for housing to provide a freedom of their spirit, housing design needed to connect Jerrinja people’s bodies to the NE winds, natural lighting and the sun’s warmth. This required an orientation to connect to the NE wind: every elderly Jerrinja person who I spoke with mentioned the importance of this
connection. For Jerrinja people the NE wind at Orient Point had its own persona and spiritual force that was geographically and culturally specific. Aunt Betty told me that:

*Traditionally we [Jerrinja people] always spoke about the four winds and they all come at different times... That’s another thing; you know that NE wind that comes through here? Well it’s not only about ventilation, because when that wind comes through the window, it actually falls onto our grandchildren’s chests.*

Betty wanted to pass on her embodied knowledge to her grandchildren via the development of a Small House that facilitated a physical and spiritual connection to Country. The NE winds at Orient Point moved in and through Jerrinja people bodies and had a direct agency over how they were able to make sense of their material house-as-home. Home was understood as a relationship between bodies, materials and affective flows.

Given the significance of maintaining embodied connections to Country, elderly Jerrinja people also became highly conscious of where a connection to County was no longer felt, in and through the body. Oftentimes, this felt connection was disrupted by poor orientation, internal layout and lack of windows of the material house-as-home. A majority of participants discussed their embodied knowledge of light and darkness in their houses. People’s embodied knowledges of light and dark were particularly influential in shaping whether or not areas in and around the material house-as-home that felt homely or unhomely, liveable or unliveable. This embodiment of light and dark was expressed by Betty. In her words:

*If we walk into the room that is dark we just walk right back out the door.*

Furthermore, when I asked by way of confirmation whether the light restricted where she would go in her house, she said:

*Yeah but it is lots of things, the dark, the light, whether or not I can feel the breeze or not, and where the sun is.*

Betty highlights how the agency of Country is both multifaceted and multidirectional. Her embodied knowledge of wind, light and warmth constantly shaped where she would and would
not go in and around the material house-as-home. Furthermore, this brings to the fore the permeability of the material house as an object, which simultaneously facilitates and disrupts the flows and pathways of the agency of Country as it creates home (Gieryn, 2002). Additionally, Alfred explained a very complex interaction between the flow of light, colour of walls and an affective feeling of space, as he said:

*And the light, you know... the place that I am at now has got a big northern facing veranda like this. But the problem is in winter it’s dark in the living room and in the lounge room. And the worst thing is, I painted it a different colour, I’d done some painting so it just made it even darker. Mum was saying "hey you shouldn’t" but I didn’t listen to her. It was good for a year. But now it needs lighting, it needs a sky light, you know if I’d options I’d have a couple of sky lights. (The darkness) doesn’t make the house... (The light) it like sort of widens it in a way, so I don’t even really use it; I’ve sort of gone off going in to the living rooms and that. Oh I’ve got plans to sort of brighten it right up. But I heaps like the colour. For me too it’s sort of open space inside a dwelling. Yeah, you got to have support systems in a home but even with that I’d just have beams and like an open something like you just grab a curtain or like a divider and when its time and you’ve got people over you can just pull it across and bang it has got privacy there.*

This highlights the relational interplay between objective, aesthetic and affective aspects of the material home. Alfred begins by identifying that, *objectively*, having a north facing orientation and veranda made his living room and dining receive less light flow in the winter making it feel unhomely and unliveable. Moreover, to make the room feel homelier, he decided to paint the room a darker colour which he liked the colour of *aesthetically*. However, this aesthetic appeal wore off over time, when— due to a *relational* ontology— a feeling of darkness began to work against a sense of home.

The discussion of affective flows being disrupted by materials and disconnecting bodies from a felt connection to Country, contrasted sharply with people’s discussions of verandas. When
having a conversation on the Medical Centre veranda with Jenny— a female elder living on-
Country— she noted:

_We need places like the veranda to keep us spiritually connected._

Jenny’s house is one of few at Orient Point that does not have a veranda. She went onto explain
that this absence was culturally dysfunctional, forcing both a physical and spiritual disconnect
between her body and the affective flows of Jerrinja Country. How the veranda facilitates
embodied connections to Country is imperative to understanding a Jerrinja house-as-home. On
the one hand, the veranda is understood as a social gathering place and important to achieving
thermal comfort, and on the other hand, the veranda functions as a place where Jerrinja people
can feel physically and spiritually connected to Country, via connections to wind, natural
lighting and warmth. Alfred mentioned how, on the ‘cuppa consultation’ day, most people,
including himself, were more comfortable sitting outside on the veranda and grass than they
were sitting in the air-conditioned room inside. This was reinforced by my research diary, in
which I observed elderly Jerrinja claiming to feel hot in an air-conditioned room, and saying
how they preferred to be outside. This was perhaps best explained when Alfred said:

_Outdoor spaces are very important. Like today, I was just much more comfortable going
outside and chatting. It’s more of a cultural thing you know and it’s sort of sitting
together and if it’s a lovely day you just sit around on the ground or on the grass or
whatever._

For Alfred, sitting on the veranda, and grass, not only connected people to Country and
corporeal comfort, but also generated a profound cultural meaning. Therefore, spaces that
enabled a felt or embodied connection often became social gathering places. Crucially, these
became places in which Jerrinja people could feel at home. The agency of Country is central to
creating this feeling. Jerrinja people’s understandings of home were understood in a
relationship between bodies, materials, spaces and affect. As Aunt Mary explained, a range of
tensions have been produced from not simply poor design but also from ‘mainstream’
‘European’ designs at Orient Point, NSW. Therefore, considering Indigenous ontologies of home
through a relational lens was necessary in order to expose the multifaceted and multidirectional tensions.

**9.5 Conclusion**

In summary, this discussion has highlighted three lens of the material house-as home that emerged when Jerrinja people spoke about house-as-home: the objective, aesthetic and relational. Objective dimensions of the house as home were often shaped by the need to accommodate and live with family and kin. Having larger utilities —sinks, showers and water heaters— was proposed as a way of nurturing a greater sense of comfort for elderly Jerrinja people and for younger generations living with family. The aesthetic of material things was also discussed as integral to house-as-home. Older generations spoke of the things to be discarded; the younger generation spoke of things to be stored. An attentiveness to the relationality through which house becomes home highlighted the importance of embodied knowledge and the agency of Country. Places where a felt connection was possible, such as the veranda, sustained a sense of homeliness. In contrast, spaces where Jerrinja people’s bodies were disconnected from a felt connection made spaces feel affectually unhomely, and at times unlivable. Crucially, elderly Jerrinja people’s lived experience of the material house-as-home was shaped by the more-than-human movements and flows, such as wind, light and warmth.
Chapter 10: Conclusion- ‘Leaving Place’

© Photo by Hilton Penfold- Photo of Jerrinjia Country and Cullunghutti Mountain “Leaving Place” in the Background
This concluding chapter is structured into four sections: First, I propose three design principles for the Small House derived from this research: adaptability, sustainability, and permeability. These principles have been recognised as contributing towards nurturing Jerrinja people’s understandings of home through the design of house. Second, I revisit the aims of the thesis to summarize the key findings. Third, I revisit my positionality and pay specific attention to the impact of the project on how I understand myself, Indigenous issues and everyday life. The final section closes the thesis with concluding remarks on Indigenous-led research.

10.1 Design Principles
The overarching aim of the wider Small House; Big Living project is to facilitate the return of elderly Jerrinja people back to Country at Orient Point, NSW and, in so doing, reconnect younger generations to traditional Jerrinja culture and identity. The wider project seeks to engage in a process of co-designing and master planning sustainable Small Houses for elderly Jerrinja people. Auxiliary aims of the wider project included a need to diversify the current community housing stock on-Country and also to develop a Small House enterprise run by the Jerrinja community. The role of this research in the wider Small House; Big Living project is to integrate elderly Jerrinja senses of home into the design of the Small Houses, and so are aligned with the wider project. The findings of this thesis are being used to inform an architectural design competition to be judged by the Jerrinja community. Following from this, I provide three design principles that can be derived from my discussions with Jerrinja people, which suggested a range of culturally rich, Indigenous design ideas identified by Jerrinja people as ways to make a house feel more like a home for them. I suggest that these specific design ideas can be captured within three principles of housing design.

10.1.1 Adaptability
Alfred identified that a key consideration for designing a house as home was, “...where do you fit relatives?” Many Jerrinja people suggested that designing a house as home might come about through creating an adaptable design that could ‘extend’, ‘expand’ and ‘open up’ spaces in order to accommodate relatives and provide an embodied feeling of comfort. Adaptability was expressed in three ways: Internal flexibility of walls, extending outwards temporarily, and extending outwards permanently. Having housing that is adaptable was identified by Jerrinja
people as necessary in order to remain flexible to changing circumstances, such as temporarily accommodating relatives associated with kinship obligations, semi-permanently or permanently, and growing family sizes. This flexibility of design would mean that the objective dimensions of home would remain open to fluctuating household and family sizes over time. Therefore, flexibility is an important cultural element of housing design as it would enable Indigenous residents to maintain cultural obligations to accommodate extended family and kin. Additionally, flexibility also ensures that the material house-as-home remains sensitive to complex Indigenous socio-spatial behaviours. For instance, kinship avoidance and gender behaviours necessitate that certain family members or members of kin remain proximately separate from one another (Memmott, 2003). Thus, flexibility may also facilitate a greater sense of privacy, comfort and security, which are central to homemaking practices (Blunt & Dowling, 2006).

10.1.2 Sustainability
Sustainability was an important principle of house design for elderly Jerrinja people. This was reflected by Alfred, who told me that in the Jerrinja community “One of our philosophies here is sustainability.” The research participants suggested that sustainable housing technologies contributed towards a wider Indigenous sense of home, by allowing a type of housing politics that both ‘connects to’ and ‘cares for’ Jerrinja Country. Sustainable materials and technologies were also important in order to allow houses to go ‘off-grid’ and therefore would allow for larger, more appropriate spacing between houses. There was an agreement amongst participants that the Small Houses should all be connected to rainwater tanks and solar power. Additionally, the idea of having composting toilets was identified as a way to ensure the Small Houses do not have to conform to sewerage infrastructure. However, unlike solar and rainwater tanks, people shared concerns with such technologies in regards to housing issues of health and maintenance. Additionally, sustainable housing was also identified as contributing towards a sense of home through reducing the costs of living. Sustainability has a strong cultural resonance with Jerrinja people’s values, in which utilizing sustainable technologies and materials was understood as a way of connecting to and caring for Country. Oftentimes, Jerrinja
elders would explain this cultural relevance through storytelling practices, which explained Jerrinja people’s long history of engaging in sustainable living practices.

10.1.3 Permeability
Permeability is concerned with the ability of the material house-as-home to permit affective flows of light, wind and warmth to move in and through the spaces, objects, bodies and materials of home (Jenkins, 2002). Jerrinja people frequently noted the importance of maintaining a felt connection to wind, light and warmth when inside their house. In order to provide this connection, participants suggested measures that would improve the permeability, such as having a North East orientation, sky lights, more windows and flexibility of internal walls. However, they also suggested that housing design should be able to block unhomely flows of sound, which permeated through poorly insulated houses and became embodied as ‘noise pollution’. Elderly Jerrinja people wanted a sense of control over when and where these movements and flows entered the material house-as-home. Housing design for elderly Jerrinja people should allow elderly people to choose when and where parts of their material house-as-home becomes permeable and impermeable.

10.1.4 Spatial Freedom
Spatial freedom required an embodied feeling of spaciousness both within and between houses on the Roseby Park site. This principle was most clearly explained by Aunt Mary who said “wherever we live we've got to have this freedom of our spirit and it’s a strong spiritual feeling but it’s also a physical feeling, we have to have that space.” When Aunt Mary later walked me through her home, she stated that narrow areas—such as the long corridor and tiny bedrooms (See Figure 9.1) —created a feeling of confinement, which according to her is inappropriate for Indigenous people. Similarly, Alfred noted how the absence of natural lighting and the dark colour of his walls worked together to make him feel a sense of confinement in his living and dining rooms. Accordingly, Jerrinja people noted that a feeling of spatial freedom required a culturally appropriate layout of spaces both inside the house, and also of spaces between houses. In particular, a feeling of spatial freedom was shown through the findings of this research to contribute towards a sense of home for Jerrinja people. Particularly, larger spaces
between bedrooms and houses were shown to enable people a greater sense of privacy and peace, whilst also facilitating important connections to family and kin.

10.2 Thesis Aims
Here I address each of my four thesis aims in turn in order to establish the key contributions of this thesis. Crucially, these contributions contribute towards the decolonizing research—in a modest way—through emphasising Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies of home.

10.2.1 To contribute to understandings of Indigenous senses of home.
Aim one was left intentionally broad so as to remain open to new or unexpected trajectories of Indigenous senses of home that might emerge throughout the course of this research (Wright, 2014). In Chapter 4 I presented a literature review of Indigenous geographies of home as a conceptual framework for understanding what constitutes Indigenous senses of home in the available geographical literature. I identified how Indigenous senses of home are commonly understood in relation to three key forces: house, kinship and Country. However, my research suggests the need to critique the way the literature represents kin and Country as forces that necessarily contribute towards a sense of home. In Chapter 8, I illustrated the highly contradictory forces of homemaking and home unmaking that simultaneously underpin Indigenous relationships kin and Country. This helps to illuminate how Indigenous senses of home are simultaneously comprised of feelings of belonging and alienation, security and fear, comfort and discomfort (Blunt & Dowling, 2006). Chapter 9 investigated Jerrinja people’s understandings of the material house-as-home according to three definitions of home: objective, aesthetic and relational (Bissell, 2008). This discussion identified that the material house-as-home must take into consideration the Small Houses must accommodate large numbers of family members on a temporary basis. This is because of the importance movement to maintain family and kin relationships. In practical terms, this meant that something required to be big – light water heaters and sink. At the same time it meant that rooms required flexible layouts. Equally, while material objects held less significance in making places home for older generations, secure storage was central to accommodate the processions that younger generations may bring with them – like bikes, surfboards and kayaks. Finally, non-human agency – especially wind and sunlight – was integral to making house-as-home through
connecting Jerrinja people’s bodies to Country. It was in this sense that Country had an agency over how Jerrinja people’s understandings of house-as-home were configured.

10.2.2 To engage qualitative and participatory methods as a framework for Indigenous-led research.
Upholding this second aim was an important ethical and methodological decision. It enabled Jerrinja people to shape and reshape the entire research process. This shaping and reshaping was demonstrated through methodological changes that took place through the course of the research, as detailed in Chapters 6 and 7. In Chapter 6 I presented an in-depth theoretical interrogation of Indigenous-led research in theory and, in Chapter 7, illustrated how the ‘doing’ of Indigenous-led research resulted in a drawn-out untangling and reworking of much of this theory in practice (See Table 7.1). What this suggests is that Indigenous-led research cannot be held in isolation from the wider social terrain that comprises the lives of Indigenous Australians. Notwithstanding the fact that the original methodology was co-produced with the Jerrinja community, the methodological changes that occurred were the result of multiple unforeseen factors including contacting protocols of recruitment, local housing politics and important cultural practices of maintaining relationships to kin and Country. The qualitative and participatory methods that were deemed appropriate in practice, in the context of this social terrain have been outlined in Table 7.1.

Crucially, the community gathering—the cuppa consultations—presented me an opportunity to participate in an Indigenous talking circle, where knowledge gathering and sharing practices took place. Additionally, this community gathering enabled me to build relationships and have a private yarn with a range of both elderly and young adult Jerrinja people. All of these methods were unobtrusive for the Indigenous participants who, according to the Jerrinja LALC, often experienced consultation fatigue around the Small House: Big Living project as a result of having multiple community projects competing for attention (Moran, 2016). Nevertheless, these methods also provided significant depth and scope into understanding Jerrinja people’s lived experiences of the house-as-home. A key methodological finding was how Indigenous storytelling practices were able to do much of the work intended by living diaries, as elderly
Jerrinja people were able to accurately recount—through storytelling—their consciously embodied experiences of everyday life spent in and around the material house-as-home.

10.2.3 To engage with the Jerrinja people’s understandings of home and its creation through everyday practices and processes of meaning making.

Home for Jerrinja people was understood as something that can be both made and unmade through everyday living. In Chapter 8 I illustrated how Jerrinja people’s understandings of kinship-as-home and Country-as-home contained often contradictory feelings of home. For instance, accommodating kinship was viewed as something that contributed towards homemaking for Jerrinja people. Accommodating kinship was particularly important for elderly Jerrinja people who wanted to look after and share cultural knowledges with their grandchildren. However, living near or with kin was also understood to contribute towards the unmaking of home for elderly Jerrinja people who identified that ‘noise pollution’ often resulted in sleep deprivation or other disruptions. Similarly, in Chapter 9 I explored how Jerrinja people’s understandings of Country-as-home contained contradictory notions of ‘paradise’ and ‘doom’, ‘heaven’ and ‘mortality’. Opening up the positive and negative qualities of homemaking and home unmaking reflects the history of colonisation and ongoing forces of settler colonialism which continue to affect Indigenous lives, families and social practices. Crucially, it is these ambivalent forces, which continue to shape the meanings and practices involved in home-making for Indigenous people. Indeed, this research has demonstrated how Jerrinja people’s understanding and everyday lived experiences of home were simultaneously idyllic and non-idyllic. The findings suggest the importance of acknowledging the historic and ongoing effects of colonialism as a key part of addressing and changing this reality, beginning at home. The Small House idea, framed in this way, can be seen as a way to contribute towards homemaking that can simultaneously afford elderly Jerrinja people a sense of privacy and seclusion, as well as connection to family and community.
10.2.4 Co-produce an Indigenous-led contribution to the geographies of home literature. Addressing this final aim was particularly important as Chapter 4 identified the paucity of scholarship which considers Indigenous geographies of home. This research has co-produced an Indigenous-led contribution to the ‘mainstream’ geographies of home literature. More specifically, there are even fewer geographical studies that have investigated Indigenous people’s lived experiences of the house-as-home, which is the core focus of this research. The paucity of research in this domain is particularly alarming given the widespread Indigenous housing challenges, outlined in Chapters 2 and 4. In particular, Chapter 2 identified that the current housing market is premised on housing designs that privilege White/Anglo notions of home. Therefore, providing rich opportunities for Indigenous communities to co-design houses according to their understandings of home is likely to produce a range of unforeseen benefits in regards to Indigenous housing outcomes. A key contribution of this research to the geographies of home literature has been its application of an Indigenous relational ontology which, as Chapter 4 explained, has key similarities with a post-humanist ontology. This builds upon key pieces of research by Bawaka Country (2015; 2016), which identified how space/place in Yolngu ontology is always in process of co-becoming with Bawaka Country. This research has demonstrated the more-than-human agency of Jerrinja Country, through identifying that connections to Country in fact shaped and reshaped elderly Jerrinja people’s understandings of home.

10.4 Positionality
Waitt (2010) identified the importance of considering how one’s positionality changes through the experience of engaging in research. Throughout the course of doing this research, I recorded my ongoing reflections in a research diary. Based on these diary reflections, Box 10.1 considers how my positionality has either changed or has been reinforced over the course of the research. Crucially, my initial view of the material house-as-home as a place of corporeal deprivation has been reinforced through learning from Jerrinja peoples embodied knowledges of the material house-as-home. Moreover, I have become more attentive of places in my
material house-as-home where a felt connection to light, wind and warmth is felt or no longer felt, in and through my body. Furthermore, I explain how my view of family has changed, as I now have a deeper respect for familial responsibility and place less value towards individual freedom. This positionality highlights the importance for researchers to engage in research that is ‘for’ Indigenous people (Koster et al, 2012), and in particular the need for non-Indigenous researchers to “adopt new ways of seeing” (Kendall et al, 2011: 1719). In particular, the shifts in my positionality reinforce the importance of understanding cross-cultural research as an opportunity to learn about different ways of seeing and looking at the world.

Box 10.1- Researcher Positionality: How has this research shaped me?

Following from the completion of knowledge gathering and sharing with the Jerrinja community, I was given a moment of reflection to consider how my own experiences of doing research has shaped my understanding of home.

‘Material House-as-Home’— this research has provided me an opportunity to learn from elderly Jerrinja people’s stories about their embodied knowledges of their material house-as-home. Therefore, this learning has enabled me to reconsider my own embodied knowledges of the material house-as-home. Prior to engaging in research I understood my own material house-as-home as a place where I felt “numb”. I now realise that this was pointing towards an embodied disconnection from wind, light and warmth. Additionally, I am also more aware of unhomely sounds which permeate through the materials of my home, such as dogs barking and construction workers. Moreover, I am also more conscious of how these sounds only become embodied as noise through my lack of control and agency.

‘Family-as-Home’— another key way that this research has shaped me has been through my understanding of family-as-home. In particular, the words of Aunt Mary resonated with me, as she said “You can’t put us in the same box as retirement villages because we come from a different culture, we like to be together”. This led me to view retirement villages as Westernized institutions, which normalize a sense of detachment from family. In contrast, I now understand the Small House idea as an alternative form of housing to retirement villages for people of any ethnicity and race, which facilitates connections to family.
10.5 Closing Remarks
In closing, I return back to my question initial question posed in Chapter 1, where I asked: what would it mean to provide a more-than-symbolic acknowledgement of Indigenous people and Country? In the context of an Indigenous-led honours project which focused on co-designing Small Houses for elderly Jerrinja people, a more than symbolic acknowledgment came about through upholding two principles. First, through engaging in Indigenous-led research, I have sought to effectively centre my authority as researcher, and thereby centred Jerrinja people as leading authorities of knowledge production in this research. In doing so, this research acknowledges Indigenous people and elders—past, present and future—in a more-than-symbolic way. Second, by decentring the authority of human beings, this research has also sought to acknowledge Jerrinja Country in a more-than-symbolic way. This was achieved through remaining attentive to the more-than-human agency of Country, which has been shown throughout the findings of this research to affect Jerrinja people’s lived experiences of home.

In line with Indigenous-led research principles and a more-than-symbolic acknowledgment, I conclude the thesis by reiterating the words of Aunt Mary, who summed up the need to design a house according to Indigenous understandings of home. In her words:

*Aboriginal people, we relate spiritually and physically to Space! We have to have space around us. This is where mainstream housing design have let Aboriginal people down, not just here in Australia but anywhere in the world where they live. They have let us down because they have got us living in houses that European people... suited their needs, they have long corridors, tiny block bedrooms, whatever else! This is where it all impacted on us...with what we got. But we have an opportunity now, an opportunity to turn this all around. How many years later?*
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Appendix A- Invitation to Participate in Research

To Whom It May Concern,

The Jerrinja people of the Crookhaven Shoalhaven Rivers, Lake Wollumboola and Northern Jervis Bay areas have a connection to this country over the last 40,000 years. We have significant land assets in the region but little income and over 92% unemployment rate. Our 5 year business plan has identified a number of key projects and enterprises to realise our self-determination and strengthen our culture. They are:

1. Housing development at our Orient Point Site to ensure the basic health and wellbeing of our people are provided for;

2. Ecotourism at Jerriwerri on Jervis Bay; and

3. Aquaculture

To assist in the development of these projects we have partnered with a not-for-profit, social enterprise: ALL Sustainable Futures Inc. This partnership is to provide the skills, experience and knowledge to build capacity within Jerrinja to realise our strategic plan over the next five years by creating enterprises that educate, train, employ and provide income for Jerrinja.

To begin this series of projects ALL Sustainable Futures Inc have secured a grant from Family and Community Services to establish a co-design process with University Technology Sydney (Institute for Sustainable Development and School of Architecture) and design competition to develop a series of age appropriate, ecologically sustainable, small house designs: Small House, Big Living project for our land at Orient Point. Jerrinja would like to build at least 15 homes for our people on our land that have been co-designed by Jerrinja.

As part of this project we have invited University of Wollongong to share in the learning potential of this project and be part of the co-design process.

We support this application and look forward to working in partnership with the University of Wollongong in realising our plan for self-determination. If you wish to discuss this letter please call me on 0410850271 or email me at jlalc@bigpond.com

Yours Sincerely,
Alfred Wellington
CEO Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council
Appendix B- Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title: Small House Project

This Project is being conducted by Honours student, Hilton Penfold, under the supervision of Gordon Waitt and Pauline McKee from the School of Geography and Sustainable Communities at the University of Wollongong. The project has been developed at the invitation of the Jerrinja Aboriginal Land Council. It is part of the wider Small House: Big Living project between the Land Council and ALL Sustainable Futures Inc. about appropriate housing design and development to ensure the basic health and wellbeing of the Jerrinja people.

The purpose of the Honours project is to gather knowledge to build understanding of how Jerrinja people make a house into a home through everyday practices and processes of meaning making.

What you will be asked to do.
If you consent to being involved in the project, representatives from the Jerrinja Aboriginal Land Council will introduce you to Hilton Penfold. Your role in this project involves telling stories about your house and home to Hilton.

There are two stages in the project and you can chose to participate in one or both stages. All levels of participation are greatly valued and appreciated. In the first stage you will be asked to tell stories about yourself, your house and how you make it a home, what you like the most about your home, what you dislike about your home and what you would like to change. These stories will help build an understanding of how meaning is made so as to make a house a home.

As a next step you will have the option to take the student volunteer to particularly important places in your home to talk about and show why they are important and, if you wish, to capture these key places through photographs. The student volunteer will provide you with a camera for the purpose of taking these photographs. There are no right or wrong answers. The conversation will take about 60 minutes.

With your permission, the conversation will be audio-recorded and transcribed. You can have a copy of the recording or transcript, and of the photographs if you wish. You will have the opportunity to review and change anything you may want to edit, or to remove photographs.

Representatives from the Jerrinja Aboriginal Land Council, and a family member or friend can stay with you throughout the conversation if you wish.

If you choose to participate in the second stage, it will involve the following:
In the second stage you will be given the option of creating a ‘living diary’ of how you live in your home, in audio and/or photographic form. Creating the diary requires you to record observations about your everyday experiences and practices in the home for 5 days of your choice over the course of 3 weeks. You will be provided with an audio-recorder and/or camera by the student volunteer for the purposes of creating the diary. Creating the diary will take about 20 mins on each day.

If you agree to create a living diary, you will be also be asked to participate in a follow-up conversation to further clarify and explain your experiences and practices of home and to help the student volunteer to interpret your diary. The follow-up conversation will take about 30 minutes. The diary will be transcribed to assist interpretation. You may have a copy the recording or transcript, and of the photographs if you wish. You will have the opportunity to review and change anything you may wish to edit, or to remove photographs.

With your consent, quotations from the conversations, diary and the photographs taken may be used in the honours thesis and related publications and presentations.

**Withdrawal**

Your consent can be withdrawn at any time without providing a reason. Any information you provide to the project can be withdrawn at your request. Withdrawal of consent will have no consequence for you.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

Privacy and confidentiality is ensured through providing us with a pseudonym for audio transcripts of conversations and diaries. Your name will not be used in the project unless you choose to be identified. For the purposes of privacy, any identifying features will be blurred in any photographs you take before the photographs will be used in the project or in any related publications or presentations.

A copy of transcripts of the conversations, diaries and photographs will be provided back to the Jerrinjia community via the Jerrinjia Local Aboriginal Land Council, in recognition that the project information remains in the ownership of the community. Community members can access this project information via the Land Council.

Otherwise, all information will be stored secured by the University of Wollongong, with access permitted only to the principle and student volunteer.

Importantly, whether you chose to get involved in the honours project or not will have no impact on whether you ultimately have access to the housing that is designed or developed as part of the wider project between Jerrinjia Aboriginal Land Council and ALL Sustainable Futures.
Benefits and risks

While real names will only be used if a participant chooses, and identifying features in photographs will be blurred, it is possible that you will be identifiable in the project information.

The project benefits arise through the potential of the honours project to contribute to facilitating a new model of age appropriate housing, which involves ongoing participation, consultation and agreement with the Jerrinja community.

Ownership
Ownership of the knowledge produced in the honours project will remain with the Jerrinja community. A copy of all the information produced will be provided to the Jerrinja community.

What to do if you wish to get involved?
If you are willing to get involved in the project, please either:

(i) Contact Hilton Penfold at the University of Wollongong: Email: hbp972@uowmail.edu.au or phone: 0435 144 305 or
(ii) Contact Alfred Wellington (CEO, Jerrinja Aboriginal Land Council): Phone: 0407 402 271 or Email: jilc@bigpond.com who will put you in touch with Hilton Penfold.

Thank you for your interest in this study.

If I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the honours project is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au
Appendix C - Consent Form

Consent for involvement in Small House Project

Project organisers:
Gordon Waitt, Pauline McGuirk and Hilton Penfold

To take part in this project, we need to have a record of your informed consent to participating voluntarily. Please respond to each of the points below:

I have been given a Project Information Sheet and understand what the project is about.  
Yes/No *(Student volunteer to record responses verbally on audio)*

I am aware that whether I chose to get involved in the Honours project or not will have no impact on whether I ultimately have access to the housing that is designed or developed as part of the wider project between Jerrinja Aboriginal Land Council and ALL Sustainable Futures.  
Yes/No

I am aware that I may choose to participate in one or both stages of the project.  
Yes/No

I understand that, for privacy purposes, conversations or diaries recorded for this project will not identify my real name unless I choose to be identified.  
Yes/No *(Student volunteer to record here whether participant wishes to have their real name used)*

I understand that any photographs I provide with have identifying features obscured.  
Yes/No

I give my permission for quotations from the conversations, diary to be used in the project.  
Yes/No

I give my permission for photographs I provide to be used in the honours thesis and related publications and presentations.  
Yes/No

I understand that I may edit audio/transcripts of the recorded conversations and diaries and may remove photographs as I wish.  
Yes/No
I understand that knowledge gathered in the project will be used for further enquiry, including publications, academic conferences and reports by ALL sustainable Futures to Family and Community Services.
Yes/No

I understand that my consent and information can be withdrawn at any time without providing a reason and that withdrawal of consent will have no consequence for me.
Yes/No

Please indicate verbally which Stages of the project you consent to getting involved in:

**Stage 1:**
Taking part in a conversation about your home for the Small House Project.
Yes/No

Walking the student volunteer through your home to tell stories about and photograph key aspects of the house that are important to how it is made a home for you.
Yes/No

**Stage 2:**
Taking part in the Living Diary stage (Audio/Photographic).
Yes/No

Taking part in a follow-up conversation about your Living Diary (Audio/Photographic)
Yes/No

Please indicate if you wish to be sent:
- a copy of your conversation (audio or transcribed)
  Yes/No
- a copy of photographs you have provided
  Yes/No
- a copy of your audio/photographic diary (audio or transcribed)
  Yes/No

If so, please provide contact details:
Name: .................................................................
Email or postal address: ..............................................................

If you wish to edit your audio/transcript or remove photographs, please contact Hilton Penfold on the email address provided above.
If you have any questions or difficulties with the project you can contact:

(i) Hilton Penfold at the University of Wollongong: Email: hbp972@uowmail.edu.au or Mobile: 0435 144 305 or

(ii) Alfred Wellington (CEO, Jerrinja Local Aboriginal Land Council) Phone: 0407 402 271 or Email: jlalc@bigpond.com

Terms and conditions: I understand that my personal particulars will be stored by Gordon Waitt, University of Wollongong, for a minimum of five years for record keeping and administrative purposes only and will not be supplied to any other person or organisation for any other purpose. I understand that a copy of the information produced in the honours project will be supplied to the Jerrinja community using anonymised transcripts and de-identified photographs.

If I have any concerns or complaints regarding the way the honours project is or has been conducted, I can contact the Ethics Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee, Office of Research, University of Wollongong on 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au.
Appendix D- Draft Invitation to Participate Research

Dear _______________ (Personalized)

We want to invite you to be involved in the ‘Small House, Big Living’ Project run by the Jerrinja LALC and ALL Sustainable Futures. Your input will help us ensure that the new house designs are suited to Jerrinja needs, customs and everyday lifestyles.

The ‘Small House, Big Living’ project is an important project for the Jerrinja community to help facilitate the return of elderly Jerrinja people back to Country and to increase local building capacity. That means this project will help to enhance self-determination and reconnect with the knowledge and expertise held by the elderly Jerrinja people living off-Country.

We have invited Hilton Penfold, an honours student from the University of Wollongong, to work on this part of the project which involves finding out about what you like and dislike about your current house, how you make it a home, and things that you might like to change about it. Hilton grew up on the Port Hacking River in Sydney area, right beside the Royal National Park, where he spends much of his time outdoors fishing, surfing and bushwalking.

Being involved in the project means taking part in a conversation with Hilton in your current house or backyard, so you can tell stories about your home. I will introduce you to Hilton and I, or a friend or family member, can stay with you during the conversation, if you’d prefer.

You can also chose to take part in a second stage of the project which involves you going off on your own to record an audio/photographic diary about how you live in your current house (we’ll loan you a camera and/or audio recorder to do this). This lets you think about and record your experiences and practices of making your house a home, and may help to identify things about home that might be harder to grasp in a conversation.

If you are interested in getting involved or if you would like more information (see below) you can reply either to me directly or to Hilton.

(If postal) Please find attached a Participant Information Statement (PIS)

(If verbal) We will send you more detailed information about the project.
If you are willing to be involved please contact:

**Alfred Wellington**: Phone: 0407 402 271, Email: jlacl@bigpond.com

OR

**Hilton Penfold**: Phone: 0435 144 305 Email: hbp972@uowmail.edu.au

With thanks Alfred Wellington
Appendix E- Interview Schedule and Proposed Questions

The Small House Project

Stage 1 is divided into 3 sections. Each section explores a different aspect of how meaning is constructed in the home in order to generate narratives of practices, activities and routines.

Stage 1: Semi-Structured Interview

Step 1:

1. ‘Getting to know you’

Question(s):

1. Tell me about yourself?
   
   (Prompts: Birth, family background, heritage, upbringing etc.)

2. How did you come to be living in this house?

Aim: To establish rapport with the participant and understand their background.

2. ‘Tell me about your home’

Question(s):

1. What do you cherish/like the most about your home?
   
   What does it allow you to do?
   
   Where do you spend most of your time?

Aim: To generate narratives around positive or functional aspects of home and respect oral traditions.

2. What do you dislike the most?
Why?

Aim: To explore the undesirable or impractical elements of home as a prelude to what the participants would like to change.

3. What would you like to change?

Why?

Aim: To build upon what the participant dislikes by offering a potential solution or modification of the home, in order to align with their specific wants or needs.

4. What makes a place home to you?

Why?

Aim: To explore some of the physical and non-physical aspects of home, such as memories, social and cultural associations, which are of significance to the participant?

5. What else would you need here to make it a home?

Aim: To explore which of these physical and non-physical elements of home the participant would like change or create in home.

6. What do you love to do the most in your home?

Aim: To explore people’s preferred activities and consider how these relate to aspects of the home and what it can accommodate.

Step 2

1. Optional: ‘Dwelling Points’

Question: You have shared multiple stories of how you turn a house into a home. Can you walk me to places in the home that make this place a home to you?

Aim: To create an opportunity for storytelling whilst walking through the home. The participant will be invited to take the student researcher through the home, using photographs if they wish to highlight key moments. A digital camera will be provided by the student researcher.
2. **Invitation to Stage 2**

Participants will be asked if they would like to volunteer for Stage 2.

**Stage 2: Living Diaries (Audio/Photograph) & Follow up Conversation**

**Summary:** If the participants choose to generate the diaries they will be supplied with audio recorders and/or cameras by the student researcher (supplied by the School of Geography and Sustainable Communities, UOW). The student researcher will discuss with them (i) how to use the equipment and (ii) ethical considerations of using cameras or audio recorders in research, e.g. attention to privacy considerations.

The participants will be asked to document their everyday practices and experiences for 5 days over a period of 3 weeks.

Aim: To explore the everyday practices, activities and experiences that can be easily overlooked through narrative accounts.

**Step 1: Living Diaries**

*Can you please record your observations (on audio and with photographs if you wish) about how you are spending your day in the house.*

*You can make these observations at a series of times during the day.*

*OR*

*You can reflect on your day in the evening, thinking back over your day.*

Things to make observations about /reflect on/ photograph include:

**Activities/doings**

- How did you spend your time in and around the house today?
- What did you do?
  - E.g. cooking, housework, resting, socialising, caring for family and friends, gardening)
- How did you use the different areas of the house to do these things?
- How did aspects of the house help you to do or enjoy these things?
  - E.g. size of the rooms, numbers of rooms, heat/cold, lighting, comfort/discomfort, storage spaces, the outlook of the house.
- How did aspects of the house make doing these things frustrating?
Experiences/feelings

- How did things you did in the house today make you feel ‘at home’?
- What about the house (or the things in it) made you feel this way?
- Did any events happen in or around the house that may you feel at home?
- What other things or events happened that shaped the way you feel about the house?

Hilton Penfold will contact you after 3 weeks to arrange to visit to collect your completed Living Diary.

On collection of the Living Diary participants will be asked if they would like to volunteer for the final step (Stage 2), which will take place approximately 4 weeks after participants have completed their Living Diaries.

Step 2: Follow up Conversation

Summary: The student researcher will provide the participant with a summary of the key themes of the audio and photographic material and an initial summary interpretation. They will then ask the participant clarify and explain further and to comment on and inform the researcher’s interpretation as led by the participant. This provides the participant with another opportunity to reflect and revise and inform the interpretation of the data in the diaries.

The conversation is expected to last around 30 minutes.

Aim: To allow the participant to reflect and revise the data from the diaries and ask for further clarification and explanation of key themes.
# Appendix F- Table Displaying Details of Participant and Key Collaborators and Methods Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Current Location</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aunty Jenny</td>
<td>55yrs+</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Ronald</td>
<td>55yrs+</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunty Betty</td>
<td>55yrs+</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>30-40yrs</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Neville</td>
<td>55yrs+</td>
<td>Off-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunty Mary</td>
<td>55yrs+</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation, Talking Circle and Talking Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>30-40yrs</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>30-40yrs</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>30-40yrs</td>
<td>On-Country</td>
<td>Talking Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborators Names</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Wellington</td>
<td>Jerrinja LALC</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Situated Conversation and Follow Up Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Miller</td>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Phone Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>