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Abstract

In Shakespeare’s classic work *Romeo and Juliet*, one of the key characters Juliet Capulet, famously ponders one evening on her balcony, ‘What’s in a name?’. This question has been the central focus of this thesis, although rather than directing attention to personal names, as was Juliet, the doctoral research program sought to uncover the essential constructs and explore the functions of toponyms (place names).

The central tenet of the thesis was founded on the principle that whilst toponyms are utilised by people on a daily basis, their central importance in daily social functions had previously mostly been overlooked by academic researchers. Whilst the main focus of prior academic research had been directed towards exploring the socially and culturally constructed meanings of physical and emotional places, it was hypothesised that toponyms also play an important role in symbolising historical cultural identity and provide a means of locating and differentiating places from each other. As previous research has shown that people form attachments to places because they are important to daily functioning, the research program set out to investigate whether similar attachments to toponyms may be said to occur. Essentially, the aim was to discover whether the existing theories on place attachment, identity and dependence could be extrapolated to explain the social and cultural roles of toponyms, or whether new theories were required.

The doctoral research program utilised the *Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park* name restoration program of 1989/1990 as a case study through which to explore the key thesis questions. The National Park was selected as the case study area because in 1989 the Government of the State of Victoria, Australia, proposed to restore Indigenous names (and thereby remove non-Indigenous names) for the park and various features within it. This proposal was met with large-scale public reaction, with those opposing the idea essentially stating that removing the non-Indigenous names would cause confusion and be tantamount to erasing colonial history in the area, whilst those who supported the proposal asserted that it would give recognition to the importance of Indigenous cultural heritage and provide a boost to tourism in the area.
The research program involved gathering information published at the time of the proposal and undertaking surveys and interviews with those involved in the debate to collate a collection of data through which to investigate the key thesis questions. This thesis determines whether the participants had formed attachments, identities or dependencies with the toponyms central to the name restoration proposal. The theory of toponymic identity and its key components of *history*, *community*, *emotions* and *actions* is rationalised and an introduction to the proposed theory of toponymic dependence is provided through discussion of its key components *location*, *promotion* and *identification*. The ultimate intention of the thesis is to propose the meta-theory of toponymic attachment, which is comprised of toponymic identity and dependence, and to explore ways in which it is related to, but distinct from, existing widely-published theories on place attachment.
Statement of Authorship

Except where explicit reference is made in the text of the thesis, this thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma. No other person’s work has been relied upon or used without due acknowledgement in the main text and bibliography of the thesis.

Laura Kostanski
Candidate

Associate Professor Ian D. Clark
Principal Supervisor
Acknowledgements

The research for this thesis came about through a Linkage Grant provided by the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the Victorian Office of the Surveyor-General. The funding from the ARC was provided to allow for two years to complete the requirements of a Research Masters degree. The Victorian Office of the Surveyor-General also provided two years of funding (to the sum of $5,000 p.a.) for the research. Fourteen months into the research program, the thesis was upgraded to PhD level after a conversion of candidature report and presentation were approved by a Candidature Committee including the Registrar of Geographic Names and Surveyor-General of Victoria and representatives from the University of Ballarat Research Higher Degrees Committee, the School of Business and the Research and Graduate Studies Office. When the initial two years of ARC funding were completed, the University of Ballarat and School of Business funded the remaining eighteen months of stipend and fee support.

The submission of this thesis would not have been achieved without the support of a multitude of people, whom I would like to acknowledge here. Firstly, I want to thank the staff of the University of Ballarat Research and Graduate Studies Office, especially Di Clingin, who over the years have provided much welcomed advice and guidance and always had a friendly smile for me. In addition, I would like to thank the academic staff of the schools of Business and Behavioural, Social Sciences and Humanities, especially Jeremy Smith, Janice Newton, Lorene Gottschalk and Glen Wood who provided research advice, employed me as a tutor and gave me the opportunity to assist with the publishing process of an international academic journal. My thanks also go to Professor David Battersby, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ballarat, who assisted me during my final year of full-time studies and provided support for my travels to New York to attend the United Nations in 2007. In addition, I would like to thank John Tulloch, Registrar of Geographic Names, for being understanding as I worked full-time and finished this thesis.

To all the research students who I was fortunate enough to meet along the way including Laura Davenport, Strobe Driver, Jennifer Hazelwood and Jacqueline Wilson, I give a big heart-felt hug of appreciation. To those who helped create the
Christmas-in-July/August/Winter institution (you know who you are, but I’ll print your names for the purposes of posterity: Fred Cahir, Uma Jogulu, Jaloni Pansiri, Rajat Taneja, Jackie Tuck, Ruth Williams and Nadine Zacharias) what can I say? A couple of sentences here is not enough to express my gratitude for your friendships over these past five years. I hope that I have expressed to you before, and that you know, how much I appreciate all your advice, assistance and general excuses to be Epicureans and enjoy some good conversation with great food and wine.

To my family, Erin, Dad, Madeleine, Mum and my extended family Ellen, Rob, Dan and Bec, I truly thank-you for your understanding during those many times over the past five years when I have missed important family gatherings so that I could sit and contemplate or write this thesis. I truly value our family and your unflinching support has been a strong source of encouragement and energy to me. I hope the submission of this thesis makes you all proud.

And finally, the two people I want to thank most of all. Firstly, Ian Clark, my supervisor. We’ve travelled, conferenced, published, project-worked, debated, sat on committees, and generally had an extraordinary five years. Obviously without you this research would not have happened and for that, and all the research experiences these past five years, I sincerely thank-you.

Saving the best for last, I openly acknowledge the role my partner Tom has played in this journey. Our relationship was new when I was offered the scholarship for this research, and you made the sacrifice to move back to Ballarat to be with me, for what we thought would be a two-year stint in the country…five years later we’ve just bought our first home together in that same country town and are expecting our first child any day now. You’ve been my constant source of support through the busy times and the worried times, the one who had a hug for me on bad days and who could always make me laugh no matter what (especially with Gemma: you two are a powerful team). Your love of cooking and gardening has seen us through many student-finance crises with a sense of style and sophistication. As this research journey ends for us both, a new chapter in our lives is about to commence…I can’t wait for our adventures with Speck to begin!
This thesis is dedicated to Speck

*Your existence and impending arrival into the world has been a source of inspiration to complete this thesis*
Table of Contents:

ABSTRACT II
STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS V

TABLE OF CONTENTS: VIII

TABLE OF FIGURES: XII
TABLE OF TABLES: XIII

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION 2
RATIONALE 4
CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE AND KEY QUESTIONS 9
INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE STUDY 11
INDIGENOUS PRE-COLONISATION HISTORIES 15
1836 AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHANGE 23
DEVELOPMENT OF TOWNS AND NATIONAL PARK 28
THE 1989/1990 NAME RESTORATION DEBATE 30
CONCLUSIONS 41

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 42

INTRODUCTION 43
ONOMASTICS AND TOPYONYMS 45
TOPONYMIC RESEARCH 47
ETYMLOGIES 48
CULTURAL TOPYONYMY 52
PLACE AND SPACE 56
DEFINING PLACE FROM SPACE 57
CREATION OF PLACE 61
INFLUENCES AND MEANINGS OF PLACE 63
SENSE OF PLACE 64
PLACE ATTACHMENT 67
PLACE IDENTITITY AND DEPENDENCE 70
TOPYONYMS AND PLACES AS OBJECTS FOR SOCIAL & CULTURAL RESEARCH 73
INTERFERENCE 79
CONCLUSIONS 80

CHAPTER THREE: FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGIES 84
Table of Figures:

FIGURE 1. 1 NATIONAL PARK FEATURE NAMES AS REGISTERED IN 1989  12
FIGURE 1. 2 NATIONAL PARK FEATURE NAMES AS REGISTERED IN 2007  13
FIGURE 1. 3 VIEW OF SOUTH-WEST CORNER OF THE GRAMPIANS (GARIWERD) NATIONAL PARK, FOREGROUND HAS LIMITED VEGETATION DUE TO BUSH-FIRES IN SUMMER OF 2005/2006 (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI)  14
FIGURE 1. 4 VIEW ACROSS CENTRE OF GRAMPIANS (GARIWERD) NATIONAL PARK FROM THE BALCONIES (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI)  14
FIGURE 1. 5 LOOKING NORTH TOWARDS MOUNT ABRUPT (MOUNT MURDADJOOG) (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI)  15
FIGURE 1. 6 JARDWADJALI AND DJABWURRUNG LANGUAGE BOUNDARIES (CLARK, 1998)  16
FIGURE 1. 7 DJABWURRUNG AND JARDWADJALI CLAN AREAS (APPROXIMATE) (CLARK, 1998)  17
FIGURE 1. 8 TRADITIONAL INDIGENOUS NAMES FOR FEATURES IN THE STUDY AREA  19
FIGURE 1. 9 BUNJIL’S SHELTER ROCK ART (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI)  22
FIGURE 1. 10 LETTER OF PROTEST PUBLISHED IN NEWSPAPERS  34
FIGURE 1. 11 GOVERNMENT GAZETTE NOTICE, 23 OCTOBER 1991  39

FIGURE 2.1: STRATIFICATION OF SENSE OF PLACE WITHIN THIS RESEARCH FRAMEWORK  65
FIGURE 2.2: CURRENT LITERATURE’S THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ROLE OF TOPONYMS IN THE CREATION OF PLACE FROM SPACE  81
FIGURE 2.3: HYPOTHESED MODEL FOR THIS RESEARCH AS TO THE CHANGING AND DEVELOPING ROLE OF TOPONYMS THROUGH TIME  82

FIGURE 3. 1 A PARTIAL MAP OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS ON PLACE ACCORDING TO RESEARCH TRADITIONS (PATTERSON AND WILLIAMS, 2005: 366)................................................. 91
FIGURE 3. 2 QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1.7 (RESPONSE N= 56 NON-RESPONSE N=2) .......................................................... 104
FIGURE 3. 3 QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO QUESTION 1.8 (RESPONSE N= 49 NON-RESPONSE N=9) .......................................................... 105
FIGURE 3. 4 MAP OF LOCATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE PHASE OF RESEARCH......................................................... 107
FIGURE 3. 5 LOCATIONS OF ORAL-HISTORY INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS......................... 109
FIGURE 3. 6 CUMULATIVE MENTAL MAP RESULTS ..................................................... 123
FIGURE 3. 7 INDIVIDUAL AGGREGATION STRATEGY OF ANALYSIS (KITCHIN AND FOTHERINGHAM, 1997: 270) ......................................................... 125

FIGURE 6. 1 ROCK ART AT YANANGINJ NJIWI SHELTER (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI) ........................................................................................................... 201
FIGURE 6. 2 ROCK ART AT NGAMADJIDJ SHELTER (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI) ........................................................................................................... 202
FIGURE 6. 3 GRAMPIANS TOURISM ZONE AT TIME OF NAME RESTORATION PROPOSAL (VICTORIAN TOURISM COMMISSION, 1990: 5)............................................. 204
FIGURE 6. 4 WELCOME SIGN TO NATIONAL PARK (PHOTOGRAPHER: LAURA KOSTANSKI) ........................................................................................................... 218
FIGURE 6. 5 GENERIC SIGN TO ‘ABORIGINAL ART SITES’ ........................................... 220
FIGURE 6. 6 SPECIFIC SIGNAGE TO GULGURN MANJA SHELTER ................................ 220

FIGURE 7. 1 MENTAL MAPPING PARTICIPANTS, WHO COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE, OPINION OF NAME RESTORATION PROPOSAL IN 1989/1990 ........................................... 228
FIGURE 7. 2 NAMES USED BY PARTICIPANTS (N=42) FOR THE NATIONAL PARK........... 229
FIGURE 7. 3 RATIO OF INDIGENOUS, NON-INDIGENOUS AND DUAL-NAMES USAGE FOR THE NATIONAL PARK.................................. 229
FIGURE 7. 4 NAME TYPE USAGE COMPARED TO SUPPORT/Opposition TO THE PROPOSALS IN 1989/1990............................................................................. 231
Table of Tables:

TABLE 1.1: LIST OF PETITIONS LODGED WITH THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL’S DEPARTMENT OF VICTORIA, WITH DETAILS OF SIGNATURE NUMBERS ..................36
TABLE 1.2: KEY CONCEPTS IDENTIFIED FROM LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.........................40

TABLE 3.1 NEWSPAPERS UTILIZED FOR THIS RESEARCH PROGRAM ..............................98

TABLE 7.1 FREQUENCY OF NAMES UTILISED FOR FOUR INDIGENOUS ROCK ART SITES. ....................................................................................................................................................232
Introduction

If, as I would argue, there can be no places without names, then perhaps someone will soon turn to what may be one of the most important research avenues yet to be explored?

(Robinson, 1989: 163)
General Introduction
In Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*, one of the central characters, Juliet Capulet, laments that the new object of her affection, Romeo, is a member of the Montague family, a family with which her own kin are feuding. This negative family association between the Capulets and Montagues precludes Juliet and Romeo from conducting an open relationship. Indeed one evening, standing on her balcony, Juliet laments that were it not for Romeo’s surname the two could be an official couple. Essentially, Juliet announces that it is the surname of Romeo which does the couple a disservice, nothing else. Famously she states:

Romeo, O Romeo! wherefore art thou Romeo?
Deny thy father and refuse thy name;
Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love,
And I'll no longer be a Capulet.

ROMEO
[Aside] Shall I hear more, or shall I speak at this?

JULIET
'Tis but thy name that is my enemy;
Thou art thyself though, not a Montague.
What is Montague? It is not hand, nor foot,
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
Belonging to a man. O! be some other name.
What's in a name? That which we call a rose,
By any other name would smell as sweet;
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd,
Retain that dear perfection which he owes
Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name,
And for thy name which is no part of thee
Take all myself.

ROMEO
I take thee at thy word.
Call me but love, and I'll be new baptis’d;
Henceforth I never will be Romeo.

JULIET
What man art thou, that, thus bescreen'd in night
So stumblest on my counsel?

ROMÉO
By a name
I know not how to tell thee who I am:
My name, dear saint, is hateful to myself,
Because it is an enemy to thee;
Had I it written, I would tear the word.

JULIET
My ears have not yet drunk a hundred words
Of that tongue's utterance, yet I know the sound.
Art thou not Romeo and a Montague?

ROMEO
Neither, fair saint, if either thee dislike.

(Shakespeare: II, ii, 33-61)

This text, written by William Shakespeare, points to the notion that it is the name Montague which represents the family history of Romeo, and thus characterizes the man himself. Juliet espouses the idea that the removal of the name Montague will essentially dissolve the family history associated with Romeo. Therefore Juliet asserts that the changing of the name will result in them not having family histories interfering with their mutual love.

The crux of Shakespeare’s argument lies in the question ‘what is in a name?’, ergo can a name represent the character of a person, or is it the symbol of a different personal characteristic, perhaps a generational legacy or contemporary relationship?

In complement to Juliet’s ruminations, the research in this thesis has focused on the abstruse qualities of toponyms (place names). This doctoral research began life as an Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage Grant funded at a Masters level that was established to explore the relationships between people and toponyms. Specifically, the original research program was designed to explore the dimensions of toponymic attachment, identity and interference through analysis of the case studies of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park and the town of Churchill in the State of Victoria, Australia (refer to Appendix A for copy of the original ARC project proposal). Thus, the program did not begin as an organic process of developing the topic from scratch and searching for a suitable case study through which to explore the various research questions. Rather, the topic was given in 2004 and the next four years were spent exploring possible avenues for researching the various pre-designated themes.

The original ARC proposal was deeply rooted in geographical literature, as the research proposer and principal supervisor for the program Associate Professor Ian Clark’s research pedigree is in historical geography. From this geographically-influenced project the Masters soon developed into a PhD when the complexity of the
topic became more apparent. Over time the research project allowed for some organic development and was refined to focus on one case study, as enough data were accumulated to warrant a thorough exploration of identity, change and attachment theories in relation to toponyms of the Grampians (Gariwerd) region.

At the centre of the research in this thesis is an exploration of what occurs at the social, emotional and physical levels when a toponym is changed. Adopted from Juliet’s ponderings the broad question developed during the course of researching the program for this thesis was ‘what is in a place name?’ Further questions provided greater context to the theme of exploration, such as ‘does a toponym only symbolise the meaning(s) of a place, or can a toponym have its own meaning(s)?’ and ‘does a change in toponym, as Juliet proposes (albeit for personal names), change the meaning(s) of the place?’ These questions are explored in detail in the following chapters, particularly chapters four, five and six which discuss and compare the key messages from the case study data to existing theoretical literature.

Before this discussion commences though, in the current chapter I will outline the rationale for undertaking the doctoral research program into toponymic attachment. First, I will discuss the focus of the research and the key questions framing the research program. Secondly, I provide in this chapter the background of the selected case study area, the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park (as the name is registered today) through a brief discussion of the public renaming debate in 1989 and 1990 which acted as a catalyst for this research. A more general presentation of the history of the Grampians (Gariwerd) area is also provided. This historical information is not meant to be exhaustive, rather it is offered to provide background details which allow insight into the debate and furthers understandings of the literature review and data analysis which follows.

**Rationale**
The past four years spent researching the topic of toponyms has lead to many interesting conversations with people from outside this specialist research area. In discussing my doctoral topic with many people, the most frequent question I have encountered has been ‘Why would you study that topic?’ The posing of this question
in a variety of environments and situations has allowed me to reflect on the need for this research, and therefore has allowed a critical examination of its rationale. The response that I have formed is that this research and line of enquiry is justified when looking at evidence of the community reactions to the Victorian Government’s decision in 1989 to restore Indigenous names for the Grampians National Park (as it was registered then) in Western Victoria. The case study area was selected as the basis for this program for the following reasons:

1. During 1989-1990 the National Park was the focus of a Victorian Government campaign to restore Indigenous toponyms to various features, landmarks and populated areas within and surrounding the park.

2. At the local level the proposed restoration of Indigenous toponyms was met with widescale public debate. This display of interest to the proposals indicated that many members of the community had formulated ideas about what toponyms meant to them. From this, it was hypothesised that even though the majority of vocal community members were opposed to the proposal, many locals in the community would be interested in participating in the study, because of their prior engagement in the debate and the obvious importance they had given to, and demonstrated towards, the toponyms concerned. This hypothesis was supported by various literature theories which noted that people’s sense of place is heightened in times of change (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996; Sharpe and Ewert, 2000)

3. The proposal not only affected locals in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area, but attracted the attention of people across the state of Victoria, and even interstate. This level of attention to the debate resulted in hundreds of letters being written to the editors of local, metropolitan, regional and state newspapers from people within the local area and from around Victoria. In addition, the debate was discussed in meetings of town councils across Victoria, with many councils supporting the Grampians (Gariwerd) area councils in their rejection of the proposals. Further to this, over 60,000 people signed petitions and lodged them with the Victorian government and Surveyor-General’s department of Victoria. This level of reaction to the proposals generated a plethora of documented information which indicated people’s group and individual reasons for their attachments to the toponyms, their reasons for
supporting or rejecting the proposals and their thoughts on the processes involved in the restoration of the Indigenous toponyms. These sources of information were thought to be invaluable in obtaining data for the formation of theories on toponymic attachment.

4. There are ongoing issues in the National Park regarding signage, tourism promotion, heritage and marketing. These issues are still in need of resolution, and it was thought that the research project would aid in setting standards and guidelines for the resolution of these issues and the establishment of future guidelines for renaming proposals. In addition, the study area is not the only place to have undergone a process of restoring toponyms, with countries such as New Zealand, Singapore, Hawai’i and South Africa having undertaken similar programs, and it was thought that this doctoral program could have findings which would be useful in the future for other renaming processes nationally and internationally.

From something that the Government had possibly perceived at the time to be a benign process of restoring Indigenous toponyms in a National Park area approximately 250 kilometres from the seat of State Government in the capital city of Melbourne, entire sections of the Victorian community expressed their opinions. The data available from these public expressions of support or rejection of the renaming proposal makes the case study area a rich source of research material.

Drawing on information from the community of the case study area, this research program is informed by community members’ perceptions of place and toponym, and it aims to show how toponyms are understood, experienced and identified by different members in this community (residing both locally and non-locally). Specific details of the research design and participants are provided in chapter three but for the purposes of outlining the scope of this thesis it should be noted that the participants in the study were drawn from a range of backgrounds. Some lived locally and others were frequent visitors or tourists in the region. Cultural backgrounds and awareness of the participants ranged from those with Indigenous family lineages to those who had no formal knowledge of Indigenous cultural heritage. Associations ranged from those who were fifth generation farmers in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area, to those who lived in Melbourne and visited the park for recreational pursuits. The
generational influences and ideas ranged from those who were in their 70s to those who were in their mid to late 20s. The connecting thread for all the participants was that they all used the Grampians (Gariwerd) area for living, working or recreational pursuits. As such, the breadth of the research data collection provides an understanding of how toponyms are perceived and used by a variety of people.

This study is significant in that it is concerned to move beyond the traditional linguistic based definitions of toponyms to discover their ideological significance or cultural meaning and to bring together the research domains of geography, history and linguistics in this exploration. Through the twentieth century geographers (Tuan, 1974; Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Relph, 1997) began to develop theories of place and attachment; historians (Hummon, 1992; Hayden, 1995; Cameron, 1999; Said, 2000) began to research the role of identity in shaping cultural interactions; and, linguists (Fitch, 1987) began to investigate the symbolic role of names. Now as we embark on the twenty-first century there is an opportunity to consolidate these domains of enquiry into a search for the symbolic nature of toponyms, and how, if at all, they provide an opportunity to explore the cultures of places. Exploration of the key literature which has shaped and informed this research is provided in chapter two.

Until recently there was a dearth of information regarding the subjective, social, political and emotional or symbolic nature of toponyms. Traditionally onomastics, the study of names, has been the domain of linguists. However, recently there has been an increasing interest in onomastics research, in particular toponymic research, by geographers and cultural historians, and with it new research has begun to be published on the symbolic and cultural nature of toponyms (Carter, 1987; Cohen and Kliot, 1992; Berg and Kearns, 1996; Hilterman and Koopman, 2003). Because this research is now undertaken by researchers from a variety of fields, there is a wide range of theories which have not yet been truly harmonised or extrapolated upon. Thus, this research program aims to bring together the disparate literature to enhance, in a variety of research domains, understandings of the functions of toponyms. Therefore a further rationale for the project was to consolidate the existing theories and contribute to the literature on geography, history and linguistics by providing a basis for toponymic identity, attachment and interference theories. In essence, this current research project aims to contribute to the development of a field of research
dedicated to toponymic theories, and thus makes a significant contribution to the domain of geographical theory and knowledge.

The study examines the subjective, social, political, emotional and symbolic meanings associated with place names and the personal bonds and attachments people form with specific toponyms. These meanings and attachments are explored through the use of the case-study name restoration proposal of 1989/1990. Specifically, the social and cultural significance of toponyms to people, rather than their etymological meaning (which has been the focus of most toponymic research to date) is the focus of this doctorate. In undertaking the literature review for this research it has been determined there is a veritable paucity of definitions which focus on the sociological impact of toponyms in the daily lives of human beings. Further, whilst place and attachment, identity and dependence have been researched, there has been no extrapolation of these theories to toponyms. Thus, this thesis is well placed to make a valuable contribution in this field.

The exploration of toponymic attachment theories has been undertaken in this thesis by firstly investigating the background history of the Grampians (Gariwerd) name restoration debate. This discussion of this history is contained in the second section of this current chapter. Secondly, the thesis undertakes a review of the current literature in areas identified as being related to the study. The identified literature relates to theories on space and place; sense of place and the components of attachment, identity and dependence; toponyms and onomastics; and, interference. These areas of literature are focused on due to their relevance to the key issues that were highlighted in material collected from the case study. Chapter three provides an outline of the methodologies employed in collecting data for the research analysis, and also provides background details on the participants who contributed information during the doctoral research program.

In chapter four the thesis explores in detail the extent of current knowledge on the components or social structures of toponyms and places. This section discusses the merits of developing toponymic theories based on those already developed for sense of place and its various components of place attachment, place identity and place dependence. From this discussion, the thesis moves into the fifth and sixth chapters
which look in more detail at developing theories of toponymic identity and
dependence, based on the theoretical principles of place identity and dependence. Each of the developing theories is contemplated based on analysis of the case study data and rigorously discussed with connections to academic literature. The various proposed components of toponymic identity are discussed in chapter five and include history, actions, events and feelings. In chapter six the various proposed components of toponymic dependence are analysed and include promotion, location and identification.

Chapter seven investigates the impact of toponymic restoration in the study area, through the lens of the theories developed in chapters five and six. This analysis includes a discussion of toponyms that participants in the study currently use for features within the National Park and highlights the impact the restoration process has had on the local usage of toponyms. Chapter seven also discusses other international studies into toponymic restoration programs and moves onto a discussion of this study’s participant proposals about how the original process could have been organized to ensure an enhanced outcome for all involved. The final chapter outlines the multitudes of information gathered during the four year doctoral program. It concludes with proposals on the constitution of attachment, identity and dependence and proposes future avenues of research.

**Contribution to Knowledge and Key Questions**

This thesis examines the interactions people have with, and the bonds people form with, toponyms. In particular the focus is to develop an understanding of the relationships between people and toponyms, and determine whether there are underlying factors which assist people and communities in forming attachments to not only the places in which they live, work and relax, but also with the toponyms for those places. Essentially, this doctoral research program makes a contribution to academic knowledge by exploring the existing literature on sense of place and establishing new theories on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence which can be utilised to explicate the relationships people form with toponyms.
The key questions for this thesis were developed and continually refined during the course of the doctoral research program. In this sense the method employed for developing and refining the thesis questions fell within the broad category of qualitative research, which Lofland and Lofland describe as a strategy of ‘calculated chaos’ (1971: 69) and Liamputtuong and Ezzy (2005: 257) define as a process whereby ‘researchers intentionally immerse themselves in interviews and participant observation, and then in reading and rereading the data’ they can make ‘discoveries’ (further detail on the methodology is provided in chapter three). As previously discussed, it was through readings of the literature and analysis of the case study data that the ‘discovery’ of clear themes for exploration began to emerge. The main themes related to history, nationalism, tourism and identification. When these themes were contemplated in relation to existing theories on place attachment, identity and dependence the key questions to guide the research program were identified.

As noted at the opening to this chapter, the main focus of the doctoral program has been to investigate the questions of ‘what is in a place name? Does a toponym only symbolise the meaning(s) of a place, or can a toponym have its own meaning(s)?’. To support the investigation of the answers to this meta-question, the following sub-questions were devised:

1. **Toponymic Attachment**
   1.1 When government authorities announce that they are planning to change an official toponym, what are the community reactions to the change, and how do these reactions possibly relate to a greater theory of toponymic attachment?
   1.2 How might attachment to a toponym be separable from attachment towards a place?

2. **Toponymic Identity**
   2.1 How does a toponym bear identity?
   2.2.1 What might the components of toponymic identity be?
   2.2.2 How might toponymic identity be distinguished from place identity?

3. **Toponymic Dependence**
   3.1 How and why might people form dependencies on a toponym?
3.2.1 What might the components of toponymic dependence be?

3.2.2 How might toponymic dependence be distinguished from place dependence?

4. Toponymic Interference

4.1 When official toponyms are changed by government authorities, what is the rate of uptake of the ‘new’ toponym?

4.2 How may an official toponym be changed by government authorities without interference being caused in attachment, identity or dependence?

4.3 How and why do ‘old’ toponyms remain in the lexicon?

The aim of the key questions is to provide a supportive framework through which to explore the case study data and to examine the possible existence of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence, theories of which have not yet been consistently nor explicitly defined. Before moving onto discussion of the literature which underpins the exploration of the answers to the key research questions, an outline of the chosen case study area is now provided.

Introduction to the Case Study

The Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park is located near the regional town of Stawell, approximately 250 kilometres west of modern-day Melbourne (refer to Figure 1.1 for a map of the National Park with the names as registered in 1989 and Figure 1.2 for the same map with the names as registered today). The National Park covers 170,000 hectares containing ancient mountains, rocky escarpments and Indigenous rock art. The area is popular with tourists for mountain walking, rock climbing and learning about Indigenous art and cultural heritage, whilst the area around the park is populated by farming and tourism-based communities (refer to Figures 1.3-1.5 for photos of some of the study area features). The population size of the National Park and surrounding towns and communities is approximately 14,000 people, of which 39% are aged between 25 to 54 years (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006).‡

‡ Due to the fact that the National Park crosses sections of four local government area boundaries it is difficult to ascertain the exact population size of the study area. The figures provided are based on data available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics for the Northern and Southern Grampians Statistical Local Areas which cover the majority of the National Park area. Thus, the figures stated here are not exact and are provided as an indication only of the approximate population size.
Figure 1.1 National Park feature names as registered in 1989
Figure 1.2 National Park feature names as registered in 2007
Figure 1. 3 View of south-west corner of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park, foreground has limited vegetation due to bush-fires in summer of 2005/2006 (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)

Figure 1. 4 View across centre of Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park from The Balconies (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)
In order to give a full meaning to the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park region of Victoria, and the name debate that occurred in 1989/1990, it is necessary to explore the histories which created the contemporary places, names and culture of the area. Specifically, this section of the thesis aims to provide details on the Indigenous pre-contact, colonial and contemporary cultural associations within the study area so that greater context can be given to the later discussion and analysis sections.

**Indigenous Pre-colonisation Histories**

Leading up to 1836 the landscape of what was to become the contemporary National Park, was understood solely by Indigenous groups. The traditional custodians of this landscape are the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung peoples. As can be seen in Figure 1.6, the boundaries of the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung peoples dissects the area currently defined as the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park. Research by Clark (1996) has identified 41 clans within the Djabwurrung and 29 Jardwadjali clans within the language groups. Figure 1.7 illustrates the approximate areas for each of the clans. The Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali peoples have names for sites and areas within the contemporary National Park area. As the languages are not spoken fluently in the 21st Century, the toponyms were researched and reconstructed in 1989 by Ian Clark and Lionel Harradine (1990) and are shown in figure 1.8 (refer to Appendix B.
Figure 1.6 Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung Language Boundaries (Clark, 1998)
Figure 1.7 Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali Clan Areas (approximate) (Clark, 1998)
for the list of toponyms and their English translations where available).

The Buandig, Wergaia, Dhauwurdwurrung and Wathawurrung peoples whose countries adjoin the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung have cultural associations with the mountains and this is exemplified by the fact they too have names for features in the area (Clark, 1998). These names exist because many of the features can be seen from their territories. For example, the Dhauwurdwurrung name for the mountain ranges is *Murraibuggum*, with ‘murrai’ translated as ‘stone’ (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 211) and the Wathawurrung name for the ranges is *Tolotmutgo*, for which a translation is unavailable (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 211).

The occupation of the study area by Indigenous people can be traced back at least 22,000 years, and the evidence of this occupation can be found through fossils and rock art which exist in the National Park area (Wettenhall, 1999: 6). Clark (1998) has noted that Indigenous groups identified the landscape as part of estates and ranges. Toponyms are used as tools for relaying cultural histories and for assisting in navigating the ranges. Henderson and Nash (1997: 24) assert that a plausible approximation of how many toponyms each Indigenous language group has for their landscape tends to be 500. Essentially, the traditional Indigenous understandings of the landscape differed dramatically from the colonial ones.

Before colonisation, Indigenous societies’ land tenure system involved understanding the landscape as a series of interconnected places which were created by ancestral spirits (Sharpe and Ewert, 2000). The places existed in micro (particular trees, rock features or caves) and macro (mountain ranges, rivers) scales. As Hercus and Simpson (2002: 1) note, the differences in toponymic practices between Indigenous and colonial cultures ‘caused much confusion to European settlers’.

As one of the main purposes of this research is to explore the meanings of contemporary and historical toponyms and places to current members of the community, it is important to gain an understanding of the traditional Indigenous perspectives and values in relation to land tenureship. Contemporary historical literature points to the notion that in traditional Indigenous landscapes, features and sites are identified by names linked to ancestral stories, which enable the inhabitants
Link to Figure 1.8 AS AN A3 MAP PAGE

Figure 1. 8 Traditional Indigenous Names for features in the study area
to travel across the country along clearly defined routes (Harrison, 2004: 19). More than this, the names give identity to the Indigenous groups, as the land is a part of them. Ramsay (2003: 111) asserts that ‘land lies at the heart of Aboriginal spirituality; it is the life source for all that is connected to a place’. Stephen Davis and Victor Prescott (1992: 70) note that for Indigenous people in Australia

the land was given form by ancestral beings who traversed the landscape, conferring territories and naming each locality. Each named locality within the total territory can be identified by senior custodians of the territory. Names are recited in a particular order. When asking a senior custodian the extent of his territory he will, most often, name all localities on the territory to which the ancestral being travelled and performed all the daily activities of life in the creative epoch. The names are recited in the order in which they were visited. This naming of localities matches the order in which names appear in the song cycle during the performance of rituals involving clans from the wider ritual group with which the clan identifies.

Thus, it can be stated that toponyms form a core link to traditional Indigenous cultural heritage through their use as locational and heritage devices. Hercus and Simpson (2002: 10-13) assert that there are four main distinguishing features of Indigenous and non-Indigenous, or colonial, toponymic practices. Firstly, as each Indigenous group utilises toponyms for their way-finding and cultural purposes, a single feature located on the boundary of two or more groups might have multiple names conferred on it. Within colonial practices though it is generally acceptable to have only one name applied to a feature for official purposes. Secondly, as colonial systems utilise maps to navigate between places, the etymology of a name is not entirely relevant, and as a mnemonic device toponyms can represent meanings to people who have not visited an area. Within the Indigenous system though the use of mapping devices is limited and so the etymology of a toponym is exceptionally important in providing guidance on where a place is located, and is generally used by people who intend on, or who have, visited an area. Thirdly, as Indigenous people did not generally build permanent structures, the use of a name to describe a waterhole’s location relative to other areas is more important than within colonial systems whereby a permanent structure will be a permanent landmark easily distinguishable from the rest of the landscape. Finally,
the last distinguishing feature of Indigenous and colonial toponymic practices is the consideration of what counts as a ‘significant feature’. What counts as one mountain, with many names for ridges, escarpments, waterfalls and so forth in the colonial tradition, might within the Indigenous heritage not have a name for the entire mountain, but for various features upon that mountain.

Henderson and Nash (1997: 24) note that ‘transmission and recording of Aboriginal knowledge of country and place of course involves much more than the names of places. However, place names are a focus, convenient in many ways, and are felt to encapsulate wider and deeper knowledge’. Indigenous cultural heritage as displayed through toponyms can be found in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area. Clark and Harradine (1990: 28) explain that, ‘many of the Aboriginal place names…are believed to be conferred by mythological Ancestors, and as such they are memorials to these mythic heroes’. They explain in further detail how the names in the area relate to specific cultural heritage of the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung peoples, because ‘the “Grampian Mountains” were central to the dreaming of buledji Brambimbula, the two brothers Bram, who were responsible for the creation and naming of many landscape features in western Victoria’. The mountain ranges themselves are known as Gariwerd by the Jardwadjali. As Clark and Harradine (1990: 21) explain, Gariwerd is a compound noun, with Gar meaning ‘pointed mountain’, i meaning ‘the’ and werd meaning ‘shoulder’. The combination of these words is translated into English as ‘The mountain range’.

The story of how Gariwerd was created focuses on the creator-god Bunjil, who ‘created the beautiful sandstone ranges of Gariwerd’, and built a ‘special place…from where he could look out over the ranges’ (Wettenhall, 1999: 49). Today this place is known as Bunjil’s Shelter, a rock art site that contains an image of Bunjil with his two dingoes (refer to figure 1.9 for a photo of the rock art painting). It is believed that Bunjil appointed the two Bram brothers to ‘bring order to the new world; to name the animals and creatures and to make the languages and give the laws’. While the Bram brothers were bringing order to the area, a large Emu called Tchingal, who lived in the area was hatching an enormous egg, which Wah the crown decided to peck at. This act is said to have made Tchingal so angry that he chased Wah across the mountain ranges, and the actions that occurred during this journey created many of
the places and features in the study area. For example, where Wah saw a gap in the mountains in which he though he could hide, Tchingal stamped his foot and the mountain split open, creating *Barigar* (which at the time of the name restoration debate was registered with the name *Rose’s Gap*, and today is registered as *Barigar Gap* (*Roses Gap*). Many other names and their associated meanings are available in the study area, and will be referred to during the course of this thesis.

![Figure 1. 9 Bunjil’s Shelter Rock Art (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)](image)

With the arrival of British explorers and colonists in the region, the Indigenous understandings of the landscape did not cease to exist, but they did become overwritten by ‘official’ colonial interpretations of the landscape (Kostanski, 2003). They thus became subjugated to a lesser status in the new ‘Australian’ landscape manufactured and owned by a predominantly Anglo-Celtic culture. In the Grampians (Gariwerd) area, this lessening of status began in 1836 and predominated until 1989, when the Victorian Government announced its intention to restore the Indigenous names within the National Park. The onset of this landscape change will now be discussed in further detail.
1836 and the Beginnings of Change

In 1836 the continent of Australia (or Terra Australis, as it was then known by colonists) was inhabited mainly by Indigenous people. On the eastern coast, predominantly in the area now known as Sydney, the British had established a colony in 1788. This colony was founded mainly as a result of the British Empire desiring a place to send convicted felons. By the 1820s the colonists were desiring an enhanced knowledge of the landscape around them. Various expeditions of exploration were embarked upon. Thus it came to be in 1836 that Thomas Mitchell, then Surveyor-General of New South Wales set out to map the southern section of the continent.

During his expedition through southern Australia, which was later referred to as an exploration of *Australia Felix*, Mitchell mapped vast swathes of the landscape. He admitted in one of his journals that the English vocabulary was limited as an identifier of Australian geographical knowledge. He wrote

> The great convenience of using native names is obvious… so long as any of the Aborigines can be found in the neighbourhood… future travellers may verify my map. Whereas new names are of no use in this respect. (Mitchell, 1838a: 174)

Mitchell was acknowledging that the Australian landscape was perceived as an unknown quantity to colonial explorers. In every way it was different from the rolling green hills, hedgerows and oak trees of the United Kingdom. Manning Clark (1980: 4-5) asserts that for the first Europeans to live in Australia they had the impression that they were in a landscape where God had had an ‘attack of the sillies’ as it was perceived to be an ‘incomplete land, the land that God had created on the afternoon of the sixth day when he was very tired and quite possibly bored’. Whilst Clark’s description of colonial landscape perceptions is comical, there is an underlying truth to his assertions.

This truth can be seen in the fact that the use of Indigenous names for place identification was officially announced in 1828, following Thomas Mitchell’s appointment as Surveyor-General of New South Wales. Immediately upon his promotion, Mitchell (1987: xviii) sent out a circular to his staff stipulating the rules governing the transcription of Australian Indigenous placenames,
In order to establish uniformity in the spelling and pronunciation of native names, as well as to avoid the printing of long names which are by no means desirable on maps, I have to request that you will be particular in spelling such names with as few letters as possible, observing the following rules:

1. That where g begins a syllable it is never to be followed by h…

… by avoiding thus unnecessary consonants and diphthongs, names to which some have fourteen letters may be written in nine…

In this process of name regulation, the toponyms for Australia began to be transferred from Indigenous ownership to colonial. As Birch (1992: 234) argues:

Attaching names to landscape legitimizes the ownership of the culturally dominant group that ‘owns’ the names… this is an exercise in cultural appropriation… for the colonizers to attach a ‘native’ name to a place does not represent or recognise an Indigenous history, and therefore possible Indigenous ownership.

Birch makes an important point here about colonial landscape appropriation and identification. Where the landscape was colonially unidentifiable, and explorers might become lost, Indigenous names for place became an aide-memoire for newcomers. Therefore, to define places in a landscape where the predominant culture, the aborigines, did not utilise colonial maps, Indigenous names were called upon as a type of vernacular mapping technique for colonial journeys. While placenames used for colonial purposes were Indigenous in origin, when used for colonial purposes they ceased being Indigenous. They became, in my view, a corrupted form: which I call Anglo-Indigenous (Kostanski, 2003, 2005). Simply, at the moment of colonial recording of these Indigenous names, they moved from their Indigenous usage and meaning to a new Anglo-Indigenous identification of the landscape. The hyphenated form suggests that the two are forever interrelated, however uneasily.

Whilst in no-way a simple task to explore the colonially-unchartered southern areas of Australia, history texts often present Mitchell’s actions of exploration, mapping and naming, as benign processes of cultural appropriation and expansion. Carter has been a major critic of this method of writing history as a reduction of space and events to a stage, a method he links to imperial history. To avoid writing imperial history, it is imperative to acknowledge the reasons behind people’s actions, rather than accepting
the actions as being ‘somehow natural’ (Carter, 1987: xvi). Carter asserts that it is important for a spatial historian to discover and explore the language of colonial explorers, to understand the historical significance on their actions. This method of writing and analysing history is different to geographical histories, as it ‘makes no claim to authoritative completeness. It is, must be, like a journey, exploratory ’ (Carter, 1987: xxiii).

As stipulated in his own regulations, Mitchell often attempted to obtain names from the local Indigenous people of the areas he was travelling through, and so it is unusual that he did not choose an Indigenous name or names for the case study area. This can be explained through an analysis of events before Mitchell arrived in the area. On 27 May 1836, at a place that Mitchell would later call Mt Dispersion, Mitchell’s party had killed seven Indigenous people. After the massacre word spread to other Indigenous groups in western Victoria to avoid Mitchell’s party. So, when Mitchell (1838b: 185) could not locate Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung people in Gariwerd to obtain their names, he set about his own naming practices:

In adding this noble range of mountains to my map, I felt some difficulty in deciding on a name. To give appellations that may become current in the mouths of future generations, has often been a perplexing subject with me, whether they have been required to distinguish new counties, towns or villages, or such great natural features of the earth, as mountains and rivers. I have always gladly adopted Aboriginal names, and in the absence of these, I have endeavoured to find some good reason for the application of others...

It is at this point in Mitchell’s travels that the process of transforming a culturally-defined Indigenous place into a place known to colonists can be found. For Mitchell’s exploration party the landscape of the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali was unknown, unmapped and uncategorized in any European manner that was familiar to them. Thus, this landscape was culturally defined by the Europeans as space. Through the process of exploring the area, different European meanings were attached to the landscape by Mitchell and his group, and symbolized through the use of names. One prime example of this was in the use of the name Mount Zero, which Mitchell used to name the mountain where he slept on the night the temperatures dropped to
zero degrees centigrade. For the Mura Mura clan of the Jardwadjali this mountain is known as *Mura Mura* (little hill) (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 261) which indicates a completely different understanding of the landscape from that of Mitchell’s. Another obvious example, which is the focus of this thesis, was Mitchell’s use of the name *Grampians* to define that mountain range known primarily by the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung until that time as *Gariwerd*.

Mitchell named the area after mountain ranges in his home country of Scotland. The name *Grampians* originally comes from Scotland, where the name is used to refer to a range of mountains in the western regions of the country. Originally referred to as *Mons Graupius*, in honour of a battle waged there in 84CE by Gnaeus Julius Agricola, a Roman general who has been credited with much of the Roman expansion into Great Britain (Fraser, 2005: 66). The name Grampians has been used for the area since 1520, when the scholar Hector Boece wrote of the battle in his book *Agricola*. The meaning of the name Mons Graupius is unknown, except for the fact that ‘mons’ refers to ‘mountain’.

As the landscape is a mental construct, Richard Baker (1999: 33) argues that we must see it as a cultural construct, and should thus observe it as the physical form of social and political ideologies. Mitchell’s seemingly simple act of place-naming at once transferred the legal and cultural identity of the landscape from Indigenous possession and understanding to colonial possession and control. I must acknowledge that in asserting this transferral of control from Indigenous to colonial structures, I am not diminishing the ongoing nature of Indigenous interactions with the landscape. McNiven and Russell recently published a treatise on Aboriginal understandings of colonial dispossession. They observed that ‘Aboriginal people neither acknowledged conquest nor ceded sovereignty to the colonizers’ (McNiven and Russell, 2002: 28). I am not therefore asserting that the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali people immediately ceased to be the Traditional Owners of the landscape. Instead, I am acknowledging that with Mitchell’s naming of the area ‘Grampians’ he was laying colonial claim to the area which thus turned the landscape into one with colonial and Indigenous understandings. Further to this, with the subsequent colonisation of the landscape and the ensuing colonial acts of legitimating Anglo-Celtic control, I argue that the Indigenous understandings of the landscape have often been subjugated to second-
ranking in Australian social and cultural history behind those of the colonial purposes of mapping, farming, irrigation, town and city building, road creation and homestead construction. How Indigenous cultural understandings were pushed to the peripheries of the dominant Australia historical identity is explored and discussed further in chapter two. Thus, I am asserting in this introductory chapter that the colonial processes of naming started a system of colonial domination in all ‘legitimated’ interactions with the landscape, which relegated Indigenous understandings of Gariwerd to be ‘kept in the shadows’ of colonial history-telling and promotion until 1989.

So it was that in 1836 the Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung understandings of the landscape were overlaid with European understandings, as evidenced in the toponyms. Cowlishaw (1998: 32) posits that the landscape in Australia is a palimpsest (the place where a text has been overwritten or erased to make way for another text), and this example of Mitchell’s naming lays as a testament to this perception of the landscape. From 1836 onwards the European names defined by Mitchell and the colonists who followed him, became the official government records of the landscape. Maps, addresses, electorates and government zones all came to identify with the area as Grampians in essence. The Jardwadjali and Djabwurrung were dispossessed from official records by an act of toponymy. As Stuart Macintyre (2002: 4) notes, the explorers ‘were superimposing their own form of knowledge for their own purposes’. Ryan (1996: 15) notes that the creation of maps was the production of knowledge which was ‘invariably an exercise of power’.

Stephen Greenblatt (1991: 83) has acknowledged that with acts of placenaming, the ‘taking of possession and the conferral of identity are fused in a moment of pure linguistic formalism’. David Day (2005: 67) extends this argument, and notes that colonists named places to support their claim to new territory. Day argues that names tie a place symbolically to the ‘owners’ of the toponym. In this case, the landscape now known as the Grampians was suddenly tied in ownership to the Anglo-Celtic colonial cause.
Development of Towns and National Park

The colonial cause was extended after 1836 with the arrival of non-Indigenous pastoralists who came to claim areas of land for agricultural purposes. Charles Browning Hall was among the first of the pastoral colonists to come to the area and establish a squatting run in the late 1830s. As retold by Stanton (1988: 7), in her local history of the area, Hall recorded that the Indigenous people were welcoming of his arrival and shared with him knowledge of local foods and resources, while establishing a trading system for colonial goods such as mutton and flour. During Hall’s travels in the area, Stanton asserts that the Indigenous locals (unfortunately she only refers to them in the generic term ‘Aboriginal’ and does not give specifics of which group or clan they belong to) showed him tracks which allowed him to navigate between the various ranges in the area. One track in particular allowed him to navigate a ‘gap’ between two ranges, and this gap became known and recorded in colonial circles as Halls Gap (this name is still in usage today for the central town in the National Park, while research by Clark and Heydon (2002) assert that the traditional Djabwurrung name for this area is Budgem Budgem). Stanton also notes that another ‘gap’ in the ranges was later officially recorded with the name Rose’s Gap after Philip Davis Rose, the person who took over Gap’s run in 1842 (Clark and Heydon (2002) note that the traditional Jardwadjali name for this area is Barigawa, translated to mean ‘mountain stream’).

In concert with Hall, to the south of the mountain range in the area now known as Hamilton, the Wedge brothers Charles, Richard and Edward established a run in late 1838 (Garden, 1984: 10). They gave their run the colonial name of Grange, utilising a name that Mitchell had assigned in his 1836 travels to a local creek (research by Clark and Heydon (2002: 100) indicates that the traditional Djabwurrung name for this area is Mulleraterong, for which a translation is not available). By 1839 the Wedges were running 5,500 sheep and 220 cattle in the area (Garden, 1984: 12) and by 1840 the run had expanded to approximately 27,000 acres and was providing pasture for over 17,000 sheep and 1,400 cattle. By the mid 1840s the area of the now National Park was divided into six large sheep runs, squatted on by separate pastoralists. Whilst Stanton might assert that Hall was welcomed by the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali peoples, Garden provides a different perspective. Garden (1984: 16) asserts that once ‘large numbers of whites spread across the countryside with their
flocks and herds…the Aboriginals found that they were being displaced, deprived of access to their traditional tribal lands, their sacred sites were being desecrated and their food supplies threatened. Naturally they resisted’. This resistance took the form of periodic attacks upon the colonists, the stealing of sheep or cattle or the act of breaking sheep’s legs so that the pastoralists could not profit from their eventual sale at market. The resistance was often met with brutal physical reprisals from the colonists, a well referenced example being the slaughter of 40 Indigenous men, women and children near Koonongwootong in 1840 by the local Whyte brothers (Garden, 1984: 16).

With the gold-rush period of the 1850s there was an influx of migrants to Western Victoria and in 1864 the first legal purchase of land in the area was established by Robert and Sarah Graham, who bought 217 hectares of land near today’s Dairy Creek, so named because they established a dairy at the property (Stanton, 1988: 10). Settlement in the area increased at a regular rate from the 1860s onwards, with towns such as Ararat, Stawell, Hamilton and Horsham developing from gold-towns to regional cities. The study area was increasingly viewed as a vitally important resource for water and in 1875 a pipeline was established between Mount William (as it was then recorded) and the town of Stawell, 30 kilometres to the north-east (National Parks Service, 1989: 20). Further water projects followed, with the damming of lakes and areas within the study area, for the purposes of providing sustainable water supplies for the surrounding towns and farms. In the 1920s the area was registered as reserved forest, and by the 1970s the status had officially changed to recognise the area as a State forest (Land Conservation Council, 1996). These statuses of reserved and State forest allowed for pastoralists to utilise the areas at certain times of the year to graze sheep and cattle and to collect timber.

The study area was always popular with holidayers and day-trippers, even those who lived locally would utilise the area for recreational pursuits. Thus, in the early 1980s the Victorian Government sought to secure the biodiversity and natural attractions of the area, which is stated to have over 900 native plant species, 20 of which are endemic, and declared it a National Park (Land Conservation Council, 1996: 108). The declaration of the area as a National Park removed the rights of local farmers to graze their sheep and cattle in the area, essentially ‘locking them out’. The
boundaries as declared in the early 1980s are predominantly those that still stand today, and as will be discussed later in this thesis, the area is now mainly utilised for tourism and recreational purposes, with surrounding areas outside the National Park boundaries being used for residences, town settlements and agricultural purposes.

**The 1989/1990 Name Restoration Debate**

In March 1989 the Hon. Steve Crabb, Minister for Tourism with the Victorian Labor Government,§ introduced the process of Indigenous toponym restoration in the National Park. Crabb approached the Victorian Tourism Commission, and asked them to undertake research to profile the traditional Indigenous names in the area. Ian Clark, a historical geographer, and Ben Gunn, an archaeologist, were hired as consultants to research the traditional names and locations of features in the study area. Ian Clark was subsequently employed on a full-time basis by the newly-created Koorie Tourism Unit (KTU) to research the names. In a meeting with Brambuk elders and council members, where they agreed to assist with supporting the research efforts, Ian Clark secured funding from the KTU to ensure Lionel Harradine, Indigenous elder with connections to the Gariwerd area, could assist in finalising the report into the traditional Indigenous names for features in the study area.

Once the draft report had been submitted to the government, a press release was issued before the local Indigenous and non-Indigenous people had been consulted. In a research interview with one Djabwurrung Indigenous elder, Denis Rose, he acknowledged that the first he had heard of the government report in 1989 was when ABC radio rang him and asked for his thoughts on the matter. He admitted during the interview with me that he was unable to articulate a response for that initial media enquiry as he didn’t even trust that they were correct in asserting that the Indigenous names would be restored.

Steve Crabb agreed to be interviewed for this doctoral research program [and agreed to having his name and details published]. When asked why he had started this

---

§ In Australian politics the Labor Party is considered to be predominantly left-wing. Refer to footnote in Appendix K for details of political party affiliations in Australia.
process, he stated that there were two reasons for restoring the Indigenous names.
The first of these reasons pertained to the idea that

one of my experiences of having sort of tramped around the Grampians
was that one of the most fascinating things about it was the Aboriginal
heritage that was there…there was a whole lot of quite mystical stuff
there that wasn’t there, it wasn’t very well interpreted and a lot of the
time there were wire cages around it or it was hidden because they
didn’t want people to know it was there and none of the rest of the
Grampians reflected it so there was…stuff with silly names…like
“Elephant’s Hide”…

The second reason related to the idea that Steve Crabb had been to Kakadu (in the
north of Australia) and seen the tourism potential created by the ‘branding’ of the
location with an Indigenous name:

So, Kakadu is now, you know, maybe the great Australian icon. I
mean, people go there before they die sort of stuff, and well,
somewhere in my futile way, I thought well we could do with some
controversy around the Grampians and so…I thought, right! There you
go! Change its name, or put its Aboriginal names back.

In essence, Steve Crabb’s proposal to restore the Indigenous names came from his
desire to ‘correct’ what he perceived to be the historical ‘wrongs’ of removing
Indigenous toponyms from the landscape, and his wish to create controversy to
promote tourism to the area. The implications of his decision to ‘create controversy’
will be explored in detail in chapters six and seven.

At the time of Steve Crabb’s proposal to investigate the traditional Indigenous names
for the National Park area, the government regulations which guided naming practices
in the State of Victoria, stipulated that there was only the possibility of having ‘one
place and one name’. The implications of this regulation meant that for the
Indigenous toponyms to be restored, the colonial toponyms would have to be
removed, and therein the problem and the fuel for public reaction lay. This regulation
and its implicit notion that the restoration of Indigenous toponyms could only be
enacted with the removal of existing, predominantly Anglo-Celtic, toponyms was the
catalyst for overwhelming political and community reaction to the proposals.
By the 1st April 1989, politicians had begun to denounce Crabb’s proposal to research and restore the Indigenous names for features in and around the National Park. In their denouncements some aimed to whip up public condemnation of Crabb’s proposal. The press recorded it as a fait-accompli, ‘new names were likely regardless of government’ (New Names Likely Regardless of Government, 1989), and the first recordings of these protests at the political level were issued in the Ararat Advertiser which quoted Mr Dick DeFegely, Liberal Member for Ballarat Province at the time, as stating that ‘the idea was utterly preposterous and is obviously put forward to pander to the Aboriginal community or in the hope of winning a few votes from misguided residents of Greensborough who do not know the area or its history’ (Moves to Change Name Preposterous - Mlc, 1989).

By the 3rd April, Bob Stone, Councillor for Stawell Shire, had announced to his constituency that a formal petition had been organised ‘against Tourism Minister Mr Crabb’s plans to rename the Grampians and its landmarks with Aboriginal names’ (Petition against Grampians Rename, 1989). This petition was joined two days later by one established in Horsham by the local council (Horsham Starts Petition on Grampians Naming, 1989). On the 7th April the Hamilton Branch of the Liberal Party had announced plans to establish a formal petition against the changes (Editor, 1989c) and Bill McGrath (1989), National Party Member for Lowan, wrote an open letter to Crabb a few days later which stated that

the motive in suggesting place names is no doubt fine [but] the reality for those hearing the suggestion is to believe they are under attack for being what they are and living where they are. We consistently overlook the deep attachment that any of us may have to his or her landscape and country. Most Victorians have European roots. The attachment of the majority is to the places named as they understand them today, regardless of the source of the word.

In having read through most of the public press of the time, McGrath’s statement still resonates as the first one to make a claim of human attachment to the landscape and importantly also to its toponyms. While McGrath stated that the source of the name was unimportant, at the same time he was implicitly stating that the name itself is important.
By the middle of April 1989 other political figures started to contribute new aspects to the debate. Lawrie Rudolph (Editor, 1989e), Horsham Promotion Committee chairman, was promoting the notion that the ‘money that would be needed to change the name of the Grampians and many of its landmarks could be better spent on an Aboriginal cultural centre and tourism’. David Hawker (Editor, 1989e), Liberal Member for Wannon, stated that

This proposal sounds like the Russian communists changing the name of St Petersburg to Leningrad. The only difference here is that they had a bloody revolution in which tens of millions died...the proposals [are] an example of the misguided efforts of a small minority to try to discredit Australia's heritage (sic)...

At this point in the developing community debate, the researcher Ian Clark (1989a; Clark, 1989d, 1989b, 1989c, 1989e) wrote to regional and metropolitan newspapers in an attempt to counter the prevailing negative political voices. The basic crux of his argument lay in the following statement:

Given the importance of the Grampians to Aborigines it is amazing their placenames were not given to features. The Grampians are valued for its Aboriginal art sites and its natural features, and these are the basis of its tourist industry. To continue to name a peak Mt Zero because the temperature fell to zero is absurd when the local Aboriginal people knew it as Mullub Guwa and Murra Murra. One hundred and fifty years or so of European presence in the region is insignificant when compared with the many thousands of years of Aboriginal occupation. (Clark, 1989a)

From the public records, it would appear that while a few people took notice of Clark’s statements in April 1989, as obviated in their responsive letters to the editor, the majority empathized, identified or were swayed by the negative political voices. Only a few days after the publication of Clark’s letters, the Wimmera Mail-Times (Lone Voice Backs Change for Grampians, 1989) received more than 250 replies to a questionnaire asking for a yes or no answer to the question: ‘Do you agree with suggested name changes in the Grampians?’ In total, 249 respondents answered ‘no’
with one person voting yes and stating ‘It is about time that minority groups were given a go in this community! I also hope that your article on this is not full of right-wing bigotry!’. This was the first large-scale public voicing of opinions, and with this the debate continued at the political and public levels unabated for months.

Towards the end of April the results of the first petitions started to roll in. Keith Oldfield collated a petition with 558 signatures on it from Nhill, this petition then formed the basis of a 11,000 signature petition which was tabled in the Victorian Parliament by McGrath on 1st May 1989 (Oldfield, 1989). This tabled petition contained a combination of signatures from petitions circulated in Nhill (as outlined above), Horsham by Mayor Don Johns (circa 1400 signatures) and in Stawell by Cr Bob Stone (9019 signatures) (Grampians Petition Off to Parliament, 1989). By June, Jeanette Brown and Doreen Brown (Editor, 1989d) had collected a petition with 20,153 signatures of protest from the Ballarat region. To add to this, local newspapers began running full-page print-outs of letters that readers could send to Crabb (refer to Figure 1.10), protesting against the proposals (Editor, 1990).

---

**Figure 1.10 Letter of Protest published in newspapers**
In August a petition was collected in Warracknabeal with 167 signatures (Editor, 1989b). In addition to these petitions reported in local newspapers, were other petitions filed in parliament and also presented to the Office of the Surveyor-General Victoria. Under Freedom of Information legislation I was able to gain access to these petitions, and the results are presented in Table 1.1.

Steve Crabb, during an oral history interview undertaken as part of this research program, when asked what he and the government had thought about the petitions at the time of the debate, replied that:

> Petitions are good things for getting people on the ground, you know, when people think they are doing something…in the main street of Portland, or wherever. But, they don’t mean much…have a look at the list of petitions in Parliament, on any given day, and there’s a road of them and about god knows what.

[Interviewer]: Okay, so you don’t use it to gauge public response really?

[Steve Crabb]: No, absolutely not.

The fact that over 60,000 signatures were obtained on various petitions around Victoria, did not seem to faze Crabb in the slightest. Whether this was due to political bravado, the passage of time (over 17 years had passed since the issue had occurred) or genuine disinterest will never be known. What is interesting about these petitions, for the purposes of this thesis, is the fact that such a large number of people in Victoria felt passionate enough about the toponym restoration proposal to sign a petition. This toponymic passion underlies the key reasons this research began: namely the idea that if a large group of people were passionate about toponyms, then there was probably some attachment, identity and dependence formed with the toponyms which people felt were under threat.

Following on from the petitions, by May 1989 the editorial in the Wimmera Mail-Times was likening Crabb to ‘a fox with its tail on fire dashing through a stubble paddock. Everywhere he turns, he starts fresh spot fires. First, he decides he wants to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Senior Citizens</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain</td>
<td>4417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Hampden</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian C Walter (fire persons)</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Ararat</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain</td>
<td>3613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain (on behalf of fire fighters)</td>
<td>2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laang CFA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Napthine MLA</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland 4WD Club</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Chamberlain</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Camperdown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians Support Group</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians Support Group</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians Support Group</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians Support Group</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Atkinson MHR</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain District 4WD Club</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A. Dunstan OBE JP (Donald &amp; District Promotional Development Committee)</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyston Post Office</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms M Wills</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions lodged by B Chamberlain to Legislative Assembly</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stone</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stone</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60897</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.1: List of Petitions lodged with the Surveyor-General's Department of Victoria, with details of Signature Numbers*
change the name of the Grampians, describes existing names as boring and stupid, and sparks fires of protest across Western Victoria…’ (Editorial, 1989). Bill McGrath (Mp Fears Handover: Leaseback Plan for Grampians?, 1989) also chose to focus his argument more directly on Crabb, stating in the Victorian Parliament ‘Will Mr Crabb assure the House that his unpopular push to rename the Grampians as Guriwurd [sic.] is not part of a hidden agenda to hand the area to people who may claim to be the traditional owners, and who would then lease it back, as with Ayers Rock?’”. This fear-mongering campaign appeared to bear fruit, with numerous newspaper articles and letters to the editor addressing concerns about an ‘Aboriginal takeover’ (MP Fears Handover: Leaseback Plan for Grampians?, 1989; Government May Give Grampians to Aborigines, 1989; Government May Give Gramps to Aboriginals, 1989; Grampians for Aboriginals, 1989).

In August Crabb was stating that "From a tourist perspective, the experience of visitors to the Grampians is enriched by an appreciation of the Aboriginal heritage of the area and a first-hand exposure to the Aboriginal contribution to Victorian history and culture. The process of place-names change will be preceded by community consultation and more study to identify original Aboriginal names of the Grampians' natural features" (Minister Firm on Grampians Change, 1989; Crabb Persists with Grampians Change, 1989).

It was over a year since the original proposal had been made by Crabb before the submission from the Koorie Tourism Unit was released on 24th May 1990. The twelve months had seen continued public and political debate, mostly negative in substance. The debate had moved between themes of attachment, to ones of the proposal being a waste of money, followed by a focus on Crabb’s politics, onto a concerted fear campaign by some politicians and community leaders.

The 1990 submission to the Victorian Place Names Committee proposed that there was ‘a very strong case for the restoration of Aboriginal place names and for the ascertaining and publishing of the meanings of these words’ (Clark and Harradine, 1990: 5). Essentially, the long-awaited report recommended that:
i) 21 incorrectly spelt Aboriginal place names currently in use be corrected, and that a further 10 Aboriginal names be retained;

ii) the use of 44 known Aboriginal names of features more recently given European names be restored;

iii) the traditional names of 11 places that do not carry European names be adopted; and

iv) the more appropriate names conferred on nine Rock Art Sites in this submission be formally adopted.

Amongst the recommendations it was proposed that Mt Zero be recognised with its original name Mura Mura, that Hall’s Gap be recognised as Budja Budja and that the Grampians be recognised as Gariwerd. (Refer to Appendix B for a copy of the report recommendations). The Victorian Place Names Committee received this submission in May 1990, and it was not until October 1991 that the Committee published a notice in the Victorian Government Gazette that most of the Indigenous names were restored, either as replacements for existing non-Indigenous names, or as dual names (which was possible as the Committee agreed to change the long-standing ‘one place, one name policy’- refer to Figure 1.11 for copy of the Gazette notice published by the Secretary of the Victorian Place Names Committee on 23 October 1991). In total 10 Indigenous names were recognised for the first time for ‘new’ features, 8 Indigenous names were recognised to replace non-Indigenous names, and 32 features were dual-named.

Birch (1996) has written on this episode in history, and he claims that the restoration project was initially motivated by the interests of an exploitative tourist industry. Pertinently, Birch (1996: 66) asserted that

naming and mapping is a potent form of history making and writing. As the Gariwerd name restoration project highlighted, those who control these names seek to control the history of both the natural and physical landscapes named. Any threat to the legitimacy of those names, or the recognition of the earlier, in this case Indigenous name, threatens the security of the dominant colonial version of the past.

As has been discussed previously, the names that are applied to official government maps are the names that assert a colonial history. As has been discussed here, and will
**Victoria Government Gazette**

*Name changes in and around the Grampians National Park*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Name Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wudjigiadj</td>
<td>Wudjigiadj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djadji-djawa</td>
<td>Djadji-djawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundudarin</td>
<td>Gundudarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durd-durd</td>
<td>Durd-durd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarram Ngarram</td>
<td>Ngarram Ngarram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguddingiri</td>
<td>Nguddingiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badi-djadjing</td>
<td>Badi-djadjing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunubridj</td>
<td>Bunubridj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngillin ngillin</td>
<td>Ngillin ngillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirri-gurag</td>
<td>Mirri-gurag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenisla</td>
<td>Glenisla Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp of the Emu’s Foot</td>
<td>Yanangunj Njawi Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation Creek 5</td>
<td>Gunangidjara Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Fishes</td>
<td>Larghunjara Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Ghosts</td>
<td>Ngamadjidj Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Hands</td>
<td>Manja Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range 2</td>
<td>Mogadadjini Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range 3</td>
<td>Burrunji Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherrypool</td>
<td>Djurarub (Cherrypool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konangidjara Creek</td>
<td>Gunangidjara Creek (formerly Konangidjara Creek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirranatwa</td>
<td>Mirranatwa (Miririnaduwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirranatwa Gap</td>
<td>Mirranatwa Gap (Miririnaduwa Gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asses Ears</td>
<td>Djibalara (Asses Ears)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birges Nose</td>
<td>Galbij (Birges Nose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfellow Rock</td>
<td>Billimina Rock (Blackfellow Rock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range (West)</td>
<td>Burrunji Range (Black Range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Creek</td>
<td>Ngarrwarwarwil Creek (Burnt Creek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation Creek</td>
<td>Billimina Creek (Cultivation Creek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Range</td>
<td>Dundas Range (Grimgundji Range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Alton Peak (1009 m)</td>
<td>Gurdjargawurd Peak (D’Alton Peak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyans Creek</td>
<td>Fyans Creek (Barri yalooog Creek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gog &amp; Magog</td>
<td>Banyin yalooog (Gog &amp; Magog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians National Park</td>
<td>Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollow Mountain</td>
<td>Mount Wudjub-guyan (Hollow Mountain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Abrupt</td>
<td>Mount Abrupt (Mount Murdadjing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Cassell</td>
<td>Mount Cassell (Mount Djudji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Difficult</td>
<td>Mount Gar (Mount Difficult)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Lang</td>
<td>Mount Yaranula (Mount Lang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount McIvor</td>
<td>Mount McIvor (Mount Ngumadj)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Nelson</td>
<td>Mount Marum Marum (Mount Nelson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Sturgeon</td>
<td>Mount Sturgeon (Mount Wurgarri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Victory</td>
<td>Mount Bagara (Mount Victory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount William</td>
<td>Mount William (Mount Dwili)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount William Creek</td>
<td>Mount William Creek (Barbrial Creek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses Gap</td>
<td>Barigar Gap (Roses Gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Gap</td>
<td>Yanangunj Njawi Gap (Victoria Gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Range</td>
<td>Victoria Range (Billawin Range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallaby Rocks</td>
<td>Moongalga Rocks (Wallaby Rocks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Gap</td>
<td>Dirag (Boundary Gap)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORRIGENDUM**

In the Notice of Assignment published in the *Victoria Government Gazette* No. G30 dated 7 August 1991, on page 2206 the description for Dingley Village should read “City of Springvale.” Locality bounded on the west by Boundary Road, on the south by Lower Dandenong Road, on the east by Springvale Road and the Freeway Reserve and in the north by the Freeway Reserve.

PLACE NAMES COMMITTEE, c/o Survey and Mapping Victoria, 2 Treasury Place, Melbourne 3000.

RON McLEOD
Secretary

Department of Manufacturing and Industry Development

APPLICATION FOR MINING LEASE WITHDRAWN

No. 1292; W. J. Kyte & D. R. McLean; 144 ha, Parish of Bailarik.

APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT LEASE WITHDRAWN

No. 183; Gold Mines of Kalgoorlie Ltd; Parish of Moors.

No. 1214; Transit Mining (Aust) Ltd; 134 ha, Parish of Craige & Eglintron.

No. 1215; Transit Mining (Aust) Ltd; 38 ha, Parish of Craige.

No. 1216; Transit Mining (Aust) Ltd; 18-19 ha, Parish of Craige.

No. 1217; Transit Mining (Aust) Ltd; 34-46 ha, Parish of Craige.

---

Figure 1.11 Government Gazette Notice, 23 October 1991
be explored in greater detail later in the thesis, perceptions of history being under threat were prolific. Yet, Birch’s assertion that the threat to the legitimacy of the names threatened the security of the colonial version of the past is only one aspect of the debate’s historical narrative. The threat to the name also created a feeling of insecurity in people who relied upon the names to ground a variety of emotions associated with their sense of place.

The most informative of the reactions to the changes were those from individual members of the community. These responses were recorded as letters to the editors of rural and metropolitan newspapers, and as signatures on petitions during the debate. The letters were both supportive and negative, and their contents highlighted the key concerns the community had about the research and the proposal to restore Indigenous toponyms. The several themes of the letters concerns are outlined below, and they form the basis for the development of the theories on toponymic attachment (which will be discussed in further detail in chapters four, five and six). The key concepts raised in the letters are shown in Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Percentage of Letters</th>
<th>Number of Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste of Money</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem for Tourism</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Proposal</td>
<td>69.95</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Proposal</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to History</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with Indigenous History</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Key Concepts Identified from Letters to the Editor

The key arguments of the letters can be summarised as pertaining to people’s resistance to change, their perception of the toponyms embodying the local history, their desire to retain the current names for tourism and marketing purposes and the rejection of perceived governmental interference in local cultural heritage and identity. These themes are important as they shaped the direction of the research and literature review, which is the focus of the next chapter.
Conclusions

Minister Steve Crabb’s proposal in March 1989 to restore Indigenous toponyms for the National Park and areas within it caused great controversy within a multitude of communities in Victoria. The original proposal was initially met with resistance because of the Government’s ‘one place-one name’ policy which regulated that if Indigenous toponyms were to be restored, the non-Indigenous toponyms would have to be removed. This proposition initiated strong debate in parliament, local councils, amongst Indigenous groups and local communities. The debates centred on the issue of how people believed that Australian historical and cultural identity should be acknowledged, and whether the restoration of Indigenous toponyms was a worthwhile pursuit or a white elephant intent on stomping colonial heritage into the dust.

I believe that the statements outlined in the letters from 1989 and 1990 show that there is reasonable evidence to infer that people do indeed form bonds with places as well as toponyms. As such, a basis for the theory of sense of toponym being developed from theories of sense of place has been shaped. The theories underpinning sense of place will be evaluated and analysed in chapter two as part of the literature review for this thesis. This literature review will then act as a framework through which to analyse the letters and contemporary interviews with participants in the research to form an outline of the proposed theory on toponymic attachment.

Due to the absence in the literature of comprehensive theories on toponymy, the design of this thesis focuses on place names as the signifiers of places. Essentially, the design of this thesis is to analyse contemporary theories on place, and define whether the current theories on place can be applied to toponymic practices, or whether toponyms require their own theoretical explanations. Hence, this study will analyse the main theories on place, place attachment, place identity and place dependence to discern whether they can adequately define the functions of toponyms, or whether new theories are required. The key aim is to find a working explanation of resistance to toponymic change. Discussion and analysis of the literature which has framed this research program and analysis of the key theories on toponymy, place, place attachment and resistance is contained in the following chapter.
Literature Review

‘What’s in a name?...The short answer is, a world’
(Lambek, 2006: 135)
Introduction

Toponyms are frequently discussed in both academic and general literature. The print media print often reports on quirky names or the emergency service issues that occur when name standardisation practices fail. In academic circles geographers, linguists, psychologists and historians refer to toponyms in various ways. Anthropologists and Geographers have often discussed the importance of toponyms in the process of defining place from space (Levi-Strauss, 1962; Tuan, 1974; Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977; Sack, 1980; Rodaway, 2004). Linguists have analysed the etymologies of toponyms and the meanings of names in general (Tyrrell, 1933; Russell, 1956; Ryan, 1963; Hercus, 1969; Atchison, 1986; Fitch, 1987). Historians have discussed the processes of colonisation, orientalism and ‘othering’ through the use of toponyms (Carter, 1987; Bulbeck, 1991; Carter et al., 1993; Carter, 1995; Baker, 1999; Said, 2000; Withers, 2000; Day, 2001, 2005). Marketing academics have even begun to discuss the “marketing” potential of toponyms in journals such as Place Branding.

Yet, through all of these fora, links have rarely been made between toponyms and their combined political, symbolic, emotional and social significance. There have been a few studies internationally, and very few in Australia, that have researched the constructs of toponyms (Carter, 1995; Berg and Kearns, 1996; Feld, 1996; Frake, 1996; Fair, 1997; Seddon, 1997; Harvey, 1999; Wong, 2002). In Australia the bulk of this research has been limited to references contained within wider discourses on colonial mapping and contact histories (Day, 2001; McKenna, 2002; Day, 2005).

Having examined the available literature and discussed the current research trends at international conferences with established toponymists it is apparent that there is currently a gap in the academic literature. Internationally the gap exists in theories of the social and cultural components of toponyms. Within Australia the gap extends from a lack of focus on the cultural import of toponyms. This thesis therefore aims to be a catalyst for filling these gaps. Indeed, the scope and extent of toponymic research in Australia has previously been so limited as to leave few national research resources available for this doctoral program. In contrast to European and North American countries, where the majority of toponymic research has been undertaken to date and where extensive toponymic study programs are provided at universities and
libraries readily stock toponymic books, in Australia toponymic research was only recently offered as a coursework tertiary subject in 2005 at Macquarie University in New South Wales and the latest edition of international journal *Onoma*, established in 1950, available for public reference is from 1982 and accessible only at the State Library of New South Wales. This limited availability in Australia of reference and research material which is widely available to European and North American toponymist has meant that my search for relevant literature has at times been hindered by availability and access issues. With the ongoing development of electronic research resources this has been alleviated to some extent and frequent attendance at international conferences has been necessary to ensure exchange of ideas with established researchers in this field. Whilst in no way is this explanation of research material availability in Australia offered as an excuse for any literature oversight in this thesis, it is provided as a rationalisation for the reliance this thesis has had with selected texts from a broad range of literature in the fields of geography, history, psychology and sociology.

Through an analysis of the existing divergent and diverse academic literature it will be shown that the key theories from geography, linguistics, history and marketing can be brought together to provide a basis for toponymic theories. The key theories of these research fields will form the framework through which the case study of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park will be analysed in later chapters.

The review of the literature begins in this chapter with a discussion of contemporary toponymic research, in an effort to place this thesis within the wider subject area. Complementing this discussion, the review will give consideration to linguistic theories on names. In order to provide an understanding of the diverse academic understandings of toponyms, the literature review will analyse geographical literature with a particular focus on place and toponyms. The review then moves into an analysis of the cultural implications of toponymy through a discussion of Australian history and how both Indigenous and colonial practices shaped the contemporary landscape. Finally, consideration is briefly given to the psychological literature on people’s resistance to change. In essence, this literature review analyses research publications and theories which have been important in shaping the doctoral research, and which will provide the underpinning rationales for the development of the
Onomastics and Toponyms

The study of words is generally the domain of linguists, who study how they work in terms of syntax, etymology, grammar and semantics. This thesis focuses on the latter of these areas, the meanings and associations people make with toponyms. Whilst there have been many studies on the etymologies of toponyms, there has been minimal attention paid to the meanings of toponyms. For this reason, this section will look at various theories on how names themselves work, and in particular how toponyms wield an influence in daily life. Later in this chapter focus will be given to the various etymological, political and historical studies of toponyms that have been undertaken.

Within the study of naming-systems there are various categories of place names. There are hydronyms (from the Greek hydros meaning water and onoma meaning name); oronyms (from the Greek oros meaning mountains); odonyms (from the Greek odos meaning street); choronyms (names for general areas) and when we are speaking of general place names we employ the term toponym.

Toponyms themselves can be composed of different styles and formats, thus toponyms are also classified into different categories: simplex when the name consists of one single word; composite where there is a generic and a specific element in the name; eponym when the name is derived from that of a person; hagionym if it is named after a god; commemorative if it has been named after a particular event; and descriptive if it evokes the landscape which it symbolizes.

One of the most important academic works to be written on proper names was by Fitch in his book Naming and Believing (1987). Fitch analysed the semiotic theories of Bertrand Russell and Gottlob Frege, and through a complex description of the two theories discerned a working theory which Fitch believed to be the most accurate description of the semiotics of proper names. Whilst Fitch’s analysis of proper names
is not entirely relatable to toponyms, it is his analysis of Frege and Russell which is informative for the purposes of this literature review.

Frege noted that there was a distinction between the *sense* of an expression, and the *referent* of an expression. This theory of names is referred to as the ‘indirect theory of reference’ by Fitch (1987: 1). Notably, Frege stated that ‘beside that to which the sign refers, which may be called the *reference* of the sign, [there is] also what I should like to call the *sense* of the sign, wherein the mode of presentation is contained’. The statement by Frege relating to referent and sense, is of major import to the design of the current study into toponyms. Frege’s notion of the name containing both a referent (object) and a sense (mode), might readily lend itself to theories of place and toponymic attachment. Indeed, it could be extrapolated to designate that the referent of a toponym is the place itself, whereas the sense of the toponym is the identity or dependence that the toponym represents. Is it possible that this disjunction between object, referent and sense exists in a toponym?

In contrast to Frege, Russell ‘rejected Frege’s distinction between sense and reference… [and] held that in most uses of ordinary proper names we should view names as truncated descriptions’ (Fitch, 1987: 1). For Russell, the names that we use on a daily basis are linked directly to the referent, and it is the referent itself which holds the meaning (Russell, 1956). Here we can see the distinction between Frege’s and Russell’s theories. Where Frege proposed that the name itself can hold meanings outside of the object, Russell argued that it is the object itself which holds the meanings. For the current research project this is an important proposition. Indeed, when incorporated into Carter *et al.*’s (1993: xii) notion that it is the toponyms which represent ‘grounded identification’ then it can be seen that the toponym itself is not merely a benign name. It is more than that, it consists of reference, identification and it is the device which aids humans in delineating space from place in verbal communication.
An often misquoted** theory that Claude Levi-Strauss promoted in his book *The Savage Mind* (1962: 168), posits that ‘space is a society of place-names just as people are landmarks within the group. Places and individuals alike are designated proper names, which can be substituted for each other in many circumstances common to many societies’. This observation of Levi-Strauss is important to geographical notions of place (which will be explore in greater detail later in this literature review). It is here that Levi-Strauss links the process of toponymy to the creation of places from space. As discussed in the section on place and space later in this literature review, places are elements of the landscape to which people form an identity or attachment. Here Levi-Strauss indicates that toponyms are similar to names that people bear as their own personality. If this is the case, then two central questions to be answered in this thesis are: ‘can toponyms be the same as proper names?’ and ‘can toponyms symbolize the identity of a place?’

This current research project will focus on uncovering the various roles that toponyms play in the daily lives of people. Particular attention will be paid to the propositions that names have both a sense and a referent, and that they act as the symbolic delineators of places from spaces in order to answer the research question of ‘is the meaning of a toponym separable from the meaning of the place?’ Before investigation of these questions can occur, it is important to establish the current status of toponymic research in Australia and globally within which this thesis positions itself.

**Toponymic Research**

Essentially there are two types of toponymic research that have been published widely. The first stream focuses heavily on the etymological study of toponyms. The second has come about in more recent years and seeks to explore the cultural aspects of toponyms. This section will give consideration to both types of publications.

---

** This passage has been misquoted as ‘space is a society of named places’ by (Frake, 1996; Auslander and Henderson, 2001; Newberry, 2005). This quote leads to a different interpretation of Levi-Strauss’ intentions.
Etymologies
Traditionally books on placenames were compiled as Gazetteers, with one of the earliest such compilations recorded in modern western history being the *Domesday Book* of toponyms in the United Kingdom. The Domesday Book (The British National Archives) was commissioned as a survey of all places, properties and titles in England in 1086 by William the Conqueror. The information was compiled based on the names of the towns and villages that were surveyed, and therefore acts as an early form of Gazetteer. Gazetteers are still compiled today and their essential role is to list all toponyms in a defined area (such as a region, state or country) along with details of what feature type they are used for (mountain, river, town etc) and where the feature is located (usually indicated with the centroid coordinates). The production of Gazetteers is usually undertaken by government naming authorities to assist them with the production of maps and other spatial resources.

The production of Gazetteers in the eleventh century lead to the development of etymological books as people began to show an interest in the histories of place names. These publications have taken many forms over the years, and in Australia etymological collections originally began in the nineteenth century as recordings of Indigenous cultural histories taken by anthropologists and Aboriginal Protectors such as Robert Brough Smyth (1878). More modern publications in Australia began to explore etymological themes such as Indigenous names (Reed, 1967; Massola, 1968) or names within a particular state or territory (Clark and Heydon, 2002).

In the general public domain etymological publications have tended to focus on printing lists of toponyms along with details of the history or meanings of the names. In Australia the most widely published books of this type were produced during the 1960s and 70s (Reed, 1967; Massola, 1968; Endacott, 1973; Blake, 1977). As I have discussed in other fora, the publication standards of Australian toponymic books to date has been low and has lead to the misrepresentation of toponymic histories in some places (Kostanski, 2005). For example, as shown in my publication of 2005 the trend of toponymists to promote vague translations of Indigenously-contrived toponyms has lead to incorrect Indigenous cultural heritages being promoted in towns such as Moama, on the Murray River in New South Wales. Recent efforts by
researchers such as Clark and Heydon (2002) have sought to correct these misinterpretations through concerted archival and linguistic research.

International etymology books which have explored themes beyond those normally encapsulated in other texts include those by Stewart (1975), Kadmon (1997) and Baylon and Fabre (1982). These texts distinguish themselves from others as they include discussions regarding toponymic categories and research domains. One of the leading modern etymological books published in English was written by George Stewart in 1975, under the title *Names on the Globe*. Stewart’s book was very light on the philosophical discussion of toponyms, and he stated upfront that there was no need for the discussion as ‘with place already defined, a place-name may be considered to be - superficially, perhaps, but practically - a word or words used to indicate, denote, or identify place’ (1975: 4). In his discussion of the importance of place names, Stewart acknowledged that place names exist only in the minds of humans. His description of this phenomenon (Stewart, 1975: 4-5) is almost twee, and requires noting herein:

> Though a place may be conceived as existing in itself or as standing in the consciousness of an animal, a place-name exists only with men, being part of the language – “No names without people!” The converse is also true, “With people, names!” At least no tribe has ever been discovered so primitive as to be without names, both for people and for places. Man has been defined as “the thinker”, “the tool maker”, and in many other terms. We can also describe him as “Man, the namer”.

Setting aside the archaic use of the word ‘man’ to denote ‘human’, Stewart’s writing reflects a passion for the study of toponymy which is not easily surpassed. Stewart’s research focused on the types of toponyms that exist in the landscape. Reflection is given to descriptive, associative, incident, possessive, commemorative, commendatory, manufactured, folk, mistake and shift names. The focus on typology means that the work is relatively devoid of descriptions of the contemporary meanings of names to people, and no research was offered on the identity of names (outside of how they were allocated), nor analysis of the attachments that are formed to place names. Stewart (1975: 7) recognised that the emphasis of his book would be ‘upon human motivation – that is, upon the reasons for which the names arose or were
bestowed’, but this exploration of motivation was limited to analysis of name typologies, not relationships.

Since the publication of Stewart’s 1975 text, there have been a few other authors who have published books on the same themes (Baylon and Fabre, 1982; Kadmon, 1997; Rayburn, 2001). Baylon and Fabre’s book *Les Noms de Lieux et de Personnes* was written with the intention of describing the various forms toponyms can take (hydronyms, oronyms, odonyms); providing a history of toponymic practices around the globe; followed by an analysis of the types of place names that exist in the landscape. Baylon and Fabre (1982: 6) suggest that ‘l’histoire, la géographie, la sociologie accaparent, chacune à sa façon, les données de l’onomastique’ [History, geography, sociology, each in their own way have an input into onomastic study] and the possibility that multiple schools of research are involved in the study of toponymy, they suggest, can be stimulating. This is a factor that has been considered for the research framework of this doctoral thesis, and as such multiple disciplines have been investigated during the research program.

Naftali Kadmon is a researcher and lecturer in the School of Geography at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and in 1997 he published the book *Toponymy: The Lore, Laws and Language of Geographical Names*. Kadmon’s book analysed various areas of toponymy, described the workings of United Nations Groups of Experts on Geographical Names (UNEGGN), and briefly described the connotative meaning of toponyms. It is this last topic which is of major interest to this doctoral research program as Kadmon (1997: 48) proposed that in ways similar to words and phrases, some toponyms are associated to ideas which may be subjective and highly personal. For example:

The name Villarica – a cone-shaped, snow-capped volcano in central Chile – brings to the mind of the author a very vivid picture of a misty and mystical atmosphere, because he experienced these conditions when visiting the mountain. But this connotative or pragmatic meaning of the name Villarica is entirely subjective and personal; if the volcano had been visited under different conditions – not directly connected with the mountain itself – a different mental picture might have been conjured upon hearing the name.
He reasoned that all visitors to the Vallarica site would have different mental pictures associated with the names. Therefore a toponym could have many individual connotative meanings.

Kadmon refers to toponyms such as Villarica, where the name is used by many people, Kadmon refers to as having connotative or pragmatic meaning. He explained that a name such as Venice, Paris or Beverly Hills acquire ‘meaning beyond the immediate descriptive-lexical meaning embedded in it’ (1997: 49). It was argued by Kadmon that the imbuing of a toponym with connotative meaning makes it ‘lose its most salient function, namely its locational value’. Kadmon was not expansive about the connotative meanings of place names, and this is to the detriment of his argument. It will be important to note in this doctoral research whether a name which has been given connotative meaning loses its locational value. This discussion will be explored in chapter six in relation to the dependency construct of toponyms.

Richard Randall’s (2001) *Place Names: how they define the world - and more* discussed many aspects of toponymy, including national guidelines, exonyms, endonyms and the work of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographic Names (UNGEGN). As part of the book Randall also discussed the way that ‘place names communicate’, in particular how they gave identity to people around the world. Unfortunately his discussion of the identity politics of toponymy was superficial, and centred on providing general descriptions of the importance of names in identifying people from certain national backgrounds. It certainly left much room open for research into toponymic identity and dependence.

Elsewhere in the world, in places such as Canada since 1983 Alan Rayburn has been publishing a regular place names article in the magazine *Canadian Geographic*. The culmination of these articles was the publication of Rayburn’s book *Naming Canada* in 2001 wherein each chapter is dedicated to a description of how different landscape features in Canada were named, yet apart from insight into cultural mores, the publications do not contain much insight into the emotional or functional roles of toponyms in society.
Outside the general public domain of etymological publications, the international journal *Onoma*, published by the International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS) was established in 1950, and until 1996 focused on producing bibliographies of onomastic research around the globe. Since 1996 the focus has changed, and Onoma now publishes mainly etymological studies and methodology papers on proper names and toponyms. Essentially, the main focus of the journal is name research in general, not specific toponymic research. In addition to *Onoma*, is the journal *Names* published quarterly by the American Name Society. This journal has been published since 1953, and the focus is similar to that of *Onoma*, in that articles are published on general names studies, not specifically on toponymy. The articles published in Onoma and Names cater to academic etymologists and outline the current status of research on specific or general name themes.

Yet, these styles of toponymic research do not differ greatly from those etymological studies mentioned previously, and indeed this lack of extension from the traditionalist etymology model further exemplifies the need for the current doctoral research to be undertaken, to understand the extent of the social and cultural importance of place names. To this end, there has been recent progress in the arena of developing a greater knowledge of how toponyms are created (Feld, 1996) and how they function culturally within different societies (Kadmon, 1997; Randall, 2001). These will be explored in further detail later in this chapter. Yeoh (1996: 298) notes that the traditional ‘etymological enquiry into the naming of places…appears to be a well-honed art if of somewhat antiquarian and esoteric appeal’, thus to move beyond the antiquarian nature of etymological studies, attention will now be given to the emerging field of what I term *cultural toponymy*.

**Cultural Toponymy**

In the mid 1990s research which concentrated on the cultural meanings of toponyms began to emerge. Prior to this, the cognitive and cultural aspects were discussed in passing, as part of larger studies into Indigenous tribal traditions or geographical explorations of the concept of place, example include the works of Claude Levi-Strauss (1962) and Eric Carter (1993) which will be discussed in detail later. By the mid 1990s studies began to focus exclusively on cultural toponymy with research...
undertaken by academics such as (Berg and Kearns, 1996; Feld, 1996; Withers, 2000). Various areas of cultural research have been explored from Indigenous to political to acoustic themes and these will now be discussed to provide background for where this research thesis is placed in the wider research field.

Research by Steven Feld in the mid 1990s asserted that the study of Kaluli [a tribe in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea] place names could be what he defines as *acoustemology*. Acoustemology is stated to be the study of the spoken forms, the aural qualities, of toponyms. Whilst Feld’s research centred on the acoustemology of Kaluli words, which is not entirely relevant to this current research program, he also made theoretical conjectures that have application to this research and its exploration of toponymic identity and dependence. For instance, Feld noted that ‘place names act as mnemonics for the historical actions of humans that make places singular and significant’ (Weiner 1991:45 cited in Feld, 1996: 109). Further to this proposition, Feld (1996: 113) contended that ‘every place and place name, regardless of linguistic formation and markedness, can and does peg some sort of story for someone, and a broad spectrum of possibilities surrounds the extent to which those stories are shared, significant, meaningful, or memorable through time for particular individuals or social groups’. As stated in chapter one, ‘history’ was identified by many letters to the editor as being an important theme for supporting or rejecting the case study naming proposal. To this extent it will be important in chapter five (which explores place identity and themes of history) to compare with Feld’s assertions the extent to which the histories are shared by, or possibly held separately by, places and their toponyms.

There is a paucity of information available on the contemporary politics of naming. The information that has been published relates mainly to the naming practices of New Zealand (Berg and Kearns, 1996) and South Africa (Hilterman and Koopman, 2003). In these cases their foci was on the reinstatement of Indigenous names or non-colonial placenames.

The country of South Africa has recently undergone political and social changes. As part of these changes there has been a move by the incumbent government to reinstate native names to the named features of South Africa, and thus remove what they perceive as names which represent colonial histories. In a style similar to those in the
Grampians (Gariwerd) case study, ‘the letter columns of the *Natal Witness* in Pietermaritzburg were flooded with letters from city residents objecting to a proposed plan by the …council to change the names of a number of streets’ (Hilterman and Koopman, 2003: 1). Hilterman and Koopman’s article focused on the phenomenon of odonym changes in South Africa, with a particular emphasis on analysing the contents of the letters to the newspapers which discussed the odonymical propositions. Hilterman and Koopman conclude that the reasons for toponymical change in South Africa were political, and the resistance to change evident in some of the newspaper letters was due to many factors including: ‘existing names reflect history’, new names were inappropriate, the consultation process was flawed, the renaming would cause chaos and confusion and the project was a waste of money. Hilterman and Koopman’s article was written in an explanatory, rather than exploratory style, wherein the article did not so much analyse the letters to the editor, but merely discussed them in thematic sequences. In contrast, this current research thesis will lend a more detailed analysis of the phenomenon of toponymical change, based on research conducted into the letters to the editor, and contemporary interviews with the stakeholders, being explored through literature and theoretical discussions, rather than exclusively thematic ones. In addition, in chapter seven of this thesis attention will be focused on Hilterman and Koopman’s article in an attempt to negotiate whether the themes discussed therein can be explained by the theories developed during this research program.

The research which most closely resembles the current proposed topic, is that of Lawrence Berg and Robin Kearns in their article, *Naming as Norming: ‘Race’, Gender, and the identity politics of naming places in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (1996). Their key contention is that ‘the naming of places is a key component in the relationship between *place* and the *politics of identity* in contemporary societies…names are part of both a symbolic and a material order that provides normality and legitimacy to those who dominate the politics of (place) representation’. Whilst ostensibly discussing the place names of New Zealand, this theory on the provision of power and legitimacy through toponyms can be applied to Australia as well. As is often discussed in Australia (Carter, 1987; Carter *et al.*, 1993; Read, 2000; Day, 2001; McKenna, 2002), the production of the contemporary Australian landscape was undertaken at the bequest of colonial powers. These
colonial productions of landscape included mapping, surveying, naming and claiming and they overlapped or adopted elements of the Indigenous understandings of the landscape (Strang, 1997: 218). These common elements of landscape control, and Berg and Kearn’s assertion that toponyms play a central role in this political play, is of major importance to the framework of this research. This is because many letters to the editor expressed concern about the historical importance of colonially-defined names.

In essence the colonial production of maps, and the colonial use of toponyms on these maps, aided in the promotion of colonial powers and their dominance over the Australian landscape. Berg and Kearns (1996: 105) noted that in relation to maps, place names play a central role, ‘for they provide the means of filling ostensibly empty space (on maps) with meaningful points of interest. The use (and reproduction) of place-names can thus be seen as a means of communicating (often ideological) meaning about place’. This meaning of place in New Zealand, they argue, is the meaning of the colonially-dominated landscape. As discussed earlier, the contemporary portrayals of history in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area can be seen as colonially-dominated, through the promotion of Anglo-Saxon histories to the detriment of Indigenous or shared ones. This theme will be explored further in chapter five when consideration is given to the histories discussed in the letters to the editor and the contemporary questionnaires and interviews.

Pertinently for this current study, Berg and Kearns discuss the issues associated with the reintroduction of Maori place names. The most prevalent issue is that people ‘are unhappy about changes in accustomed place names’ (Berg and Kearns, 1996: 109). Berg and Kearns argued that ‘such responses – which usually arise when Maori attempt to replace European names with Maori ones- are indicative of an explicit cultural politics of identity…In this sense, then, place and place names are (material and metaphorical) sites of contested representational discourses’. Hence, it will be important in this thesis to explore the issues surrounding the case study name restoration program and whether they were based on the cultural politics of identity, as it was mainly non-Indigenous voices which expressed resentment towards the government proposals. Berg and Kearns do not offer suggestions on how to overcome these politics of identity which are borne out in renaming issues, rather they
state that the purpose of their article was to ‘suggest some of the ways that the contested politics of naming places in Aotearoa articulate with wider discursive constructs of “race” and gender’ (1996: 118). Thus, this present study will aim to fill the ‘gap’ in the literature, by uncovering the politics of toponymic identity and resistance to change, and also providing theoretical solutions on how to rename places for the incorporation of all identities.

From an interesting new angle, recent studies of toponyms have to some extent taken form in the journal Place Branding which was established at the close of 2004. This journal assesses the marketability of places through their ‘brand’. Articles in this journal typically treat and assess places with the notion that ‘the worst thing an aspiring community, country or any other type of place could do is not intervene in their own image creation and ignore branding concepts’ (Freire, 2005: 350). In response to the assertions in this journal, chapter six will consider in greater detail the implications of toponymic dependence through marketing and tourism.

As has been considered in this section, toponyms are viewed and theorised mainly as symbols of places, symbols which can be researched at a linguistic, etymological, political or social level. It has been shown that previously research has been conducted into the histories of toponyms and also into the contemporary politics of naming or renaming places. To complement the discussion of literature on toponyms, it is also considered important to investigate what places are, how they are formed, and how toponyms are used to represent places. An exploration of these themes will now be provided.

**Place and Space**

*Place*, both physical and emotional, is a concept of major importance to the focus of this thesis because toponyms are, by their very description, names for places. Thus, before development of toponymic theories can commence, it is important to understand the landscape itself, and what constitutes a place. Therefore, this section will discuss the development of theories on place, with the aim of discerning which theories are of relevance and can be applied to the research of this thesis. Vitally, as
part of the major research question into whether a toponym symbolises the meaning(s) of a place, or if it stands alone with its own meaning(s), the focus of this section of the literature review is partly on whether or not theories of place can be extrapolated to explain the nature of toponyms or whether new theories are required.

The term *place* takes on many different definitions in contemporary western academic literature. Theories are espoused from sociologists (Von Hoffman, 1994; Oldenburg, 1999), philosophers (de Certeau, 1984), psychologists (Canter and Stringer, 1975), and human or cultural geographers (Rapoport, 1972; Tuan, 1974; Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977, 1980; Relph, 1997; Tuan, 2002), with each researcher developing the term *place* to complement their particular area of study. It should be noted that Donald Meinig (1979: 3) differentiated between ‘general recognition of certain areas as places, and a personal sense of place. One is a public concept, the other private; we all live intimately in both’. Thus, this section will define the public concept of place, and later consideration will be given to personal sense of place. This section will give a synopsis of the most pertinent and widely-utilised theories on both these functions of place, to arrive at a working-definition of place that will act as part of the framework of this thesis.

Currently, the geographical term *place* is most simply defined in the *Dictionary of Human Geography* as ‘a portion of geographical space occupied by a person or thing’ (Johnston, 1981: 254). Even from only considering this statement, a myriad of questions concerning the constitution of place arise. For example, we might ask ‘how is place delineated from geographical space?’, ‘What influences are evident in the creation of place?’ and ‘How do people or things occupy place?’ The simplest approach in defining place is to answer these three questions.

**Defining Place from Space**

Of central import to the current study, is the rarely cited academic notion that ‘it is not spaces which ground identifications, but places. How then does space become place? By being named’ (Carter *et al.*, 1993: xii). Carter *et al.* are among the few geographers who have overtly linked the process of naming to the creation of places from space and his theoretical cohort include Claude Levi-Strauss (1962) who noted
that place is named space, and Tim Cresswell (2004: 10) who briefly mentioned that ‘when humans invest meaning in a portion of space and then become attached to it in some way (naming is one such way) it becomes place’. In essence, this concept is of integral importance to this research in that places can position identifications whereas spaces do not, and that it is toponyms which symbolise this identification.

The constructs of space and place are of particular import to this study, in that geographical literature links the western separation of place and space to the use of toponyms. How space and place are created will now be discussed in more detail to ascertain the processes involved which geographers argue lead to the creation of toponyms. It is important to note here that a particularly western perspective of space and place is being discussed in this section of the literature review. As mentioned previously traditional Indigenous understandings of landscape are different to western ones. The differences in these two cultural perceptions will be discussed in detail in chapter four when consideration of objections to the renaming for historical reasons is discussed.

In 1958 Martin Heidegger (1958: 19) noted that ‘place places man in such a way that it reveals the external bounds of his existence and at the same time the depths of his freedom and reality’. This description of place was motivated by studies of a sociological nature, which posit that place is a binding aspect of daily existence, which is mediated by external forces. These external forces give meaning to the landscape, and provide a nexus with which people decipher their interactions with place.

Heidegger’s proposition of place being a tangible portion of the landscape governed by organizational procedures was developed and then superseded in the 1970s when a fresh set of theories regarding place developed. Rodaway (2004: 306) asserts that during the 1970s development of new place theories was part of ‘the reaction to positivist spatial science [which] reawakened many human geographers to the uniqueness of place, the emotional encounter with the environment, and this humanistic tradition’. The changes in epistemology lead to the definition of place as a binary partner to space. During the 1970s, theorists such as Tuan and Relph were
the leaders in the development of the ontology that place is mediated space. Relph (1976: 3) posited that

existential or lived-space is the inner structure of space as it appears to us in our concrete experiences of the world as members of a cultural group… it is intersubjective and hence amenable to all members of that group for they have all been socialized according to a common set of experiences, signs and symbols… Furthermore, existential space is not merely a passive space waiting to be experienced, but is constantly being created and remade by human activities.

Hence, according to Relph, existential spaces are elements of the landscape that are culturally defined as the receptacles, the borders, the supporting elements of places. Relph’s (1976: 141) definition of place centres on the notion that they are ‘profound centres of human existence to which people have deep emotional and psychological ties’, and they are ‘basic elements in the ordering of our experiences of the world’ (1976: 43). Pertinently, places are elements of the landscape which have been constructed, and places exist within space, as opposites of space.

Another phenomenologist publishing during the 1970s, Tuan’s work, *Space and Place*, is often cited in geographical literature research. Tuan’s definitions further Relph’s definitions and aid the understanding and exploration of the ontology of defining space and place. Tuan (1977: 6) posited that

what begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value… The ideas “space” and “place” require each other for definition. From the security and stability of place we are aware of the openness, freedom, and threat of space, and vice versa. Furthermore, if we think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible to be transformed into place.

Thus, if we combine Tuan’s and Relph’s theories, we can come to the conclusion that space is an unmediated area, such as a landscape, wherein people pass through this area without necessarily taking in all the elements. Where people stop, where people
begin to tie emotions to a particular part of this space, that space then becomes a place. The places are stopping points, spaces with meanings attached, focal points of human interactions and discourses.

Almost a decade after Tuan and Relph began contributing to the discourse on space and place, a distinct delineation of the two concepts was provided by the philosopher de Certeau (1984: 114). Namely:

a place (lieu) is the order (of whatever kind) in accord with which elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence…space is composed of intersections of mobile elements.

De Certeau therefore argued that space is a subject-defined concept of unknown elements. When classified by the subject, through a process of defining certain elements as distinct from others, this space becomes place(s). Many other researchers have continued to utilise this theory on the delineation of place from space. As space is an “unknown element”, it is important to define what it can be constituted of, as it provides the background for places. According to Cresswell (2004: 10), spaces can ‘be seen in distinction to place as a realm without meaning – as a “fact of life” which, like time, produces the basic coordinates for life’. Sack (1980: 3) espoused the notion that spaces are ‘seen and evaluated in different ways at different times and in different cultures’. Most importantly, Sack (1980: 4) reminds the reader that ‘geographic space is not empty. It is filled with matter and energy, or substance. The fact that people discuss this space, describe it, and analyse it, means that they are conceptually – not actually – isolating and separating space from substance’. It is the basic conceptual notion of space, as defined by Sack, that will be utilised in this thesis- essentially that space is filled with substance which can be described and analysed.

It is important here to also note the difference between landscape and place, because if Sack is suggesting that geographical space can be filled with matter and energy, then this would denote the common notion of landscape. Whilst the theories of landscape are broad, we can give a brief discussion of these theories in relation to space and place. Cresswell (2004: 10) posits that ‘…in most definitions of landscape the viewer is outside of it. Places are very much things to be inside of’. Hence, if a landscape is something that people can travel through, be outside of, and once a
meaning is attached it becomes a place by deduction, according to the theories of Tuan, Relph, Sack and Cresswell, this would allow the western concept of the landscape to be theorised as a space.

From definitions of how place is defined from space, consideration needs to be given to the actual processes involved in delineating place from space. The focus here will be on place itself, as the research of this thesis centres on place names. Whilst the bulk of this discussion of the literature will be contained in chapter four, in an analysis of place theories and how they can relate to toponymic attachment theories, for the purposes of outlining the various theories a brief discussion of the most pertinent literature is outlined below.

**Creation of Place**
Altman and Low (1992b: 5) note that place ‘refers to space that has been given meaning through personal, group, or cultural processes’. They argue that in the process of transmogrifying space into place, meanings are attributed to a geographical area. Further to Altman and Low’s theory, Eisenhauer, Krannich and Blahna (2000: 422) posit that ‘the process of transforming spaces into places is influenced by one's culture’. They argue that cultural influence not only controls the processes involved in forming place, but also guides and shapes all future place interactions, ‘local community cultures influence sense of place because understandings of the environment are rooted in the cultural network of beliefs of an individual's social group’. Thus, the process of creating place influences not only the appearance and physical structure of the place, but the interactions that occur there. Further to this, the interactions are shaped in part by the locality, and also by the predominant culture of the inhabitants. It is in a sense a symbiotic relationship and the theory can be used to explain the differences in land use or architectural styles that exist around the world. They can in this way also be extrapolated to describe the differences in colonial and Indigenous interactions with the Australian landscape.

Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff (1983: 64) have noted that the influence of culture on the creation of place
means that place-identities of different ethnic, social, national and religious groups in a given culture should reveal not only different uses and experiences with space and place, but corresponding variations in the social values, meanings, and ideas which underlie the use of those spaces.

In Australia, particularly with its policies on multiculturalism, this statement has strong currency. Yet, I would go further than Proshansky et al, and hypothesize that not only do different groups use and value places differently, but that mainstream society also defines what constitutes ‘normal’ interactions, which then subordinates all other interactions as ‘outside the norm’. It will be interesting to examine the influences of culture on the creation of place in Grampians (Gariwerd) and to investigate in further detail which cultures are present in the areas, and which ones are promoted and/or recognised as the ‘mainstream’ identities. To further this research, it will be interesting to note whether culture has shaped the creation of the place names, and not only the creation of the names, but their continuing presence and understanding in the landscape. This exploration will be contained in chapters four and five.

Yet, we might ask, what is meant by the term ‘culture’ in geographical studies? Cosgrove and Jackson (1987: 99) posited that in geographical studies, culture is ‘the medium through which people transform the mundane phenomenon of the material world into a world of significant symbols to which they give meaning and attach value’. Nevertheless, Don Mitchell (1995: 102) has argued that in geographical studies ‘there is no such (ontological) thing as culture’. Importantly Mitchell (1995: 103-4) asserted that:

there is only a very powerful idea of culture, an idea that has developed under specific historical conditions and was later broadened as a means of explaining material differences, social order and relations of power….But these explanations are not of “culture itself”, whether defined as a level, medium or signifying system. These ways of seeing “culture” do not avoid reification, rather they perpetuate it by smuggling right into the heart of geography what are still a quite mystified set of assumptions about how social practice proceeds. And
this will continue to be the case until social theorists dispense with the notion of an ontological culture and begin focusing instead on how the very idea of culture has been developed and deployed as a means of attempting to order control and define “others” in the name of power or profit.

It would seem from Mitchell’s arguments on cultural geography that he is delving into the antique descriptions of anthropology, and attempting to start distancing cultural geography from this background of ‘other’ creation. Mitchell’s arguments are important for the current study, as there is a fine line to be drawn between defining a cultural characteristic of a landscape, and defining the cultural landscape as one in which ‘others’ exist. The processes employed in this thesis will focus on describing the patterns evident in the cultural landscape which have perpetuated the notion of an Indigenous “other”. This discussion will be provided in detail in chapter five.

Dear and Flusty (2002: 2) have noted that places exist to act as locales for the repository of history, ‘in particular economic, political and socio-cultural history is place-specific in that such relationships unfold in recognisable locales according to a (sometimes opaque) logic of spatial diffusion’. According to Carter et al. (1993: xii) places embody ‘the symbolic and imaginary investments of a population’. Relph (1976: 43) posits that ‘events and actions are significant only in the context of certain places, and are coloured and influenced by the character of those places even as they contribute to that character’. Hence, there can be a dualistic meaning to a place. The place can have a cultural meaning, which in turn influences the cultural practices undertaken in that place. In the same way meanings can be taken from, and reinforced in, a place.

**Influences and meanings of place**

Milligan, (1998: 12) extrapolating from Zerubavel’s (1996: 285) conceptualisation of mnemonic others as being the reminders of the past, defines places as ‘mnemonic devices’. By utilizing the term *mnemonic places* Milligan (1998: 12) stated that she wanted to ‘emphasise the capacity of physical sites to organise the past experiences of an individual, as well as to transmit aspects of a shared or collective past’. The
current thesis will test and see if this is the same for the toponym: whether the experience is made possible not only by the physical site, but by the symbol, the name, of that site. Indeed, mnemonic devices are used with the intention of assisting the memory. Thus, whilst Milligan’s focus was on the physical location itself, this research will focus on the symbolic, or imagined, representation of that location, the toponym, as a mnemonic device for memories and associations. Importantly, as Milligan has noted, places transmit aspects of individual and collective pasts. As was seen in the letters to the editor, the gatekeepers of the “official” past were hesitant to acknowledge the Indigenous history. This research will explore further the possibility that as mnemonic devices, places and names are hegemonic devices which act as official symbols a particular culture wishes to promote, thus subjugating all other symbolic devices to an “other” status.

How meanings are received from the landscape is a wide area of research, pertaining to the studies of what Tuan (1974) termed *topophilia*, known contemporaneously by many different guises such as *sense of place, place attachment, place identity* and *place dependence*. The various topophilic theories will be utilised later in the thesis, mainly in chapters four, five and six, where the focus will be on how meaning is attributed to space to create places and how toponyms are involved in this process. The theories will be utilised as a framework for analysing the research data to explore the constitution of toponyms. For the purposes of this chapter the topophilic theories will be explored in order to provide a basic background to the focus of the doctoral research.

**Sense of Place**

From descriptions of how place is created from space or landscape, and how cultural aspects influence the meanings of this place, we come to a point in the literature where theories of *sense of place* play a pivotal role in the understanding of the term place. Subsumed within the category sense of place are theories of *place attachment, place identity* and *place interference*. These topics are important to the framework of the current study, as they allow an understanding of the roles of places in daily lives. It is hypothesised that everyone’s place experiences are represented, or in part possibly symbolized by, toponyms. There is a paucity of information on or theory of
sense of toponym, and as such a review of the literature on sense of place will allow for these place-based theories to be tested for their relevance to the cultural and social role of toponyms. Therefore, the question is asked in this research, can the theories of sense of place also be attributed to toponyms, or do toponyms require different theories? Yet, to reach the point of exploring the answers to that question an analysis of sense of place theories is first required.

Many geographical and psychological researchers have developed their own sense of place theories over the past forty years, and often there is criticism within the literature (Pretty et al., 2003: 274; Patterson and Williams, 2005) of the lack of a distinct theory being a hindrance to the progression of the study. Nonetheless, to create a structured basis for this research an attempt has been made to categorise the myriad of theories into distinct groupings. In effect this research designates the study of ‘sense of place’ as the overarching study of ‘place attachment’ and ‘place interference’, with place attachment consisting of ‘place identity’ and ‘place dependence’ (refer to Figure 2.1). This grouping has been determined based on recent research by various geographers (Shamai, 1991; Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001; Williams and Vaske, 2003; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006) and is explored in detail below.
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Figure 2.1: Stratification of Sense of Place within this research framework
Shamai (1991: 347) asserts that sense of place is an umbrella concept that includes other concepts such as place attachment, national identity and regional awareness. Hidalgo and Hernandez (2001: 274) assert that a general description of place attachment defines it as ‘an affective bond or link between people and specific places’. They posit that place attachment takes two forms: emotional and physical (Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001: 279). Jorgensen and Stedman (2006: 316) note that place attachment is a concept that can be included under the term ‘sense of place’, along with the constructs of place identity and place dependence. These two terms identity and dependence are similar Hidalgo and Hernandez’ social and physical, and considering recent literature by Williams and Vaske (2003) and since then others (Sharpe and Ewert, 2000; White et al., 2008) this thesis will defer to the terms identity and dependence. Williams and Vaske (2003) also classify place attachment under the term ‘sense of place’, but go further than Jorgensen and Stedman and state that identity and dependence are correlated concepts which are sub-constructs of place attachment. The specific theories for these concepts will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter. For the moment attention will be given to the definitions of sense of place.

Meinig (1979: 3) posits that there is a difference between the location of place, and the personal interactions within that place:

Place commonly refers to a definite area, a fixed location; events "take place" and we can be in a place. But place, too, has its ambiguities. There is, most basic of all, the difference between general recognition of certain areas as places, and a personal sense of place. The one is a public concept, the other private; we all live intimately with both. The first kind of place depends upon some public agreement as to name, location, and character; some legibility, some identity commonly understood. Our personal sense of place depends upon our own experiences and sensibilities. It is unique to each of us in its content and in the way it relates to general definitions of places.

Hence, as the first section of this chapter described the physicality of place and how it is definable from space, we now come to discuss the emotional concept of sense of place. Sense of place, as Meinig suggests, is created by us to make a place distinct or
memorable. Indeed, we do this on a practical plateau by remembering that the kitchen is where we cook food, or that the university is where we work. Emotionally people can look at their church or synagogue as a place for marriage, and the graveyard for death. Each of these places have a memory or feeling attached to them and this phenomenon is called ‘sense of place’.

A symbolic interactionist perspective on sense of place predicates that it is borne out of the cultural interactions that occur within a place (Eisenhauer et al., 2000: 422). According to Greider and Garkovich (1994: 6) ‘the natural environment is transformed into culturally meaningful phenomena and this is then viewed from the perspective of these cultural traditions’. Eisenhauer et al. noted that as the definition of place from space is culturally defined, then the shared meanings that form cultures provide the frameworks for constructing a sense of place. They then hypothesised that collective cultures which give landscape, place and space definitions to social groups have a strong influence on the formation of sense of place.

Furthering Eisenhauer et al.’s hypothesis on community as dictator of sense of place Pretty, Chipuer and Bramston (2003: 274), asserted that ‘one’s residential community can have personal meanings that are constructed such that the experiences and images of the place constitute a symbolic extension of the self’. Thus, the personal experiences of place as discovered through community interaction, are posited by some geographers to be a part of everyone’s identity.

**Place Attachment**

Place Attachment theories are not specifically located within one academic domain. Rather, the term and its respective subcategories have been researched and theorized not only by geographers but also sociologists, historians, ecologists, and environmental scientists to name but a few. As such, the theoretical definitions of the term ‘Place Attachment’ in the literature are as varied as the research projects which have been undertaken to gauge levels of place attachment evident in communities and individuals around the world. It would appear from the literature that research into the area of place attachment has been undertaken in its current context since the
1980s. Before this period, in an era referred to by human geographers as ‘modern’, research into place attachment was based at a psychological and geographical level.

The 1990s heralded an expansion in place attachment literature and theoretical debate. The main protagonist of this development was the 1992 publication of Irwin Altman and Setha Low’s edited book on theories of place attachment. Within this book each contributor wrote on a varied aspect of place attachment, of which this thesis will draw mainly from the articles of Brown and Perkins (1992), Hummon (1992), Altman and Irwin (1992b), Riley (1992) and Low (1992), due to the relevance of their theories to this research.

Brown and Perkins (1992: 284) theorised that place attachment provided a ‘framework for both individual and communal aspects of identity and have both stabilising and dynamic features’. Thus, for Brown and Perkins the notion of place attachment is intrinsically linked to identity. In contrast Altman and Low (1992b: 3) state that ‘place attachment is a complex and multifaceted concept worthy of systematic analysis’. Yet ultimately, their definition of place attachment is described as ‘the bonding of people to places’. The question remains whether a similar bonding between people and toponyms occurs. This will be explored in further detail in chapter four.

To date, the most succinct appraisal of the approaches that various disciplines have taken in studying the attachments people have for places is provided by Williams and Vaske (2003: 834) who stated that

Sociology…emphasises how the symbolic meanings of settings influence the social context of human interactions…Anthropology seeks to understand the cultural significance of places in day-to-day life…Human geography has explored the concept of “sense of place”…which is similar to the notion of “place attachment” as developed in environmental psychology.

In effect, Williams and Vaske have distinguished between place attachment and sense of place as two separate constructs. Indeed, attachment theories are grounded in psychological perspectives, whilst sense of place is more geographical philosophy.
Thus, the positing of sense of place as an overarching theme for place attachment would fit the description of place attachment being a psychological assessment of geographical ideas. Indeed, this thesis will concentrate most of its attention on the human geographers’ and psychologists theories of sense of place or place attachment, whilst occasionally considering sociological and anthropological perspectives. In this sense the terms sense of place and place attachment will be used almost interchangeably, the notable difference being whether the theory the discussion is based upon was originally grounded in a geographical or psychological ontology.

Within the literature there is ongoing debate about not only the location of sense of place and place attachment, but also where place identity and dependence fit. Some theorists note that place attachment, identity and dependence (along with sense of community) are separate but related concepts (Pretty et al., 2003) whilst others state that place dependence and identity are models of person-place relationships (Shumaker and Taylor, 1983). During the research phase of this program the most convincing theoretical assertion was promoted by Williams and Vaske (2003) who stated that place identity and dependence were constructs of place attachment. Their argument was most convincing because they were able to demonstrate from large-scale psychometric testing in the United States of America that the two concepts were correlated but separate and combined to provide people with a level of attachment to a place. Importantly they showed that sentiments of identity could simultaneously be strong while dependency sentiments were low to create an overall medium level of attachment to a place. Other theories of place attachment, identity and dependence have not, to my opinion, satisfactorily accounted for the ability of one construct to be strong and the other weak with an overall general attachment level.

Williams and Vaske (2003: 835) assert that there are two different forms of attachment to place. The first they label ‘place dependence’ and describe it as a functional attachment to place which ‘reflects the importance of a place in providing features and conditions that support specific goals or desired activities’ and also ‘suggests an ongoing relationship with a particular setting’. The second form of attachment to place Williams and Vaske label ‘place identity’, which they assert is an emotional attachment to place. Further, they posited that place identity ‘generally involves a psychological investment with the place that tends to develop over time’.
In addition to this is the theory that place identity does not have to result from particular experiences with the place, yet place identity ‘enhances self-esteem…increases feelings of belonging to one’s community…and is an important component of communications about environmental values and policies’. Thus, Williams and Vaske defined place attachment as occurring in two distinguishable forms, that of the emotional and that of the functional.

Williams and Vaske (2003: 837) quoted 15 other academic research articles related to place attachment, which he argued ‘confirm the existence of two dimensions of attachment (place dependence and place identity)’. Furthermore, Williams asserted that one of his previous studies affirmed that ‘attachment is strongly associated with familiarity and extent of contact with a place’. Whilst Williams and Vaske’s review of approaches to place attachment provide substance to the current research project, several questions remain unanswered. Firstly, it will need to be ascertained whether the protesters had an emotional attachment to the place, or a functional attachment. Did those who participated in the study have a functional attachment or an emotional attachment? Are they distinguishable? Or are they interconnected and dependent on each other for the creation of a sentiment of place attachment? It will be of interest to this research to determine whether toponymic attachment is defined by both toponymic identity and toponymic dependence, or only one of the constructs.

**Place Identity and Dependence**

For Sharpe and Ewert (2000: 218) the term place identity is a second component of place attachment, which is linked to ‘the emotional and symbolic nature of person-place relationships’. This theme of the emotional nature of person-place interactions is explored by Proshansky (1978; 1983) who determined that place identity is a subconcept of self-identity. Importantly he noted that:

place-identity is the source of meaning for a given setting by virtue of relevant cognitive clusters that indicate what should happen in it, what the setting is supposed to be like, and how the individual and others are supposed to behave in it. These groups of cognitions serve as an ever-present background system of meanings of spaces and places which enables the person not only to recognise a setting but to understand its
intended purposes and activities in relation to its design and other substantive properties. (Proshansky et al., 1983: 67)

Twigger-Ross and Uzzel (1996: 210) expanded upon Proshansky’s notion of place identity to claim that it is ‘not a separate part of identity concerned with place, but that all aspects of identity have place-related implications to a greater or lesser extent’. Thus, the literature allows that personal identity is intrinsically linked to place identity, as part of a larger emotional or cognitive experience of sense of place.

Similarly, Pretty et al. (2003) assert that ‘discursive evidence that a place has become integrated into one’s self-identity is reenacted in “I” and “me” statements regarding the place. Such personal positioning with respect to place can indicate that the person’s construction of self-identity has included that place’. This proposition will be tested in relation to toponymic identity through the review of the historical literature regarding the renaming debate. The letters to the editor written at the time will be analysed for the content, and the incidents of people utilizing the statements of “I” and “me” in relation to the toponym will be noted. In addition, these occasions of the use of I and Me will be related to the content of the letter, and a theory on whether the statements can indicate a sense of toponymic identity in the user will be tested.

John Donat (1967: 9) has posited that ‘places occur at all levels of identity, my place, your place, street, community, town, county, region, country and continent, but places never conform to tidy hierarchies of classification. They all overlap and interpenetrate one another and are wide open to a variety of interpretation’. Many theorists, such as Donat, warn that place as a concept is difficult to define, and as such we need to be aware of the multiplicity of types of places, in order to comprehend fully their impact on identity.

Eviatar Zerubavel (2003: 42) noted that places ‘play a major role in identity rhetoric’. Zerubavel proposed that events such as the hajj to Mecca, or romantic couples visiting the site of their first date are examples of pilgrimage which bring ‘mnemonic communities into closer “contact” with their collective past’. In addition, Zerubavel argued that the protection of old architecture, such as the Chechens defending old stone towers that helped them “connect” with their ancestors is a further example of
how place evokes identity and memories. Indeed, the contention of Zerubavel’s argument is that memories of place imbue a present-day identity on the users or inhabitants of the place.

Zerubavel’s theories on places acting as repositories for memory are similar to those espoused by Nora (1989). Nora’s research focuses on lieux de mémoire, or sites of memory, where memory is attached to prisons, castles, town squares which are physical sites, and celebrations, performances, and rituals that are non-physical sites. Memories of place are constructed, according to Nora, and the construction is undertaken by the dominant cultural group of the place in question. These constructions of place memories lend an historical identity to the place and to the communities in the place. This historical identity is open to deconstruction, as can be evidenced in the aftermath of war, when the victor ‘rewrites’ the history and changes the identity of the place. Hoelscher and Alderman have noted that the ‘memories projected onto…colonial spaces, and their frequent conflict with Indigenous understandings of the past, make them part of an ongoing legacy of conquest’ (2004: 351). In the instance of Australian place identity this theory of memories is powerful in explaining the divergent histories of place that exist within the landscape – histories of ‘settlement’ of ‘others’ of ‘ours’. This will be explored later in this chapter.

Lowenthal (1997) has written on the social construction of the past, and the impacts it has upon the identity of places and communities. Lowenthal reminds readers that ‘the remembered past is both individual and collective’ (1997: 194). Importantly for this current research project is the notion that ‘remembering the past is crucial for our sense of identity…to know what we are confirms that we are’ (Lowenthal, 1997: 197). Hoelscher and Alderman (2004: 347) have theorised that ‘together, memory and place conjoin to produce much of the context for modern identities’. The purpose of the current study is to examine whether the same notion of memory giving a context for identity applies to toponyms.

In addition to the theories on place identity, there are occasional and scant references to place dependence. As outlined earlier, Williams and Vaske regard place dependence as one of the two components of place attachment. In addition to Williams and Vaske, Milligan (1998: 9) also asserted that the meanings that people
attach to place ‘is linked to the idea of the site, represented by the site, and made possible by the site’, and these meanings are always ‘socially constructed based on current situations’. In essence, Milligan is referring to the dependence on place that people have in understanding the meaning of their past and their current environmental interactions. This can be exemplified through the notion that people rely and depend upon their homes as repositories of meaning and identity. When the home is affected in some way, through fire, flood or other destructive phenomena, the level of dependence a person feels towards the place of their home is exemplified. Without the walls, floors, adornments and features of the home, the person can feel lost, without an identity. People are attached to their homes because essentially they depend on them to be the locus of memories. This dependence on place is linked closely with theories on the effects of place interference, which will be the subject of discussion in chapter six. The literature on place dependence is limited though, and as such a more thorough discussion of the key concepts is provided in chapter six in concert with analysis of the research data.

**Toponyms and Places as Objects for Social & Cultural Research**

As discussed earlier in the literature review, Milligan (1998: 2) noted that ‘a place, or physical site given meaning through interaction, is a form of object’. Following from Frege’s and Russell’s theories (as discussed by Fitch, 1987) of proper names symbolizing objects, it would be fair to assimilate Milligan’s notion of places being objects with the theories of Frege and Russell. Hence, this study will rely upon the notion that toponyms are symbols (in one sense or another) of places, which are objects (both physical and emotional). The notion that place is defined from space is intriguing from the perspective of the contemporary Australian cultural landscape having only been in existence for approximately 200 years. Thus, approaching the subject matter of the Grampians (Gariwerd) cultural landscape as places which have been defined through a colonial process of delineating reservoirs of meaning from spaces of nothing will be of import in this study. Furthermore, this approach will allow me as the researcher to question how the places of Grampians (Gariwerd) have been both ‘mentally constructed’ and ‘physically constructed’, and how the toponyms symbolise the mental or imagined part of this construction. The opportunity exists to
test whether the theories on Australian place can incorporate Australian toponyms, or whether the toponyms need their own theoretical explanations.

Studies focusing on Australian place, sense of place, place attachment and place identity have only started to emerge with any real strength in the past decade by researchers such as Carter (1987; 1991; 1995), Strang (1997), Read (2000; 2003), Taylor (2002), McKenna (2002) and Pretty (2003). These authors have fused theories on nationalism, identity, place and sense of place in efforts to explain the Australian collective consciousness and its relationship with the landscape. This section will discuss the current literature on Australian sense of place, with additional reference given to theories on nationalism and identity. Further reflection on this literature is undertaken in greater detail in chapter four as supporting tools for analysis of the research data. The purpose of this section is to outline the current status of historical research in Australia which has focused on places and, to some extent, toponyms, to give a context for this doctoral program’s research focus.

Seddon (1997: 15) theorised that the words of the landscape carry ‘cultural baggage’ that may ‘imply values and endorse power relations’. This notion of power relations being born out through place names is no more evident than in Australia. Since the time of early European exploration of Australia the landscape has been mapped from a colonial cartographic perspective. European explorers, surveyors and ‘settlers’ brought with them to Australia a colonial understanding of land tenureship, and with this the existing Indigenous understandings of the landscape were overwritten (McKenna, 2002: Chpt.1). The landscape was almost a palimpsest, constantly being overwritten to suit the needs of the colonial government. In the act of mapping Australia the colonists began to take control of the landscape, and one of the most important and powerful ways they did this was to name places in the landscape (Day, 2005: Chpt. 3). Sometimes names were taken from those of the colonial officials, or borrowed from places ‘back home’. In other instances, where the landscape was deemed ‘too foreign’, Indigenous languages and their vocabularies were used to give expression to the places (Carter, 1995).

The colonial acts of mapping and naming the Australian landscape from 1788 onwards have lead to a historical and contemporary colonially-tainted sense of place
for non-Indigenous and some Indigenous Australians. This ‘western’ sense of place and its impact upon the national psyche or collective consciousness of Australians has been discussed most poignantly by Read (2000) and McKenna (2002). McKenna (2002: 63) argued that

Once the colonies federated on 1 January 1901 and the framework for the writing of national history was in place, the desire to forget the violence of the frontier, or to at least dismiss it as an inevitable by-product of a far greater good, became stronger… the history of the settlers’ forgetting of Aboriginal Australia was far more complex and subtle than the locking of a cupboard or the obscuring of a window. There was never one point in time when it clearly began, never one moment when it came to an abrupt end.

This statement reaches into notions of Australian national identity as one which predominantly ignores an Aboriginal past. Trees (1991: 67) proposed that ‘official history has served to marginalize “Aboriginal” knowledges, customs and beliefs and further ensures a privileged place for “white” knowledges, customs and beliefs as the foundation of Australian society’.

Similar sentiments arose during the Grampians (Gariwerd) debate in the 1990s, where public opinion intimated that the reinstatement of Indigenous names was unnecessary because ‘none of them live here anymore’. This sentiment was borne out through the notion that Indigenous history ‘was over’. This notion is explained to exist because ‘history, specifically official Australian history, is a fiction that both creates and substantiates a political reality that is itself fictitious’ (Trees, 1991: 66). Penrose and Jackson have argued that ‘the concepts of “race” and nation are deeply entrenched ways of thinking about the world’ (1994: 204) and assert that whilst these ways of thinking are promoted as being ‘natural’, they are learnt behaviours. Most pertinently, Penrose and Jackson distinguished between the terms ‘race’ and ‘nationality’ by stating that:

Whereas “race” is something that members of dominant groups generally use to distinguish others from themselves, nation tends to be used to distinguish themselves from others. Whereas those in power regard nationhood as something they possess but which they deny others, “race” is regarded as something that applies to others but not to
themselves. In each case, it is the dominant group that sets up the 
oppositions, regarding itself as “normal” and treating subordinate 
groups as different or “other”.

Penrose and Jackson noted that ‘place contextualizes the construction of “race” and 
nation, generating geographically specific ideologies of racism and nationalism. As 
discussed earlier, culture influences the creation of meanings attributed to, and 
perceptions of, place. One of the main purposes of the current research is to explore 
the geographically specific ideologies of racism and nationalism in the Grampians 
(Gariwerd) area, and whether these can be attributed to the place or the toponym or 
both. An exploration of this will further our understandings of cultural toponymy. 
Indeed, Penrose and Jackson (1994: 203) call for this type of research to be 
undertaken for places: ‘part of our research agenda, therefore, must be to understand 
how specific places are incorporated into specific constructions of “race” and nation 
and their associated assumptions about the nature and function of space’, and I see no 
reason why this assertion is not equally relevant for this study into toponymy.

Theories of the constitution of nationalism abound (Fishman, 1972; Rushdie, 1982; 
Schafer, 1984; Hobsbawm, 1990; Salecl, 1993; Johnson, 1995; Patton and Austin-
Broos, 1997), and an example of the plethora of theories is best provided by Schafer 
who stated that ‘having defined nationalism to no-one’s complete satisfaction 
(including my own), I may say that the debates have just begun- for full agreement on 
any significant concept, value, or interpretation is rare’ (1984: 3). Schafer does give a 
definition of nationalism as being ‘a sentiment (belief) unifying a group of people who 
have a real or imagined (or believed in) common historical experience, and a common 
aspiration to live together in a separate group in the future, and a sentiment dividing 
them from other like groups (primarily from other nations)’. Schafer goes to great 
lengths to insist that nationalism is hard to define because each person on the planet 
has their own individuality, which causes their personality to differ slightly from any 
other person of the same ‘nationality’. Thus, how to pinpoint the exact nature of what 
is ‘national’ can be difficult. For example, what tenets of the term ‘Australian’ were 
called upon in the name restoration debate to define ‘normal’ attitudes? This will 
require exploration in chapter five.
Essentially, the first theories on the historical development of Australian place or places from a geographical and cultural perspective were published in 1987 by Carter in *The Road to Botany Bay*. The focal point of Carter’s research was the creation of an ‘Australia’ by the early European explorers. Carter’s writing on spatial-relations asserted that ‘the early travelers [colonial explorers]…invented places, rather than found them’ (1987: 51). This “invention” of colonial places required colonists to apply toponyms to the landscape, so that maps could be produced proclaiming the lands as being owned by the English. Carter argued that this process of utilizing the landscape like a palimpsest created an Australian identity based on the subordination of Indigenous landscape heritages to those of colonial landscape control.

Since the publication of Carter’s work other Australian and International researchers have sought to expand the theoretical and analytical lens to other aspects of the Australian landscape. Read’s text *Belonging: Australians, Place and Aboriginal Ownership* (2000) discusses the ideology of place in Australia, and what place means to different Australians. Read noted in his introduction that he was inspired to write the book after a discussion with a fellow academic, in which he realized that one place could have many meanings. The specific example that Read gave of this realization is too long to quote here, but can be briefly summarized as a meeting with Denis Foley, an academic at Queensland’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Unit. During this meeting Read came to realize that Foley had been brought up in the same area as Read, yet had a different memory of it completely. In essence, Foley’s memory of the place was from an Indigenous perspective, which Read had never perceived before; indeed, had never acknowledged as existing in that place before. Read began to realize that the Australian landscape was a treasury of multiple interactions, and different memories and associations, which could be uncovered through research.

Read’s work highlights an important and fundamental question for this research program in relation to the meaning of place. In Australia, a place of official multiculturalism, a place with Indigenous and European heritages, how is Indigenous heritage perceived and promoted in the study area? In a more direct manner, Read’s work asks us to investigate how many different stories of place exist in the landscape. Read proposed that non-Indigenous Australians have a collective consciousness about
the past which does not incorporate Indigenous understandings of the landscape. Read (2000: 16) insisted that ‘our collective consciousness should include all the past; if Gallipoli is “ours”, so should be the relations with Indigenous people’. This in itself will be an important aspect of the current research project, in that the toponymic identity and dependence of people from different genders, classes, races and historical backgrounds will be researched in the case study to ascertain to what degree they understand or recognise Indigenous/Non-Indigenous landscapes in their area. Exploring the collective group’s understanding of the ‘shared’ landscape will aid in the development of a theory on how name restoration/dual-naming could be used to its full potential.

Taylor’s work on the history of Kangaroo Island (2002) is an account of the multiple landscape histories that exist on this small island off the South Australian coast line. Taylor’s methodologies were similar to those employed by Read, and her final narration involves weaving the stories of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people who have lived on Kangaroo Island into one coherent history of place. Her book exemplifies the ways in which one place may have multiple associations and histories, and this approach will need to be adopted by this current research project, in order to lend it a coherent structure.

As has been shown, there has been particular attention paid in the literature to the historical development of places in Australia, and the power struggles that these developments have caused. The concept of power struggles and claims for sovereignty of place attachments will be explored in detail in chapters four and five of this thesis. Before these chapters can commence though, it is important to provide a brief discussion on one final theoretical concept: interference. This concept is important to the research program because it was only through the Victorian Government announcing that they planned to change the names in the study area that data was available for this research program because people publicly voiced their sentiments on why they supported the concept of Indigenous or non-Indigenous names being utilised for the Grampians (Gariwerd) region.
Interference
In a recent article for the newsletter of the medical and health services of Australia, Higginbotham and Freeman (2003: 9) proposed that the term ‘solastalgia’ be applied to the feelings of individual and community pain associated with changes to place:

it has its origins in *solacium* = solace and *algos* = pain, and connects a yearning for that which comforts (gives solace), relieves or alleviates distress or a sense of desolation about the state of one’s home territory...the diagnosis of solastalgia is based on the recognition of the distress within an individual or a community about the loss...of a sense of control of its destiny.

Hence, the term can be applied to any instance where places are changing and the communities are reacting in a negative way to this change. This term might also be applied to the negative feelings associated with toponymic change, as the term itself does not indicate that it only applies to the physical location of the place, and thus might be extrapolated to include toponymic interference.

Relph (1976: 31) argued that continuity of place ‘serves to reinforce a sense of association and attachment to those places’. Further to this, Riley (1992: 27) asserted that ‘the slowness of change and the regional distinctiveness of a folk landscape could offer a sense of security, permanence in times of change, even the ability for a physical return. That is less likely in a popular landscape, with its rapid changes over time’. Thus, attachments are enhanced in places that experience slow changes, or none at all. Importantly, Zerubavel (2003: 41) posited that constancy of place is a formidable basis for establishing a strong sense of sameness...as a result [places] constitute a reliable locus of memories and often serve as a major foci of personal as well as group nostalgia. In providing us with some sense of permanence, they help promote the highly reassuring conservative illusion that nothing fundamental has really changed.

To understand how feelings of angst and pain can be experienced by people whose place, and hence sense of place, is being interfered with, Proshansky *et al.* (1983: 66) noted that:
One dimension of the person's experience of environmental stability lies in the affirmation of the belief that the properties of his or her day-to-day physical world are unchanging. The individual's recognition of these properties at any given moment in a given situation serves to confirm their continuity from the past, and in turn this perceived continuity portends that they will occur again in the future. The perceived stability of place and space that emerges from such recognitions correspondingly validates the individual's belief in his or her own continuity over time. Since the individual's place-identity mirrors a physical world, the continuing recognition of that world over time gives credence to and support for his or her self-identity.

The question remains, can this notion of self-identity being supported through a constancy of place be extrapolated to incorporate toponymic-attachment theories? Of note in the current literature is the theory that 'it is only when one's sense of place is threatened that he or she becomes aware of it' (Proshansky et al., 1983: 63). Essentially, could the protests in the case study have arisen because the constancy of the toponyms were being interrupted, and this interference was causing the stability of the identity of the local population to be disrupted? This theory will be tested by focusing on all aspects of identity which manifest themselves in the historical records and oral history interviews and attempting to relate them to toponymic interference. The literature on place interference will be referred to in more detail throughout this thesis, especially in sections where contemplation is given to the reasons underpinning people’s expressions of support or opposition to the name restoration proposal.

**Conclusions**

As seen in Figure 2.2, the current literature on place and toponyms espouses the notion that when space is given meaning through interaction, place is created and a toponym is utilized to represent this place. One of the questions this research will ask is whether this is a robust model of toponymic development. Indeed, the question will be asked as to whether this model is only apt in describing the actual process of
creating a place and toponym and does not adequately continue to describe the situation after the place is created.

Figure 2.2: Current literature’s theoretical description of the role of toponyms in the creation of place from space

Figure 2.3 shows one of the models that will be tested during this research. The hypothesis is that whereas at the inception of a place the toponym represents the meaning of the creation of the place, and also the meaning that the namer gave to it, with the passing of time new meanings are attached to the place and toponym, which leads to the toponym representing the place, but also representing a different meaning. It is hypothesised that this model represents the development of toponymic attachment, and describes how attempts to change a toponym change both historical and community identification in addition to promotional and locational dependency, as distinct from place histories and place locations. In essence, place-based histories of landscape will always exist within culturally-defined boundaries, even if the toponym changes. But, it is hypothesised that historical identification and dependencies change when the toponym changes.

It has been asserted by Davis (2005: 610) that places are ‘fluid, permeable, and affected by the ways in which they are imagined’. I would like to take this current trend for geographers to analyse places as fluid conceptualisations or “discursive-material formations” and insert the notion that toponyms are the symbols through which these formations are mediated. I believe that where geographers assert that places are imagined and interacted with on a ‘fluid basis’, I would argue that toponyms are the mechanism through which these imagined interactions occur when the physical place is not apparent.
As has been discussed in this chapter, toponyms are names for places, and as a subject of research the literature to date has focused on either providing gazetteer-like lists of toponyms with their etymological meanings or discussion of the types of toponyms which exist, such as associative or commemorative. Recent research has begun to investigate the import of historical acts of toponymy, such as those undertaken by colonial explorers in Australia, or the contemporary issues involved in restoring...
Indigenous or non-colonial names for post-colonial places. This doctoral research thesis positions itself amongst the contemporary research into toponymy, by exploring not only the historical implications of colonial acts of toponymy in the study area, but also the contemporary rationales for why people support or oppose name restoration programs. In addition, where other studies have examined these issues on a thematic basis, or limited their focus to exploring only the political motivations and outcomes, this research aims to develop theories to explain the underlying reasons for why people utilise and rely upon toponyms in their daily lives.

The theories of toponymy will be developed based on the literature reviewed in this chapter. Essentially, as explained previously, as toponyms are names for places, and as there is a wide variety of literature on places and the attachments people form with them, this research program relies on utilising the theories on place attachment, identity and dependence to explore the sentiments expressed by people involved in the name restoration debate in the study area. This exploration will aim to uncover whether in the same way that theorists posit that people can become attached to places, it is possible to state that people also become attached to toponyms.

This exploration will be facilitated through the use of data collected during the doctoral research program. Three types of data were collected, namely printed historical data collected from newspapers published at the time of the original name restoration debate in 1989/1990; qualitative and quantitative data provided by participants in September and October 2006; and information gathered from participants during oral history interviews in 2006 and 2007. The methods employed in the collection of these data sources will now be discussed in chapter three.
Framework and Methodologies

“I’m from Ireland, and my parents wanted to give me an ‘exotic’ name, so they called me ‘Ardal’ after a place in Norway. Having never been to Ardal they didn’t know it was an industrial centre in Norway renowned for its aluminium smelters and zinc processing plants...what sort of exotic identity did they think they were giving me?? I guess that’s why they called my brother ‘Hiroshima’ and my sister ‘Chernobyl’…(sic)”

Introduction

Comprehensive mapping of the symbolic, cultural and social meanings of place names requires the acquisition of personal and community knowledge of the Grampians (Gariwerd) area names. In an effort to gain these understandings it was understood that interaction would need to occur between myself, as the researcher, interested parties of the study area and others who were involved in the name restoration proposal at the time. The people who were involved in the name restoration proposal were considered to be the most pertinent group to participate in the study, because attachments to places (and as it is hypothesised toponyms) are constructed unconsciously, and according to Hidalgo and Hernandez (2001: 276) ‘this only manifests at a conscious level when there is a break or distancing from the place of attachment’. Through this reasoning of Hidalgo and Hernandez (the concept has also been discussed by Proshansky et al., 1983; Brown and Perkins, 1992), it was thought to be imperative to contact people who had been involved in some capacity in the original debate, as they were more likely to have consciously thought about their attachments to the places and toponyms during the name restoration proposal period and in the fifteen intervening years and therefore were possibly able to provide detailed insights into the roles of places and toponyms in society.

The overarching framework for the doctoral program was informed through a mixed-methodologies, but predominantly qualitative, research approach. This framework relied more on analysing and being informed by data from individual participants, than data being collated and analysed as figures representing a collective of community sentiment. The framework allowed for multiple data collection tools and analysis methods to be utilised during the doctoral research program, including the use of archival research, questionnaires, oral history interviews, mental maps and a psychometric scale. Each of these data collection tools will be discussed in this chapter in regards to the approaches that were taken in utilising them for the purposes of the doctoral research program. Firstly though attention will be given to the research design and participant identification methods employed and then detailed discussion will be provided on the framework of the research before this chapter moves into an exploration of the research tools.
Research Design & Participant Identification

In order to locate those involved in the debate, the starting point for the research was to gain an understanding of the events that took place during the name restoration program in 1989/1990. Discussions with my supervisor indicated that many letters to the editor had been written at the time and that various government reports were commissioned and issued. Thus, it was thought that locating and analysing the letters to the editor and government department reports would provide a good basis upon which to set the research framework and through which to identify participants in the research program.

To begin the research I undertook a comprehensive archival search for newspaper reports and Letters to the Editor published in 1989/1990 in rural and metropolitan newspapers relevant to the study area. The regional newspapers included (but were not limited to) the Ararat Advertiser, Ballarat Courier, Colac Herald, Hamilton Spectator, Horsham Mail Times, Portland Observer, Warrnambool Standard, Stawell Times-News, Warracknabeal Herald and Wimmera-Mail Times. Metropolitan newspapers which circulated across Melbourne and the state of Victoria were the Sun, Herald and The Age. My research supervisor was also in possession of five archived folders with newspaper and letter clippings from the above newspaper sources, and some more local newspapers such as the Avoca & District News, Kowree Advocate and Shepparton News.

In the process of collecting these letters and newspaper articles, I created a database in the Endnote computer referencing system which allowed me to enter the reference details of the text, along with relevant quotes assigned to each individual reference entry. Each of these entries was then coded according to the theme(s) it addressed, such as ‘support’, ‘against’, ‘history’, ‘tourism’, ‘Indigenous’, and in most instances multiple codes were applied to each entry. The coding developed over time, and when a new code was implemented which would have relevance to previously coded entries, I would reanalyse the existing entries and add the new codes if relevant. This coding then allowed me to easily extract relevant references for each type of analytical query made during the research program.
In addition to the Endnote program coding, I created an Excel spreadsheet which contained the names and locations of the letter writers along with a summary of the text they had expressed. It was thought that this database would provide an invaluable resource with which to contact people to undertake more in-depth analysis. In total 141 letters and 94 newspaper reports or editorials were collated in the database. Once the main arguments outlined in the letters and reports had been compiled I was able to highlight and identify preliminary factors thought to be involved in the construction of sense of toponym and toponymic attachment. More information on the framework for analysis of the letter data can be found in the section on ‘Discourse Analysis’ included in this chapter.

Whilst the letters were an invaluable resource in developing an understanding of the issues involved in the renaming debate, because they were written with the express purpose of highlighting specific concerns and issues, they did not provide in-depth information about the writers’ histories or associations with the area. Based on contemporary theories concerning sense of place, it has been shown that personal histories and associations with places affect a person’s sense of place (Shamai, 1991; Cuba and Hummon, 1993; Feld and Basso, 1996; Smith, 1996; Hay, 1998; Dewsbury, 2003; Manzo, 2003). For this reason, it was thought that it would be necessary to undertake further research into the community attitudes towards the renaming debate, and that this research should involve the solicitation of personal background or historical information from questionnaires and oral-history interviews. Thus, questionnaires were developed which asked for demographic data as well as participant attitudes and involvements in the original renaming debate and their contemporary use of, and attitudes towards, the study area toponyms. The development of the questionnaires is discussed in the ‘Questionnaires’ section of this chapter.

Essentially, all letter writers and people mentioned in the newspaper reports were identified in the newspapers by their name (in some instances the full first and surnames, in others only an initial and surname) and locality of origin. In total 159 people were identified in the letters and reports and using their surnames I was able to utilise the online Whitepages telephone directory to locate mailing addresses for 114
people. Cover letters and questionnaires were sent to these people in October 2006 and 37 questionnaires were returned (which represents a 32.5% return rate, and when it is considered that 23 letters were returned due to incorrect participant address identification, the return rate can be considered to be 40.65%). The questionnaire, amongst other items, asked participants to nominate others who they believed would be interested in participating in the research program. A total of 33 nominations were received through this method, questionnaires were sent to them and 21 were returned (which represents a return rate of 63.5%). The cover letters are provided in Appendix C and set out the purposes of the research program, and a copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix D (ethics approval was provided and a copy of the approval letter and final report is provided in Appendix E).

Two weeks after each questionnaire was sent out a postcard was sent to recipients to remind them to return their completed questionnaire. The rationale for the use of this postcard is outlined in the ‘Questionnaire’ section of this chapter. Similarly, the questionnaire was developed in lines with the guidelines set by Don Dillman’s *Total Design Method* (1978) and details of its construction and format are also discussed in the ‘Questionnaire’ section of this chapter.

It was hypothesised that by targeting people who had written letters to the editor or been quoted in newspaper reports that a greater response rate would be achieved than by simply sending the questionnaire out to anonymous members of the community who might have had no interest in the debate. It was hypothesised that people who had participated in the original name restoration proposal debate would have formed strong opinions on the issue and would be more willing to contribute their knowledge to the doctoral research. In addition to sending the questionnaires to letter writers, people who had been key stakeholders in the debate, such as politicians and community group lobbyists were contacted and asked if they would like to participate in an interview. Others who completed the questionnaire were also given the option of participating in an oral history interview. Some 29 questionnaire participants nominated themselves, and a further 16 people were contacted directly because they were politicians or key stakeholders in the name restoration proposal. In total 45 people were interviewed for this research program between October and November 2006.
The interviews involved asking the participants open-ended questions, which related to their sense of place and toponym. A copy of the questions is provided in Appendix F and discussion of the rationale for the questions and interview format can be found in this chapter’s section on ‘Oral History’.

In summation, to obtain the information for this doctoral research program, data were sought from published letters to the editor and newspaper articles from 1989 and 1990; a questionnaire was formulated and sent to people who had written letters or been mentioned in newspaper reports (and was also sent in a snowball style to people suggested by those who had received the questionnaire); and oral-history interviews were conducted with letter writers and key stakeholders in the original debate. The various methodologies employed in these data collection methods are outlined in the following sections, but first a discussion of the research framework is provided.

Framework
As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the doctoral research program has been predominantly framed by qualitative research methods to explore the meanings of toponyms in relation to existing theories on place. In a recent article focused on categorising the multiple theories on place that have developed since the 1960s, Patterson and Williams (2005: 361) noted that research into places allows for an exploration of ‘the relationship between humans and the environment’. Patterson and William’s article also identifies the same issues I encountered when beginning this research project: the fact that there is ‘little agreement regarding the name of the underlying concept [of place], its definition, or what methodological approach is best suited to its study’. As discussed in chapter two, the theory of place has been utilised by geographers, sociologists, linguists, anthropologists and economists and with each academic discipline discussing the concept of place, there has been an equal explosion in the definitions of what place is, and how it should be studied. Patterson and Williams suggest that instead of confining place research to one epistemology, it is more appropriate ‘to view place as a domain of research informed by multiple research traditions’ (2005: 362). In an effort to categorise these research traditions, Patterson and Williams (2005: 365) suggested the schemata which can be found in
Figure 3.1 and which they state ‘provides a useful structure for organising a discussion of a diverse array of research programs’.

Essentially, Patterson and Williams (2005: 365) argue that there should never be an argument for academics adopting one theory on place, as the inter-disciplinary nature of place research means that there is no one ‘single research tradition from which a single overarching theory of place could and should emerge’. I would agree that there should never be one theory of place, given the wide range of literature which was required to inform this doctoral research program. Thus, the findings of this research are positioned to provide a contribution to knowledge within multiple, but not all, academic domains.

This doctoral research utilises a mixed methodology approach which at its core is fundamentally a qualitative approach with occasional uses of quantitative methods. Qualitative research is defined as a methodology which ‘explores the feelings, understandings and knowledges of others through interviews, discussions or participant observation’ (Limb and Dwyer, 2001: 1). To give added depth to the research findings, basic quantitative methods of research are also utilised. The data have been gathered qualitatively through archival research (to discover the written official histories of the study area and the debates that occurred due to the name restoration proposals) and participant interviews which employed both qualitative and quantitative methods (during which oral history, mental mapping and toponymic attachment scale techniques were used). In essence, this research is informed by theories from social psychology, environmental psychology and tourism studies and therefore fits the model of meaning based research which is, according to Patterson and Williams’ model, predominantly located in studies of a socio-cultural perspective. As can be seen in Figure 3.1, Patterson and Williams define this theoretical perspective in place studies as being underlined by a study of meaning in a world with multiple realities.

††Toponymic attachment psychometrical evaluation scale data were collected but eventually not included in this thesis due to various factors, which are outlined in detail in the ‘Psychometric Evaluation Scale’ section of this chapter.
Figure 3.1 A partial map of research programs on place according to research traditions (Patterson and Williams, 2005: 366)
Hubbard, Kitchin and Valentine (2004), in their discussion of the development of theories on space and place, have noted that theorists such as Relph and Tuan, who have taken a phenomenological approach to human geography, have reminded ‘geographers that people do not live in a framework of geometric relationships but a world of meaning’. (2004: 5) Relph and Tuan’s work has ‘conceptualized place as subjectively defined’ and ‘what constituted a place was seen to be largely individualistic, although attachments and meanings were often shared’ (Hubbard et al., 2004: 5). This approach provides a holistic research framework to gain an understanding of the multiple realities that exist for people and communities in their creation of, and interaction with, place. As such, it can be stated that this doctoral research program has been framed by both socio-cultural and phenomenological ontologies. In this thesis, as will be shown in chapters four, five, six and seven, I will be utilising data collected from individual participants, comparing the information to other participant data and then making statements and conclusions at a social-group level.

Farber posited that ‘since concrete, factual propositions belong to the spatial sciences, the goal as expressed in phenomenology is the…foundation and clarification of the essential structures which underlie knowledge and (known or experienced) reality’ (1943: 572). The exploration in this doctoral thesis of participants’ understanding of their places and toponyms is in essence an attempt to identify the structures of toponyms and their roles in society. The method of interpretive geography involves searching for and accepting the ‘definitions and meanings of the social worlds as given – it reconstructs reality by revealing the taken-for-granted assumptions of individuals and groups in space’ (Eyles, 1988: 2). It is predominantly a hermeneutic phenomenological perspective, in that it is a ‘problematising of the everyday, taken-for-granted world’ and it ‘is concerned with the way in which objects are constituted; that is, with the conditions or horizon of meaning within which objects have the meaning they have for us (be we concerned with physical things or non-physical objects such as consciousness, society, place or power)’ (Pickles, 1988: 237-8). The concepts of power and place are discussed in detail in chapter five and the exploration of toponymic meaning and representation as discussed in chapter six is the basis of this thesis. Further to this, utilizing a phenomenological perspective can allow a researcher to see how cultural symbols let ‘us know our past’, and hence allow us to
'plan our future’ (Crotty, 1998: 81). As the focus of this research is toponyms, which are defined as cultural symbols (Levi-Strauss, 1962), utilizing a phenomenological approach affords me as the researcher to uncover the multiple realities and meanings of the toponyms themselves and to lay bare the histories of the study area and provide suggestions for understanding the social and cultural use of toponyms in the future.

The use of mixed-methodologies is deemed a necessary aspect of interpretive geography, as ‘quantitative dimensions obtained from survey or sociometric analysis may be useful correctives to ideas gained from conversations in field research’ (Eyles, 1988: 5). Mixed methodologies involve utilizing both quantitative and qualitative research methods, which at one stage this research undertook. Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie (1998: 1) use the term ‘mixed model studies’ to define research which draws on both positivistic and constructivist methods, and they argue that this approach is a pragmatic paradigm. As noted previously, this mixed-methods approach was thought to allow a breadth of understanding in relation to place and toponymic attachment that would not be available by utilising a single approach. This approach would appear to be supported by the research of Patterson and Williams (2005), which as discussed earlier, essentially posits that multiple research methods are required to explore the multiple meanings of, and theories for, place.

As mentioned previously, this doctoral program has been underpinned by research of a predominantly qualitative nature. Thus, it is essential that I now outline what qualitative research is and what form of this framework has been adopted most frequently in this thesis. Qualitative research, according to Ezzy (2002: xii), involves ‘working out how the things that people do make sense from their perspective’. Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005: 2) assert that qualitative research ‘draws on a variety of theoretical perspectives…and techniques such as interviewing, narrative analysis….it essentially aims to capture lived experiences of the social world and the meanings people give these experiences from their own perspectives’.

Within the concept of qualitative research design, this doctoral program relied heavily on grounded theory methodology, which Strauss and Corbin (1997: vii) assert is ‘among the most influential and widely used models of carrying out qualitative research when generating theory is the researcher’s principle aim’. Liamputtong and
Ezzy (2005: 265) posit that grounded theory ‘argues that theory can be built up through careful observation of the social world’ and essentially involves a method of research which identifies ‘theory, concepts, categories and themes…while the research is being conducted’. As noted in chapter one, the key questions for this thesis were developed in an evolving manner, first being drafted to assist in locating literature and initial research data and then being redrafted and refined according to the findings of the initial literature and research data analysis, and so on.

Researchers utilising the grounded theory method are discouraged from starting their investigations with existing theories, except in cases where the ‘purpose is to open these up and to find new meanings in them’ (Strauss and Corbin, 1990: 50). As Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005: 266) note, the use of existing theories in grounded-theory research, should be to support the ‘building up of observations and insights from concrete empirical research’ rather than the generation of theories from ‘logical argument from general laws’. This research program utilised pre-existing theories from which to develop new insights and meanings for the field of toponymy.

The essence of grounded-theory research is that it ‘occurs in an ongoing dialogue between pre-existing theory and new insights generated as a consequence of empirical observation’ (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005: 266). In utilising a grounded-theory methodology for this doctoral research program, the essential structure of the enquiry was constantly modified based on the observations made from the literature and research data. As noted in chapter one, the original research questions for this thesis were provided up-front as the result of the project initially being funded through an Australian Research Council (ARC) grant, supported by funding from the Office of the Surveyor-General Victoria. The original grant application set-out key questions and areas of literature to be reviewed (refer to Appendix A for copy of ARC application), which were used as a starting point for the research program. As my review of the literature expanded, new research questions developed and insight was gained into how research data might be collected to find answers to those questions. As the data began to be collected new questions also emerged, and with them new areas of literature needed to be reviewed, which led to more research questions and inevitably the need for more research data to resolve the queries. It was only at the completion point of the data collection period that the key themes were able to be
identified and with them the key questions were solidified to assist in making further enquiries into the data. Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005: 267) assert that the essential core of grounded-theory ‘is the process of coding, sorting and organising data’ and that ‘data analysis leading to theory formulation is an explicit process’. Thus, the mechanisms through which the key questions, data collection methods, data analysis tools and theories were developed were part of a well-structured and well-established academic qualitative methodology of grounded-theory.

The purpose of utilising grounded-theory was to enable the research questions to be informed by the information presented from the research data. Essentially, as a researcher I wanted to learn from the doctoral program what information was out there in the population and develop a method through which to analyse it and make sense of it. As such, the research program questions, methodology and investigations developed as my learning increased. For this reason I have chosen to utilise the first-person pronoun of ‘I’ as a writing tool to reflect the personal nature of the research. As Ezzy (2002: 150) asserts, ‘however much authors have tried to suppress it, the self is always an abiding influence in and on our writing’. Thus, whilst the use of first-person narrative for a doctoral thesis might be considered by some to be unconventional, there is growing acceptance of this writing style, as noted by Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005: 309) who assert that within qualitative research ‘the language is not as objective or formal as quantitative papers. A writer usually uses the first person (I)’. For those who might question the veracity of a report written in the first-person narrative style Ezzy (2002: 154) posits that ‘writing the self into research reports enhances the authenticity of the research’. Thus, the use of ‘I’ to describe my role as researcher, interviewer and theorist for this doctoral research program is justifiably applied throughout this thesis. At the conclusion of the thesis a brief analysis of the learning process throughout the doctoral program will also be provided to allow for reflection on my role as a researcher.

In addition to the self-reflection at the conclusion of the thesis, it will be important to note whether the use of the grounded-theory methodology has been useful in providing suitable analysis of the key issues at play in the name restoration program of the case study. Charmaz (2006: 182) asserts that there are four criteria through which a study based on grounded-theory should be assessed: credibility, originality,
resonance and usefulness. In regards to credibility, Charmaz asserts that the manner for assessing credibility comes down to assessing whether strong links have been provided between the research data, the argument and the analysis. For originality, Charmaz notes that this can be assessed by ascertaining whether current ideas, concepts and practices have been challenged, refined or extended. To assess resonance, Charamaz posits that the findings should be able to offer participants and their communities deeper insights into their lives and worlds. For usefulness, Charmaz argues that a grounded-theory project should make a contribution to knowledge and be a catalyst for future research. Thus, chapter eight, the concluding chapter of this thesis, will provide an assessment of the doctoral research program based on these four categories to allow a complete understanding of its outcomes.

Now that the mixed-method, predominantly qualitative methodology, framework has been defined as having a basis in socio-cultural and phenomenological studies, it is important to outline the various methods and tools utilised in gathering and analysing the research data. This will be the focus of the remainder of the chapter, beginning with discussion of discourse analysis and moving into explorations of the questionnaire, oral history, mental mapping and psychometric testing.

**Methodologies**

**Discourse analysis**

The preliminary source for information regarding the community reaction to the government’s 1989 proposal to restore Indigenous toponyms in the study area were the letters and reports written in rural and metropolitan Victorian newspapers. These letters were written by people from a cross section of the Victorian community, from politicians to farmers, Scottish clans-people to Indigenous leaders, the elderly and the young, both men and women seemed to have an opinion they wanted to share with the rest of the community about what they perceived the restoration proposal to mean. It is in this observable desire for people to express their opinions in a written form that an avenue for research analysis was found.
As can be seen in Table 3.1 a wide variety of newspapers (n= 37) were searched for data relating to the case study. The data search was not exhaustive, and it can be assumed that in some instances, especially smaller local newspapers which could not be searched archivally but whose articles were provided from my principal supervisor’s files, that other reports and letters would have been printed at the time of the name restoration proposal. In total 235 letters (n=141), reports and editorials (n=94) were utilised for this doctoral research program. As discussed previously in this chapter, the data was collated into an Endnote file to allow for easy sorting and sampling of the information.

This section will briefly outline the major theories on discourse analysis, in an effort to outline the framework which underpinned the analysis and broad categorisations of the information contained in the letters, editorials and reports. The method of discourse analysis also applied to the process undertaken in the later stages of the research program when the oral history interviews were being conducted, transcribed and analysed. Yet, for the interviews the methods of oral history were also applied, and therefore discussion of the participants and the tools utilised for the interviews are contained later in the ‘Oral History’ section of this chapter.

Discourse analysis is a methodological tool utilised predominantly by researchers in the fields of sociology, psychology and linguistics (Schriiffin et al., 2007). Wooffitt (2005: 14) explains that discourse analysis was developed by sociologists in the 1970s as a methodology which allowed them to ‘explore the social dimensions which underpinned accepted or true scientific knowledge’. The general description of discourse analysis as a process is that it is a ‘rejection of the realist notion that language is simply a neutral means of reflecting or describing the world, and a conviction in the central importance of discourse in constructing social life’ (Liamputtong and Ezzy, 2005: 261). Thus, it is a process which recognises the important role that language plays in developing and communicating ideas and sentiments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number of Letters</th>
<th>Number of Reports or Editorials</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Number of Letters</th>
<th>Number of Reports or Editorials</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Age</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>North-Central News</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat Advertiser</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Northern Times Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoca &amp; District News</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portland Observer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ballarat Courier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shepparton News</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boort Standard and Quambatook Times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Gippsland Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Colac Herald</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Standard Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon-Ringwood Mail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stawell Times-News</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Birchip Times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Sun Observer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Express</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Sunday Age Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Geelong</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Sunday Sun Observer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunraysia Daily Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Spectator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Times Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Herald</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Times-Spectator Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald-Sun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warracknabeal Observer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Mail-Times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warragul Gazette Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kowree Advocate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weekly Times Observer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillydale &amp; Yarra Valley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whittlesea Post Observer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mail-Times</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wimmera Mail-Times</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Courier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. 1 Newspapers utilized for this research program
‘Discourse’ in the context of discourse analysis can be any type of text, either written or oral, which can be used for analysis. As Gee (2005: 1) asserts, discourse, or language, supports ‘the performance of social activities and social identities’ and also supports ‘human affiliation within cultures, social groups and institutions’. An investigation of social identities and affiliations is an important aspect of this doctoral research, and thus examination of the discourse surrounding the name restoration debate is important to achieving an understanding of the key issues and themes. In the case of this research program the discourses utilised for analysis were those printed in the media, provided in the questionnaires and generated through the oral-history interviews.

The purpose of discourse analysis according to Phillips and Hardy (2002: 3), is that ‘social reality is produced and made real through discourses, and social interactions cannot be fully understood without references to the discourses that give them meaning’. As Liamputtong and Ezzy (2005: 262) assert, the focus of discourse analysis is to not uncover the reasons why people interact or react to situations, but to ‘seek to find out “how”’ they have formed the opinions which lead them to react in the way they did, what the implications were for their reactions and what they thought of the opposing views. Essentially, the fundamental construct of discourse analysis is to ‘explore how the socially produced ideas and objects that populate the world were created in the first place and how they are maintained and held in place over time’ (Phillips and Hardy, 2002: 6). Thus, discourse analysis was utilised in this research program with the purpose of understanding the social interactions the participants were involved in and the social constructions which informed their support or opposition to the name restoration proposal both in 1989/1990 and contemporaneously.

Wooffitt (2005: 16-17) states that discourse analysis should be undertaken in such a way as to organise multiple meanings from data sources into a coherent structure which allows for analysis. He posits, based on prior research, that within the original discourse analysis framework established in the 1970s there are four key steps a researcher must take when conducting discourse analysis. The first step is to obtain statements. The second step is to find similarities between the statements, and then if some statements occur frequently the third step is for the researcher to acknowledge
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there is some underpinning truth to the statements. Finally, the researcher is to construct a generalised version of the statements and through analysis provide conclusions. Wooffitt (2005: 20) asserts that there are limitations to this design, in that it doesn’t allow for much variation in language use or for multiple realities being analysed. Yet, I would assert that for the purposes of this thesis the four steps provided a good basis upon which the doctoral program was positioned, as the purpose of the research was to analyse general themes presented by individuals within their varying communities in the study area.

To build upon the four steps outlined by Wooffitt, I also utilised the advice provided by Gill (2000) who provided key points that researchers should consider in their research design. Gill notes that it is important to first construct a research question or questions and then choose the data to be analysed. In the analysis of the text the information should be coded and then the research questions revised as patterns emerge. In writing up the data analysis the hypotheses and theories developed should be checked through analysis of existing case studies or reports. In this way the points raised by Gill follow a similar pattern to the grounded-theory methodology discussed earlier in this chapter, and therefore lent themselves suitably to the framework of this research. Thus, as outlined earlier in this chapter, the data from the newspapers was collated, then coded. In this process the key research questions were refined and new avenues for research collection (such as the development of the questionnaires and oral-history interviews) presented themselves as a way of further scrutinising the fledgling theories.

In addition to Gill’s points I utilised the ‘seven building tasks’ outlined by Gee (2005: 10) to guide my analysis of the discourse presented in the media, questionnaire and interview texts. These seven building tasks are key areas which Gee (2005: 11-13) asserts exist in all discourse and from which questions can be asked, they are:

1. *Significance*: question how the language is being used to make certain things significant

2. *Activities*: ask whether the language is asking the reader to do something, and if so, what.

3. *Identities*: query what kind of identity the user is asserting through their use of language
4. **Relationships**: determine whether the language establishes a particular relationship between the user and the object they are discussing.

5. **Politics**: look at how the language is connotating the user’s perceptions of what is ‘normal’ or how things should be according to them.

6. **Connections**: analyse how the user’s language makes connections between things which are determined by them to be relevant.

7. **Knowledge**: uncover how the language shows a different way of knowing and believing the world to be.

Each of these key questions were utilised where appropriate during the research program. As will be shown in chapters four, five and six, the questions themselves formed part of the writing task for the thesis, and allowed a mechanism through which key theoretical questions could be answered by the data collected.

Discourse analysis allowed for the collation and analysis of key information which informed this doctoral research program, but was not the only method used. Attention will now be given to another tool utilised in this research, that of the questionnaire.

**Questionnaires**

As outlined in the ‘Research Design and Participant Identification’ section of this chapter, questionnaires were sent to various participants to elicit information regarding their support or opposition to the name restoration program in 1989/1990 and their views on the issue today. This section will provide a discussion on the methods employed in developing the questionnaires sent to participants, and then provide a brief overview of the key demographic data relating to the participants in the questionnaire phase of the research program.

There has often been much academic discussion around the methods utilised in interviewing participants. Among the most highly regarded theorist in his field, Dillman (1978) outlines reasons why researchers should undertake mail and telephone surveys, in addition to, or instead of, face-to-face interviewing. Dillman notes that many research studies have been conducted in the past in regards to the effectiveness of different methods for obtaining higher response rates from mail questionnaires. Dillman’s (1978) ground-breaking book *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total*
Design Method analyses all of these different methods of eliciting strong response rates and makes some conclusions as to their effectiveness.

Dillman (1978: 12) notes that with mail surveys the ‘process of sending a questionnaire to prospective respondents, getting them to complete the questionnaire in an honest manner and return it can be viewed as a special case of “social exchange”’. Thus, Dillman asserts there are three things that must be undertaken to ensure a high response rate to questionnaires:

1. Minimise the costs for responding
2. Maximise the rewards for doing so
3. Establish trust that those rewards will be delivered.

It can be difficult to offer rewards for research, and Thibaut and Kelley (1959: 21) acknowledge that one such way is by ‘explaining to someone that they are part of a carefully selected sample and that their response is needed if the study is to be successful’. This action increases the positive regard for the participant, which in itself can act as a reward. Gillham (2000: 38) notes that it is important to provide the potential participant with clear information about what the questionnaire is asking, and to do this the wording of the questionnaire title is fundamentally important. The questionnaire developed for this research utilized the title ‘Renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park’ to provide a strong indication of the key subject matter. Dillman (1978: 13) also asserts that by using personalizing techniques such as ‘real signatures, individual salutations, and individually typed letters’ you increase the positive regard for the participant. To adhere to this recommendation, the questionnaires for this research were sent out with individually addressed envelopes and cover-letters, constructed using a Microsoft Excel database of the participant pool and utilising the mail-merge facility of Microsoft Word. In addition to this, for the purposes of fulfilling the University of Ballarat ethics requirements, a statement of ‘informed consent’ was provided, which participants were asked to complete. Refer to Appendix C for an example of the cover-letters and Appendix G for an example of the informed consent statement.

Sending questionnaires out into the ether, even if they have been addressed individually, is no guarantee of a result. Many times questionnaires are ‘lost’ on
desks or put in drawers and forgotten about. For this reason Blau (cited in Dillman, 1978: 13) suggests that using a postcard designed as a ‘thank-you for the prompt return of “the questionnaire sent to you last week” has been found to be followed by a response burst equal to that which follows the original mailing’. For this reason, postcards were developed and sent to all participants and it was found that a high rate of response was received from people once they had received the postcards. Refer to Appendix H for details of the postcard.

The design of the questionnaire distribution was considered alongside how the content was formatted and presented to potential participants. In regards to survey length, Dillman (1978: 27) has shown that in surveys that contain less than 12 pages and less than 125 items, the response rate averages 76 percent whilst the response rate to questionnaires with more pages or items the rate is 65 percent. Dillman (1978: 55) notes that ‘there is not much difference in response rates for questionnaires of less than 12 pages or those which contain less than 125 items…This suggests that increasing length up to these limits does not have an adverse effect on response rates’. Gillham (2000: 37) asserts that ‘the visual packaging of your product may put people off or invite them to look into it’. For this reason, my questionnaire was limited to 10 pages in length, and was organised as Dillman suggests in a booklet form, with no questions on the front or back pages, and was printed on off-white (sand colour) strong quality paper (Dillman, 1978: 121). Refer to Appendix D for an example of the Questionnaire.

In regard to question order in the questionnaire Dillman notes (1978: 123) that ‘when respondents open the questionnaire to page 1 and discover no queries about their opinions, but rather that the researcher wants to know their age, sex and so forth, any initial enthusiasm is likely to vanish. There is no need for innocuous questions, personal or otherwise, to serve as icebreakers in the mail questionnaire’. Thus, he suggests that researchers must consider placing demographic questions at the end; grouping similarly themed questions together; and, placing any likely-objectionable questions towards the end.
In order to elicit the best response rate possible for this research, each of the guidelines above were adhered to and adopted as part of the questionnaire development stage. In addition to this, consideration was given to the layout of the front and back covers of the questionnaire booklet. Dillman (1978: 150) suggests that the front cover should contain ‘(1) study title, (2) graphic illustration, (3) any needed directions, (4) the name and address of the study sponsor’. Importantly, Dillman notes that the graphic illustration is a very crucial aspect of the questionnaire cover. Its purpose if to add interest…The design may be quite simple…or more complex...
The detail is far less important than its presence’. For this reason the cover of the questionnaire in this research incorporated a colour picture of one of the features of the park, and this picture was also used in the postcards, to ensure a consistency in the promotion of the research. Dillman (1978: 153) notes that the back cover should ‘consist of an invitation to make additional comments, a thank-you, and plenty of white space’, principles which were also adopted by this research program.

The qualitative questions in the questionnaire (questions 1.7 and 1.8) were formulated based on the literature review and analysis of the letters to the editor which had already occurred. It was deemed important to understand whether the participant had supported or opposed the proposal in 1989/1990 and whether today they supported or opposed the idea of restoring Indigenous toponyms in Victoria.

![Questionnaire participant responses to question 1.7 (response n= 56  non-response n=2)](image)

**Figure 3.2** Questionnaire participant responses to question 1.7 (response n= 56  non-response n=2)
The results for questions 1.7 and 1.8 are shown in figures 3.2 and 3.3. They indicate that of the participants who responded, the majority were originally opposed to the idea of restoring the name Gariwerd for the National Park in 1989/1990. The results also show that the majority of participants were now also opposed to restoring Indigenous names for features in Victoria, but less likely to be so.

The quantitative questions (1.1-1.6 and 4.1-4.13) were developed based on the key themes which had been raised during the initial phase of data and literature research, and to which responses had not been located. In addition, the specific questions in section four, relating to participant details, were formulated with the aim of broadening the depth and range of data available for analysis based on previous place-based research which indicated that participation in community groups and length of residence could affect someone’s attachment to a place. The tables of data collected for each question are available in Appendix I.

Upon return of the questionnaires the details were entered into an Excel spreadsheet where participants were assigned numbers so as to ensure their responses were treated anonymously. Using the Excel program allowed for qualitative responses to be recorded alongside quantitative information. Those participants who indicated
availability to participate in the oral history interviews were contacted once all questionnaires had been received and the data entered into Excel. Once the data was entered it was analysed using the SPSS computer statistical program. Essentially, the key demographics of the participants indicate that 58 people participated in the questionnaire phase of the research, of which the mean age was 57.6 years, with the minimum age being 29 and the maximum age being 82. The average length of residence for participants was 32.02 years, with 1 being the minimum years lived in the area and 77 being the maximum (refer to Appendix I for the results) The locations of the questionnaire participants is also interesting, and a map was developed based on the participant’s response to question 4.8 which asked for their postcode of residence. The map can be seen in Figure 3.4. As shown in the map, the majority of participants lived within close proximity of the National Park, essentially within the study area.

The information provided by the questionnaire participants is mainly referred to in chapter seven, as it was found that the most relevant statements and data for chapters four, five and six came from the newspaper and oral-history data. Where questionnaire participants are referred to in the thesis, they are identified by the labels ‘participant one’ or ‘participant two’ and so forth. This is to distinguish their data from the other two participant information sources, namely the newspaper material which is referenced and provided in the reference list, and the oral-history interview participants who were given pseudonyms, or their real names were used, with permission, because of their political or key stakeholder role in the initial name restoration program [the use of pseudonyms is discussed further in the next section]. Where a participant provided information in both the questionnaire and oral history interview phases of the research program, their data is identified through the use of their pseudonym or, if appropriate, their real name. For the purposes of providing some background details on the questionnaire participants, a table has been constructed which details the participant’s number or pseudonym and whether they supported the renaming proposal in 1989/1990 and what they think generally of the idea of restoring Indigenous names in Victoria. This table is provided in Appendix J.
Link to Figure 3.4 as A3 Map Page

Figure 3.4 Map of locations for participants in the questionnaire phase of research
Now that dialogue has been provided on the development of the questionnaires, it is important to discuss the methods utilized in developing the oral history interviews. This is the focus of the next section in this chapter.

**Oral History**

Of interest to this research were the accounts of people who had an interest in the name restoration debate. People were identified for participation in the oral history stage of the research program through their indications on the questionnaires and also through the snowballing technique. The snowball technique was mainly used to identify key political and social protagonists in the original debate, those who were not necessarily suitable for the questionnaires (because they did not live in the area or have ongoing connections) or who did not want to complete a questionnaire but wanted to be interviewed.

In total 45 people participated in the oral history interviews: 39 participated in face-to-face interviews, while 6 participated over the phone due to distances or work commitments precluding their availability to meet with me. General demographic data relating to the interview participants is available only for the locations of the participants, as not all of them completed the questionnaire which asked for them to indicate their age and sex etc. Thus, to gain insight into a general description of those who participated in the oral history interviews, refer to Appendix K for a summary of each participant’s length of residence in the study area and an indication of their support for or opposition to the name restoration proposal. Where possible, the participant’s political affiliations or stakeholder role in the name restoration debate are also indicated. In addition, refer to Figure 3.5 for a map of the interview participant’s locations.

The general length of each interview was 30 minutes, with some taking up to an hour depending on the participant’s knowledge and willingness to share their information. Those interviews conducted face-to-face were usually held in the participant’s home, which I travelled to. The participants signed statements of informed consent (refer to Appendix G for a copy of this) and all interviews were tape-recorded to allow for accurate data collection and to provide me with more time to focus on the interview
Link to Figure 3.5 as an A3 Map Page

Figure 3.5 Locations of Oral-History Interview Participants
rather than taking notes. The interview tapes were then sent to an on-line transcription service based in Australia, and they converted the taped data into manuscripts.

I then corrected the transcribed information where it had been misheard by the typists before sending the transcripts to all participants, along with personalised cover-letters thanking them for their assistance and confirming they could correct or withdraw their information [refer to Appendix L for details of the cover-letter]. Once all transcripts were approved by the participants the manuscripts were then coded by myself to ensure that no participants, unless they had indicated during their interview that they wished to be identified in the thesis, could be identified. Those that were coded were provided with pseudonyms, the list of which can be seen in Appendix K. For those who opted to be identified in the thesis, their consent for this was recorded and an explanation of the possible implications (such as their name appearing in this thesis and subsequent research papers or conference presentations) was provided. Those who did opt for identification usually did so because they believed they had already played a public role in the name restoration debate and were not seeking to now cover their role or opinions. Thus, in this thesis where a name appears by itself, such as ‘Doug’ or ‘Anita’ this is a pseudonym used to identify oral-history participants. Where a name appears with a surname, and is not followed by a reference indicating that it is a quote taken from a media source, this is the real name of an oral-history participant.

The interview information was then analysed utilising the NVIVO software analysis tool. Key themes were highlighted and grouped. Interview quotes relating to the key themes were then collated into thematic files to allow for analysis of participant responses and for linking to key literature themes. The final selection of quotes to be utilised explicitly in this thesis came down to the quotes’ ability to express an idea clearly and directly. In many instances in this thesis the use of […] will be shown in quotes which indicates that the non-essential information has been removed for purposes of clarity and succinctness. It should be noted that on no occasion was information removed or doctored because it was considered to be unfavourable to the arguments and focus of this thesis. The methods employed in constructing and
conducting the interviews were based on available literature on oral history and this will now be discussed.

The methodology of oral history has been defined by Douglas, Roberts and Thompson as ‘the actual testimony obtained by interview, whether it is left untouched on tape or transferred to written form’ (1988: 3). Importantly, Douglas et al. (1988: 3) note that:

this testimony may be regarded as a pool of raw material for historical interpretation, and as a form of historical narrative and explanation by the interviewee in its own right. In this sense, oral testimony can be described as a dialogue between two historians about the past.

It is also important to recognise that ‘oral history is…a first hand report of experience’ (Douglas et al., 1988: 4). Thus, according to Douglas et al. the oral history method can be useful for obtaining raw material of a firsthand account of a historical event or experience. Hart noted that the ‘use of oral evidence can enable us to see more clearly the problematics of all evidence’ (1993: 595). In essence, oral histories can provide contextual depth and alternative avenues for critiquing written accounts of history. Eklund commented that the value of oral histories lies in the fact that they ‘can challenge dominant notions of what constitutes history by producing evidence and locating analysis at the level of the everyday lives of “ordinary” individuals’ (1997: 73). Yet, the method applied to the use of this raw oral material often draws much academic discussion.

There has been debate about the reliability of oral history sources in academic writing. The Popular Memory Group (1982: 83) asserted that there are four main areas of difficulty in realizing the potential of oral sources in academic discourses. These areas are related to the individual form of oral history testimonies; the effect of the present upon memories of the past; how the historian uses the testimonies; and, the empiricism of orthodox historical practice. Blatti (1990: 615) posited that it is the method of the oral history that can affect its presentation to the public, but contends that this presentation allows for ‘multiple points of view and the recognition of…integrative approaches’. Portelli (1979) has fervently posited that oral histories are as reliable as written histories, in that it is in the interpretation of oral histories that the reliability can be shown. Portelli theorised that the main difference between oral
and written histories are that oral history ‘tells us less about events as such than about their meaning…they tell us not just what people did, but what they wanted to do, what they believed they were doing, what they now think they did’ (1979: 99). This is a fascinating method of obtaining historical information, because whereas written records at the time of a historical event provide insight into the psychology of the time, the oral history interview can also provide information on the outcomes of the events, and the participants’ thoughts since then. Hay acknowledged that the usefulness of oral histories lay in the fact that they allow a researcher to ‘move beyond the limits and biases of the written record’ (1985: 245). For this reason oral histories were taken with the aim of moving beyond what was presented in the letters and limited scope of the questionnaire. It was proposed that the oral history interviews would allow an exploration of the current reflective perceptions of the events that took place in 1989/1990. In many instances this was the case, and the data provided in these instances is discussed in chapters four, five, six and seven.

It is this point of the methodology of oral histories that often receives criticism, the fact that the interviewee might change their historical evidence based on contemporary circumstances or changes in their memories which have been affected by cultural phenomena. Hay recognised that ‘informants may seriously distort…not because we or they lie, but because both of us know that the way the past is viewed has consequences for the way the present is structured’ (1985: 245). Hay asserted that the researcher who utilizes oral histories as sources for information must remember that ‘the documents we produce are artefacts of the time of their creation, not the period under discussion’. Grele took this assertion one step further, in commenting that oral histories are ‘not history but memory’ and the researcher is ‘searching not for fact, but the truth behind the fact’ (1985: 129). In agreement with this, Portelli (1979: 100) stated that

- there are no “false” oral sources. Once we have checked their factual credibility with all established criteria of historical philological criticism that apply to every document, the diversity of oral history consists in the fact that “untrue” statements are still psychologically “true”, and that these previous “errors” sometimes reveal more than factually accurate accounts.
Further to this, Portelli made it clear that the written record is also never recorded at the time of an event, but often with a time lapse in between, which can also lead to a distortion of facts. In addition, it can also be stated that the political bias of the writer at the time will distort the written record, as much as the passing of time will distort the evidence available in an oral history. Further criticism of the use of oral histories lays in the fact that the information provided in an interview is provided based upon the questions provided by the interviewer. Hay noted that ‘oral histories are only a portion of [the lives of the interviewees]…they contain within themselves a preselection’ (1985: 244). It is important to keep in mind that as with the removal of part of the quantitative research, the qualitative research has been limited to analysis of the information provided by the participants. For this reason, this research can not claim to be complete or comprehensive, merely a contribution to knowledge. The analysis was limited to key areas identified as important from the literature and similarly from the letters and interviews.

For the method of the interview, Portelli (1979) recommended the use of ‘open’ interviews. The specifics of this include using a semi-structured interview question routine, which means that the interviewee knows what directions the research is going in, but also means that should new information arise it can be used. Alternatively, if a rigid interview system with a set of questions to be answered, is used, the interview ‘excludes elements whose existence and relevance were previously unknown to the researchers and are not contemplated in the question schedule’ (Portelli, 1979: 103). This method of open-ended questions was heavily utilised and it can be reported that in all oral history interviews the list of questions was produced for each participant and any additional questions which had arisen as a result of that participant’s questionnaire responses, or previous interviewee’s information, were added. This was a constantly developing oral history method which allowed for continual refinement and expansion of the research focus. In addition, even though detailed question lists were developed they were only partially referred to in the interviews, as I preferred to sit and hold a conversational-style interview with the participants to allow for easy flow of information and exchange of ideas. Questions would be asked complementing the direction of the conversation; only as an interview was drawing to a close would the question list be referred to directly to ensure key areas had not been overlooked.
Hay suggested that the ideal method for oral history interviews involves ‘challenges’ for the interviewee (1985: 259). This method involves not taking testimony at face value, but seeking alternatives from their opinions, introducing new evidence and exploring contradictions. As many interviewees noted in a similar fashion that their memories or perceptions were being challenged in a positive and reflectful manner the method undertaken was understood to be non-confrontional.

From the literature base outlined above, the oral history interview questions were defined. A full listing of these questions can be found in Appendix F. In brief though, the questions were formulated to direct attention to key areas of the literature. These key areas included:

**Personal History in the Area**

This section included questions such as:

- When and where were you born?
- What places have you lived in, and for how long, during your lifetime?
- Do you feel a part of the community that you currently live in?
- Where were your parents born?
- What places have/did they live(d) in, and for how long, during their lifetimes?
- What is your association with the Grampians region? (how long lived here, what used it for?)

These questions were formulated to gain an appreciation of the various factors that might be involved in the participants considering themselves to be a part of the local community. In addition, these questions sought to illicit the personal histories that people were bringing with them to the interview, histories that would ultimately shape their responses to my questions. In fact, it was often found that by asking people about their histories, they would ‘open-up’ to later questions.

**Personal Involvement in the Debate**

This section included questions such as:

- Why did you think the government made the proposal to rename the Grampians?
What did you think of the proposal to rename the entire National Park? and, what was your role in the debate?

- (If positive response): why did you think that renaming was important?
- (If negative response): why did you think that renaming was a problem?

What did you think of the proposals to rename sections and specific features of the park? (discuss particulars such as:

- Anglicised forms of names (Cherrypool being Djarabul)
- History of name use (oldest non-indig names only 154 years old, whilst Indigenous names been around for 5,000 years)
- Culturally inappropriate (Mt Lubra, Blackfellow Rock, the Picanniny, Halls Gap (Hall was involved with killing two Indigenous people in July 1841)
- Fosters cultural identity

- (If positive response): why did you think that renaming was important for specific sites?
- (If negative response): why did you think that renaming was a problem for specific sites?

This set of questions was designed to allow the participants to discuss how and why they were involved in the debate. Ultimately, it was designed to guide the participants into discussing what they perceived to be the main issues in the debate at the time. It was often found that the participants were at first cautious about responding, as they were suspicious of my motives, being at first guarded in trusting a university researcher, and secondly not trusting the motives of the government in “opening up this stuff”. This was highlighted many times by participants and none more so than Doug who stated to me:

I would have liked to have known who some of your [participants are] so I could just about put them all into categories but I know it’s confidential…

If I starting to push this [research] through, I would work out all the controversial [participants], I would get their names and I would say now this is the list that I will submit to Laura Kostanski for her to write
to. It will be loaded two thirds with these names so therefore you will get the answer back “this is a yes” and well there you are. It’s a bit like a union thing you know, you get them to write and the rest of the people that are thinking and worried about it don’t have time to write and you’ll load it. This is the way to restart a thing. I have been there and seen that.

[LK]: That’s true. But I’m not that malicious so don’t worry.

[D]: But you must admit I’m cautious and watching.

[LK]: I can understand completely why you are, I really can.

[D]: But this time we are more forewarned of who to ring before it starts, which politician to ring and say - “there’s a thing going around from the University of Ballarat, do you know anything about it?”,” “Never heard of it, for god’s sake don’t sign it and we’ll see what happens”…some of the old fellows said it’s not worth telling it, the more you tell them they’ll just use it to their advantage and to your disadvantage… I hope [the current research] doesn’t become political.

This perception of distrust and some participants’ eagerness to ‘prove a point’ to me because of their previous dealings with researchers was a common theme. This ‘apprehension’ to trust researchers can also at times lead to participants becoming ‘gatekeepers’ of knowledge. This gatekeeping of knowledge means that the participants were often ‘pushing their cause’ at the beginning of their interviews with me. I am not the only doctoral student to have experienced these reactions, as documented by Jacqueline Wilson in her doctoral dissertation, where she noted that when interviewing prison guards about their histories involved in guarding prisoners, ‘any line of questioning that could be interpreted as sympathetic to “the crims” was met with marked ausperity’ (Wilson, 2006: 65). Wilson reminds researchers that they must ‘make some effort not to offend the social norms of those she is working with and/or attempting to make the subject of study’ (Wilson, 2006: 67). Nor am I the only researcher to have encountered these issues of mistrust. As noted by Skelton (2001: 93) in her research, ‘in the context of interviews conducted in the village where I lived, I realised, afterwards, that I had been “tested”…people had been waiting to see if I could be trusted’. This issue of mistrust was usually dissipated by my asserting that I had no prior-thoughts or yet drawn conclusions from the research and that the only conclusions which would be reached would be based on participant information.
Understandings of local and national histories

These questions included:

- Did you think that the renaming would change the identity of the area?
  - Why? What sort of identity would it change to?
  - What does the name Grampians mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc)
    - Do you know the history/meaning of this name?
    - What do you know about the colonial history in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area?
      - Are you aware that Major Mitchell had a policy of utilising Indigenous names for features?
    - How and when did you learn about the colonial history (ie was your interested piqued when the debate occurred, but prior to that you didn’t know? or did you have a prior knowledge of the history?)
  - Do you have family history/associations with the name?
    - What does the name Gariwerd mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc etc)
      - Do you know the history/meaning of this name?
      - What do you know about the Indigenous history in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area?
      - What names of local clans/languages do you know about?
      - How and when did you learn about the Indigenous history (ie was your interested piqued when the debate occurred, but prior to that you didn’t know? or did you have a prior knowledge of the history?)

These questions were asked to illicit responses which demonstrated the participant’s knowledge of the history around them. It was deemed important to ask these questions in order to gain an understanding of the participant’s views of the world, and in order to estimate how prior knowledge of and learning about local/national history combined to create the person’s identity and perhaps then reflected on their reactions to the study area renaming proposals.
Personal, familial and community interaction with the NP and its names

The questions included:

- In 1991, Jeff Kennett vowed that if elected to Government, he would reverse the decision of the Geographical Placenames Committee to dual-name the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park, and revert the name to ‘Grampians National Park’.
  - What do you think of the fact that he never did reverse the decision, and now the park is still officially known as Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?
- What name do you use now for the park? (if using Gariwerd, ask about when they started to use this name)
- (Show map of park with specific areas highlighted) What names do you use for these sites within the park? (if using Indigenous names, ask about when they started to use these names)
  - What do these names mean to you? (ie do they bring up any memories/history/associations for you?)
  - Do you have special associations with these areas? (ie what activities do you do there? have you spent a lot of time there as a child? have you been there with family and friends?)
- What places in the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park would you show to a tourist/ a friend/acquaintance coming from elsewhere? What places would you not show?
  - would you show different places to different people?
- Does the situation/company (age, degree of familiarity, where the person is from etc.) have an impact on the way you use place names? (official/ unofficial slang names)
- Have you noticed a change in the way you use place names (e.g. the names you used as a child or right after you’d moved to the region were different from those you use today)?
  - have you started to use more official/ unofficial names?
- Do you remember situations etc. in which you have learnt certain place names? (e.g. whilst consulting a map, asking, “listening”, inventing names)
Participants were invited to share their memories of experiences within the National Park and specific features within it. These memories were sought in relation to gaining an understanding of the memories and associations that the participants had in regards to the area. As the literature which discusses place attests, it is associations with areas that create memories, and thus creates attachments. Thus, I was interested in uncovering what these associations were with the places, and whether the names were a part of those associations on a personal, familial or community basis.

**What names mean**

These questions included:

- Do you think it is possible that a place or placename can have many different meanings, histories and identities for different people? Do you think we should acknowledge these different meanings, histories and identities?
- What does the name Grampians mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc)
- What does the name Gariwerd mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc etc)
- Do place names make a place? (or do names matter in general to you?)

These questions were thought to be imperative in gaining an understanding of the meanings the participants had with the names they used. In particular, the questions were asked to ascertain the participant’s thoughts and feelings about Indigenous and non-Indigenous names, and why these names did or did not hold meanings for them. In addition, the participants were asked to reflect upon whether the toponyms created a place, or whether the place could hold meanings in its own right. This question was often greeted with mixed reactions, with people both supporting and negating this notion, and my honest answer was always ‘it’s time to get a bit philosophical, no answer is correct, I’m just interested in understanding what you think’. Most people would react by stating that they ‘didn’t often think about these things’, but once they started it was hard to stop.

**Future Processes**

These questions included:
At the time of the proposals, there was no government legislation to allow for dual-naming. So, when the proposals were put to the government, it was stated that the Indigenous names should be reintroduced and the Anglo-Celtic names removed.

- What do you think of this one place-one name legislation?
- Now that we have dual-naming legislation in Victoria, are you more accepting of reintroducing Indigenous names?
  - Do you think that if we’d had a dual-naming policy at the beginning of the renaming debate, that the issue would not have been as hotly contested?
- If we are to use dual-names, which name should be written first (Indigenous/non-Indigenous?)
- If we are to sign-post Indigenous names, how should they be written on signs? (ie second name in brackets, have a slash, be in different colours?)

- With hindsight, what do you think was wrong with the government proposal and processes in particular that generated so much fierce debate at the time? (ie not enough consultation, appearance of "pandering" to Indigenous needs, promoted by people not from the area itself)
  - Are you interested in seeing more processes of Indigenous renaming across Victoria?
  - if we are to consider Indigenous renaming in the future, what should be different about the government processes?

- Do you think that the Grampians area has undergone change recently?
  - what sort of changes?
  - Are these changes a good thing?
  - (if not a good thing) Why are these not good changes? What needs to be done?

- Do you think the renaming of Ayers Rock to Uluru was successful?
  Why/Why not? Why is it a different story to the renaming of the Grampians?

As many participants had already voiced an opinion about what “went wrong” during the name restoration debate it was thought that there would be good advice amongst
them on how they would prefer to see restoration projects run in the future. These questions were an opportunity to elicit from the community their opinions on how they would like to be involved in restoration projects, and also served as a valuable tool in uncovering whether the participants were at all interested in the notion of toponymic restoration, or whether they were holus-bolus against such a proposal.

In addition to the questionnaires and oral-history interviews, part of the data collection process involved participants completing a mental-mapping exercise, to ascertain which names they now used for various features in the study area. The development of this mental mapping-exercise will now be discussed.

**Mental Mapping**

Mental Mapping is a common method utilized by geographers to gain an understanding of people’s geographical identity (Lloyd, 1989; Langfield-Smith and Wirth, 1992; Jacob and Luloff, 1995; Luffman, 1996; Young, 1996; Kitchin and Freundschuh, 2000). Langfield-Smith and Wirth (1992: 1135) have noted that ‘a causal cognitive map is a directed network representation of an individual’s beliefs concerning a particular domain at a point of time’. Fisher, Bell and Baum (1984: 29) define cognitive maps as mental representations or cognitions of the environment. In addition, Kitchin and Fotheringham (1997: 269) espoused the notion that ‘cognitive mapping involves the description of the way individuals store and process geographic information’. To that end, the use of cognitive or ‘mental mapping’ as part of the review, allowed me to gain an understanding of the place names that the participants use for the study area. These mental maps were included as part of the questionnaires and interviews, a copy of which can be found in Appendix M. Participants were asked to identify the toponyms they used for thirteen pre-allocated places on a map of the National Park and surrounding area. The purpose of this identification was to compare the toponyms that people used for specific areas, with those of the official register of toponyms, to discover whether people had made the transition by 2006 from colonial to Indigenous toponyms or not.

A total of 60 participants (58 questionnaire participants and 2 oral-history interview only participants), contributed to this mental mapping exercise. The cumulative
results are provided in Figure 3.6 and are analysed in chapter seven as part of the discussions of the outcomes of the debate. It should be noted that Downs and Stea (1973b: 6) stated that for mental maps ‘there is no single correct path to understanding and explanation: hence it is impossible to specify an optimal research methodology’. With this in mind the rationale and method that are used in the analysis of the mental maps for this research will now be outlined.

In 1960 Lynch (1960: 45) defined five categories of features found on cognitive maps that could be used by geographers to describe and analyse human perceptions of their environment. These categories are paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks. Of importance to this study is the category of landmarks. Lynch asserted that landmarks are those features in the landscape which carry particular associations, and their value is that they are distinguishable from the general landscape. In the name restoration debate, the spotlight of the tensions centred on landmarks such as towns, art sites, mountains, and roads which were going to be renamed. As has been discussed previously, the focus is on places as objects. Thus, the mental maps to be constructed for this current research will involve using current locational maps, with the names of the specific landmarks which were due to be (and have subsequently been) renamed during the controversies.

Recent studies into cognitive mapping have focused on the use of maps as representations of human spatial orientation (Downs and Stea, 1973a). Griffin (1973: 296) noted that recognition of the special relationship between objects that are in one’s environment is called topographical orientation. The most common method for uncovering people’s topographical orientation involves the use of blank maps, where people are asked to draw their local environment and various paths, nodes, landmarks etc. The researcher then collects this information and compares the scaling of features in relation to each other and a real-time scale of the actual objects. Since this study is not focusing on the participants’ perceptions of the scale of their environment, it was not necessary to utilise blank maps. Thus, the mental maps for the research were constructed with an outline of the National Park, with surrounding areas. The maps were devised by me, and commissioned from a cartographer working for the Victorian Office of the Surveyor-General. The specific named features which are the focus of this research were identified with stars. Participants were invited to apply the
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Figure 3. 6 Cumulative mental map results
toponyms they use to the particular features, in identified yellow boxes on the map surface. This method allowed the participants to orient themselves within the maps, and aimed to reduce any spatial confusion.

The analysis of these mental maps will follow the individual aggregation technique outlined by Kitchin and Fotheringham (1997). This technique involves analyzing cognitive map data at the individual level but then ‘the results are both pooled and averaged and either the mean or median values are taken to represent the members of the whole group’ (Kitchin and Fotheringham, 1997: 269). This method was compared to two others, disaggregation and collective aggregation, by Kitchin and Fotheringham, and it was shown that for a study focusing on a group of individuals’ cognitive map knowledge, the ‘preferred type of analysis is that employing individual aggregation’. The methodology employed by Kitchin and Fotheringham was complex, and beyond the needs of this research, as they were calculating the cognitive awareness of distances as represented on mental maps by participants. Thus, the main thrust of their methodology is all that will need to be employed in this research, and a representation of this can be seen in Figure 3.7. In essence, the data provided by the participants on the maps will be interpreted on both a collective, and where required or possible, an individual basis, and compared to the results of their individual participants. Items such as their history associated with the name, and their affinity with the place will be compared to their use of the toponym. Then, on a group scale, the information will be compiled, and a map of toponyms utilised per location will be produced.

The mental-maps provide invaluable insight into the current toponymic situation in the study area. In addition to the mental-maps, a psychometric scale was developed for this study, a methodological tool which was deemed important at the onset of the research program and the reasons for its development and eventual non-inclusion in this thesis will now be discussed.
Psychometric Evaluation Scale
As discussed earlier in this chapter, a psychometric scale was originally developed to explore the quantitative rationales for the possible existence of toponymic attachment. The scale was developed based on prior research into the development of a psychometric scale to test for place attachment by Williams and Vaske (2003) and a preliminary test undertaken as part of a research project into assigning official names for State forests in the Ballarat region (refer to (Kostanski and Clark, 2004) for more details).

Thus, the questionnaires sent out to participants as part of the doctoral research program also included a psychometric scale developed for testing the existence of any differences between sense of place and sense of toponym. The psychometric scale questions can be found in section two of the questionnaire, provided in Appendix D. A total of 58 participants participated in the psychometric scale section of the questionnaire. While the results were interesting, the length of discussion required to adequately address the key findings precluded their inclusion in this thesis. It was proposed that this research thesis needed to focus on the qualitative aspects of
toponymic attachment (and on the quantitative aspects of the mental maps) rather than try to superficially cover all aspects of qualitative and quantitative study into the subject area. It is proposed that to give justice to the topic the psychometric scale will form part of a future research project.

**Conclusions**
The utilisation of a mixed-methodologies approach, which relied heavily on qualitative research methods, informed and shaped the entire doctoral research program and its findings. Whilst research questions and a basic literature outline were provided by the ARC grant application which established this project in 2004, the use of grounded-theory as a research framework allowed for the constant development and refinement of the research direction based on literature and data analysis. Thus, over the course of the research program the thesis questions and discussion developed organically, and lead to the formulation of theories based not on my preconceptions of the study topic, but based on the issues which were identified by the participants in the project.

The data which inform this thesis were collected and collated from various sources including newspaper publications, questionnaires, oral-history interviews and mental maps. The newspaper publication data were collected and collated from May 2004 until June 2005, with analysis commencing in July 2004 and continuing until the submission of this thesis. The questionnaires and mental maps were developed in late 2005/early 2006 after the Masters program was approved for upgrading to PhD level. The questionnaires were sent to participants in October 2006 and the results collated whilst the oral-history interviews were conducted in October and November 2006.

All of the data sources provided unique insights into the participant’s observations of the name restoration debate, and were invaluable in providing answers to key research questions (whilst also helping to develop further research questions in the process). The data were continually analysed in correlation with the existing literature which was discussed in chapter two of this thesis. The results of the investigation of the data and literature and analysis of the links between them, and the apparent gaps in existing knowledge, will now be provided in chapters four, five, six and seven.
What does ‘Grampians (Gariwerd)’ mean? Attachment to a place or a name?

‘Geographers have focused almost exclusively on material processes and socioeconomic forces, without raising, explicitly, the role of language. It is as though all the socioeconomic (and political) forces can be marshalled and the processes of material transformation occur, in the absence of words. Put this way, the idea is manifestly absurd’

(Tuan, 1991: 692)
Introduction

Toponyms are not common conversation topics when people discuss the issues that affect their lives. Hot topics of debate are usually in areas deemed to be controversial. Indeed, the three topics Australians are told to avoid at dinner parties are politics, religion and sex. So, to focus a thesis on the implications of toponyms in the daily lives of people is often met with an incredulous raising of the eyebrows, and a question of ‘why?’ One of the most indicative reasons for pursuing this topic of toponymic attachment stemmed from the fact that during the period of 1989-90 over 60,000 Victorians signed petitions protesting against the State government’s proposal to restore Indigenous names in and for the Grampians National Park. In addition to the petitions, letters were written to local and metropolitan newspapers, with the authors outlining their opposition or support for the proposals. The letters that were written in protest highlighted the key concerns of the population that believed the toponyms were the linking agent, or the symbol of attachment, between a person and the place. Essentially, key themes identified in the letters acknowledged people’s affinity with the case study area and how the toponyms linked the authors with their sense of place.

Geographical literature on place attachment (Shumaker and Taylor, 1983; Altman and Low, 1992a; Brown and Perkins, 1992; Hummon, 1992; Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996; Eklund, 1997; Relph, 1997; Pretty et al., 2003) focuses heavily on the interactions of people within defined places or spaces, with limited regard given to the symbolic nature of the toponyms themselves. It should be noted though that in 1992 Altman and Low (1992b: 5) asserted that ‘questions for future research concern the nature and dynamics of attachment to different types of places and objects…A community or even a nation is a tangible and definable place. A flag, slogan or caricature is, however, a symbol of a community or nation. Are attachments to real places different than or seperable from affective feelings toward symbols of places?’ Linguistic theories on toponyms (Russell, 1956) are limited to definitions of symbols, agents and objects. Whilst there have been some attempts in previous years to define the use and symbolic nature of toponyms (Lind, 1962; Sopher, 1978; Atchison, 1986; Kadmon, 1997; Clark, 1998; Harvey, 1999; Withers, 2000; Randall, 2001; Bonyhady
This chapter will bring together these three fields of research with the aim of grounding the existing theories on place and toponyms to common day understandings and uses of toponyms. The focus will be on establishing how theories on sense of place or place attachment, can perhaps be extrapolated to include toponyms and their importance in people’s lives. Further to this, consideration will be given to existing linguistic theories on names and these will be included in the discussion of how toponyms work. Using a socio-cultural and phenomenological framework, supported by theories on discourse analysis and the grounded methodology outlined in chapter three, the theories will be explored through a close analysis of the letters and contemporary interviews conducted with participants living near, or with affinities tied to the study area. The purpose of this chapter therefore is to set out a rationale for the focus of this thesis: the relationships people have with places and whether similar relationships can be said to exist with toponyms.

In chapter two, consideration was given to theories of space and place. It was noted that place is defined by geographers as space with meaning attached (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977). This attachment of meaning is brought about and recognised through toponyms, which characterise the distinction between spaces and places (Levi-Strauss, 1962; Carter et al., 1993; Cresswell, 2004). Cresswell (2004: 10) acknowledges that ‘places are very much things to be inside of’. Relph’s (1976: 141) definition of place centres on the notion that they are ‘profound centres of human existence to which people have deep emotional and psychological ties’, and they are ‘basic elements in the ordering of our experiences of the world’ (1976: 43). Pertinently, places are elements of the landscape which have been constructed either physically or emotionally, and places exist within space, as opposites of space, as objects to ‘be inside of’. In the study area, the definitions of place can be varied, for in many ways there are three sets of places in the National Park: Indigenous, non-Indigenous and anglo-Indigenous. The first being the original Indigenous understanding of the landscape and its places, the second being the landscape as defined by colonists since 1836 and the final being a fusion of contemporary Indigenous and non-Indigenous understandings.
As the places in the National Park have been defined through different cultural processes, mainly Indigenous and colonial I would like to spend some time considering these cultural processes of place and toponym creation and understanding, before moving into more in-depth analysis of sense of place and sense of toponym. In particular, attention will focus on the multiple interactions and understandings in the study area to allow for background details on the core arguments presented from a range of social viewpoints in regards to places and names of the area.

**Multiple Understandings of Places and Toponyms in the Case Study Area**

Indigenous creation of places in the study area began with the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali peoples as long as 22,000 years ago, and the places were created based on understandings of the creator spirits’ journeys through the landscape (Wettenhall, 1999). As discussed in chapter one, these places were defined from space through the use of toponyms which linked to song cycles and stories which guided the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali people through areas which could be used for recreation, food gathering and ceremonies (Clark, 1998; Hercus and Simpson, 2002).

Even though it has been determined that Indigenous people were living in the study area as long as 22,000 years ago, it is not possible to determine whether the places and names they used then were the same as those recorded by colonists in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali people interacted with places and names in the study area and many are engaged with today in the National Park, as explained in an oral history interview by Tim Chatfield, cultural heritage officer at Budja Budja cooperative in Halls Gap:

> People ask me where... to go somewhere, well go down to *Nangangawi* or go up to *Ngamadjidj* or go to *Gulgurn Manja*, great experiences up there and if you want to go to *Bunjils* or *Duwul*... I think that the names we’ve mentioned are our existence, who we are…

The toponyms *Nangangawi, Ngamadjidj, Gulgurn Manja, Bunjils* and *Duwul* are all derived from the Djabwurrung language and identify in the first four instances rock
shelters, and the final toponym is that of a mountain (refer to Figure 1.8 for map of the features and Appendix B for the English translations). For Tim Chatfield, and others sharing his Indigenous heritage, the names that the ancestors used still resonate today, and the places that were defined from a landscape of space still hold significant cultural meaning. For Tim Chatfield, the toponyms represent an understanding of the study area landscape which differs from the contemporarily dominant colonially-defined geography where the features were mapped and promoted until 1990 as *Camp of Emu Foot, Cave of Ghosts, Cave of Hands, Bunjils Cave* and *Mt William*. As Tim Chatfield mentioned:

> …from our perspective though, the stuff that was written for us was either on rock paintings, but also you know the Aboriginal people who were still attached or associated with the country were able to pass on that and that was just by coming together in large gatherings and talking about stuff. That’s how I suppose a lot of people like myself in those days learnt about our history, the culture and learning from the elders. It wasn’t in a book, say here it is and read it, but yeah, no look it was an interesting process.

What Tim Chatfield is pointing to in this example is the fact that after the colonisation process which began in the study area in 1836, a second form of defining the landscape and its places began to be promoted through ‘official means’. Tim acknowledges this when he states that the knowledge of places and toponyms ‘wasn’t in a book’, as is the traditional method of colonial transmission of knowledge and power, rather the Indigenous landscape knowledge came about primarily through learning from the elders. It should be noted that in the study area the traditional Indigenous languages are no longer spoken fluently and thus much of the toponymic knowledge promoted and utilised today was gathered through archival research during the name restoration debate. For Tim Chatfield, the Indigenous toponyms are used because they link to country, they promote Indigenous understandings of the landscape, and also pay homage to creator spirits. Tim Chatfield is not alone in his use of Indigenous toponyms, and his beliefs of how important they can be to cultural heritage. Kaye Harris, CEO of Brambuk at the time of her oral history interview, noted in relation to the colonial name *McKenzie Falls*:

131
I mean McKenzie Falls, for heaven’s sake, McKenzie Falls, what’s sexy about that? It is so, it’s boring. Like Black Fish Dreaming, what does that say? …I would much rather go and visit … Black Fish Dreaming than McKenzie Falls, I mean it could be anywhere…black fish are some of the only native fish left in Victoria today and they are our native fish. They are being completely wiped out all over the place but McKenzie Falls is, it actually means many black fish floating on the water. That’s how many black fish used to exist in this mountain range, so many that you could see them! You know, a whole other food source and it actually provides those pointers to the health and welfare of the communities, the Indigenous communities of the day, that that sort of food source was there and that’s why it is a culturally significant place and because of the food source, there were all these stories that go with that.

For Kaye Harris, the non-Indigenous name is unimportant, as it was given by Major Mitchell when he travelled through the area in 1836 in honour of a friend in the Peninsula war Captain McKenzie (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 140), and could be seen to be a less significant cultural indicator of place associations. This point on the significance of place being indicated in a toponym is further articulated later in her interview when she stated that:

I think it’s a bit like that local government stuff isn’t it? Those old shire councillors who used to name their roads after themselves so they would be famous forever…That’s my opinion of…the colonial history attachment to place names. Often they are names like Zumsteins, as being named after a German guy, called Mr Zumsteins obviously, and you think “so what?” The person’s long since passed away, there are no family within cooee for ever and ever, possibly his only family is in Germany.

Here Kaye Harris is asserting her opinion that Indigenous toponyms link to significant place heritage, and are therefore important to her, compared to non-Indigenous names that represent to her an obsequious colonial system of sycophantism.
Denis Rose, in his oral history interview, added to this discussion in the links between names and places and stated that:

one of the sad parts about the debate recently about the teaching of Australian history and Australian values and all that sort of stuff that people they just want to ignore the fact that Australia’s got an Aboriginal history, a lot of people. Yeah I just think that let’s face it, let’s look at some things from another perspective and not from James Cook and that particular view. Let’s look at this country, its about, its not just about names and perspectives of how people view it but this is Aboriginal land you know I’ve yet to see the receipt that it was signed over. And that’s part of this as you are probably well aware there was quite a lot of controversial statements later but it is all part of the denial stuff that…you know people saying it was bullshit and these lands weren’t the case and whatever else. It’s a part of that denial stuff that Australia and Gariwerd and this whole area has a strong Indigenous history, Indigenous culture you can call it whatever names they are…the stories need to be told and this is part of the story telling.

When colonial explorer, and then Surveyor-General, Thomas Mitchell came through the study area in 1836, he brought with him the tools of colonisation. Pens and paper could be transformed into journals and maps, which in their own way transformed the landscape seen as space by the explorer into places known by his party. This process of transforming space into place by Australian explorers has been analysed in detail by Paul Carter. Carter (1987: xvii) acknowledges that traditional, empirical histories of Australia tend to legitimate actions of historical characters, to ‘give the impression that events unfold according to a logic of their own’, rather than focus on interpreting and they refer ‘neither to the place, nor the people’. In his reference to Mitchell, Carter (1987: 101) posits that Mitchell translated space into a ‘symbolic object’, and this object is what I am focussing on in this thesis. The object he created was the ‘Grampians’, a colonial interpretation of a landscape inhabited with Djabwurrung and Jardwadjali places. Mitchell had the means of using detailed maps and surveys to claim the land with not only geographical and empirical colonial means, but he also used names to claim. Denis Rose in his interview was acutely aware of the colonial interpretations of the landscape and how they have been promoted as the mainstream
histories. As such he was speaking against the hegemonic discourse and stating that Indigenous histories of place are just as important and relevant and deserve recognition through the use of Indigenous toponyms.

Day (2005: 52) asserts that the acts of mapping by colonial explorers were ways of asserting claim over land and were done as ‘part of the process of “knowing the land” and is an essential precondition before a supplanting society can assert credible claim to that land’. These places in the case study area, as described in chapter one, were those that Mitchell and subsequent colonists defined as important. Essentially, stations, rivers, mountains and eventually townships defined as places by colonists became those that were recorded, acknowledged and transmitted through the generations as places of importance. Day (2001) argues that the colonial act of mapping was a form of power over the landscape, wherein the colonists controlled the official knowledge and ownership of their own colonially-defined places, and subsequently placed Indigenous landscape understandings on the periphery. Mitchell’s acts of mapping and naming, which have been considered in Chapter 1 in more specific detail in regards to the case study area, laid the basis for the stories of colonial history to be told. An empirical, colonially-tinged repetition of ‘facts’ laid down in official journals and maps, through which subsequent inhabitants and visitors to the area sought to understand and connect with the place(s) (or in the case of Indigenous people, through which they were marginalised from the official understandings of the place). The sentiment that Kaye Harris, Denis Rose, and Tim Chatfield expressed were not done in isolation, or brought about in reaction to mainly historical events and social attitudes. As expressed in many letters, questionnaires and interviews, a vast section of the Grampians (Gariwerd) community continue to this day to remain ignorant of the local Indigenous history.

Doug, a local farmer in the area, often spoke in his interview of the veracity or ‘unreliability’ of the Indigenous claims. For Doug, evidence comes in the form of verifiable papers and maps and the notion that Indigenous people don’t necessarily have to use colonial tools of power to assert their claims appears to annoy him. Doug stated this as:

There’s no-one alive to say or criticise them to say that that is wrong.
If they can come up with an answer and say that’s what it is and you
accept it as gospel. If I give you something you want to see it in triplicate form and then research it don’t you?

Reilly (2003: 3) in a paper on native title and cartography in Australia, notes that ‘the imperative to map is colonial’. Reilly discusses the fact that there is an epistemological gap between the transmission of Indigenous understandings of the landscape, understandings which are passed on through oral testimony, and the colonial cartographic representations of the landscape, representations which are recorded on definable objects such as paper. Doug’s discussion outlined above is testament to the idea that in Australia, or at least acutely in the study area, the traditional colonial forms of knowledge and power transmission are still regarded by some in the community as legitimate, whilst Indigenous forms of knowledge transmission are somehow deemed ‘illegitimate’. Thus, he argued that non-Indigenous knowledge of place and use of toponyms was legitimate compared to Indigenous uses.

Lionel Harradine, a Gunditjmara elder based at Framlingham noted in his interview that because colonial concepts and understandings of the landscape were promoted vigilantly in official maps, books, brochures and histories, it was difficult for Indigenous people during the name restoration debate to promote their own understandings of the landscape as being reliable and valuable:

…when they started doing research on names and the…Aboriginality of the district and said “well jeez there’s a lot of Aboriginal history here, there’s names and there’s this and there’s that”…we then sat down and designed the Brambuk building and the Brambuk story, or didn’t design that, but you know we told the Brambuk story in the building which became sort of pretty unique, and then that was then a spring board. I think that’s where my own stuff comes in, it was a spring board to them challenging everything European in that area, to put the Aboriginal perspective to it and that’s what Brambuk almost is, is that. It, you know, gives the Aboriginal history to the area as best as we can. But what we found was a very hostile environment like the government. You’d go into Halls Gap you know, they’d sort of say, “oh there’s no Aborigines here, never was”, sort of thing. Well Jesus you know this is down the road from where Brambuk’s built, Lake
Bellfield is where the first killings were you know, a couple were
killed there and buried here. So, it’s an enormous history, and once you
start digging round, all the locals of course didn’t want to see it and
every time you know: just our presence they opposed.

In his book exploring the meaning of place to Indigenous and non-Indigenous people
in Australia, Read (2000) soliloquises a personal debate about the role of hegemonic
histories in Australia. In the reflective argument Read (2000: 2-3) acknowledges the
discursive issue of Indigenous and non-Indigenous histories when he states ‘but surely
there is no real truth, only partisans telling parallel narratives. Yes, but we do not
allow the parallel narrative to be told. Yes, but theirs is a fundamentally different
narrative of everlasting mythological and spiritual bonding with the land. Yes, but
many non-Aboriginals also feel a spiritual bonding to the land’. Read’s
acknowledgement of the uneasy relationship many Indigenous and non-Indigenous
people have with understanding the multiple associations that can occur with one
place was a theme often brought out in interviews with locals, as could be seen in the
statement above by Lionel Harradine, and was expressed by the non-Indigenous
farmer Doug. Gabriele Vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn (2006: 12) acknowledge
that ‘the political economy of place naming is not surprisingly ferociously fought
when the stakes are conceived to underpin the formation of nation-states and when the
peoples involved coexist in unequal positions’. Perhaps the statements from Lionel
Harradine and Doug belie an undercurrent of national ideology wherein Indigenous
and non-Indigenous peoples are coexisting in an unequal manner. It is certain that the
attachments to and importance of place is also coming across in these participant’s
statements as attachments to the toponyms too.

The basic concept that some non-Indigenous people expressed in relation to colonial
understandings of the places in the study area can be summarised as a feeling that
Indigenous places are not recorded in writing (traditionally official colonial
documents which stated who had power where), and where they are recorded, the
documents might be wrong. Linda, in an interview, expressed this as: ‘well, they
didn’t have a written language for a start, so that’s just somebody’s interpretation and
each tribe would have had their own language, and half of them mean sort of trees by
the water or something’. Whilst on the one hand acknowledging that Indigenous
languages and thus toponyms, cannot be verified in an area where the language is
perceived to be ‘dead’, on the other hand Linda did note that she had no problem with oral histories and that it was ‘fine, as I said, virtually every parish in this shire is an Aboriginal name anyway, so that’s fine’.

Further to this, there was an undercurrent of fear of the unknown, as stated by Anita ‘I mean we’ve got to acknowledge that the Aboriginal people were here but a lot of people feel threatened I think, they’re scared that they are going to lose their farms’. Read (2000: 5) acknowledges that Australian ‘culture seems unable to deal with the Aboriginal “other”’ and Anita’s statement shows partly how the inability to deal with the “other” stems in part to a fear of non-Indigenous people losing their farms, their places, their lifelines if they do acknowledge Indigenous place and its associated cultural heritage. For Linda and Anita the toponyms held important cultural information in a similar way the places did.

Barry, a non-Indigenous local, is able to acknowledge Indigenous heritage, and says of others in his cultural position, who cannot acknowledge the same landscape associations that:

- this prejudice arose from ignorance. They had no understanding at all of prior naming and they couldn’t put themselves in the position of saying “well if someone else came in and did that to us how would we feel about it 100 years later? Wouldn’t we still want to call it our own name? And why should someone else suddenly change it?” But no, they couldn’t do that.

For Barry, his ability to acknowledge the Indigenous places came from his experiences as a child living away from the eastern sea-board of Australia, where he was able to connect with Indigenous people on a daily basis and ‘it was just accepted…that was it you know? And no-one complained about it there’.

For all people interviewed, whether from an Indigenous or non-Indigenous perspective, the place(s) of the study area was very important in shaping their sense of self, and many interviewees discussed the place as having a ‘spirituality’ of some kind. Toby stated:

- …there’s something about these mountains that are just wonderful, one of the problems is when you live here you tend to take them for
granted because you see them every day. You see when you come back from Melbourne on a clear day you can see them for 80ks down the road and you think, “Wow I can see the mountains and it’s not that far now”. There is something very, very soothing and reassuring about that and every day they look different depending on how the sun shines on them. There’s something magic about it and so they mean a lot to me. To me they mean home because I live here, even though I’m not a local.

A similar sentiment was expressed by Glen, when he noted that:

And to me, it’s not the beauty, there’s an energy out there that I can’t explain…we’ve had guests from all over the world stay here and…some of them say it’s the most beautiful place they have ever been, can’t tell me that, I haven’t hardly been out of Australia but I’ve watched telly. It’s not the beauty, there’s an energy there and I’ll query them about it and they say that’s what it is. So, that’s what the Grampians mean to me.

From this analysis of the interviewees, a common thread can be found: that of attachment to the places and the toponyms. The notion that the case study area has Indigenous, non-Indigenous and a mixed Anglo-Indigenous understanding of places can be seen. I have briefly discussed understandings of place, and briefly alluded to how place meanings are constructed, to give a greater contextual understanding of the multiple interpretations available in the area. Now, more discussion will focus on the way that place meanings are constructed and form a sense of place for people. The key importance of this discussion will be to outline how sense of toponym might be correlated to sense of place.

**Sense of Place and Sense of Toponym**

Altman and Low (1992b: 5) note that place ‘refers to space that has been given meaning through personal, group, or cultural processes’. Altman and Low argue that in the process of transmogrifying space into place, as discussed in chapter two, meanings are attributed to the geographical area. Further to Altman and Low’s theory, Eisenhauer, Krannich and Blahna (2000: 422) posit that ‘the process of transforming spaces into places is influenced by one’s culture’. They argue that
cultural influence not only controls the processes involved in forming place, but also guides the utilization of this place in all future interactions, ‘local community cultures influence sense of place because understandings of the environment are rooted in the cultural network of beliefs of an individual's social group’. Thus, the process of creating place influences not only the appearance of the place, but the interactions that occur there. Further to this, the interactions are shaped in part by the locality, and also by the predominant culture of the inhabitants. It is in a sense a symbiotic relationship.

The relationships that people form with places are intrinsically important in their daily lives. The formation of a positive feeling towards a place can be called ‘sense of place’ or ‘place attachment’. Hidalgo and Hernandez (2001: 274) assert that a general description of place attachment defines it as ‘an affective bond or link between people and specific places’. Hidalgo and Hernandez posit that place attachment takes two forms, a social and a physical attachment (2001: 279). Jorgensen and Stedman (2006: 316) note that place attachment is a concept that can be included under the term ‘sense of place’, along with the constructs of place identity and place dependence. These two terms of identity and dependence are similar to those of social and physical, and considering recent literature by Williams and Vaske, this thesis defers to the terms identity and dependence. Williams and Vaske (2003) also classify place attachment under the term ‘sense of place’, but go further than Jorgensen and Stedman, along the same lines as Hidalgo and Hernandez, and state that identity and dependence are correlated concepts which are sub-constructs of place attachment. Given that this thesis is concentrated in part on defining whether the theories on place attachment, identity and dependence can be correlated or linked to toponyms, this chapter will focus on the theories of place attachment, and the following two chapters, chapters five and six, will discuss identity and dependence.

Dear and Flusty (2002: 2) have noted that places exist to act as locales for the repository of history, ‘in particular economic, political and socio-cultural history is place-specific in that such relationships unfold in recognizable locales according to a (sometimes opaque) logic of spatial diffusion’. According to Carter et al. (1993: xii) places embody ‘the symbolic and imaginary investments of a population’. Relph (1976: 43) posits that ‘events and actions are significant only in the context of certain
places, and are coloured and influenced by the character of those places even as they contribute to that character'. Hence, there can be a dualistic meaning to a place. The place can have a cultural meaning, which in turn influences the cultural practices undertaken in that place. In the same way, meanings can be taken from, and reinforced in a place. In the study area, the predominant culture of the inhabitants is that of a colonial Australia, one where the official histories are often told as a pre-history of Indigenous people being in the landscape until Mitchell came along and ‘claimed it’. This culture was aptly described in a letter by Eric Beale, in the *Hamilton Spectator* (1989):

..what is important is that mountains were named in 1836 as the Grampians and that is what they have been known as here and all over the world for the last 150 years. As for Crabb's crazy statement that "the white man...wiped out thousands of years of civilisation". I simply ask what civilisation? Does anybody know what he is talking about? Does he know himself?...Places in Victoria had to be named, and Major Mitchell's epic journey did us a great service not only in discovering these wonderful mountains but in giving some of the features very appropriate names, e.g. Mount Abrupt; and even if one or two were unsuitable, which they are not, they are still the name by which millions of Australians have known them since the first days of settlement...Also for Mr Crabb's information, thousands of features in the Grampians already have a name. Only a very few have ever had Aboriginal names. So if he pursues his crusade, he is going to have to invent a few thousand Aboriginal name places, ones that never existed before...

Beale’s statement can be analysed critically for its notion that the important associations, and by implication the important places, were created by a culture predominantly influence by colonial perceptions of an ‘empty’ landscape, waiting to be claimed and named, as the Indigenous people for Beale were not a ‘civilisation’. This assertion of a place understood in terms of its colonial importance was common amongst the letters.
Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff (1983: 64) have noted that the influence of culture on the creation of place means that place-identities of different ethnic, social, national and religious groups in a given culture should reveal not only different uses and experiences with space and place, but corresponding variations in the social values, meanings, and ideas which underlie the use of those spaces.

In Australia, particularly with our policies on multiculturalism, this statement has strong currency. Yet, I would go further than Proshansky et al (1983), and hypothesize that not only do different groups use and value places differently, but that mainstream society also defines what constitutes ‘normal’ interactions, which then subordinates all other interactions as ‘outside the norm’. This description of ‘normal’ was highlighted many times, and in different ways, in the letters, questionnaires and participant oral history interviews. On the one hand, there were people asserting their right to be proud of colonial history, and on the other hand there were people claiming that they had a right to acknowledge Indigenous history. Somewhere in the middle there were also people saying that the two histories should be merged.

The desire to be proud of colonial history, was penned by M.E. Mercovich in the Sun newspaper (1990):

Steve Crabb will insult our early settlers by renaming the Grampians...Crabb and his advisers should read Like the Ark by Lorna Banfield, to understand local history. My great-grandparents were Scottish migrants, forced off their crofts on the Isle of Skye by the Chieftans, and had to migrate to Australia. I was reared in the Grampians, and am now 85 years old, and the only Aboriginal I ever saw was Mulga Fred, who used to throw boomerangs at Stawell Gift meetings.

Mercovich’s letter highlights not only her approval of colonial history, that of ‘settlers’, but also identifies that Indigenous people were on the peripheries of the society, they were minimal in their impact on her understanding of the place, they were ‘boomerang throwers’. For Mercovich the understanding of place, the sense of place, is identified through colonial stories of pioneers and settlers. A similar sentiment was shared by Pawsey (1989) who wrote to the Wimmera Mail-Times that:
As a descendant of pioneers of the Halls Gap area, I feel it would be an insult to our pioneers and the explorers who came before them to erase their names and memory from these mountains...If the Aborigines claim they own the Grampians, hence the name change, then surely they must claim to own all of Victoria and Australia...The many names of features in the Grampians have become familiar to tourists and residents over the years and I feel would totally lose their character if changed.

This letter expresses the feeling that for Pawsey his sense of place is linked to the history of the ‘pioneers’ in the area. Essentially Pawsey’s sense of place is defined through interactions based in a colonially-defined place of the National Park. The influence of this colonial culture can be seen in the fact that Pawsey locates the pioneers at the centre of his sense of place, and the Indigenous understandings are on the periphery, because as Pawsey hints, almost sarcastically, Indigenous people cannot claim ‘ownership’ of all Victoria and Australia. By deduction, it can be inferred that for Pawsey his sense of place is based on ‘legitimated’ colonial concerns, and that Indigenous places do not factor into this. For Pawsey too the linking symbols of the colonial understandings are the toponyms as he understands them to be: non-Indigenous or Anglo-Indigenous.

Cosgrove and Jackson (1987: 99) posited that in geographical studies, culture is ‘the medium through which people transform the mundane phenomenon of the material world into a world of significant symbols to which they give meaning and attach value’. Nevertheless, Mitchell (1995: 102) has recently argued that in geographical studies ‘there is no such (ontological) thing as culture’. As defined in chapter two, Mitchell (1995: 103-4) asserted that ‘there is only a very powerful idea of culture, an idea that has developed under specific historical conditions and was later broadened as a means of explaining material differences, social order and relations of power’. Mitchell’s arguments are important for the current study, as there is a fine line to be drawn between defining a cultural characteristic of a landscape, and defining the cultural landscape as one in which ‘others’ exist. It can be seen from the examples above, that the colonial culture of the case study area and Australia in general, has allowed Mercovich, Pawsey, and others like them, to found their sense of place on an
understanding of colonial power at the centre, and Indigenous people being ‘boomerang throwers’ who cannot possibly claim ‘ownership’ of the study area, let alone Victoria or Australia, at the periphery. The sentiments expressed in these letters seem to correlate with my hypothesis that mainstream society creates and promotes a sense of place where colonial understandings are at the centre, and non-colonial understandings are on the periphery. Yet, as Proshansky et al. have noted: in a multifaceted culture, many meanings can be created around and derived from a place. This divergence of sense of place can be seen in Indigenous and middle-stream senses of place. Interestingly too it could be asserted that the use of colonial toponyms such as Grampians act as a symbolic claim of colonial meaning being centre-stage in Australian culture.

For people who have an Indigenous heritage and sense of place in the National Park area, they expressed a sentiment of having been ‘forgotten’ for many years by a mainstream culture that placed them on the ‘outside’. James, an Indigenous man in his mid-20s, residing in western Victoria, stated to me in an interview that:

I still remember my high school years and I remember doing, I think year 9 history, we finally got onto Aboriginal Australia as a subject and basically they drew a pie chart on the wall, on the black board and a small slice. They said this pie chart represents 40,000 years and this small slice is for how long white people have been in the country. And they told us what a boomerang was and a spear, and basically then we went on and studied American Indian history for the next 3 months.

In this recounting of his sense of place in Australian history, James is admitting that even at school he was placed on the periphery of knowledge. Manzo (2003: 55) notes that places can be political, in that the site of places can be a contested area for rights and usage, and places can define who ‘belongs’. The teaching of Indigenous history in Australia has had a chequered past, and recent research by Anna Clark (2008) has illuminated certain factors which have been at play. Clark asserts that there has been reluctance from teachers to present Indigenous cultural heritage to students because of their own lack of knowledge or access to resources, and politically there were at various stages pushes to present linear, chronologically based narratives of history. James’ sense of place in the National Park area identifies how his attachment to the
area is positive, but also sometimes negated by the mainstream community ideals and values. James states that even today in the National Park area some people still expect that you’ve got to be you know, blacker than the night, and basically you should be painted up 24 hours a day wearing a lap-lap. And it just continues to astound me that’s what people perceive as what Aboriginal people are. They expect you to still be living off the land, in 2006, when there’s no land to live off.

This is a common cultural occurrence in Australia, and James’ experience is not isolated. As Paradies (2006: 359) asserts, ‘arguably even more prevalent than the fantasy of marginality that adheres to Indigeneity is the pernicious fantasy of the “Indigenous look”…Fair-skinned Indigenous people experience racism, scorn and disbelief from other Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike’.

For others, with a colonial heritage or non-Indigenous heritage, some came to a ‘middle-of-the-road’ analysis of their understandings of place. For Ted, his sense of place was collected over many years. It started as an understanding of colonial place history, where the colonists had come in, created the places he now lived in, and the Aboriginal people had seemed to fall out of focus:

you had no idea that there were Aboriginal communities still in Victoria…but I sort of became interested in those things when I was teaching and books started to come out…but again I don’t think it would say anything about descendants of these people are still around, it just wasn’t a jump that people made you know? It was all about them, you know the Frontier Wars or whatever they’re called, the Aboriginal wars of the 1840s and squatters having to defend their huts and all the rest of it you know?...I’d known about and visited a couple of the art sites and knew a little bit about them but yeah I mean they weren’t presented in the early days with much sort of context, it was just this kind of odd little thing that had happened, a few Aborigines had come along and painted a few pictures and then gone away again, you know?

Ted acknowledges that he sought out more information on Indigenous cultural heritage, and started to see an understanding of the multiplicity of place connections around him. It was not a simple task, and something that he reflects on earnestly:
I studied Australian history in what’s now Year 12 and I can remember thinking at the time that we were told that the official policy was an assimilation of Aborigines, because you study the Aborigines sort of thing, the official policy was assimilation but there was also this thing called self determination. I can remember thinking well which is the policy? These two things are mutually exclusive you know, it’s gotta be one or the other but that was never made clear and I could never work it out myself. I can sort of see now how the two things were sort of going wrong in parallel and you know obviously in conflict and eventually I suppose, well both still have their effects today you know, but it wasn’t sort of made explicit then.

The act of attaching meaning to place infuses a location with different memories. These meanings can become personal or collective memories, called upon for purposes such as national commemorations (war memorials), personal celebrations and loss. Casey (1987: 194) wrote that

moving in or through a given place, the body imports its own emplaced past into its present experience: its local history is literally a history of locales. This very importation of past places occurs simultaneously with the body’s ongoing establishment of directionality, level and distance, and indeed influences these latter in myriad ways.

Thus, according to Casey, places are presents and pasts at the same time. To understand a place you must understand its past, or have a past association with it. In regards to the understanding he gained of his own sense of place, Ted noted that he was at first uninformed and preferred a colonially-defined sense of place, but only because the original cultural ideology he adopted didn’t give him a ‘sense of long occupation or close spiritual relationship with the land, or creation stories, or anything like that, that all came later you know?’.

How meanings are received from the landscape is a wide area of research, pertaining to the studies of what Tuan (1974) termed topophilia. So far in this chapter we have considered how a sense of place(s) has been formed in the National Park area, and the multiplicity of meanings that exist. The sense of place experienced by people familiar with the National Park has been shaped by their own personal cultural heritage, and
the heritage promoted and taught by the society around them. In addition, it can be asserted that in the letters and oral-history interviews the keen sense of place was also described through a sense of toponym. For instance, as noted earlier, Pawsey linked the toponyms to ‘memories’ and stated it would be an insult to ‘pioneers’ to remove the names. This notion of memories being linked to toponyms has not been expressed before in geographical literature, it is generally referred to as links made to a specific place, rather than the name itself. It is here in the data, that a link between sense of place and a general sense of toponym can be found and a rationale is provided for further investigating what the roles of toponyms are in society. I would now like to consider in detail the thoughts of the interviewees as to their understanding of the importance of toponyms and place in their lives.

**Can a Toponym Make a Place?**

Place Attachment is an interesting phenomenon. Stueve, Gerson and Fischer (1975: 3) note that attachment can occur or be formed with a place because of a territorial instinct, or a need to develop a psychological stability. The authors also note that the functional explanations of attachment to place attest that the attachments occur because a ‘place meets certain social or psychic needs, so that without it people suffer’ (Stueve *et al.*, 1975). Riley (1992: 20) asserts that the attachments to place are not to the landscape itself, but to the memories associated with the place. Altman and Low (1992b: 4) note that attachment to a place ‘contributes to individual, group and cultural self-definition and integrity’ and that the attachment aspect of the term relates to the emotions people experience, whereas the place aspect of the term relates to the environmental settings. Importantly, Altman and Low (1992b: 5) assert that future research into place attachment should concern itself with the ‘nature and dynamic of attachment to different types of places and objects’ to ascertain whether ‘the same principles apply to people’s bonding to objects and places of varying scale’ or if they can be understood as ‘distinct phenomena’. They question whether attachments made to places are possible to distinguish from attachments made towards the symbols of places. In this regard, this thesis is examining this exact question: is a person’s attachment to a place distinguishable from their attachment to a symbol of the place, the toponym? In this chapter this has already partly been shown to exist and will now be explored in greater detail.
According to Bonyhady and Griffiths (2002: 1) two elements of the landscape (place and toponym) can possibly be seen as opposites:

While "landscape" often evokes the natural world, "language" suggests the human. But landscape is also a word freighted with cultural meaning which suggests a view that is remote and painterly - a product of the world of art - while language can be portrayed as regional if not local, native if not natural.

This notion in itself calls into question the relationship between landscape and language. Namely, if landscape and place are, as defined by Bonyhady and Griffiths, culturally based, then it stands to reason that the specific language being localized is relevant. Hence, close attention needs to be given to the impact that varying linguistic styles arising from cultural events have in the creation of toponyms. As stated earlier in this chapter the three linguistic aspects of the toponyms in the case study area can be categorised as Indigenous, non-Indigenous and Anglo-Indigenous. The Indigenous toponyms are those that have been used contemporaneously pre- and post-colonisation. The non-Indigenous toponyms are those that were used in the colonisation process of transforming space into place, and are sometimes also referred to as colonial names. The Anglo-Indigenous toponyms fit between the categories of Indigenous and non-Indigenous, in that they comprise Indigenous words/names to define place from space for colonial purposes (Kostanski, 2005). These toponyms are ones that used to be the exclusive domain of Indigenous cultures, but are now used for colonially-defined places. For example, the toponym *Ballarat* pre-colonisation was utilised by the Wathawurrung people as part of their cultural heritage and post-colonisation the toponym was used for the name of a colonially-formed town in Wathawurrung country.

Milligan, (1998: 12) extrapolating from Zerubavel’s (1996: 285) conceptualisation of mnemonic others as being the reminders of the past, defines places as ‘mnemonic devices’. By utilizing the term *mnemonic places* Milligan (1998: 12) stated that she wanted to ‘emphasise the capacity of physical sites to organise the past experiences of an individual, as well as to transmit aspects of a shared or collective past’. In this research, I sought to find out whether this is the same for the toponym: whether the
experience is made possible not only by the physical site, but by the symbol, the name, of that site. Indeed, mnemonic devices are used with the intention of assisting the memory. Thus, whilst Milligan’s focus was on the physical location itself, this section will focus on the symbolic, or imagined, representation of that location, the toponym, as a mnemonic device for memories and associations. Importantly, as Milligan has noted, places transmit aspects of individual and collective pasts. As was seen earlier in this chapter, the gatekeepers of the “official” past were hesitant to acknowledge the Indigenous history. There is a possibility that as mnemonic devices, places and names are hegemonic devices which act as official symbols a particular culture wish to promote, thus subjugating all other symbolic devices to an “other” status. As David noted in his oral-history interview:

…they live in supplanted European history on Australian soil. If we could just get them to understand that look, restoration of names which really are a reflection of the history of the country is better than a substitute name. I can’t see people of goodwill would be upset by calling it Gariwerd now.

Here there is acknowledgement that toponyms act as mnemonic devices and that the linguistic background of the name is important as it makes direct correlations to the cultural import of the name.

According to her theory of interactional past, Milligan (1998: 8) argued that a site becomes meaningful for individuals specifically because of the ‘activities that have occurred within its boundaries’, and thus a history of the place is created through the processes of experiences. Indeed, the experiences are linked so emotively to that place, that it is the place itself which, Milligan theorised, holds the essential element with which people become attached. Furthermore, it is posited that due to interactions with a place, meanings are bestowed upon it ‘to the extent that an attachment has formed due to the meaningfulness of the interactions that have occurred there’ (Milligan, 1998: 9). Thus, in essence, Milligan asserted that people are attached to past experiences that specific places represent to them. It could be found in the interviews that toponyms also filled the role of representing past experiences and associations, as stated by Victoria and her partner Graham:

Victoria: It is very much an associated thing and in that sense Dunkeld [a town to the south of the case study area] has a real affiliation with
Dunkeld in Scotland to the point of the schools used to…correspond and there was various people when they travelled that they always went to Dunkeld to take a little bit of this Dunkeld or there were flags exchanged and things like that and so if this was named some Aboriginal name…

Graham: …That association would disappear.

Essentially, as could be expected for a place, Victoria and Graham are asserting that the toponym Dunkeld also has an interactional past to which they are attached and identify with both individually and as a community.

As a result of this building of place-based history, Milligan (1998) further asserted that individual attachment also focuses on the future direction of this attachment, through which ‘specific features of the site shape, constrain, and influence the activities that are perceived as able to happen within it’. Additionally, consideration of this theory can be given in line with the idea that ‘people often speak of not knowing what they have lost until it is gone, but this is exactly the feature of nostalgia which acts to create continuity in identity’ (Milligan, 1998: 11). Milligan’s study focused on physical place attachment and evidence was located in the oral history interviews which suggests that it is not only place which provides a continuity of identity. Don Johns, a participant in the oral-history interviews, asserted that ‘once they are established, once you’ve got a name established, people relate to that name…They’re synonymous with Australia’. Ergo, the proposal to remove the colonial names could be perceived as an attempt to discontinue the colonial identities associated with the places. In this way it can be seen that toponyms provide continuity of identity.

Zerubavel (2003: 6) noted that mnemonic communities centre their identity within specific places, and that this identity is transmitted through oral traditions. This method of transmitting identity is referred to as mnemonic transitivity, and relies on preserving memories ‘in the form of oral traditions that are transmitted from one generation to the other’. The memories form a basis for group cohesion, and imbue the place with meanings. In this sense we come to a key question of this research, namely is the attachment solely a place-based experience? Or, is it the mnemonic
device to which people form an attachment in conjunction with, or exclusively from, the place?

The mnemonic capabilities of toponyms are important to consider. As there are multiple cultural types of toponyms used in the study area, participants in the oral history interviews were asked to reflect on what the toponyms represented to them. Importantly, the participants were asked to discern the role that toponyms play in their lives: whether toponyms make a place, or help identify associations with a place. The participants’ responses to this question will be considered in regards to place attachment with relevance to two clearly identified themes: Indigenous toponyms and non-Indigenous toponyms. A key question concerning this thesis is in regards to whether attachment to place can be distinguished from attachment to toponym. This question was posed to participants in the oral-history interviews, wherein I asked them whether a place name makes a place, or helps in identifying it in a different way than the place does itself. Low (1992: 173) posits that one form of attachment to a place is based on a ‘narrative linkage’ which works as the telling of myths and family histories and functions ‘as a type of cultural place attachment’. She describes how for the Pintupi of Western Australia, their landscape narrative ‘actively links people to place’ (Low, 1992: 175). Respondents to the question I posed regarding their attachments to the toponyms and the places, would often give an answer through a narrative format, wherein they would describe their attachment to the toponym through a story of an interaction they’d had with the name. For purposes of clarity I have divided this discussion into two distinct elements: Indigenous toponyms and non-Indigenous toponyms, as the participants in the research often discussed different associations with these two name forms.

Attachment and Indigenous Toponyms
Jenny noted that for her the town name of Mirranatwa (which is an Anglo-Indigenous toponym derived from the Djabwurrung word Mirranaduwa meaning ‘a hole in the ground, or a cave’ (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 147) was just a name to represent the place. Yet, Jenny also acknowledged that for visitors the name was intriguing because it was ‘strange’ and
people want to go to Mirranatwa because it’s a nice name, it comes off the tongue very easily, and I say well, look Mirranatwa is just an area and all you’ll see is a hall and a fire station [but they don’t seem to mind that this is all that will be there], so to me a name does make a place.

Jenny is indicating here how there is a distinct difference in the types of representations a toponym can make for a place, compared to how a toponym can form an attachment to an area. For visitors unfamiliar with the place of Mirranatwa the name is supposedly ‘different’ and ‘intriguing’. The toponym can represent an idea of an ‘interesting’ place, a place as yet unvisited. As the name is Indigenous in origin, for visitors to the area who are interested in experiencing Indigenous cultural heritage, they can form an attachment with the toponym which will be very different to the attachment they form with the place itself. Setha Low (1992: 166) acknowledges that ‘place attachment can apply to places that a person never experiences, or it can apply to land ownership and citizenship that symbolically encode socio-political as well as experiential meanings’. As Jenny indicated, visitors in the area attach a significant meaning to the Indigenous name, and upon arriving in the place realise that it is a hall and fire station – something far removed from what the toponym is perceived by some to indicate. In this way the sense of toponym links to an ancient Indigenous heritage, whereas the sense of place is that of a small hall and fire station. Whilst Jenny was stating that the name itself might not represent an actual sense of place, there were others who thought than some toponyms could directly explain a sense of place, through their own sense of toponym.

Where place names of Indigenous origin have been restored, and the local population has adapted to the change, there are indications that the Indigenous names are perceived to be more ‘appropriate’ for an area. Richard DeFegely, local Liberal MP at the time of the name restoration proposal, noted that the type of toponym in use for an area can be very important for how people interact there. Richard noted that some toponyms can have ‘some specific sort of meaning that sparks an interest in people, then it certainly can have a, you know can be advantageous to use that name. A name for a name's sake, I don't think really makes any difference’. Richard DeFegely went on to discuss a placename of local interest to him, that of Mt Langi-Ghiran, which
was officially named *Mt Mistake* until the early 1990s (the name Mt Langi-Ghiran is a composite with the English generic followed by an Indigenous toponym). He noted that ‘you couldn’t call that place Mt Mistake, I mean Mt Langi-Ghiran was just spot on for it you know, “The home of the Black Cockatoos”. So you know, to that extent I think names are very important’. For Richard DeFegely, the toponym can create a sense of attachment, a link to the Indigenous heritage, and as the mountain area is a preserved piece of State Park in Western Victoria, the natural environment of the area lends itself to being understood in a non-colonial manner. Whilst the rigidly mapped and defined borders of the Park indicate colonial ownership, the local flora and fauna indicate a ‘natural’ environment which for Richard DeFegely the Indigenous toponym creates a more relevant attachment than the non-Indigenous name.

Low (1992: 165) has asserted that ‘place attachment is the symbolic relationship formed by people giving culturally shared emotional/affective meanings to a particular space or piece of land that provides the basis for the individual’s or group’s understanding of and relation to the environment’. It would appear from Jenny and Richard’s statements that it can be posited that toponymic attachment is also a symbolic relationship that people form which can help in transmitting meanings to a place, and which can also provide a person’s understanding of a place (whether the place has been experienced or not). This symbolic relationship and the notion of ‘relevance’ that Richard DeFegely discussed in regards to toponyms creating an attachment was also expressed by Steve Crabb, the tourism minister responsible for proposing the Indigenous name restoration in 1989. Steve Crabb lamented the lack of Indigenous toponyms to indicate landscapes which he felt were best represented by Indigenous cultural heritage:

> I was walking in the Western McDonnells’ and that came across me there, because the names are all Stanley Chasm etc. yeah, I mean and yet I’ve actually walked up those hills. It’s like being in a Njamatjirra painting, it’s superb country. But it’s lost. It’s sort of, you know, the mystical association. All that stuff, the Aboriginal legends about how things got made and giant emus and all the rest of it…All that stuff, I mean that should be in the names, it should be in there and it’s not and it’s a good shame that it's not…because we’re still walking through.
It’s a mountain but to know that there is a past to this place and there is a culture connected to it, it enhances the experience visually. It’s quite perfectly a good thing to do to it. It enhances your experience…

For Steve Crabb the Indigenous names created a symbolic link, an attachment, to the Indigenous cultural heritage of the landscape. The attachment Steve Crabb created with the Indigenous toponyms allowed him to experience the landscape in the manner he saw as appropriate. By inference, the non-Indigenous names acted as obstructions in interacting with the place, and were deemed to be ‘inappropriate’ by Steve Crabb. Rautio-Helander (2006) has noted that the non-use of Indigenous names is synonymous with the acts of ‘silencing’ Indigenous voices. Rautio-Helander posits that for colonially-dominated countries to not use Indigenous toponyms is comparable to a cultural act of silence similar to toponymic genocide. In his statement Steve Crabb is also equating this notion that a sense of toponym can aid in creating a sense of place, of linking cultural heritage to an area.

In the study area there are names which are linked to Indigenous heritage, and as has been exemplified, people can become attached to these toponyms in different ways than they do to the place. Indigenous toponyms can represent a link to a different experience of a place than the physical location allows. Yet, Indigenous names and words are not the only linguistic tools that have been used for toponyms in the area. Therefore it is important to consider the non-Indigenous toponyms and the attachments that people can possibly form with them.

**Attachment and Non-Indigenous Toponyms**

For people who expressed an attachment to the non-Indigenous names, they cited similar reasons to those that had formed an affinity with Indigenous names. Hidalgo and Hernandez (2001: 274) note that the formation of attachment for an individual to a place means that the person will have a tendency to ‘maintain closeness to such a place’. A similar sentiment can be found in expressions towards toponyms, a sentiment which indicates an attachment formed by maintaining a closeness to the name. In a participant oral-history interview, Mary noted that

I mean obviously the Grampians were named after the Grampians in Scotland and so allowing that the majority of the early population
came from England I guess for them there was an association. And I suppose some of that still lives on. When people think Grampians they think mountains. If you said Gariwerd I don’t know that they’d actually think mountains…I mean Ballarat doesn’t tell you anything. I mean Melbourne doesn’t tell you anything. Really I mean Grampians is probably one of the few names that actually does tell you a story. In terms of a name it’s got the association I suppose to the UK.

Mary is asserting that she has formed an attachment to the toponym Grampians, as it allows her (and she presumes others like her in the community) to maintain a link or association with the ‘early population’ from the United Kingdom. This was a sentiment also shared by Brian, in his oral-history interview, noted that the non-Indigenous placenames made the National Park an ‘English type of area or Scottish type of area from the point of view of being called the Grampians or Dunkeld. And you know, those sort of names perhaps have had an influence on it over the years’. For both Mary and Brian the toponymic attachment they experienced and acknowledged was based on an affinity the toponym allowed them with the British heritage of the area. Brian went as far to acknowledge that the toponym itself had reinforced or influenced the culture of the area.

For another participant, Nicholas, he maintained in his oral-history interview, that local names such as McKenzie Falls or Elephant’s Hide acted as a mnemonic device for childhood memories of camping in the National Park with his scout group, and ‘crawling up and down’ the Elephant’s Hide. Nicholas insisted that the background of the names wasn’t necessarily important for him, but he was attached to what the names represented. In a similar manner, Toby in his interview noted that if you mention Mount Sturgeon and Mount Abrupt, The Piccaninny, Mount William they all mean things to me and if you were to change all those names, I guess over time if I had a gun pointed to my head I would probably eventually work out that Mount Sturgeon is whatever the new name is. But I would find that just unsettling and, well, certainly unnecessary.

To Anita, she asserted that the colonial names in the area made people ‘very passionate, because a lot of people around here are very passionate and as I say they are of Scottish descent’. Low (1992: 166) asserts that place attachment can be
formed through six kinds of symbolic linkage, one of which is genealogical. This genealogical link is described as a link of ‘people and land through the historical identification of place and family or community’ (Low, 1992: 167). When I asked Anita whether the toponyms helped link her with her Scottish ancestry she replied that the names did, because ‘I felt an affinity, I felt a spirituality about the place’. This statement from Anita indicates that in addition to Low’s statement about place attachment being formed through a genealogical link, it would appear that toponyms also provide that symbolic link and can provide a basis for attachment.

With non-Indigenous toponyms there was a sentiment that, similar to Indigenous toponyms, people formed an attachment to the symbolic devices. This attachment was also discussed in abstract, or as mentioned before ‘narrative’ format, with some participants drawing parallels to the attachments they had with study area names and other toponyms they used in their daily lives.

**Attachment and Toponyms in General**
The general attachments that people can form with toponyms was expressed by many oral-history interview participants. The interviewees noted that the attachments they felt towards a toponym were distinguishable, yet intrinsically linked with the places they knew physically or had experienced emotionally. As highlighted earlier, Low (1992: 166) acknowledges that place attachment can occur towards places that people have never physically experienced. In her interview, Gwenda Allgood noted that toponyms mightn’t ‘make a place but they give you a vision’. She explained this by stating that ‘when you go into a new area, you always get this vision in your mind. You think you know what it’s going to be, and when you arrive the first thing that you actually see is something that stays with you, isn’t it?’ Robert indicated that toponyms are similar to names that are used for people. He stated that some ‘people that are born with the most horrible names…they make something of it and there are those who are born with horrible names and duck and baulk and weave and hate their name and change it and what have you’. He noted that for the National Park area this meant that ‘the natural beauty of the Grampians and the area has its own attraction within itself and necessarily possibly what you called it may not have a huge difference’. This idea was again iterated by Stuart, who stated that the actual
linguistic background of a toponym was probably not important to him, rather what he associated with the name was important. Stuart drew a link between how if the Grampians were referred to as Wilson’s Promontory, it’s still like I think, I don’t know, it’s possibly not important… And that’s not to diminish the importance of referring to something perhaps by its Aboriginal name, but it could be any Aboriginal name the same way it could be any European name.

In the interviews with participants this idea that the construct of a toponym was not important but the cultural links and attachments people formed with a toponym were important often lead to confusion with the participants. This idea of confusion was expressed eloquently by Liam who proposed that toponyms were important because they ‘help you re-associate back to that place perhaps…Like the place is the place, it’s regardless of the name. But we just need to associate and identify that place by the name’. He was referring to a dependence on the name as a locational tool in a similar way you might refer to a place dependence (a theme to be explored in chapter six). In the same instance Liam also acknowledged that

I don’t know if there is this huge spiritual powerful link between the name and the place. I just think it’s an association, it’s a common thing that we do, oh, The Grampians, that’s in Victoria, it’s this beautiful National Park. It could be called Gariwerd, that’s this beautiful place in Victoria, that’s a National Park. I don’t know if it’s that significant, it’s just associating with the name and the place.

Laura: So it’s important but it’s not important?

Liam: That’s a contradiction.

The contradiction was obvious to many interviewees. One participant, Matthew, and his partner, Amy, suggested that for people with an association with a toponym, ‘their association is what makes the place rather than the name. But for people that have heard about it second hand or something or read about it in the literature, it’s probably reasonably important’. Here they are indicating the same sentiments as Gwenda Allgood, that a toponym can help identify an attachment to a place not yet visited. Matthew also went on to acknowledge that, like Robert it’s like giving a child a name isn’t it? They become like their name…Because it influences the way you react to it and it influences
some of your understanding about it and it influences the, how you 
behave towards it, a child and towards a place. If a place has a name 
like Paradise, you obviously are going to have a different attitude 
towards it…

and Amy continued this idea by adding ‘…like a place called Hell!’’. Matthew 
asserted that the linguistic pedigree of a toponym was important because for 
Indigenous languages ‘we won’t have some of the concepts that go with the culture or 
the country if we lose the language. You can’t express them in our language, it’s an 
inappropriate language. So therefore the naming of it is important for how we feel 
about the place, how we regard it’. Matthew summarised his attachments to names, 
and the importance in daily life by acknowledging that ‘I think humans need 
connection a lot more than they recognise and so we connect through words and 
therefore we will connect through names’.

This idea of the symbolic nature of toponyms, and the attachments that people can 
form, was also expressed by Jason who posited that toponyms 
don’t make a place, but they help you to form an attachment to a place.

I think just by naming something in general is going to identify it in 
your head. Makes it easier to communicate to someone what you’re 
talking about, instead of saying oh, you know, the mountains up that 
way…I think the names do, they give it that purpose. I think they 
certainly give it an identity, they give it a location, whether it makes a 
place or not, I really don’t see that.

How toponyms communicate an idea is an interesting point. The symbolic nature of 
names, as discussed earlier, can provide insight into the psychological profile of an 
area, in that it can identify the cultural mores of the community that uses the name. In 
the same way that cultural geographers study the cultural formation of places, and 
how the physical landscape can identify the cultural norms of a society, so can a 
toponym. Ted, an interview participant noted that ‘the stories associated with the 
name…make the place rather than just the name itself’. The very symbolic 
importance of a name of any kind is an area of research interest for linguists.

In a letter to the editor penned by Mr and Mrs Fields (1990: 5) from Ballarat during
the name restoration debate, they outlined the fact that they were opposed to the Government renaming proposal. They stated that the name Grampians was important to them because it linked them to the history of the area. They wrote that Aborigines make up one per cent of Australia's population, a minority group, and now have to share Australia with the other 99 per cent. I was born at Bendigo, 1950, so am as much a native as any Aborigine. So was my father…. I choose to live at Ballarat, not because it has an Aboriginal name, but because it's both city and country at the same time. Day after day, week in week out, I see very few Aborigines on the streets. So, where are they? The name Ballarat is Indigenous in origin, being a Wathaurong word meaning ‘reclining on elbow’ (Clark and Heydon, 2002: 21). For the Fields the name Ballarat did not have much meaning to them at all as an etymologically Indigenous name—instead for them the name Ballarat reminded them of their history and location. For them because the physical place has its own intrinsic meaning, the etymology or Indigenous meaning of the name Ballarat was of little consequence. They had indeed built their own associations with the name Ballarat and it represented to them a meaning of an urbanised country town not a Wathaurong dreaming place. Thus, it can be seen that whilst the name Ballarat was important for the Fields, the fact that it is Indigenous in origin was perceived to be of little consequence to them.

The letter by the Fields also pointed to their abhorrence of what they perceived to be historical revisionism and the possibility that their sense of toponym, their sense of the word Grampians and all it represents, will be erased. The Fields were opposed to the renaming of the Grampians because as they saw it the place and the name were inextricably linked to their own personal historical identification with the area. The name and the place can have multiple meanings in their opinion. Their sense of place was not under threat as there was no government proposal to change a physical aspect of the study area, only a proposal to change the symbolic aspect. For the Fields to react so strongly to this perceived interference hints at the existence of them having formed a sense of toponym, or an attachment to, the name Grampians.

On the other side of the debate, as expressed in a letter by Andrew Van Diesen (1990: 8), is the proposal that people do not create any type of bond with toponyms. He
asserted that

A name is but ancilliary of the object that it is labelling. People are more attuned to remember the physical characteristics of that object at any rate, and so it is with the Grampians. No fear at all, therefore, that the Grampians could slip off the face of the earth, though this is the very fear of many...the only control man has in the Grampians is in the names they give it...My suggestion...is to make extensive studies into the geological history (millions of years) of the Grampians. Based on such research appropriate descriptive names can be attained, which well and truly have stood the test of time. Failing this, no name should be applied as at least the area will attain a unique flair in names...

Within this letter by Van Diesen it can be seen that he is applying a purely positivist approach to the understanding of toponyms. He has stripped them of any personal sense that people might have attributed to them, and has even gone to the extent of stating that “no name should be applied”. Whilst it would be interesting to create a National Park with no names, the mere thought of this existing seems to bring about a philosophical conundrum. Are we able to create a place with no name? Can it even be a place if it has no name? Importantly, can humans create a sense of place with a feature that is unnamed? I contend that nameless places might be possible on a small-scale level but not as a common day occurrence. Hence, if places need to have names, and sense of place is created through the interactions of humans with a place, ergo sense of toponym should exist when humans interact and utilise toponyms. For, without a sense of toponym linking humans to places we might not see a need for creating a name to begin with. If humans create an emotional attachment to a place (be it on a small or large scale, in a positive or negative way) then the toponym must, in some form or another, be possible of symbolising this attachment.

A proposed logical formula for these philosophical propositions could be posed as:

a)

If, space + name = place

Can we say, place – name = space
b)
If, \( \text{space} + \text{interaction} = \text{place} + \text{name} \)
Can we say, \( \text{space} - \text{interaction} = \text{place} - \text{name} \)

And, c)
If, \( \text{place} + \text{interaction} = \text{sense of place} \)
Does, \( \text{name} + \text{interaction} = \text{sense of toponym} \) ?

In his letter, Van Diesen negates the possibility that people bond with toponyms. In contrast to Van Diesen, Bill McGrath, National Party Member for the seat of Lowan at the time of the name restoration debate, asserted (1989) that people bond with toponyms as much as they bond with the places themselves because ‘the attachment of the majority is to the places named as they understand them today, regardless of the source of the word’. Here McGrath indicated that sense of place and toponym were linked and should not be interfered with. Indeed McGrath indicated that identity and dependence, components of place attachment, are facilitated through both toponyms and physical place.

Thus, whereas the location might bring up sentiments of attachment when staring at a sheep grazing field, the toponym itself can link these sentiments to historical identifications, familial dependences and community attachments. This sentiment was borne out in many letters, such as the one penned by Oldfield (1989). He explained that the names themselves can acts as an aide memoire because when he closes his eyes and thinks of the National Park from his native country of America: 'I have a strong affinity with the Grampians, having spent several years in an around and over and through the Canadian Rockies…I can shut my eyes and still see the Rockies'.

Milligan, (1998: 12) extrapolating from Zerubavel’s (1996: 285) conceptualisation of mnemonic others as being the reminders of the past, defines places as ‘mnemonic devices’. By utilizing the term mnemonic places, Milligan (1998: 12) stated that she wanted to ‘emphasise the capacity of physical sites to organise the past experiences of an individual, as well as to transmit aspects of a shared or collective past’. It would seem from Oldfield’s expressions that the toponym acts as a mnemonic device for conceptualising a place of the past.
The author believes that the statements above show that there is reasonable evidence to infer that people do indeed form bonds with places as well as toponyms. As such, a basis for the theory of sense of toponym being developed from theories of sense of place and place attachment has been shaped. In the following two chapters we shall further investigate the construct of place attachment to locate the theories on place identity and dependence and examine their suitability for explaining the reactions that participants had to the name restoration proposal.

**Conclusions**

Sense of place, as Meinig suggests, is created by people to make a place distinct or memorable. Indeed, we could do this on a practical plateau by remembering that the kitchen is where we cook food, or that the university is where we work. Emotionally we can look at our church or synagogue as a place for marriage, and the graveyard for death. Each of these places has a memory or feeling attached to them and this phenomenon is called ‘sense of place’. I posit that it can hold true that toponyms can have a memory or feeling attached to them, and I would tend to label this phenomenon ‘sense of toponym’.

Essentially, a toponym acts as a symbol of a place. I also contend that it can simultaneoulsy hold its own metaphorical, personal, collective and nationalistic identity separate to those identities held by the place. Whereas the sense of place literature points to the notion that direct physical contact has to have been made with the location, sense of toponym can occur without direct contact with the location which it represents, it can occur with interaction with the toponym itself. Take for example the idea that Robin might never have been to *Paris*, but has an idea of what Paris is like. Robin has a sense of toponym, based on stories her parents have told her about it, and from news reports of it, and these memories and associations are attributed to the toponym, not the physical place, Paris. In a similar fashion to place being mnemonic devices, as discussed by Milligan (1998) and Zerubavel (1996), toponyms could also be considered to be mnemonic devices.
Place attachment theories posit that people form bonds with places. These places can act as repositories for memories and can create a cultural link within and between communities. Research into the meanings of toponyms for the study area communities has found that people also form bonds with toponyms, whether or not the names are Indigenous or non-Indigenous in origin. It would appear from the participant data that some consider that the linguistic composition of the toponyms is important in identifying cultural heritage, whilst for others the linguistic background is unimportant because it is the symbolic nature of the names that they are attached to. This distinction between cultural heritage and symbolic nature is interesting, and warrants further investigation. I propose that the distinction can be likened to the distinction between place identity and place dependence, the two sub-constructs of place attachment. I locate heritage within identity and dependence within symbolism. This investigation of identity and dependence will continue in the next two chapters. Chapter five will consider in detail the construct of plane and toponymic identity, or the heritage that is associated with places and toponyms. Chapter six will investigate the possibility of toponymic dependence, or the symbolic and locational functions that toponyms offer to people and communities.
Linking the Place to the Past:
Place Identity

‘The meaning of words is not in their etymology
but in the full range of their use,
in which older meanings may often be heard to reverberate’
- (Sopher, 1978: 263)
Introduction

Within geographical literature it is asserted that recognition of Indigenous and non-Indigenous places gives inhabitants a stronger sense of identity (Taylor, 1992; Wong, 2002). Indeed, one of the general arguments used by government agencies (including the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names) for following the process of reinstating Indigenous toponyms in the landscape is that the names will help reassert Indigenous identity and aid in recognising the Indigenous connections to the landscape (UNGEGN Working Group on the Promotion of Indigenous and Minority Group Place Names, 2007). Yet I believe that there is currently not enough research nor theories on the determinants of toponymic identity to support these arguments.

If governments are to talk of reinstating Indigenous toponyms as a nexus from which to provide more tenable identification with the landscape for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, then this chapter aims to explore and build a strong theoretical framework upon which to base these assertions. As discussed in chapters two and four, place identity has been recognised by various theorists as a component of place attachment (Sharpe and Ewert, 2000; Williams and Vaske, 2003). The focus of this chapter is to explore previously researched facets of place identity and to determine whether these theories can be extended to toponyms, or whether new theories are required.

The concept of place identity was discussed briefly in chapters two and four. Therefore, the discussion in this chapter commences with a reintroduction to the key concepts and theories on place identity; and moves into an analysis of the key research data through examination of four correlated and interdependent elements of place identity; before finishing with a discussion of the key concepts of place identity which could be said to correlate strongly with concepts of place dependence (the subject of chapter six).

For this chapter the contents of the collected research data from the letters, questionnaires and interviews will be analysed in regards to existing literature on place identity to uncover people’s various rationales for their reactions to the
proposed reinstatement of Indigenous toponyms in the study area. The method of analysis aims to identify the key aspects of toponymic identity which came to the fore of local Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians’ minds when they were confronted with a proposal to remove European names in preference to Indigenous names which had been removed 150 years previously. It should be remembered that Victorian government policy at the time was to have one name for one place. This meant that the most angst was caused in the community because of the perceived threat of completely removing the non-Indigenous names in preference for the Indigenous names.

As has been stated previously in chapter three, the research data available for analysis is the result of a high level of community interest in the renaming proposal. Importantly for this chapter, research into place identity acknowledges that ‘the process of [identity] construction is most clearly revealed in moments of crisis’ (Penrose and Jackson, 1994: 203). Thus, for this chapter in particular it is posited that the exploration of the research data is suitable for discussion of expressions of place and/or toponymic identity. Overall, the intention of this chapter is to create a theory (or theories) of the constitution of toponymic identity. In particular, the focus is on uncovering whether there is any support for arguments in favour of reinstating Indigenous toponyms, and to explore why it is perhaps important for non-Indigenous names to be retained. These arguments will then be explored in further detail in chapter seven.

What is Identity?
Research has been undertaken in multiple academic domains on the composition of identity, such as in psychology it has centred on personal identity (Reicher, 2004), in sociology the focus has been on collective identity (Clark, 1980; Abrams, 1982; Hill, 2003; Lev-Weisel, 2003), and in geography the focus has been on place identity (Proshansky, 1978; Shamai, 1991; Altman and Low, 1992b; Carter et al., 1993; Williams and Vaske, 2002; Hoelscher and Alderman, 2004). This chapter draws on all three academic areas of psychology, sociology and geography and their theories of identity in order to analyse the research data with the aim of exploring whether it is possible to develop preliminary theories on the constructs of toponymic identity.
As outlined in chapters two and four, for this thesis it is theorised that sense of place is the overarching construct of place attachment. Within geographical literature Sharpe and Ewert (2000: 218) define the term place identity as a second component of place attachment, which is linked to ‘the emotional and symbolic nature of person-place relationships’. Similarly, Williams and Vaske (2003: 5) define place identity as an emotional function of place attachment. Branching the divide between purely geographical literature and psychology literature Proshansky (1978; 1983) explained place-identity as a subconcept of self-identity. Importantly it is noted that:

place-identity is the source of meaning for a given setting by virtue of relevant cognitive clusters that indicate what should happen in it, what the setting is supposed to be like, and how the individual and others are supposed to behave in it. These groups of cognitions serve as an ever-present background system of meanings of spaces and places which enables the person not only to recognise a setting but to understand its intended purposes and activities in relation to its design and other substantive properties. (Proshansky et al., 1983: 67)

Hernandez (2007: 311) concurs with this notion of place identity being a component of personal identity and Twigger-Ross and Uzzel (1996: 210) expanded upon Proshansky’s notion of place identity to claim that it is ‘not a separate part of identity concerned with place, but that all aspects of identity have place-related implications to a greater or lesser extent’. The human geography literature often references the social and cultural phenomena that influence the development and maintenance of place identity. Whilst in standard geographical literature the reference can be to how places ‘become site-markers of the remembering process and of identity itself’ (Taylor, 2000: 27) within a human geography exploration more attention is given to how place attachment provides a ‘framework for both individual and communal aspects of identity and have both stabilising and dynamic features’ (Brown and Perkins, 1992: 284). Thus, the relationships between physical places and emotional places are symbiotic in the formulation of place identity. Indeed, as noted by Thrift (1997: 160) ‘places form a reservoir of meanings which people can draw upon to tell stories about and thereby define themselves. Thus place and identity are inexorably linked’. And to further this, McCabe (1998: 232) posited that ‘landscapes, environments and places are…human creations…mediated and constantly
reconstituted as experience becomes enmeshed with representational and signifying practices that shape social identity and the meanings of everyday and social life’.

As place identity is intrinsically linked to personal identity, many theorists note that official and local recognition of personal and collective forms of identity and attachment is extremely important. Taylor (1992: 32) asserted that ‘recognition by others of the person one is, is central to having a meaningful life’. It can be argued that in instances such as the study area, where the government proposed to remove non-Indigenous names, the negative sentiment from some sectors of the community was borne out through anxiety of their identity being ignored and a perception that their identity was unimportant. For example, in calling upon the notions of national identity, James Glenn (1990: 21) stated in his letter to the editor that ‘the names of many parts of Australia, including the Grampians, are part of the Anglo-Saxon Celtic heritage. To change these names now would be a sacrilegious act akin to tearing down the Australian flag – or wanting to change it’. Glenn was equating the removal of the non-Indigenous name to an act of tampering with national identity, a proposition which for him seemed untenable and a denial of what he understood to be a symbolic representation of his connection to the Australian community. K.W. Dadswell (1989) asserted that his personal identity was linked to the place and/or toponymic identity, arguing that ‘by changing the name Mr Crabb would be destroying a part of your history…do your worst Mr Crabb, but the people of the area will ALWAYS cherish and call the range “The Grampians”’. On a similar note to Dadswell, Bob Stone (1990), a local Councillor, argued that ‘it would seem in the minds of some people that our heritage counts for nothing’. For Dadswell and Stone the notion of removing the non-Indigenous names was tantamount to ignoring their personal, and by extension Australian, identity. They felt threatened by this and their letters to the editor stand as testimony to the angst they were experiencing.

On the other side of the debate, for those who supported the renaming proposal, the voicing of their identity was very clear. At the time of the debate, M.I. Plant (1990: 12) asserted in their letter to the editor that ‘I prefer to think of this as reverting to the original name…why not give the so-called Grampians their original Koorie name and make them distinctively Australian?’. Concomitantly to Plant, for David Newton, an employee of Parks Victoria during the time of the name restoration debate and a local
in Stawell, the restoration of Indigenous names was an acceptable proposition, as he saw that Indigenous heritage is part of local and Australian identity. He queried ‘what is this argument really about? I feel it is about recognition and restoration of Australia’s history beyond and including the last 220 years’ (Newton, 1990: 18). Wong (2002: 454) notes that ‘the importance of recognition of one’s sense of self does not entail that such recognition is easily granted. Indeed, it is often gained only through struggle and resistance’. This notion of struggle and resistance was reflected upon many times in the oral history interviews. Most notably Lionel Harradine, an Indigenous elder who worked with Ian Clark on preparing the Indigenous name restoration proposal to the Victorian Place Names Committee, asserted that upon reflection of the events ‘we even got the local paper here which was anti-Fram⁵ they used to run articles on it, you know so we, we were fighting a bloody, a really major battle with the…press you know?’.

Wong asserts too that modern societies should recognise individuals’ identities, especially those of minority cultures, because without this recognition ‘individuals will not be able to pursue projects that are constitutive of a good life for them’. On reflection of the events in the early 1990s Geoff Clark, a prominent Indigenous leader with affiliations in the study area, noted in his oral-history interview that the Indigenous names are ‘important for the fabric of the society…that’s the heritage, that’s the history of Aboriginal Australia, which you need to acknowledge and understand’. He went on to describe how recognition of the traditional Indigenous names would give greater context and meaning to all Australians, and allow them to appreciate the landscape especially in times of drought. He posited that

I don’t know whether you can equate this to the sort of the drought or water or you know…when you overlay Aboriginal culture onto the landscape, and why things were named and descriptive and you look at the waterways and the billabongs and the springs and you know these things are drying out, or they’re all linked and it [the name] really can show can’t it, that…to keep pumping out the brown water inside the Grampians is gonna affect the water springs at Mount Rouse or some other place or down the road, Yambuck or

⁵ ‘Fram’ is the colloquial name for ‘Framlingham Aboriginal Co-operative’ a small Indigenous community town located to the south of Grampians (Gariwerd) region, whose inhabitants have cultural connections to the Gariwerd region and Brambuk centre.
something. So yeah, I mean they are connected, that amount of detail is there in the Aboriginal namings and the Aboriginal sort of war and philosophy of the country. Well, non-Indigenous people want to embrace that at some stage in the future. Maybe they need to try to start, understand a little bit of that core science I suppose, don’t they?

Others have also noted that consistency in place is important to ensure consistency in identity. Indeed, Proshansky et al (1983: 72) have noted that a person’s stability of place identity lies in the ‘belief that the properties of his or her day-to-day world are unchanging’. Chow (2008, p 370) asserts that ‘significant disruption to the people, activities or processes, and places involved in place attachment(s) and place identity will ultimately threaten to undermine the very foundations of these concepts’. Further to this, Lewicka (2008: 211) posits that the word identity whilst meaning ‘uniqueness’ also means ‘continuity’ and that an understanding of identity needs to take into account both aspects. Whilst here the literature is discussing place identity, it is not too much of an extension to posit that the major themes arising from those in the community who opposed the renaming proposal were doing so in reaction to a belief that a change in the name would affect the stability of their identity. As, Tammi Niewand (1990: 6) argued

what Mr Crabb is doing is taking away the only history and culture the descendents of the original settlers to Australia have…I am a fifth generation Australian whose sense of identity comes from the fact that I am descended from colonial Australians…Australia’s history is my history – and that is being taken away from me.

As can be seen in the literature and the case study material, the opponents and supporters of the name change strongly linked (and continue to link) the toponyms to their sense of place, to their personal and community identity. The proposed renaming in the early 1990s was either perceived to be a statement of ignoring local identity, and was therefore a threat, or was supported as a way of recognising the importance of Indigenous identity in the local and Australian historical and cultural narrative.
Components of Identity

From a reading of the available literature, it is apparent that the concept of place identity is multifaceted and believed to be composed of many elements. Proshansky et al (1983: 59) assert that place identity consists of cognitions which ‘represent memories, ideas, feelings, attitudes, values, preferences, meanings and conceptions of behaviour and experience which relate to the variety and complexity of physical settings that define the day-to-day existence of every human being. At the core of such physical environment-related cognitions is the environmental past of the person’. These elements are often referred to in the literature and after careful consideration it was thought useful, for this doctoral program, to explore systematically through the themes the concept of place identity and possibly locate the existence of toponymic identity.

From the literature review, and initial analysis of the data, it can be said that the construct of place identity is composed of four key elements: history/memory, community, emotions and actions/events. Thus, this section of the chapter will explore these four key components individually, giving consideration to the discussion of place identity, and questioning in each instance whether similar identification with toponyms can be found in the research data.

History and Memory

When considering the role of history in creating a sense of place, or of influencing the development and maintenance of place identity, it is important to note that connections to place history can be made by people living in the area, and people who only visit the area occasionally. For example, Williams and Vaske (2003) assert that ‘place identity is not necessarily a direct result of any particular experience with the place’ and therefore the formation of place identity through identification with local histories and memories can be similarly developed by both locals and non-locals to the study area. In this regard, the topic to explore for this section of the thesis is whether connections are made by locals and non-locals to place and name histories and memories as a component of toponymic identity.
First, we should explore why history and memory are considered to be components of place identity, and by extension toponymic identity. Lowenthal states that ‘remembering the past is crucial for our sense of identity…to know what we are confirms that we are’ (Lowenthal, 1997: 197). Further, Hoelscher and Alderman (2004: 347) have theorised that ‘together, memory and place conjoin to produce much of the context for modern identities’. Abrahamson notes that communities occupy their own geographical areas with which they become intimately associated. He argues that through this process of identification ‘areas acquire symbolic qualities that include their place names and social histories’ (Abrahamson, 1996 cited in Ramsay, 2003). And whilst not stating explicitly that place names are linked to place identity, Radley (1990: 47) asserted that ‘objects are used to establish a link with the past which helps to sustain identity’.

Schama (1995: 6-7) has asserted that the ‘landscape is a work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory, as from layers of rocks’. In Australia, with the onset of inland colonial exploration and mapping in the nineteenth century, McKenna (2002: Chpt.1) has argued that officially the existing Indigenous understandings of the landscape were constantly overwritten. The landscape was almost a palimpsest, constantly being overwritten to suit the needs of the colonial government. Taylor (2000: 28) asserts that by defining places as palimpsests it can be clearly identified that they are in the process of constantly being reinscribed with cultural meanings. The reinscription of the Australian landscape during the time of colonisation took many forms, and I would argue that one of the most powerful forms was place naming. Indeed, Day (2005: Chpt. 3) has argued that to take control of the landscape the colonists used many tools, including the naming of places.

As the literature asserts that place identity is partly formed through history and memory, it needs to be ascertained whether toponymic identity can also be formed through history and memory. An analysis of the research data in regards to participants’ linking of history and memory to the toponyms can shed light on whether this phenomenon exists.

As discussed in chapter two, Australian history is multifaceted, and until the late twentieth century much of the focus remained on colonial acts of exploration and
development (Furniss, 2001). Furniss (2001: 284) has noted that with colonial histories, such as that promoted until the late twentieth century in Australia, an ‘imagined linearity’ of themes is deployed by the constant referral to ‘discovery’ to ‘firsts’ and to ‘pioneers’. This referral to discovery and pioneers was notable in the research data, especially from those who opposed the renaming proposal. For example, Digby Crozier (1989), former member of parliament, asserted in his letter to the editor that the naming proposal was an ‘assault on our history and the enduring links with the countries of origin of our pioneering forebears…these names evoke an undoubted affinity’. He explicitly linked the use of non-Indigenous names with the history of the places as he knew and understood them. For Crozier, identity is linked to the toponym which represents and connects him to the history he knows of the case study area.

There were many others like Crozier who asserted similar sentiments. For instance, Vivian Day (1990: 2) wrote ‘I think this is a cause worth fighting for, to uphold the respect of the pioneers and the likes of Major Mitchell and his party, who risked their lives to explore and name such a beautiful spot in which to live’. Further to this were the words of J Atchison, a representative of the Australian Council of Scottish Clans, which intimated that the ‘section of the community which descended from the Scottish pioneers and settlers…[were] concerned to see their history and heritage under threat’ (Editor, 1989a). The inference by Day and Atchison is that by removing the non-Indigenous names the links to colonial history would be lost and would be a sign of disrespect for their toponymic identity which hinged on notions of colonial exploration and settlement in the case study area.

Tuan (1991: 688) has noted that ‘normally only a socio-political revolution would bring about a change of name…the new name itself has the power to wipe out the past and call forth the new’. In addition to the sentiments of Day and Atchison were arguments that removing the non-Indigenous names would be akin to removing colonial history from the landscape, map and community. This point was argued by Pawsey (1989) in their letter, when asserting that ‘I feel it would be an insult to our pioneers and the explorers who came before them to erase their names and memory from these mountains’. In his letter Cr. Bob Stone (1990: 2) remarked that
there were no Aborigines in the Grampians for Mitchell to name this “noble range of mountains” as he called them, so he called them the Grampians. This is well entrenched in our history books, and should stay there. It would seem in the minds of some people that our heritage counts for nothing…are we not permitted to leave anything for our descendents?

The remarks of Stone can be contextualised in regards to the theory of Crane (1997: 1372) who posits ‘that the future might mourn is the projection of nostalgia; it is also the supposition of historical thinking, which charges itself with the preservation of what would be lost both mentally and materially’. For Stone it is important to pass down historical meaning through the names for places with which he identifies. In this manner, where previously it has been argued that it is place identity which helps to connect a population with their history, it can be seen that it is toponymic identity which also connects a population with their history.

Tuan (1991: 688) argues that the naming of places by explorers lead to a colonially-tainted sense of place within Australia. He asserted that with the passing of time, and the promotion of the colonial narrative in schools and by governments, the promotion of a ‘sense of regional identity and of place’ was facilitated through the use of the non-Indigenous place names. It is argued by Furniss that the imagined linearity of colonial history erases ‘any prior Indigenous history, suggesting instead that the land and its inhabitants somehow did not exist, or their existence was unimportant, until they were “found” and incorporated into Western systems of knowledge’. Similarly, Lewicka (2008: 213) notes that ‘events that happened before the group settled down in a place are assigned less significance and are less frequently recalled than events that are a part of the group past’. Sentiments of the non-existence of Indigenous history, or unimportance of Indigenous history, to the case study area were often borne out in the letters. For example, Anne Pietsch (1990: 12) asserted that ‘Aboriginals never lived in the Grampians. They only visited and hunted there as they preferred the open spaces’. Further to this, Eric Beale wrote that what is important is that the mountains were named in 1836 as the Grampians and that is what they have been known as here and all over the world for the last 150 years. As for Crabb’s crazy statement that “the white man wiped out thousands of years of civilisation” I simply ask what civilisation? Does anybody know what he is talking about? Does he know himself?
The promotion of colonial history is necessarily one which is biased in favour of the mainstream society at the time. Furniss (2001: 279) argues that mainstream Australian history which is recognised and promoted by the majority of the population has been influenced by a ‘burden of silence borne by the many other settlers too shocked, horrified and ashamed by the brutalities they had witnessed to record their experiences on paper…by the turn of the century this silence had been transformed and codified into a new and pervasive myth: that Australia had been settled peacefully, without conflict, violence or bloodshed’. Further to this, as evidenced by Crozier’s statement, the prominent historical narrative in the case study area at the time of the renaming debate was one which centred on notions of a peaceful settlement of the landscape, a landscape devoid of Indigenous civilisation. Crozier obviously identified strongly with the colonial history recognised by the non-Indigenous names in the case study area. Thus, it can be asserted that he, and others of a similar sentiment, formed a toponymic identity similar to place identity, through the linking of history to the toponym.

Withers (2000: 534) has noted that with the creation and perpetuation of colonial history and the inevitable production of colonial maps as a technique with which to acquire and possess the landscape, ‘natives were either “mapped out” of their own spaces or falsely “mapped in”. In those terms, matters of authority…become questions of authenticity: who, if not “the native voice”, can give definitive orthographies and meanings to names?’ The question of authenticity for the Indigenous names was a common theme in the research data. J Fitzsimmons (1989: 12) asserted in one letter that ‘there is some question as to the validity of any Aboriginal place name recommendations…this is based on the claim there are no true descendents of the Grampians’ original inhabitants left’. For Fitzsimmons, being connected to a name meant that the descendents who gave the name had to still be in constant connection with the landscape. Further to this was the statement by F.R. Churton (1990: 59) that ‘Aboriginals had no alphabet nor written records. How then can anyone give a correct name and spelling of so-called Aboriginal place names?’ It was common in the data for participants to question the validity of the names, and this was summed up eloquently by Ern Golding in his letter, where he stated that ‘Old “Mulga” would have been the only person with an understanding of the names true meanings, if there are any…he stated he was “the last full blooded aborigine in
Victoria”. For Churton and Golding an ignorance of colonial translation and transcription processes whereby colonists recorded Indigenous words in official records and other now-historical manuscripts, meant a questioning of the veracity of the proposed names. It can be contended for this colonially-biased perception of landscape connection, not to mention the ignorance of the existence of an ongoing Indigenous presence in the area, that Fitzsimmons’, Churton’s and Golding’s toponymic identity related strongly to a colonially-verifiable historical connection.

Tuan (1991: 687) argues that for colonial explorers to use names to ‘differentiate space’ words such as mount or river were often inappropriate because they ‘evoked an image originating in England…that fitted poorly with Australian geographical reality’. In the case study area there are many examples of non-Indigenous names which were applied and fitted poorly with the landscape. For example, Mount Zero was named by Thomas Mitchell after he spent the night there when the temperature dropped to zero. Ian Clark (1989a) addressed his concerns at the continuation of inappropriate naming by stating in a letter to the editor that ‘to continue to name a peak Mt Zero because the temperature fell to zero is absurd when the local Aboriginal people knew it as Mullub Guwa and Murra Murra. One hundred and fifty years or so of European presence in the region is insignificant when compared with the many thousands of years of Aboriginal occupation’. Further to this was the argument by Terry Lane (1990: 15), a prominent radio announcer in Melbourne, who in one letter noted that ‘the European retagging of prominent topographical features…was really an act of extraordinary hubris’.

Interestingly, oral history interview participants in this research program contended that whilst they were not originally supportive of the renaming proposals in the early 1990s they could today see reason for applying Indigenous names to the various rock-art sites in the case study area. Of the forty-five interview participants, twenty of whom fully or partially supported changing the name of the National Park to Gariwerd or Grampians (Gariwerd), thirty-six were in favour of having Indigenous names applied to the rock art sites, with a general consensus that the names were appropriate because the features themselves had a strong and almost exclusive Indigenous heritage (refer to Appendix K for list of interview participants and their support or opposition to the name restoration proposal). In his oral history interview
Glen had very strong opinions on the renaming of the National Park stating that it was ‘unnecessary’, but when questioned as to whether it is appropriate to reinstate Indigenous names for the rock-art sites he simply stated that ‘it doesn’t worry me’. For Glen there was limited interaction and cultural affiliation with the rock-art sites, when compared to other areas within the National Park, and it could be said that having names changed for features with which he did not connect at a cultural level did not impinge upon his toponymic identity or place identity.

It can be argued that at the time of the renaming proposal, the suggestion to reinstate Indigenous names was a counter-narrative to the mainstream promotion of colonial history which relegated the majority of Indigenous histories to pre-1788 status. Tuan (1991: 685) posits that ‘although speech alone cannot materially transform nature, it can direct attention, organize insignificant entities into significant composite wholes, and in so doing, make things formerly overlooked – and hence invisible and nonexistent – visible and real’. In a letter to the editor Mollie Dyer, a noted Indigenous activist living in Horsham, asserted that whilst Australians consider themselves to be ‘fair minded’ the renaming issue brought to the forefront of public debate the recognition that ‘the blind bigotry of many “fair minded” Aussies clouds their thinking’. For Dyer the reinstatement of Indigenous names was intrinsically linked to recognition of Indigenous identity, and in this sense it can be argued that toponymic identity can exist through the concept of personal and community identification with history.

Cr Robert LoRicco of the Shire of Stawell, noted that the reinstatement of Indigenous names would recognise the Indigenous history and rights to land recognition. Indeed, LoRicco was insistent that the reinstatement of the Indigenous names would reassert Indigenous identity in the study area:

"It is now well known that the Aboriginal people have a very close relationship with their environment and that their removal from their land and the forceful imposition of our Western culture on those that survived almost destroyed an ancient culture. The claim to be made should be taken in the context of time: European settlement has lasted only some 200 years but there has been an Aboriginal presence of some 17 to 20,000 years. The Aboriginal people now have the"
opportunity to re-establish and re-assert their cultural heritage and we should assist this process. (Grampians Name Change Debate, 1989)

The councillor is discussing the notion that the resintatement of the names is linked to respecting land tenure and Indigenous identity. Thus, for this councillor the notion of place and name are inextricably linked, the toponym is a symbol of the history of a place and current attempts should be made to help change this situation.

Said (2000: 247-248) asserts that ‘it is easy to see the fact of displacement in the colonial experience…more subtle is the unending cultural struggle over territory, which necessarily involves overlapping memories, narratives, and physical structures’. It is these overlapping memories and narratives which were prominent in the research data. As Michelle asserted in her oral history interview

If you want to identify from a sort of colonial European sense then of course Mackenzie Falls and you know, Reed’s Lookout, I’m sure that’s one way of associating with it so I can understand people’s attachment to that but for me, it goes much further than that. We should be looking at the first identification with place if that makes sense? And it doesn’t mean a total banning of other names, but I think through time people just become to begin to associate the Aboriginal or Indigenous names with a place anyway.

The perceived need to identify with colonial history and names, or to assert the suitability of Indigenous names, saw the narratives associated with identity diverge according to the memories that people associated with the names. Geoff Clark, a supporter of the naming proposal, noted in his oral history interview that ‘when you come down to the principle, these people [opponents] have to acknowledge that for someone, it is another place, it has another name and another purpose and it has to be acknowledged somewhere’. The proposition is clear here that a toponym can be a symbol of multiple identities, and the use of two toponyms for one place can be a strong reminder of the multiple place histories and cultural identities which exist for a locale.

Tilley (1994: 19) posits that ‘by the process of naming places and things they become captured in social discourses and act as mnemonics for the historical actions of individuals and groups’. The use of the names as mnemonic devices was quite
apparent in many of the letters and interviews. As Manzo (2003: 55) contends, ‘identity is intimately tied to memory, both personal and collective, which manifests itself in space. Consequently, places are preserved to honour people’s memories and experiences’. It can be argued in a similar fashion that one of the major issues surrounding the reinstatement of Indigenous names, and removal of non-Indigenous names, was the opponents wanting to preserve their memories, and the supporters wanting to (re)allocate counter-memories to the mainstream-promoted local history.

For opponents to the name change, the notion of removing the non-Indigenous names could be argued to have interfered with their ongoing connection to the past. As Radley (1990: 47) asserts, museums act as repositories for objects through which “people do not remember a series of personal events which touched their own lives but enjoy a “sense of the past” through the understanding of history which other people appear to have created’. Said (2000: 178) asserts that ‘memory and its representations touch very significantly upon questions of identity, of nationalism, of power and authority’. McCabe (1998: 233) posits that ‘history interacts with memory to produce our sense of personal, familial, group, institutional, national and international identity’ and importantly Lewicka (2008: 212) contends that ‘most historical reports are reinterpretations done in the service of the present identity of a group, filtered through the “group charter”’. At this point in the discussion attention needs to be given to notions of how collective or community cultures influence the creation and interpretation of place, and perhaps toponymic, identity.

**Community**

Penrose and Jackson (1994: 204) have argued that ‘the concepts of “race” and nation are deeply entrenched ways of thinking about the world’ and assert that whilst these ways of thinking are promoted as being ‘natural’, they are learnt behaviours. Most pertinently, Penrose and Jackson distinguished between the terms ‘race’ and ‘nationality’ by stating that

Whereas “race” is something that members of dominant groups generally use to distinguish others from themselves, nation tends to be used to distinguish themselves from others. Whereas those in power
regard nationhood as something they possess but which they deny others, “race” is regarded as something that applies to others but not to themselves. In each case, it is the dominant group that sets up the oppositions, regarding itself as “normal” and treating subordinate groups as different or “other”.

This section of the chapter will explore notions of nationalism, normal, other and power through analysis of the research data to define how they relate to the concept of place, and possibly toponymic, identity. It is pertinent to explore these concepts in relation to the research data, because as asserted by Altman and Low (1992b: 6) ‘collective social attachments to places are especially salient during times of relocation, upheaval and environmental disasters’.

Theories of the constitution of nationalism abound (Fishman, 1972; Rushdie, 1982; Schafer, 1984; Hobsbawm, 1990; Salecl, 1993; Johnson, 1995; Patton and Austin-Broos, 1997), and an example of the plethora of theories is best provided by Boyd Schafer who stated that ‘having defined nationalism to no-one’s complete satisfaction (including my own), I may say that the debates have just begun- for full agreement on any significant concept, value, or interpretation is rare’ (1984: 3). Schafer does give a definition of nationalism as being ‘a sentiment (belief) unifying a group of people who have a real or imagined (or believed in) common historical experience, and a common aspiration to live together in a separate group in the future, and a sentiment dividing them from other like groups (primarily from other nations)’. Schafer goes to great lengths to insist that nationalism is hard to define because each person has their own individuality, which causes their personality to differ slightly from any other person of the same ‘nationality’. Thus, how to pinpoint the exact nature of what is ‘national’ can be difficult. For example, what tenets of the term ‘Australian’ were called upon in the Grampians (Gariwerd) debate to define ‘normal’ attitudes?

As touched upon previously in this chapter’s discussion of history and memory, the presence or non-existence of Indigenous people in Australia and the region was a consistent ‘fact’ mentioned many times by various research participants. The minority status of Indigenous Australians was often used as support for the arguments of why colonial history and community connectedness was more important than Indigenous history. Clive Johnson (1990: 17) in his letter was able to recognise that
Indigenous histories exist, but he was not willing to acknowledge them further than they had been already. He asserted that ‘I don’t for one minute deny Aborigines their place in history, but there is already an abundance of Aboriginal place names across Australia, far in excess of their percentage of the population’. Importantly, R. Pietsch (1990: 10) questioned whether the community, as she perceived it, was going to ‘have to become a radical minority group to be heard?’.

George Seddon (1997: 15) theorised that the words of the landscape carry ‘cultural baggage’ that may ‘imply values and endorse power relations’. For Johnson and Pietsch the values of their community, as they understood them, had colonial interpretations as mainstream accepted notions of identity. Jackson (1989: 151) asserts that ‘racism in Britain and similar societies is a dominant ideology…racism refers to a set of ideas and beliefs that have the weight of authority behind them; they are enshrined in statues and institutionalised in policy and practice’. The fact that predominantly non-Indigenous names were present in the landscape served to reinforce these notions of local, and by extension national, identity being that created by colonists and perpetuated by their descendents. This community identity was therefore bound to, and represented by, the toponyms. Penrose and Jackson (1994: 206) assert that ‘Aboriginal land claims challenge the apparent “neutrality” of the hegemonic culture’ and it could be extended here to assert that the proposal to reinstate Indigenous names was a challenge to the mainstream, colonially-defined local and national culture. As stated by Graham in an oral history interview, ‘we really thought it was a whole lot of hogwash because to us there were the Grampians, had always been the Grampians and everybody that we, you know, talked to or associate with referred to them as the Grampians’. Graham’s community was those whose identity was formed with the name Grampians, and he was asserting therefore that it was in the interest of community that the name Grampians be retained.

Just how people or groups are defined as being ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of Australian culture, or local community, is a complex process. Taylor (2000: 27-28) notes that understanding the reasons for conflicts over the meanings of Australian places and ‘ultimately over their ownership and control’ are ‘fundamental to an understanding of modern postcolonial Australian society’. As has been discussed previously in this thesis, the creation of colonial maps and the use of names on these maps was an act of
controlling the landscape. Harley (1988: 4) notes that ‘to map a name was to give its prejudice an anonymous legibility. To publish the name was not only to make it permanent but also to give it authority and legitimacy’. As discussed earlier, the history of a place lends an identity to a group, and by merging this notion with Harley’s discussion of naming on maps, it can be argued that the colonial names as they were mapped were given a legitimacy that was argued by many to be representative of the collective or community identity in the case study area. In this sense, non-Indigenous, and even Anglo-Indigenous names, assigned to the case study area by governments and other colonial authorities since 1836, can be said to be a major reason for conflict over the meanings of the communities they represent.

For those who supported the renaming proposals they reported that recognising the Indigenous names for the places would lead to the conferral of a greater sense of Indigenous identity. For instance, Bruce Henry (1990: 10) noted that ‘the real opposition to the proposed name changes comes from white Australia’s ongoing refusal to recognise Aboriginal prior ownership…the renaming of the Grampians…serves to recognise this ownership’. Similarly, Louise in her interview asserted that while she didn’t personally think the reinstatement of Indigenous names was important, ‘I imagine the Indigenous people would consider that an important thing to do from their point of view because they were here long before us anyway. And I guess they feel having their original names back would make them belong to the country more again’.

For those opposed to the proposal, many acknowledged an ignorance or non-acceptance that Indigenous people are part of the community. For example, C & D Hey (1990: 37) wrote in a letter that ‘we were raised in the Grampians area and did not see any Aboriginals in the district until recently…where are these people from?’. K.W. Dadswell (1989) asserted that ‘the people of the area will ALWAYS cherish and call the range “the Grampians”’. Similarly, M. Albrecht (1990: 18) argued that ‘it is our heritage and not his [Steve Crabb’s] to toy around with. The Grampians forever!’.

Pretty et al. assert that ‘discursive evidence that a place has become integrated into one’s self-identity is reenacted in “I” and “me” statements regarding the place. Such
personal positioning with respect to place can indicate that the person’s construction of self-identity has included that place’. Likewise, it can be argued that for statements such as those from the Heys and Albrecht, that the use of ‘we’ and ‘our’ denote an affinity they feel with the community around themselves. This community of ‘our’ and ‘we’ is that which rejects the renaming proposals and identifies with a colonial heritage. In this sense, it can be seen that toponymic identity does exist, and is reinforced by connection to community. Indeed, Wong (2002: 454) posits that ‘a key source of [identity] beliefs is the culture(s) or communit(ies) in which a person is located’, and similarly it can be contended that a source of identity are the toponyms recognised by the community.

The notions of inclusion and exclusion, or insiders and outsiders, are fundamental to an understanding of community and national identity. Babha (1994) notes that ‘the processes of “normalising” colonial or western understandings of place and history have sought to confirm the national identities of the colonisers and at the same time has turned the remaining populations into “others”’. Don Johns asserted in his interview that ‘since then [1836], everyone has known it as the Grampians, worldwide. Now, why change the name? I mean, its rubbish in my opinion.…I’m not a racist but I think what we’re doing sometimes is like kow-towing to them and so forth, we’re dividing’. Johns notes here that by ‘everyone’ knowing the area as the Grampians, the normal attitude is to accept that the community identity is that which is represented by the colonial names. Similarly, Brian stated in his oral history interview that he

  couldn’t see that we needed any more [Indigenous names] at that stage, we’ve got heaps of them, like Warrnambool’s an Aboriginal name…it was a history that they were just going to trample over the top of and that’s hard to do because we’re the people that are there now. If we were gone and the Aboriginals were back in, which is never going to happen around here, there aren’t many living around here, so anyway…

He was obviously linking the mainstream of society to those who have a connection to the toponyms which represent colonial history. As discussed by Salecl (1993: 102) ‘national identification with “our kind” is based on the fantasy of an enemy, an alien who…threatens us with habits, discourse and rituals which are not “our kind”. This was exposed in the interview with Doug who asserted that
they [the government] should have kept Grampians and underneath if they wanted in brackets put Gariwerd because it’s the Caucasian people’s taxes that are paying for the running and the maintaining and keeping the Grampians afore and they are the most populated, the majority of the population. It’s not that we have a thing set against that but to completely take history and completely change it to something that no-one refers to, or relates to, or understands…

It can be seen in Doug’s narrative that he perceives the non-Indigenous population to have credentials for deciding which names will be used in the landscape. Interestingly, Salecl (1993: 106) asserts that in the process of othering ‘the fantasy of how the other lives on our account is lazy, exploits us etc is repeatedly recreated in accordance with our desire’. Doug’s assertion that it is Caucasian people who pay taxes, leads to the obvious conclusion that he believes the community to comprise of non-Indigenous tax-payers who have a right to make decisions on cultural heritage and inclusion, and Indigenous non-tax-payers who ‘live off the system’. For Doug, the non-Indigenous names are a part of his identity, and the connection has been made to this identity through his understandings of the community around him.

It should be noted however, that it is not always a national identity which includes and excludes based on notions of race or cultural affiliation. Inclusion and exclusion can also be defined within a culturally homogenous community based on perceptions of connectedness. Research into belonging to a community has indicated that the length of residence in a place can determine the extent of attachment, and by extension identity, a person feels (Hernandez et al., 2007: 311). When interviewing participants during this research program it was particularly interesting to often hear from people who had lived in a town or region for 30 years that they did not consider themselves to be ‘true’ locals.

Correspondingly Cuba and Hummon (1993: 112) note that ‘social participation in the local community is essential for community identity’. Anita acknowledged for her that she moved to the area after she was married. She stated that she felt part of the community because ‘I’m a JP, I’m in the Red Cross, I’m the secretary of the cemetery trust so I organise burials and I’m the church secretary…what else am I in? the CFA…it’s enjoyable, we just consider that part of our lives’. Similarly, Brian noted
he supposed he felt part of the community ‘because I’m on all the committees and do this and do that. Yeah, I’ve been totally involved in this since I’ve been here. I’m one of those types of people. I get in a community and that’s it’. Anita and Brian felt a part of the community because they made time and commitment contributions to groups which were considered valuable by the wider community. By contrast, Barry noted that he did not feel a part of the community because ‘I’m constantly battling against what one considers to be ignorance and prejudice and pigheadedness and shear ordinariness I think gets anyone down. I think that rubs off. I think that’s probably half the problem’.

As has been seen from the discussion of communities, there are groups in society which determine who is included as ‘normal’ and who is perceived as an ‘outsider’. In this way place identity is partly formed by community definitions of inclusion and exclusion. Similarly, it can be seen that toponymic identity is partly formed through personal and community identification with particular community understandings of what is condoned as ‘normal’ and what is condoned as being from ‘outside’. People are more likely to form an identity with toponyms which are perceived by them to be ‘normal’ than those which are considered ‘foreign’. The perception of what is worthwhile and should be included in a community’s culture, and what is not acceptable, needs to be explored in further detail in relation to names.

Emotions
Altman and Low (1992b: 4) assert that ‘one of the hallmarks of place attachment that appears consistently in most analyses is that affect, emotion and feeling are central to the concept’. Therefore, it is of import to explore the concept of emotion as a component of place, and possibly toponymic, identity. The various emotions that people feel towards and within places has been said to ‘embrace an array of places, feelings and experiences’ (Manzo, 2005: 84). During the research phase of this doctoral program, various emotional responses were noted in the research data. These responses ranged from expressions of fear, to sentiments of loss and other expressions of jubilation at the thought that the study area toponyms would finally be recognising Indigenous identity.
For Tim Chatfield, an Indigenous representative who currently works in Halls Gap, the time of the proposed renaming was extremely emotional. He stated in an oral history interview that ‘at the time we felt there’s recognition of true ownership of Aboriginal people but also our identity, who we are as a people’. James, another Indigenous man who has cultural connections to the case study area, noted that he knew ‘the Aboriginal community were very happy about it, about the idea. And it just gives us a bit more recognition that we’re not…a dead culture, which in those times, it was a very big fight we had to fight because some general ignorance I suppose in the wider community’. For Tim and James, the proposed renaming brought about with it an emotional time in the Indigenous community. It was a time acknowledged by both of them, and others, to be an important step towards the wider community acknowledging and accepting Indigenous heritage in the case study area.

On the opposing side of the debate, Stawell Shire Council, wrote to the Victorian Government and asserted that the proposed renaming posed ‘an emotional threat to the history and heritage of descendents of original pioneers’ (Grampians Name Change, 1989: 36). Within other letters it was noted by many authors who opposed the renaming proposals that they felt emotionally threatened by the proposed renaming, due to their long-standing memories in the area. Writers such as Florence Schulz (1990: 18) opined that ‘As a child I could see the Grampians range from our kitchen window, even had a few days at the Halls Gap school and later had the misfortune to lose my mother as a result of an accident in the Grampians. I could not and will not ever accept any other names for the beauty spots there’. For Schulz the name ‘Grampians’ emotionally connected her to the memories she held with the area. The possibility of using other names to identify the places in the case study area was impossible because for her the proposed Indigenous names would not hold those same emotional connections.

The previous discussion, in this chapter, of inclusion and exclusion in relation to place identity leads into an exploration of what is defined as appropriate and not appropriate behaviour in a place. As posited by Manzo (2005: 83) ‘the dynamics of exclusion and creating spaces of belonging have a powerful effect on people’s emotional relationship to places’. Thus, within the cultural roles defined by community, the emotional effects of feeling included and excluded can play a major role in the
formation of identity. Emotions, as a component of identity, assist in determining what is construed as acceptable behaviour in a place.

Fred Redeker (1989) posited in a letter that it was not appropriate behaviour for the Victorian Government to propose the renaming, as it would go against mainstream values. He asserted that ‘giving the land or the rights back to Aborigines and suggesting to rename places to pacify some of the stirrers…and suggesting it is for the good and rights of the poor, exploited or displaced existing tribes…I say baloney. Wake up Australia or Australians’. In a similar vain an anonymous writer to the *Hamilton Spectator* (Anon, 1989: 8) asserted that ‘to force that name onto the English speaking people…would not work... The ownership of a piece of land, or indeed the whole world, does not lie within a tribe or race that used to live there, but with the people that live there now’. For Redeker and the anonymous writer the notion of the name change occurring due to external forces outside of their community, such as the Government or Indigenous people, was anathema to their emotional understandings of what was acceptable behaviour in the case study area. This theme of emotional opposition to the name change was common, especially in regards to strong negative emotions towards the actions of the Victorian Government.

An article in *The Age* newspaper (Rindfleisch, 1989) asserted that locals in the case study area had the ‘grumps over moves to rename their homeland with Aboriginal titles’ and went on to posit that the locals were ‘crabby that experts have "popped up" with new names for their beloved mountain’. As analysed earlier, the use of ‘their’ denotes the ownership of the case study area by mainstream Australians, a community which by definition in this newspaper article does not include those who supported the renaming. One of those mainstream locals, Anne Pietsch (1990), argued that the renaming was an invalid action to take in what she perceived to be the local community because ‘the Aboriginals never lived in the Grampians. They only visited and hunted in there as they preferred the open spaces. Many thousands of European visitors visit the Grampians annually. Multiply this by 150 years and it far outweighs the Aboriginal population who also only visited’. Smith (2007: 8) notes that ‘the place of an act is part of our understanding of what is right, just and appropriate; transgressive acts are those judged “out of place” by dominant powers, and may constitute a form of resistance’. It can be stated that the sentiments of Pietsch were
emotional reactions to a perception of the renaming being “out of place” and therefore it can be asserted that toponymic identity can be composed of emotions and perceptions of acceptable or unacceptable behaviour.

Anita when questioned in an oral history interview about what she thought of the proposal at the time, noted that she had perceived it as unacceptable because it had not come from her community. Pinpointing the Victorian Government and Indigenous community as outsiders, Anita asserted that the proposal was not acceptable in her place as ‘it was just imposed on us’. Similarly, Don Fowler (1990) attacked the Victorian Government’s proposal and asserted that ‘we want honest democratic government in this State, not a dictatorship’. Likewise, Joseph in interview stated that ‘we felt that Gariwerd was just a made up name in Melbourne… So we thought well if they are going to call the Gariwerd we will still call them the Grampians anyway’.

Ian Clark, one of the original consultants hired by the Victorian Government to undertake the research to identify appropriate Indigenous names for the features, in his oral history interview reflected upon the community reactions at the time. In particular he contemplated the sentiments from the mainstream community who opposed the renaming in regards to their perceptions that the proposal was unacceptable behaviour being introduced by outsiders and those excluded from decision making within the community. He stated that he could remember when I went through the series of consultations with local councils and other groups, I remember being able to say quite clearly that I was a local, I had a long association with the National Park...In fact I don’t think I found anybody in any of the public meetings that I was at that could come up with a family association that predated mine – 1852. So, yeah, I could see people doing intellectual gymnastics and thinking “well okay, he’s one of us, he has a long association with this place, we can’t dismiss him as being you know, an out of towner, he’s not a local, an urban fellow, there’s something wrong with him”!

Barry noted that the decisions of what was perceived as acceptable and not acceptable in the mainstream community could be likened to the emotional reaction people feel
when they’ve ‘built a house and…developed your garden…you get really attached to the way it is and you don’t really want to see that change. When you sell it and you move away suddenly the garden is ripped out and people completely change it and you feel really hostile against that lot’. He went on to assert that ‘people don’t like things not staying the way they are if they are comfortable with it’. Graham in his interview also noted that ‘people don't like change really. Well, they can accept change in small degrees but not across the board I think, it sort of throws people right of our whack and that is when the sparks flow’.

Essentially, Barry and Graham indicated that the emotional reactions the mainstream community, those in power, felt to changes was one of hostility when what they perceived to be unacceptable behaviour was occurring in their community. Their sense of ownership was visibly under threat, and the emotional reaction occurred as a voicing of perceived power being illegitimated by an action which was deemed to be out of place in the community. For a proposed name change to have this effect on a community and its inhabitants points to the notion of emotions being a component of toponymic identity.

Tuan (1991: 685) notes that ‘individual words…impart emotion and personality, and hence high visibility, to objects and places’. Similarly too, the proposal to restore Indigenous names in the case study area brought high-visibility to Indigenous heritage and according to Tuan’s reasoning, the proposal brought emotional reactions. A strongly negative emotional reaction to the raising of visibility to Indigenous heritage was enunciated by Anthony Toben (1990) in a letter to the editor where he stated that

All nations have shameful skeletons tucked away in their cupboards, many of them speaking about unspeakable crimes committed against someone else. But surely…there is nothing to be gained from digging up the smut of the past…I would question those people's motives who continuously wish us to feel guilty about past events…the guilt industry has us emotionally mulling in our own moral disgust…this moral egoism, this "me and my feelings" attitude fails to offer us worthy explanations of past events.

As has been discussed in this section, community forces of power and control affect people’s emotional reactions to change where it is perceived to be against the favour
of those in power. For those who are in power, the emotional reaction is negative and can be linked to feelings of the actions being invalid and against the notions of community identity. For those who are out of power, the emotional reaction is positive and can be linked to feelings of resistance and contentment that the formerly neglected identity is being recognised.

Recognition of identity is important, and as has been analysed in this chapter so far, recognition can be undertaken through renaming events and can be linked to both non-physical and physical actions. It is at this point in the discussion that the focus on components of place or toponymic identity can be merged into an analysis of place or toponymic dependence. Before a thorough investigation of toponymic dependence can begin though, it is important to very briefly discuss how events and actions can be considered to be components of both place and toponymic identity.

**Events/Actions**

Jedrej and Nuttal (1996: 123) assert that ‘the landscape is a living landscape and place names are mnemonic devices that trigger recollection of particular activities’. Zerubavel (2003: 42) noted that places ‘play a major role in identity rhetoric’ and he proposed that events such as the hajj to Mecca, or romantic couples visiting the site of their first date are examples of pilgrimage which bring ‘mnemonic communities into closer “contact” with their collective past’. In addition, Zerubavel argued that the protection of old architecture, such as the Chechens defending old stone towers that helped them “connect” with their ancestors is a further example of how place evokes identity and memories. Indeed, the contention of Zerubavel’s argument is that memories of place imbue a present-day identity on the users or inhabitants of the place. This place identity is almost the glue which holds community groups together through a shared understanding of their collective past.

Chow (2008, p 371) asserts that ‘place meaning is in part created and confirmed through in-place-experiences’ and as such it could be argued following the previous analysis in this chapter that the experiences which create place also create names. Thus, experiences which brought about the original and then subsequent renaming of places in the case study area could be said to have brought meaning and therefore identity to the people who associate with the area. The ongoing maintenance of the
names from 1836 until 1989/1990 lead to the confirmation of perceptions of community power, inclusion and exclusion.

The experiences which are deemed to be important by a community are memorialised in various ways. Similarly to the arguments posited by Zerubavel, Lewicka (2008: 214) posits that ‘places remember and they do it though their monuments, architectural style of their buildings, inscriptions on walls etc. For people who reside there, the traces play the function of “urban reminders”, the “mnemonic aids” to collective memory’. The decision on which monuments are erected and which events are memorialised is a constant battle between those included in the community and those excluded from it. I would argue that based on the research data analysed so far in this thesis, that in a way similar to buildings and inscriptions on walls, events and actions are remembered by place names. In this way, in their memorialisation of actions and events, communities utilise toponyms as mnemonic devices for their collective identity. The dependence that communities form with toponyms as a result of actions or events, will be discussed in chapter six.

Conclusions
As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the intention of this chapter was to create a theory (or theories) of the constitution of toponymic identity. Through systematic exploration of the key components of place identity, including history, community and emotions, various explanations and justifications for the existence of toponymic identity were confirmed.

As stated at the outset of the chapter, place identity is an emotional function of place attachment (Sharpe and Ewert, 2000) and is linked to the symbolic nature of place relationships (Williams and Vaske, 2003). In addition, the formation of place identity can dictate within a community what actions should occur in a place and how people should behave within a particular setting (Proshansky et al., 1983). Recognition of one’s identity is important for leading a meaningful life (Taylor, 1992) and without recognition it has been argued that individuals will not be able to pursue a good life (Wong, 2002).
It was seen that personal and community identity can be tied to a toponym(s) in a similar way to which it can be linked to places. Through exploration and analysis of the research data it was argued that negativity expressed towards the renaming proposal was possibly brought about through personal and community anxiety of identity being ignored and replaced by a culture they did not understand nor connect with. As discussed in the literature stability of place identity lies in the uninterrupted continuity of a place. From the analysis and data available it was able to be argued that in a similar way to place identity, stability of toponymic identity is reliant on place names remaining unchanged within and for a community.

The chapter discussion also focused on the power dynamics of place inclusion and exclusion exhibited by communities. It was shown in the literature that dominant cultures and communities use strongly held beliefs as authority for maintaining their cultural practices (Jackson, 1989). In the same way, it was argued that the existence of non-Indigenous names in the landscape served as constant reminders of colonial history and ‘ownership’ of the landscape. It was with this colonial history that many opponents of the name change opposed, as they argued that removal of non-Indigenous names would remove their connections to colonial history and sense of community. Concomitantly, those in the community who identified with the Indigenous names were jubilant at the proposal because they believed it to be an acceptance of Indigenous identity in the case study area, and they connected with the Indigenous names. Thus, it was argued that toponymic identity can exist in a similar way to place identity, with a distinction being made because the connections to history and community by the participants was linked strongly to the names rather than the places themselves. Obviously, the constructs of place and toponymic identity are strongly correlated, as places would not exist without names, and names would have no purpose without places.

One of the important focuses of this chapter was on uncovering whether there existed any support(s) for arguments in favour of reinstating Indigenous toponyms, and to explore why it is perhaps important for non-Indigenous names to be retained. It was found in the research data that toponymic identity existed with both Indigenous and non-Indigenous names for many participants. The perceived threat of removing non-Indigenous names was an overwhelming experience for many people and was related
directly to their sense of identity. For those who opposed, one argument against removing non-Indigenous names was that they felt emotionally unable to connect with any proposed new names, and felt their emotional connections with the existing names would be removed completely, leaving them bereft of a name with which to connect their emotions. On the other hand, the proposal to reinstate Indigenous names was for some people akin to an act of official recognition of Indigenous identity in the case study area, and was perceived as an important step towards reconciliation with Australia’s Indigenous history.

As was touched on in this chapter, the issues of representational historical narratives and government intervention in introducing the renaming proposal were instrumental in the formation of people’s support or opposition to the renaming. The structures behind the promotion and use of the case study area’s historical narrative and the possible alternatives to the government proposal format will be explored in further detail in chapter seven. The focus of that chapter will be on participant’s current usage/non-usage of the restored Indigenous names, and their recommendations on how renaming processes should be managed by Governments to ensure community acceptance and support.

Before reaching chapter seven, there is another important component of place attachment which must be discussed: place dependence. This is the focus of chapter six and the key points of exploration are related strongly to issues raised in the research data that could not be explained or analysed in relation to the theories on place identity. These key themes relate to tourism, addressing and emergency management and, as will be discussed in chapter six, whilst it is possible to explore these themes in discussions of place dependence, it is also important to discuss them in relation to the possible existence of toponymic dependence.
‘Where the Bloody Hell Are We?’ -
Toponymic Dependence

…Every gal in Constantinople
Lives in Istanbul, not Constantinople
So if you've a date in Constantinople
She'll be waiting in Istanbul
Even old New York was once New Amsterdam
Why they changed it I can't say
People just liked it better that way
So take me back to Constantinople
No, you can't go back to Constantinople
Been a long time gone, Constantinople…

They Might Be Giants, Istanbul (Not Constantinople) song lyrics
Introduction
In reading through the research data for this doctoral thesis it became apparent that apart from the reflections upon history, community and emotions which characterised sentiments of toponymic identity, for many participants who either opposed or supported the renaming proposal there were other issues to consider. These issues focused mainly on the tourism industry, addressing services and emergency service delivery. These themes were frequently called upon as either justification for promoting the name change, or reasons for why the name change was a 'waste of money' or could 'endanger people's lives'. It became apparent in the research data that apart from notions of identity, the participants had possibly become attached to another aspect of the places in which they lived and/or the toponyms that symbolised these places.

The attachment that the research data initially pointed to was a functional attachment, which within the framework of this doctoral research program, and based on geographical literature on place, is defined as place dependence. As described by Williams and Vaske (2003: 5), place dependence ‘reflects the importance of a place in providing features and conditions that support specific goals or desired activities’. They elaborate further and note that the dependence is linked to the physical characteristics of the place, such as a State forest providing a location for legally collecting firewood, or an office providing the location and equipment to run a business. They assert that dependence on a place may increase according to a person’s ability to access the site frequently and they provide the following example:

A relatively small river with class II and III rapids, for example, may not provide the best kayaking. However, if the place is close to an individual’s home, an avid kayaker may still float the river frequently to improve specific skills. Place dependence thus suggests an on-going relationship with a particular setting (Williams and Vaske, 2003: 5).

Thus, the concept of place dependence as a functional attachment can be described in its most basic form as a reliance on the physical characteristics of a place to provide recreational, work or other required facilities. It is the focus of this chapter therefore to ascertain whether in a similar manner to the dependence people form with places, a dependence on a toponym(s) can be said to occur or exist.
As the research data collected in the area of functional attachment was expansive it was thought important to dedicate analysis to the construct of place dependence, and the possible existence of toponymic dependence, as components of place and toponymic attachment distinct from, but correlated to, place identity and toponymic identity. As there is a veritable paucity of literature on place dependence, especially when compared to the literature on place identity which framed the discussion of chapter five, the construction of this chapter has relied heavily on the research data as the focus of the discussion which is then counterpointed with literature from tourism, psychology and sociology. The analysis in this chapter therefore explores the research data themes of promotion, location and identification and analyses whether the themes can be considered as components of place dependence. All three themes are intertwined and contain components of each other, but distinctions can also be made.

The theme of promotion was evident in the research data discussions of tourism whilst the theme of location was evident through discussion in the research data of a reliance on wayfinding. The final theme of identification, while sounding similar to place identity, was actually strongly discussed in the research data in regards to physical identification of specific features and places for emergency service management. Thus, this theme of identification can be separated from place identity as it relates to the psychological import participants held with place names, through reliable business and residence addressing or site identification, being used to physically identify places for all reasons, especially in cases of emergency.

Before systematic discussion and analysis of the research data can begin on the three topics, it is important to discuss the construct of place dependence. Thus, this chapter is structured to first incorporate discussion of the limited literature on place dependence. The chapter then flows into discussion of the research data themes to explore whether the key ideas can be classified as possible components of place and/or toponymic dependence. The key aim of this chapter therefore is to discuss and analyse the key themes of the research data which did not fully fit the criteria for being components of toponymic identity, and in so doing to assess whether they can be considered components of place, or possibly toponymic, dependence as a construct of place and toponymic attachment.
What is Place Dependence?

As discussed in the literature review, much of the research to date has focused on the etymological meanings of toponyms. Yet, it has been found in this research program that there are whole other components of toponyms which need to be explored. As stated by Robinson (1989: 164) ‘names have, of course, like places, symbolic as well as purely descriptive content’. To this point this thesis has explored the symbolic emotional components of toponyms. Attention has focused on the manner in which people associate histories, sense of community and events with places and their names through an emotional attachment to the toponym of that place. What now needs to be explored is the functional attachment to toponyms.

As iterated earlier in this chapter, Williams and Vaske (2003: 5) note that a functional attachment to place can be categorised as a dependence on the place. This dependence is formed on the basis of the ability of the place in meeting certain physical requirements, such as providing a place for recreational pursuits or workplace related activities. Stokols and Shumaker (1981: 47) were amongst the first theorists to assert that ‘place dependence is described as the perceived strength of association between a person and specific places’. These associations are purported to be strengthened according to two things: whether a place meets the needs and goals of an individual, and how the place’s attributes compare to other places. Importantly, within an analysis of theories exploring place attachment, Shumaker and Taylor (1983: 225-6) noted that Stokols and Shumaker’s theory of place dependence allowed for both positive and negative dependencies, and could be applied to both individuals and groups.

Stokols and Shumaker (1981: 457), contended that ‘when occupants perceive themselves as having a strong association with a place’ they could be described as ‘place dependent’ whereas if they have a ‘weak connection between themselves and a place’ they are ‘place independent’. A person’s perception of their association with a place therefore defines the level of dependency they form with it. Stokols and Shumaker elaborate to note that someone can be dependent on places of varying
scales ranging from a home to a city to a country, and that the level or strength of dependency will vary between places too. For instance, someone can concurrently have a strong dependency on their home but minor dependency on the local park. Importantly for this chapter’s exploration of the construct of dependence will be to investigate whether dependency on certain toponyms over others can exist, or whether similar levels of dependency occur in all instances.

It was also proposed by Stokols and Shumaker (1981: 458) that dependency relied on two factors, the first being the quality of the current place and the second being the relative quality of comparable alternative places. For instance, as previously highlighted from Williams and Vaske’s research, if a choice of alternate places is limited then the degree to which a person will become dependent on one specific place for meeting their requirements will be heightened. Within this description of the functions of place dependence is the important factor that the limitation of choice increases dependency. It will be of import in this chapter to explore whether in a similar way to places dependency on toponyms can also occur. That is, do people form a dependency with certain toponyms because there are limited other toponyms perceived to be suitable for characterising or symbolising the places in question?

Recent literature by Williams and others (Williams et al., 1992; Williams et al., 1995; Sharpe and Ewert, 2000; Williams, 2000; White et al., 2008: 647) has classified place dependence as a component of place attachment similar to, but distinguishable from, place identity. Others such as Jorgensen and Stedman (2006) have located place dependence as a component of sense of place, alongside place attachment and place identity. Whilst Pretty, Chipuer and Bramston (2003: 208) have asserted that place dependence is a component of sense of place alongside place identity, place attachment and sense of community. The distinction here is that Jorgensen and Stedman assert that place attachment is an emotional construct, place identity is a belief construct and place dependence is a behavioural construct of sense of place and Pretty et al contend that in addition to the above three classifications it is necessary to distinguish sense of community.

Yet here I would disagree with Jorgensen and Stedman and Pretty et al in preference for the classifications provided by Williams and others. As has already been explored
in this thesis, the construct of place identity is best situated within place attachment as a component alongside place dependence because the emotional aspects of attachment can be argued to be related to both identity and dependency. Emotions can be argued to be related to both identity and dependency based on the definition provided by Jorgensen and Stedman (2006: 4), that they are calculated in terms of positive or negative affect. Both identity and dependency can be calculated to have negative or positive affects because people can have positive associations with the history of a place but negative associations with the facilities offered by a place. I would assert that if the construct of place attachment is located alongside identity and dependence then there is no option to allow for simultaneous positive and negative emotions towards a place. Similarly, to distinguish sense of community from the construct of place identity is to imply that the formation of the community which surrounds a person has no actual affect on their formation of identity.

For this thesis, the construct of place dependence needs to be explored in relation to the possible existence of toponymic dependence. Thus, it shall now be examined whether people form functional attachments to toponyms in the two ways it is stated that they can form functional attachments to places: by the name fulfilling a need and through the name’s comparable attributes. Firstly, the comparable attributes of names will be investigated through discussion of the use of toponyms for promotional purposes. Secondly, the needs that people associate with toponyms will be analysed through discussion of the use of toponyms as locational and identification tools.

\ Components of Dependence

Promotion
During the first data compilation and early analysis stages of the research program I had found it difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons the Victorian Government had given for proposing and pursuing the name restoration proposal. Thus, during the course of his oral history interview, I asked Steve Crabb, former Minister for Tourism who had instigated the name restoration proposal in 1989, what the rationale for the name change was. As previously discussed in chapter one, but reprinted here again for purposes of clarity and further discussion, he provided a straight-forward reply
…it came from two things. One of my experiences of having sort of tramped around the Grampians was that one of the most fascinating things about it was the Aboriginal heritage that was there…the Cave of Emus Foot I remember, Cave of Ghosts I remember, Fertility Cave I remember, which are all kind of badly named really because…there was a whole lot of quite mystical stuff there that wasn’t there, it wasn’t very well interpreted and a lot of the time there were wire cages around it or it was hidden because they didn’t want people to know it was there and none of the rest of the Grampians reflected it so there was…stuff with silly names…like Elephant’s Hide and you know, Lady’s Hat and all that sort of stuff…6

[the second thing was] we were actually embarked on a broader thing in tourism at the time, we had a project about Aboriginal tourism and it was partly in a sense of altruism but it was also practical because we were finding then that the international tourists especially were really very interested in all things Aboriginal. So it was quite an important part of Victoria’s tourism message that when you came here, you could, you know you could have an experience that was, an Indigenous experience

Thus, at the onset of the interview with Steve Crabb the two main reasons for the name change were easily identified. The first reason was widely promoted and easy to identify in the available research data: to restore a sense of Indigenous heritage to the case study region through restoring Indigenous toponyms, especially for features which could be readily identified with Indigenous heritage (such as rock art shelters). The second reason related to tourism, which is the main topic of interest for this section of the thesis. As will now be discussed it can be argued that both of these reasons for the name restoration proposal relate to the comparison component of theories on place dependency, but for toponyms. This can be argued because Crabb noted for the purposes of accurately conveying the attributes of the various rock art sites in the study area the most appropriate toponyms were those which were derived

6 The locations of these some of these features can be viewed on the map provided in Figure 1.4 Details on the backgrounds of most of the names is available in Appendix B.
from, and easily attributable to, Indigenous cultural heritage. Therefore, Crabb was stating that comparable to other toponyms in use for the rock art sites, his Ministry believed that Indigenous names were the most appropriate for creating a link to the attributes of the places.

The main government business unit under Crabb’s Tourism Ministry portfolio delegated the task of researching the Indigenous names was the Victorian Tourism Commission. At the time of the proposal, Ian Clark was hired as a consultation to research the traditional Indigenous toponyms for features in the study area. During his oral history interview I asked him about what he believed the reasons for the name change were from a government perspective, and he noted that

Well the formal reasoning was they were investing over a million dollars into Indigenous tourism in the Park and I firmly believe that it was an issue of the minister that he felt the names were inappropriate for what he considered to be such an important Aboriginal place.

Garth Head, the manager of the Koori Tourism Unit (KTU), which was established during the time of the naming proposal, confirmed this government position and acknowledged that through toponyms ‘as icons and major developments in the work…we build a better community awareness of Aboriginal culture, Koori cultural tourism’.

It is here in the research data that the second component of toponymic attachment can begin to be seen. For these three people who were intimately involved at the government level of the name restoration program the proposals were underpinned by a strong belief in the traditional Indigenous names being useful for promoting Indigenous cultural tourism. It could be proposed that in a manner similar to which a place might be compared amongst others for its attributes, or how a place might offer a setting perfect for certain activities, a toponym might be comparable for its attributes or how it offers certain unique characteristics for promotional purposes.

In chapter five some discussion was given to the notion of Indigenous and non-Indigenous toponyms being identified with certain histories and events. This aspect of toponymic identity also can create a situation whereby a dependency could be formed with a toponym for promoting certain histories and events. As discussed
previously, Steve Crabb acknowledged that non-Indigenous names for Indigenous rock art sites such as ‘the Cave of Emus Foot…Cave of Ghosts…are all kind of badly named really because…it wasn’t very well interpreted’.

The KTU submission to the Place Names Committee in May 1990 (Clark and Harradine, 1990: 58) stated that for the rock art site registered as Camp of the Emu’s Foot, the site was given its non-Indigenous name by Aldo Massola (a writer whose published books on the etymologies of Australian toponyms contained often spurious information, for further information refer to (Kostanski, 2005)), in 1960 which he had derived from the Jardwadjali name for Victoria Gap (another feature in the case study area). It was reported by the KTU (Clark and Harradine, 1990) that the Jardwadjali name for Victoria Gap is Yananginj Njawi, which when translated into English means ‘the sun will go’ (refer to Figure 6.1 for picture of rock art at Yananginj Njawi Shelter).

![Figure 6.1 Rock art at Yananginj Njawi Shelter (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)]](image)

It was argued in the report from the KTU that the discrepancy between the meanings of the non-Indigenous name and the proposed restored Indigenous name indicated that
the non-Indigenous name was inadequate. Similarly, the rock art site registered as Cave of Ghosts was reported by the KTU (Clark and Harradine, 1990: 58) to have been assigned by Barrett in 1943, ‘probably because the figures at the shelter are painted in white pipeclay’. The report argued that because the ‘motifs at this site are more likely to represent men…the local word for “white person” would be more appropriate’. The Jardwadjali word for white person is Ngamadjidj (refer to Figure 6.2 for picture of rock art at Ngamadjidj Shelter).

The inadequacy the report refers to could be linked to a perceived inadequacy of the names to represent the Indigenous heritage of the rock art. This potential inadequacy can be linked to notions of toponymic identity, and the names representing Indigenous cultural heritage. Further to this, I would argue that what is being seen here is also a component of toponymic dependence, in that it was identified by the KTU that the non-

![Figure 6.2 Rock art at Ngamadjidj Shelter (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)](image)

Indigenous names were inadequate for tourism promotion purposes and therefore created a negative toponymic dependence. The dependence was negative in that it was thought to fail in providing an appropriate representation of the facilities offered
by the places themselves. Thus, the arguments of the KTU, and by extension the Victorian Government, were to restore Indigenous toponyms to confer a positive toponymic dependence whereby the restored Indigenous names created an adequate function for promoting the facilities provided at the places the toponyms were symbols of.

In order to explore this proposed existence of toponymic dependence it is necessary to first investigate the tourism patterns and plans of the study area at the time of the name restoration proposal. This is important to discuss because the patterns and plans allow insight into the tourism trends at the time which were the undercurrent for the government’s plans to restore Indigenous names. Essentially, looking at the monetary value and marketing potential of the area in the 1989/1990 period will add depth to the later discussion on the value of toponyms, or the dependency governments and communities form with them for tourism purposes.

A report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 4) issued by the Victorian Tourism Commission in 1990, developed under the auspices of Steve Crabb, asserts that ‘visitors must be encouraged to come to the region’ and ‘greater attention needs to be given to making their experience a pleasurable one so they will stay longer and increase their spending’. A map incorporated into the report indicates that the Grampians tourism zone covered the region from Ararat to Stawell, Horsham, Balmoral, Dunkeld and Hamilton (refer to Figure 6.3 for copy of the map). Statistics in the report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 50) indicate that based on visitor days for 1989-1990 the region was the second most popular park area for visitors in Victoria. The report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 4) notes that in 1989 almost 700,000 visitors stayed in the region and tourism growth had been 5.1% between 1987-1988 and 4.1% between 1988-1989. The report estimated growth of 4.1% per annum until 2000 when visitor days would reach 4,000,000 in the region per annum. Recent figures available from Tourism Victoria (2008: 1) indicate that in 1999 the region received 2,285,000 domestic visitor nights and 1,089,000 daytrip visitors. Thus, it would appear from the available data that, whilst the growth in visitor days was substantial, the final rate in 1999 still fell 626,000 short of projected estimates.
In regards to visitor profiles, the report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 7) noted that the majority of tourists were from Victoria (66%), with tourists from across the border in South Australia being the next most frequent visitors (27%). The international tourism market at the time consisted of only 7,000 visitors, which the report indicated comprised 5% of the visitor numbers. Of international visitors the highest proportion came from Europe, followed by the United States of America and Canada. Statistics from 1999 (Tourism Victoria, 2008: 1) indicate that the international tourism market had by then grown to 41,100 overnight visitors in the region.
The 1990 report asserted that ‘the tourism industry has a substantial impact on the Victorian economy and the region’ (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 4). It noted that when figures were adjusted for inflation the tourism industry generated $68 million in the Grampians region and in Victoria the total tourism income of $4 billion equated to 7% of Victoria’s GDP. Obviously tourism at the time was seen to be important to the study area, and the government’s intentions were to continue the 4% annual increase in visitor numbers.

Interestingly, in regards to market opportunities, the 1990 report asserted that ‘the Victorian Tourism Commission marketing policy for 1990/1991 is to undertake extensive advertising campaigns for key areas of the state. The Grampians regions is one of the key areas’. As such, there was a recommendation that the marketing strategy of the study area be refreshed and renewed. The report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 9) argued that

within Australia there is an increasing interest in Aboriginal culture. Over recent years tourism demand has shifted from acquisitive (slide taking) to experience (experiencing and learning about nature and culture)...there is significant potential to increase the amount of expenditure in the region by restructuring the market mix [from campers who were stated to have low-volumes of expenditure, to the educated adult sector who were stated to have high-volumes of expenditure] and encouraging visitors to spend in the region.

As part of the identified marketable attributes of the study area the report singles out ‘Koorie Heritage’ in its own unique section. In this section the report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 19) referenced contemporary research (the Aboriginal Tourism Survey) which showed that of people living in New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria, 61.9% had very little contact with people of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent, but that 43.9% had indicated they were interested in learning more about Indigenous cultural heritage (and only 16.8% were not interested). The report noted that the Aboriginal Tourism Survey had found that of those who had previously visited Indigenous cultural sites or displays enough had done so pro-actively to ‘suggest a general interest in history and culture’ amongst the tourist population.
Whilst those surveyed were most interested in learning about culture through books and videos (44%) the survey also showed, and the report promoted (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 20), that 29% were interested in visiting Indigenous keeping places or museums run by Indigenous people and 30% were interested in guided tours of Indigenous cultural sites. As the report notes (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 42), 80% of known Indigenous art sites in Victoria are located in the study area. Thus, the report (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 20) recommends that ‘the development of tourism activities in Victoria related to Koorie keeping places and guided tours of Koorie sites have the potential to be very successful. The potential is there to bring together the product and potential customers’. It goes on to state later that ‘there is a need to develop strategies that attract visitors to the Grampians and away from other locations (especially interstate locations)’ (Victorian Tourism Commission, 1990: 42).

As can be seen from the 1990 report the monetary value of tourism was highly valued and the Victorian Government sought to capitalise on this through new marketing campaigns. These campaigns were to focus on Indigenous cultural heritage due to research indicating tourism demand for this was strong amongst inter- and intra-state visitors, who represented the core tourism market in the region. As noted previously, Steve Crabb asserted that restoring Indigenous toponyms would assist ‘Victoria’s tourism message’. Whilst the theories on place dependence indicate a reliance on the attributes of a place compared to another, and it could be said here the tourism industry was relying on the physical existence of Indigenous cultural sites in the study area with which to distinguish it from other places, a dependency on Indigenous toponyms for tourism purposes can also be clearly delineated.

The promotion of a place’s physical attributes and facilities is a fundamental component of tourism marketing strategies. Promotional strategies for all intents and purposes can be linked to capturing and promoting the attributes of a place compared to others. As noted in the literature review, recent progress in tourism studies has seen the development of a stream of research categorised as place branding. This field of studies seeks to explore the ways in which the marketing of places to potential tourists can be undertaken in the most effective manner. As it is a newly developing field there is still ongoing debate about its true value and the research to date has not
truly focused on the dependency on toponyms, rather it has focused on marketing strategies. Thus, brief attention will now be given to the ongoing debates inherent in developing the concept of place branding, before moving discussion to the key concepts and then analysing the research data in concert with exploring the literature on Indigenous tourism and place branding strategies. The purpose here is to bring developing theories on place branding to this study’s wider discussion on toponymic dependence.

**Place Branding**

The *American Marketing Association* defines a brand as a ‘name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group and to differentiate them from those of the competition’. Recently, there has been academic attention paid to the ways in which places can be brands, as some believe that the brand of a place identifies its characteristics (Blain *et al.*, 2005). Further to this, Kotler and Gertner (2002: 41) have asserted that the theories of branding need not be limited to manufactured products alone as ‘country names amount to brands and help consumers to evaluate products and make purchasing decisions. They are responsible for associations that may add to or subtract from the perceived value of a product’. Indeed, Morgan and Pritchard (2002: 60) have asserted in regards to New Zealand tourism place-branding strategies that ‘all successful brands…have personalities and enhance the perceived utility, desirability, and quality of a product’.

Yet, these concepts are not without controversy. Blain *et al.* (2005: 328) have noted that the concept of destination branding remains ‘poorly understood and is often misunderstood by practitioners’. Indeed, Skinner and Kubacki (2007: 305) have noted that whilst ‘the concept of branding is now commonly applied to place marketing…this concept does not have universal acceptance’. Skinner and Kubacki (2007: 306) go on to note that ‘many academics have shied away from entering the debate, arguing that places are too complex to include in branding discussions’. Yet, I would argue that place is important to discuss in regards to branding theories for, as noted by McCabe and Stokoe (2004: 601), ‘place and space are fundamental constructs in tourism studies’. Further to this, according to Fan (2006: 7) ‘place
branding is a component of tourism marketing...and promotes a place not just for visits and tourism but also for inward investment, job creation and settlement’.

Importantly within the academic debate on the concept of place branding has been the argument that the theories on marketing of consumer products sold in retail environments cannot be likened to marketing a country or places within it. For example, Michel Girard (cited in Ollins, 2002: 18) has argued that

In France the idea of re-branding the country would be widely unacceptable because the popular feeling is that France is something that has a nature and a substance other than that of a corporation. A corporation can be re-branded, not a state. One can take a product, a washing powder for instance, and then change the name which is actually done very regularly. Regular re-branding is normal, particularly in the life of consumer products, but can this actually be the case for countries?...A country carries specific dignity unlike a marketed product…’

The counter argument from pro-place branding theorists (Ollins, 2002; Herningway, 2007) asserts that techniques of branding places are similar to those employed in branding companies and their products. Ollins (2002: 24) notes particularly that ‘people are people whether they work in a company or live in a nation and that means that they can be motivated, inspired and manipulated in the same way, using the same techniques’. Although as Fan (2006: 8) proposes, the clear distinction between product and nation branding is that a brand ‘has a sole owner whose legal right is protected by law. In nation branding the nation itself has no control over the use (or abuse) or its name or image’. Further to this Gotham (2007: 827) argues that ‘ unlike other brands that people buy and sell in markets, a branded place is spatially fixed, non-transportable and consumed by people at the point of production’. As was seen earlier in this chapter the Victorian Government believed that restoring Indigenous names would benefit the tourism industry. Thus, I will assert here that the concept of place branding is important to explore for its possible extrapolation to creating a theory on toponymic dependence. So, what is place branding?

Blain et al. (2005: 328) assert that a place brand is a ‘name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic that both identifies and differentiates the destination; furthermore, it
conveys the promise of a memorable travel experience that is uniquely associated with the destination’. They go further to assert that place branding ‘requires a unique selling proposition’ (Blain et al., 2005: 331). This concept of a brand differentiating one place from another can be likened to the place dependence construct of comparison, in that in similar ways to which a place is depended upon for its comparable characteristics, a place brand could be said to be depended upon for its ability to portray the unique characteristics of a place.

In an oral history interview, Richard DeFegely asserted that for the restoration of Indigenous names to the rock art sites within the case study area ‘I don't have any argument with the rock art sites, I think that that’s fine, I think that's probably very appropriate for them…[because] they are Aboriginal art sites, why wouldn't they have an Aboriginal name and I mean it's just logical isn't it really?’. This was a sentiment shared by many participants in the oral history interviews, that the utilisation of Indigenous names for features which were clearly identifiable as being of Indigenous cultural heritage was a supportable concept. Robert in his oral history interview asserted that as ‘the Grampians hold about 80% of Victoria’s art sites, it [restoring Indigenous names] was the natural place for him [Steve Crabb] to go…I can understand it being used as a marketing tool and I can understand the Grampians being the rightful place to market Indigenous history’. Thus, it can be stated that the construct of comparison is evident here where participants were supportive of Indigenous names being utilised for readily-identifiable Indigenous cultural features. It is evident because the participants are stating that the ‘uniqueness’ of the name captures the characteristics of the place it represents.

In regards to the renaming of the entire national park area though, for those who did not support the proposal, they often argued that the name Grampians was intimately linked to the construct of portraying the unique characteristics of the place as they understood it (i.e. to be non-Indigenous). One such remark was made by Richard DeFegely, who was supportive of rock art sites having Indigenous names restored, where he noted that when the name Grampians was utilised by people around him, even if he was not in the physical location at the time an image of ‘the mountains’ came to his mind. Similarly for Matthew, the name Grampians allowed him to distinguish in his mind the place from all others because its ‘a moody place and it’s
that spirit, that atmosphere, the atmospherics of it and knowing its history, some of it and appreciating its longevity and all those sorts of things that is separate from just the now and the geographic point’.

This concept of the name linking to an image of the place was summarised by Nicholas in his oral history interview as the name Grampians being a representation of the place he lived as unique from all other places in the world. He stated that

I was overseas once and I was staying home, because I went over on a YMCA scholarship, and here’s a picture of the Grampians…showing the great time they had there. That was just like saying everything to me, you know, it was just a great feeling to see that they’d been to the Grampians. Whereas if it had have been Gariwerd, you wouldn’t have taken any notice of it.

Morgan, Pritchard and Pride (2002: 11) argue that branding ‘can communicate and emphasise the “feel” and “personality” of the place’ whilst Fan (2006: 6) notes that the aim of place branding is to ‘create a clear, simple, differentiating idea built around emotional qualities which can be symbolised both verbally and visually and understood by diverse audiences in a variety of situations’. Interestingly, Fan (2006: 7) also notes that ‘from the marketing perspective, nation branding has the aim of helping the nation to ‘sell’ its products and places’.

Importantly for the purposes of this research is the notion proposed by Morgan and Pritchard (2002: 60) that

every country claims a unique culture, landscape and heritage, each place describes itself as having the friendliest people, and high standards of customer service and facilities are now expected. As a result, the need for destinations to create a unique identity – to differentiate themselves from their competitors- is more critical than ever.

As noted at the outset of this chapter, one of the key elements for the Victorian Government’s proposal to restore Indigenous toponyms to the case study area was to assist in increasing tourism to the National Park. It could be argued that in line with contemporary theories on place branding, the proposal to utilise Indigenous toponyms was thought to facilitate the promotion of a unique travel experience within western Victoria. It could be said that the tourism industry supported by the Government was dependent on the use of Indigenous toponyms such as Gulgurn Manja rather than
*Cave of Hands* to market Indigenous places such as rock-art sites and other cultural areas within the study area. Based on the available literature, it would seem that with the growth in cultural heritage tourism the use of place branding has increased (Herningway, 2007: 332).

As discussed earlier in this chapter, tourism research data from 1990 indicated that there was in increasing interest in Indigenous cultural heritage tourism even when 61.9% of the Victorian, New South Wales and South Australian population had very little contact with people of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander heritage. Azarya (2004: 951) notes that ‘tourism is basically about gazing at particular scenes that are different from those encountered in one’s daily life’. It could be asserted here that the seeking out of “different scenes” can be equated to those unfamiliar with Indigenous cultural heritage being eager to engage in tourism activities related to this.

At the time of the name restoration proposal, the Victorian Government invested in the creation of Brambuk, an Indigenous cultural centre located in Halls Gap, the tourism centre of the case study area. Brambuk was established to consolidate Indigenous tourism promotion in the area and was, and still is, overseen by 5 Indigenous communities who have traditional interests in the study area. Spark (2002: 26) has noted that ‘Brambuk seeks to challenge popular misconceptions about Aboriginal people, particularly the idea that there are “none left” in Victoria’. Importantly, Spark (2002: 24) asserts that whilst ‘Brambuk challenges the historically dominant framing of the area as ‘non-Aboriginal’ settler space, Brambuk is also a product of the tourist industry’s desire to capture the interest of a ‘niche market’’. The first notion of challenging non-Indigenous concepts of place was tackled in chapter five, but the issue of “niche marketing” has not yet been investigated in detail for the study area.

For those that opposed the name restoration proposal in the study area, one argument against the use of Indigenous toponyms for tourism purposes, as put forward by Jenny Holmes in a letter to the editor (1990), purported that ‘85 alterations to meaningless, unpronounceable composites of obscure Aboriginal dialects…cannot promote tourism. It must surely hinder it’. Similarly, L. Grant (1990) asserted that ‘tourism does not need that sort of handicap’. Importantly, in a media article published in the
Wimmera-Mail Times (Gramps Rename Blasted, 1989), Cr Don Johns of Horsham City Council was reported to have said that ‘it is known as the Grampians Australia-wide and world-wide…there is no advantage in it at all’.

As discussed previously, the intent of the name restoration proposal was partly to increase Indigenous cultural tourism through the use of what the Government perceived to be toponyms appropriate for that purpose. As noted by Ryan and Huyton (2000: 308)

Indigenous tourism has emerged as a distinct subtheme within cultural tourism for a number of purposes, one being the wider political framework within which postcolonial societies grapple with issues of making amendments for past land seizures and policies inimical to the culture of Indigenous societies

As investigated in chapter five, the proposed restoration of Indigenous toponyms was thought by some to be an act of acknowledging the long-overlooked role of Indigenous cultural heritage in the case study area. Yet, other complementary purposes can also be found. For example, Ryan and Huyton (2000: 308) also assert that

from a touristic perspective, National Tourism Organizations utilize imagery derived from the culture of peoples of Indigenous extraction because they represent symbols unique to a country or destination—something not replicable in other parts of the world. Such images are thus a means of securing “branding” that is instantaneously recognizable as being part of that country.

The question here is, can toponyms be perceived as cultural images, and therefore are they conceivable as brand elements? Are toponyms the symbols of the place product? An exploration of the answers to these questions can be facilitated through an examination of the available research data.

For James in his oral history interview, the concept of a toponym being a cultural image utilised to portray the unique characteristics of a place was entirely conceivable. He asserted that for tourism purposes it was important to use the name Gariwerd because it was ‘a nice sounding name, it rolls off the tongue well, and yeah, it shows the uniqueness of the area’. Similarly for Graham, he noted that the use of
any name, be it Indigenous or non-Indigenous was important, because it portrayed the fact that a place existed uniquely within the landscape. Essentially, he asserted in his oral history interview that

the international tourists that come have done their homework and they know that Halls Gap its the heart of The Grampians… and so they have read their brochures and it says The Grampians and Halls Gap and it says that mountains are Mount William and all the other names of European connotations and so that is what they take as gospel. And it doesn't matter whether they come from the US, the UK or from Europe, Asia or whatever they all read the same stuff. Now if it was Gariwerd and some unpronounceable name for Halls Gap, I am sure it would still be the same and accepted in time.

On the other side of the debate, Kerryn Shade in his oral history interview, proposed that the background of the toponym was important in conveying a sense of uniqueness, and for this reason in his opinion the non-Indigenous names were important because ‘the Grampians…it’s an icon for tourists. I mean without the Grampians we wouldn’t have a lot of tourists going to Horsham…there’s people around Australia who know the Grampians, they wouldn’t know Gariwerd’. Similarly, Jason in his oral history interview asserted that the non-Indigenous names were important for him because ‘you know if they change the name of the Pinnacles or even Mount William if I heard the name, I’d have to think now where is that, what is it, what the hell is it? So my first thoughts are always with the European names and I would always talk about as I know them with the European names’.

For Kerryn and James there is a distinct admission that they perceive a dependence on the non-Indigenous names for tourism purposes. For Kerryn the dependency relates to the promotional aspects attached to the non-Indigenous toponyms, and the ability of the toponyms to convey messages of the places’ unique characteristics. Importantly for James, he notes that the dependency is not only for tourism purposes, but also for locational needs. It is hypothesised, as mentioned at the outset of this chapter, that the promotional aspects of the functional attachment on toponyms was only one aspect of the dependency. The locational aspect, whilst similar, can be
distinguished in the research data and while there is scant academic literature on this area it will now be discussed.

**Location**
The process of creating place from space requires certain landscape elements to be distinguished from all others and for toponyms to be applied as symbols of the created places. Due to a lack of research literature available on this topic, I would posit that to navigate between places the most common method utilised is that of toponymy. As explained in chapter one, traditional Indigenous societies used song cycles linked to toponyms to navigate the landscape. In similar ways, modern Australian culture utilises place names, feature names and street names to locate places and navigate between them. As discussed in chapter two, Kadmon (1997: 49) refers to toponyms such as *Villarica*, where the name is used by many people, as having connotative or pragmatic meaning. He explained that a name such as Venice, Paris or Beverly Hills acquires ‘meaning beyond the immediate descriptive-lexical meaning embedded in it’. I would assert that this meaning could be argued to be similar to those meanings explored in chapter five on identity, or even compared to the meaning imbued through branding techniques. Importantly though, it was argued by Kadmon that the imbuing of a toponym with connotative meaning makes it ‘lose its most salient function, namely its locational value’. Based on the research data I would argue otherwise. Namely, that connotative and locational values can be coincident, especially when considered in regards to the proposed theory on toponymic dependence.

All of those interviewed during this research program indicated a strong affiliation with the histories and meanings of both the places and toponyms of the study area. In addition to the affiliations with the connotative meanings of the toponyms, many participants also noted that they were dependent on the toponyms for the purposes of locating themselves within the landscape. For example, James asserted that ‘names just identify things, help to explain, help in the communication process’. Similarly, Jason posited that toponyms can simultaneously ‘give it [a place] an identity, they give it a location’. In a letter, Seaton Ashton (1990: 2) argued that

> if I was to tell you that I was off to Budja Budja for the weekend and also planned to have a look a Migunang Wirab you would look more
than nonplussed. But if Tourism, Conservation and Environment
Minister Steve Crabb gets his way, Budja Budja will be the new name
for Halls Gap and Migunang Wirab for McKenzie Falls.

Karen, in her oral history interview, indicated that the use of the existing non-
Indigenous names was important for location purposes, similarly to Seaton, because,
as she asserted ‘that’s what I’ve always known it [the places] as and refer to it [the
places] as’. For James, Jason, Seaton Ashton and Karen toponyms are important for
locating places within a landscape, and it is especially important for Seaton Ashton
that the names utilised are in common usage and understood by the majority of the
population.

Thus, for people to be able to communicate an idea of a place’s location in relation to
all other places and the bordering spaces, the participants in this research program
indicated that the use of a toponym was of primary importance. It could be stated that
this reliance on toponyms to assist with or underpin the locational communications
process ensures that people form a dependency with toponyms as they allow for ease
of spatial communication between two or more people.

In addition to the component of toponymic dependence of having a reliance on the
name being understood by the majority of the population, is the notion that common
usage or currency is also an important factor. This was a particularly important issue
raised by those who did not completely endorse the name restoration proposal. As
pointed out by Jenny in her oral history interview:

Ian Clark…came and gave a talk to Council and then when he
had…asked for questions, I had this little sign post up…just a miniature
name direction…all the names without anything else. McKenzie Falls
was one… directing you to all these different places and I said to Ian,
“Now Ian, people wanting to go to McKenzie Falls, the name is here,
can you pronounce it please?” and do you believe it or not, he could not
pronounce the name.

The argument of whether or not this actually occurred at the meeting in question is
irrelevant here. What is important is that Jenny is indicating that the locational aspect
of a toponym is intrinsically important for the purposes of allowing people to travel to
particular places for the purposes of experiencing their unique characteristics. The
particular locational aspect of the toponym that Jenny is indicating as important is that
of the ease of pronunciation and the currency of the name to convey the location of the place.

In regards to the means of conveying a location, wayfinding is not the only dependency aspect of toponyms. The research data showed that another strongly correlated component of dependency was also at play in the name restoration debate, namely identification. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, identification, whilst sounding similar to the construct of identity, is a distinguishable entity within the proposed theory of toponymic dependence due to its characteristics which will now be discussed.

**Identification**
The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographic Names (2001: 1) assert that consistent use of toponyms is important for a multitude of reasons, among them the purposes of tourism, map and atlas production, automatic navigation and importantly for this section of the thesis: communications for postal services and search and rescue operations. Similarly, the *Guidelines for Geographic Names Victoria* (Government of Victoria, 2004), produced by the Registrar of Geographic Names Victoria and which stipulate the processes and procedures which must be adhered to when naming features in Victoria, acknowledge that for postal and emergency service delivery to be effective the consistent application and use of toponyms is important. This section of the chapter will explore the use of toponyms on maps and signage before engaging in discussion of the use of toponyms for postal and emergency service delivery purposes.

Withers (2000: 535) notes that historically, in places such as Ireland ‘the mapping process was reliant upon accurate naming: arguably, indeed, mapping depended upon such naming since, however accurate in location and geometric terms maps might be, they were valueless as records of property ownership and guides to taxation without agreed names’. It could be argued that in similar ways in modern times, for the purposes of wayfinding and tourism activities, the use of accurate names on maps is important to allow for people to find their way from point a to point b.
Hand in hand with the use of maps is the use of signage to indicate the location of a place. People who are unfamiliar with a place will often use a combination of a map to indicate where they should be navigating to, and signage to indicate where they are in relation to their travelling route. As asserted by Puzey (2008: 8)

In semiotics, the word sign has a broad meaning, suggesting any object that denotes another object or concept apart from itself…but in geography sign is primarily used with the meaning of physical, material signs: road signs or street signs. The primary function of these signs is to communicate information, warnings and directions.

In Australia the use of road signage conforms with international standards, and is utilised extensively to indicate not only the names of roads but the location of features such as towns, points of interest and distances from one datum point to another. As noted in chapter two, Tim Cresswell (2004: 10) posits that ‘…in most definitions of landscape the viewer is outside of it. Places are very much things to be inside of’. Hence, if a landscape is something that people can travel through, be outside of, and at once stop and attach a meaning to an area of the landscape, that area of the landscape becomes a place and the landscape can be theorised as a space. Maps and signage can therefore act as a force with which notions of space and definitions of what constitutes a place with worthwhile cultural characteristics are reinforced.

In this way, I would posit that toponyms act as cultural anchors which guide tourists in their understandings of places in landscapes they are not familiar with. In this way, whether a place is indicated with a signed toponym or not is an important indication of the cultural heritage of an area. Which toponyms are selected to identify and locate a place, indeed which places are selected to be identified through maps and signs, allows insight into the dominant cultural forces at play in the landscape. As asserted by Landry and Bourhis (1997: 25) ‘the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration’. Thus, hegemonic discourses can be promoted in tourism, marketing and promotion campaigns. These discourses can work to ‘popularise’ Indigenous or minority cultures and at once subject them to “othering” discourses, relegate them as non-existent (ie through ignoring/denying/simplifying the history) or relegate them to an outdated “pre-history” status.
I noted during my travels in the study area the lack of consistent signage to indicate places of Indigenous cultural heritage. For example, the entrances to the National Park areas contained signs developed by Parks Victoria (the managing government body) which stated ‘Grampians National Park’ (see Figure 6.4 for example). No mention was made on these signs of the name Gariwerd, and it was only on Park Notes, or on interpretive signage at places of specific Indigenous cultural heritage, that reference to the toponym Gariwerd was made. I would assert that for all intents and purposes the use of Indigenous toponyms was only utilised in instances where the places being identified had exclusive Indigenous cultural characteristics and in all other cases the non-Indigenous names were utilised on maps and signs to provide tourists (and perhaps locals) with information on how to navigate through the landscape.

Figure 6.4 Welcome sign to National Park (Photographer: Laura Kostanski)

During her oral history interview, Gwenda Allgood, Mayor of Ararat at the time of the name restoration debate, argued that people had been willing to accept the Indigenous names for places such as rock-art sites and that these days the non-Indigenous names could not be used because
the signposts aren’t there anymore so people are not looking, it’s silly to keep using them. You can’t find Cave of Ghosts, people come here and say “Oh where’s the Cave of Ghosts?” and I go, “Well it’s there, it’s just not called Cave of Ghosts anymore, here it is on the map, it’s on the same place”. “Oh no it’s not, they’ve done something”. And I go, “Noooo”. So people need to stop. People in departments, government departments need to stop using the old terminology and to start using the new, just use it because people will go with that.

Gwenda raises two important points, the first being that the removal and replacement of old signage is an important process in re-identifying an area. For, it would seem, that without the ability to utilise the identification tool of old-signage to communicate the details of a place’s location, people will defer to utilising the toponyms which are indicated on the sign. Interestingly, for the formerly-known Cave of Ghosts, now Njamadidj Shelter, the road signage indicates mainly ‘Aboriginal Rock Art Site’ (refer to Figure 6.5 for picture of signage), almost a concession to not utilising the non-Indigenous name, but also not utilising the Indigenous name, whilst at the same time indication the characteristics of the place being pointed to. It is only when you travel closer to the site that the signage begins to utilise the Indigenous name (refer to Figure 6.6 for picture of signage).

The second interesting point Gwenda raises is about the need for consistency with toponymic practices. Gwenda notes that for identification purposes tourists are using maps to locate a place and signage to navigate there. When the toponyms utilised in both forms are not identical it is not possible to navigate effectively from one place to another. For this reason, it could be stated that people are dependent on accurate toponymy for place identification purposes.

During the oral history interviews, two participants, Doug and Toby spoke at length of the importance of consistent toponymic practices for the purposes of emergency service management. Both men volunteer with the Country Fire Authority (CFA), a not-for-profit, volunteer based, emergency response organisation with local brigades located across Victoria who have first-hand experience with the use of toponyms to identify places during times of emergency.
Figure 6. 5 Generic sign to 'Aboriginal Art Sites'

Figure 6. 6 Specific signage to Gulgurn Manja Shelter
Doug, in his interview, noted that the proposed restoration of Indigenous toponyms was a possible emergency service management issue at the time, because the early 1990s were pre-internet and Global Information Systems being available in cars. He asserted that because of this the updating of signage and maps with only Indigenous names with which the local population were not familiar would cause issues for emergency service delivery. Specifically he posited that

I’ll have to look at the map on the Grampians. I have got a very detailed fire map. But the…names we would have there would be the same as on your fire map. We [the CFA] never changed to any [Indigenous names] because when you talk to people, when you mention Mount Zero they knew exactly where it was. When you mentioned the Black Range they all knew it, local people. If I gave it the names that were given by the government, they’d say, “where the hell is that?” I would get the map and show them and they’d say, “oh, the Black Range. Why didn’t you say so?”.

In a similar fashion, Toby asserted that with the bushfires within the study area in the summer of 2005/2006 there were issues with the inconsistent mapping, signage and usage of the name Mirranatwa. He stated that

Mirranatwa was in the front line of the fires last summer. There was a big defence of the fire up there. You wouldn’t believe the number of variations that I’ve heard and seen written of Mirranatwa. And the reaction “Mirra what? Where in the hell is that?” Very few people have heard of it anyway and the locals up there get really upset if these foreigners that come in here and can’t even pronounce their name.

Based on the assertions of Doug and Toby, a dependency is formed with toponyms to accurately identify the location of a place in cases of emergency service management. This dependency can be said to be negatively affected by the inconsistent use of toponyms. In chapter seven attention will be given to how toponyms should be used consistently to alleviate these identification issues.

Conclusions
As has been discussed in this chapter, the theory of place dependence centres on two constructs: the comparability of a place with others and the ability for the
characteristics of a place to provide for the need of the user. Although the literature is sparse on this topic, this chapter has attempted to shape discussion of the construct of place dependence, and search for indications of toponymic dependence, based mainly on evidence collected from the research data. Thus, while the application of literature to the development of this chapter has been necessarily light, I believe that the discussion points of this chapter have raised some interesting points which indicate that dependencies can be formed with toponyms.

Based on the research of Stokols and Shumaker (1981) who asserted that place dependence is ‘described as the perceived strength of association between a person and specific places’, this chapter has explored the two factors which are purported to strengthen sentiments of place dependency: the comparable attributes of the place and the way in which the place fulfils particular needs; and has investigated whether similar factors can be said to apply to toponyms.

As demonstrated through the use of the research data the comparability factor of dependence, which assists in people forming dependencies on places, when applied to toponyms can be said to exist in the instances where people use a toponym to distinguish the unique aspects of one place from another. This comes into focus particularly with tourism promotion, or ‘place branding’. Participants in the study identified that they were generally more comfortable with name restoration programs applying to features which were readily identifiable as having aspects of Indigenous cultural heritage, compared to features which they recognised with colonial or non-Indigenous heritage. Thus, it can be stated that the dependencies people form with toponyms relates to the ability of the name itself to promote the unique attributes of a location.

In relation to the second component of place dependence, of the location providing for the needs of a population or person, the research data demonstrated that toponyms can also be said to provide for the locational and identification needs of a population. The locational needs relate to being able to distinguish one place from another, through the use of accurate toponymic practices which utilise consistent mapping and signage techniques. The identification needs are highly-correlated to locational needs because, as participants noted, it is important to be able to identify places accurately
for emergency service delivery purposes. Essentially, people are dependent on toponyms not only for their promotional qualities, but for their ability to assist people in navigating between places and identifying one place from another.

Now that this thesis has considered the until-now place-based theories of attachment in chapter four, identity in chapter five, and dependence in this chapter, and made assertions that these constructs apply in similar yet distinct ways to the bonds people form with toponyms, it is important to consider how these theories can be used collectively to ascertain how and why the name restoration program was received in the manner it was in 1989/1990. The focus of the next chapter is to explore the contemporary outcomes of the name restoration proposal, compare the key issues to international case studies, and then provide advice, based on participant-generated data, as to how name restoration programs should be run to ensure effective and community-supported outcomes.
‘Duel Names’:
Looking at the Impact of Toponymic Restoration

‘The process of naming places involves a contested identity politics of people and place.’

(Berg and Kearns, 1996: 99)
Introduction
To this point this research thesis has outlined the rationale for its undertaking, reviewed relevant literature, set out a discussion of the relationship between place and toponymic attachment, and investigated the existence and components of toponymic identity and dependence. The exploration to date has focused on developing a theory of toponymic attachment based on comparisons of existing literature on place attachment and the research data collated during the doctoral program. There could be reason for completing the thesis at this point by summarising the key findings and setting out a program for future research. Yet, I believe that this would leave some key questions unanswered, and therefore this chapter is written to complete the discussion of the case study by examining what the long-term outcomes of the renaming proposal were and considering international examples of the strengths and weaknesses of name restoration programs.

The title of this chapter ‘duel-names’ was inspired by the people who transcribed the oral history interviews for this research program. On many occasions the transcripts would be returned to me and the wording would state ‘duel names’ instead of ‘dual names’ where the participants or myself were discussing the official recognition of two names for one place. It occurred to me that the transcribers were translating what they heard into the written word, and not being familiar with the concept of dual-naming, and hearing the tones of the interview discussions, must have assumed that duel-naming referred to a process of contesting a name for a place. I thought it was rather poignant, and suitable for the title of this chapter which will discuss the outcomes of the name restoration debate, examine international examples using the newly developed theories of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence and then provide information on the key elements which undermined the Government’s efforts to restore Indigenous names for the study area.

During the data collection phases of this doctoral research program information was gathered through the use of mental maps and oral history interviews as to which names were being used by participants for various features in the study area in 2006. The results of the mental mapping program revealed various name-use patterns, which can now be explained through use of the theories developed in chapters four, five and
six on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence. This chapter will therefore begin with a discussion of the contemporary toponymic landscape and move into an examination of the key issues involved in the name restoration program in the case study area. The oral history interviews component of the doctoral research program allowed me as the researcher to ask participants what they perceived to have been the outcomes of the original name restoration program, and whether they believed the outcomes to have been positive or negative. Importantly, in finding answers to this query, the participants often reflected on whether name restoration programs were valuable and, if so, how they could be undertaken to achieve maximum acceptance and support within the community. Many participants offered advice on how name restoration programs should be established and run, and this advice is discussed in this chapter in unison with examples provided by international toponymic case study literature. The chapter concludes by offering recommendations from this case study, and others internationally, on how name restoration programs can be managed to achieve positive community acceptance and support. Essentially, this chapter explores the contemporary outcomes of the 1989/1990 Victorian Government proposal to restore Indigenous names for and within the Grampians National Park and in light of the theories developed in chapters four, five and six offers recommendations on how name restoration proposals could be run effectively in the future.

**Mental Mapping**

During the course of the oral history interview with Steve Crabb, I asked him which name he used for the study area these days. His reply was interesting, because he stated that he used the name Grampians. I questioned him as to why, if he had been the proposer of restoring Indigenous names, he had persisted to use Grampians as the name for the area. He explained that ‘I think if I said “we’re going to Gariwerd”, people would say… “where?” And if I said “we’re going to the Grampians”, they would say “yes”. It’s just a name, we just failed to change it really’. It was an admission by the original proponent that the name restoration program had not adequately achieved its purpose: namely to have the community recognise Indigenous cultural heritage and to increase cultural tourism in the region. Yet Crabb’s assertion that the name restoration program was a failure is not enough to explain the current
situation in the area. Rather, to explore whether the name restoration program can be considered to have been successful it is important to explore whether the Indigenous names which were registered in 1990 have been adopted by the population, or largely ignored. To do this, a mental mapping exercise was developed which allowed participants in the doctoral research program to indicate for the study area, and various sites within it, which names they use today.

Details on the mapping exercise undertaken are provided in chapter three, and a copy of the map used by participants is available for reference in Appendix M. In total 60 participants provided information on the mental maps (58 participants completed them as part of the questionnaire and 2 oral-history participants who did not complete the questionnaire did provide information for the mental maps). Of the mental mapping participants who completed section 1.7 of the Questionnaire (n=56) it is possible to assert that they were highly opposed to the name restoration program, with 37 of them stating that they had originally ‘disapproved’ of the proposal (refer to Figure 7.1 for summary graph of participant opinions).

The data was compiled and a map created to indicate which names were allocated to each feature. This map can be viewed in Analysis of the names that were plotted on the mental maps will now be undertaken in two discrete sections, the first will consider the names that participants used for the National Park and the second will consider the names that participants used for Indigenous cultural sites. Whilst more data are available for analysis, such as the names used for recreational areas, or those used for prominent features, it was decided to limit analysis to the name for the National Park and the names used for rock-art sites, as the letter, questionnaire and oral history data indicated that these features were the most likely to have different patterns of usage which would lend themselves to analysis for the purposes of this doctoral research program.
Participants were asked to identify at the top of the map the name(s) that they used for the National Park area. In total 42 participants completed this section, and the results are shown in Figure 7.2. As can be seen, the variations included Grampians (84%), Gariwerd (5%), Currewert (2%), Grampians (Gariwerd) (7%) and Gariwerd (Grampians) (2%). When analysed as to the ratio of usage for Indigenous, non-Indigenous and Dual-Names, the statistics indicate (as shown in Figure 7.3) that 83% were utilising an exclusively Non-Indigenous name, 7% were utilising an exclusively Indigenous name, and 10% were using a Dual Name.

Names for the National Park
Figure 7. 2 Names used by participants (n=42) for the National Park

Figure 7. 3 Ratio of Indigenous, non-Indigenous and Dual-Names usage for the National Park
These figures are given greater context when considered in relation to the backgrounds of the participants who were utilising them. For instance, Participant Three utilised the name *Grampians (Gariwerd)* for the National Park, and in section 1.8 of the Questionnaire noted that they ‘support dual names for Victorian places’ because of ‘historical reasons’. In contrast, Nicholas utilised *The Grampians* for the National Park, and asserted in section 1.8 of the Questionnaire that he had ‘some empathy with the area which entitles me to always call it the Grampians’. Of those that used an Indigenous name for the National Park, Barry, who did not have a personal Indigenous cultural heritage, acknowledged that he used the Indigenous name *Gariwerd* because ‘it acknowledges Aboriginal history…and their names are so much more evocative and poetic than European names’.

The sentiments of Participant Three, Nicholas and Barry indicate that for each of them the rationales behind their selection of toponym were personal. The reasons provided are similar to those explored as arguments for supporting or opposing the renaming proposal in chapters four, five and six, except in this case rather than being arguments from 1989/1990, they are provided as justifications for toponymic usage today. It can be stated that in regards to Barry’s assertion of having an ‘empathy’ which entitled him to use the name Grampians, he was highly attached to the non-Indigenous name for emotional reasons, which as explored in chapter five is a component of toponymic identity. Similarly for Barry, the use of an Indigenous name could be said to be explained through the theory of toponymic identity, in that the toponym he used was seen as a symbol of Indigenous heritage.

When the data are compared between the rate at which participants supported or opposed the renaming proposal in 1989/1990 and those that utilised the non-Indigenous, Indigenous and Dual-Names for the National Park it can be seen that there are clear correlations in background and usage type. As shown in Figure 7.4, those that used Indigenous names were originally supporters of the renaming proposal, whereas those that used a non-Indigenous name for the National Park either disapproved or had no opinion of the proposal. Those that utilised Dual-Names had opinions of the proposal across the spectrum, either having no opinion, disapproving or supporting the proposal.
These statistics would indicate that as regards to the restoration of Indigenous names for the National Park, the government program did not have widespread impact upon the population who opposed the renaming of the National Park. In this sense, the campaign could be said to have failed. The reasons for this are multiple, and will be explored later in the chapter in the discussion of ‘What Went Wrong?’. For now though, attention will be given to the use of names for features within the study area which are identifiable as having connections to Indigenous cultural heritage, namely rock art sites.

**Names for Indigenous Cultural Sites**

Participants were asked to indicate the names that they used for Indigenous rock art sites which are promoted for tourism and cultural heritage purposes in the study area. The sites selected to be identified on the mental maps were chosen because they were targeted during the 1989/1990 name restoration debate as the key candidates for having Indigenous names exclusively applied. These sites were at the time of the name restoration proposal officially recorded with the names *Cave of Ghosts, Camp of Emu’s Foot, Cave of Fishes* and *Cave of Hands*. Today, their official names are *Njamadjidj Shelter, Yananginj Njawi, Larngibunja Shelter* and *Manja Shelter*. 
For the first site (site 2 on map), 29 participants indicated a name. The second site (site 7 on map) had 22 participants identify a name. The third site (site 8 on map) had 29 participants indicate a name and finally the fourth site (site 10 on map) had 24 participants identify a name. The various names are indicated in Table 7.1.

As can be seen from the data, many participants did not indicate the appropriate name for the feature indicated on the map. There are many possible reasons for this, including the spatial capabilities of the map user and the design of the mental map. Yet it should be noted that the issue of whether the correct feature was identified or not is not of import to this research program. What is of interest is whether the participants utilised an Indigenous or non-Indigenous name for features which had a ‘rock art site’ or ‘cave’ symbol indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Site 7</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Site 8</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Site 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beehive Falls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camp of Emu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunjils Cave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Billywing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Ghosts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cave of Hands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blackfellow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Hands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Redrock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buandik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Rock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cave of Fishes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulgurn Manja</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wallaby Rocks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yanangin Ngawi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cave of Hands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngamadjidj</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenisla Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiation Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manja Shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Rock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Frequency of Names utilised for four Indigenous rock art sites.
The officially recorded name for the feature today is italicised and the name as recorded in 1989/1990 is underlined.

As shown in Figure 7.5 participants who indicated a name for Site 2 were more likely to utilise an Indigenous name than not (55% and 45% respectively), whereas Figure 7.6 shows that those participants that indicated a name for Site 7 were more likely to utilise a non-Indigenous name (55%) than an Indigenous one (45%).
Figure 7.5 Ratio of Indigenous and non-Indigenous names utilised for Site 2

Figure 7.6 Ratio of Indigenous and non-Indigenous names utilised for Site 7
Similarly to Site 2, the participants who indicated names for sites 8 and 10, were more likely to utilise Indigenous rather than non-Indigenous names for the sites. The data is shown in Figures 7.7 and 7.8.

Figure 7.7 Ratio of Indigenous and non-Indigenous names utilised for Site 8

Figure 7.8 Ratio of Indigenous and non-Indigenous names utilised for Site 10
A clear comparison can be seen here between participant use of Indigenous and non-Indigenous toponyms for the National Park and for features readily identifiable as having Indigenous cultural heritage. As discussed in chapters five and six, many participants in the research program indicated that they had no issues with utilising Indigenous names for the rock art sites, because they believed these names to be more appropriate for the features. As Glen noted in his oral history interview, he didn’t want an Indigenous name for the National Park, but in regards to Indigenous names for rock art sites he stated ‘it doesn’t worry me about that’. In a similar vein, Linda noted that ‘well the Cave Of Hands was sort of known as the Cave Of Hands over history, but you know, changing that to an Aboriginal name, that’s fine as far as I can see’.

It is possible to explain this phenomenon of people who are opposed to name restoration per se being supportive of Indigenous names being applied to rock art sites, through the use of the theories on toponymic attachment. For, if we are to consider that an attachment is formed with a toponym based on its simultaneous ability to link a person to the place’s cultural background and its function of promoting the characteristics of the place (ie that it indicates what activities can be undertaken there), then it can be stated that the participants who utilised the Indigenous names were forming connections between the names and their ability to symbolise Indigenous cultural heritage and the availability of this heritage at those particular sites. For those who continued to utilise non-Indigenous names for the sites, it could be explained that the non-Indigenous names were considered to adequately fulfil the purposes of identifying the cultural heritage and activities that they perceived to be available at the sites.

In contrast to the uptake rate of Indigenous names for the National Park, it could be asserted that in the instances of the rock-art sites, participants were more willing to utilise Indigenous names than non-Indigenous names. In these instances, the name restoration program could be considered to have been more successful but not a complete triumph as nearly half the participants were still utilising non-Indigenous names.
Based on the evidence collected from the mental mapping exercise, and the evidence around the study area that signage and maps have not been updated to accurately reflect the official names of various features in the study area, it is fair to conclude that the name restoration proposal and eventual program was not fully supported nor eventually embraced by the majority of the population even seventeen years after it all began. As has been discussed here, the theories of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence can be used to effectively explain the multitude of reasons for why the majority of the population did not accept the name restoration proposals in 1989/1990.

Research into available literature indicates that the name restoration proposal in this case study has not been a solitary phenomenon. Rather, there have been many instances internationally of governments and social groups proposing to restore Indigenous names for places which were colonised and had predominantly colonially-based toponyms officially recognised. Some discussion of these international examples allows a broader understanding of the key issues underlying most name restoration or renaming programs. Therefore a select group of studies based in the South Pacific, Aotearoa/New Zealand, South Africa and Singapore will now be examined with the intention of highlighting the inter-relationships of the key renaming or name restoration issues internationally. This investigation will then give greater context to the following section which discusses participants in this study’s perceptions of the key issues involved in the government name restoration proposal and their recommendations on how renaming programs could be run to achieve a positive outcome for the majority of the population.

**International Case Studies**

The subjugation of Indigenous names to secondary status in Australia and the processes by which colonial powers utilised Indigenous names for their own purposes was discussed in chapters two and four. The obvious impact that this had on contemporary understandings for mainstream society of the case study landscape was discussed in chapter five, and analysis indicated that the relegation of Indigenous cultural heritage to the peripheries of mainstream society had lead to the lack of
widespread understanding of the multiple histories evident in the case study landscape. It was also a main factor in determining community or individual acceptance of the name restoration program. The use of the toponymic restoration proposal for mainly tourism purposes was discussed in chapter six and was founded on principles of toponymic dependence. The fact that Indigenous toponyms were utilised by colonial powers for their own purposes, and that the restoration proposal was implemented by a Government wanting to not only promote Indigenous cultural heritage, but to also increase tourism revenue, is not an exclusive Australian phenomenon. Research papers published by academics in post-colonial states, or countries with minority populations striving for recognition, indicate that renaming or name restoration programs have received similar public reactions to those seen in this doctoral program’s case study. A selection of these research papers will now be discussed for the similarities they offer. In the process I will draw links between this case study and the international example and offer an explanation of the social behaviours based on the theories developed in chapters four, five and six. The papers are discussed in groupings of their geographical region, rather than the themes they explore, to allow for consistent examination of the meta-arguments they present and how they relate to this study.

Hawai‘i and the South Pacific
Herman (1999) has studied the toponyms of Hawai‘i, a contemporary state of the United States of America, and in particular examined a renaming proposal for a street in the capital city of Honolulu. The street in question, Thurston Avenue, was named after a prominent historical figure who had been an ‘early force behind the overthrow of Queen Lili-uokalani’ and the proposed renaming was for the birth-name of the Queen, Kamakaeha, to be used instead. Herman (1999: 95) asserted that ‘the Thurston Avenue controversy, and the debate and comments that surrounded it, showed that indeed the politics of language, place names and sovereignty are intertwined’. Those who opposed the renaming stated similar arguments to those that arose in this case study, namely that it was ‘revisionism and “political correctness”…if applied across the board it would lead to many more street-name changes…it was “disrespectful for the residents here now”…[because] this archipelago is not the Hawaiians’ place anymore, but rather belongs to everyone’ and
that English place names were ‘at least pronounceable’. Those who supported the proposed renaming stated that it was a good idea because the name ‘seems more Hawaiian’. These arguments on both sides of the debate are similar to those seen in the case study for this doctoral program. In particular, the argument of Hawai’i ‘belonging’ to all residents, not just those with Indigenous cultural heritage, can be said to correlate strongly with the sentiments seen in the Grampians (Gariwerd) debate on the sense of community that a toponym bears. In this way, it can be argued that sentiments of toponymic identity were expressed in the Hawai’ian street-renaming case. Likewise, the notion that English toponyms were ‘pronounceable’ compared to their traditional Hawai’ian names can be said to be linked to a sentiment of toponymic dependence.

Crocombe (1991: 233) asserts that in the South Pacific, in places such as Hawai’i and New Zealand, the general debate over the reinstatement of what he calls ‘first names’ usually comes down to an argument that the first names are ‘more correct, more prestigious, or more meritorious, than a later one’. He notes that he does not see any validity in that argument, except from those who seek to gain advantage in the renaming because ‘naming is a reflection not so much of history, but of current struggles for advantage…when later ones get changed back to earlier ones it is not because the earlier one was right, but because those who benefit from identification with the early ones have regained power’. The issue of power relations was evident in the case study for this research program, and also arose in the case study selected by Berg and Kearns (1996) in their discussion on the politics of naming in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

**Aotearoa/New Zealand**

Berg and Kearns (1996), in their study on renaming practices in Aotearoa/New Zealand, posit upfront that ‘the process of naming places involves a contested identity politics of people and place’. Their article argues that the naming of a place is an act linked to emotions, beliefs and attitudes which create a nationalistic sense of community based on myths and traditions (Berg and Kearns, 1996: 100). They posit that in New Zealand the sense of nationalism is essentially a representation of a ‘Pakeha [New Zealanders of European descent] masculine subject’ and that it is
strongly reinforced in the official toponyms of many New Zealand places. In ways which can be argued to be similar, but distinct from, the colonisation practices of Australia, Berg and Kearns (1996: 105) argue that the colonisation of Aotearoa/New Zealand resulted in the disempowering to some extent of the Maori peoples.

Stokes (1992) argues that the Treaty of Waitangi, which allowed for recognition of Maori land tenureship, is being used in modern times to reinstate Maori cultural heritage to the status of equal importance with Pakeha heritage. Stokes (1992: 184) posits that contemporary ‘Maori claims against the Crown are many and varied but can be summarised as seeking redress for loss of language, culture, land and resources’. One of the processes through which Maori language and culture is recognised is through the official restoration of Maori toponyms for places. The article by Berg and Kearns selectively analyses the contents of some submissions made to the New Zealand Geographic Board (NZGB) in regards to a proposal to change the names of three places in the Otago/Murihiku region. The proposals were submitted to the NZGB by a man who had Maori cultural connections to the area, but did not live there, and the reaction to the proposals was similar to that of this doctoral program’s case study. Essentially, the arguments presented in one newspaper editorial alone stated that the proposal was made by a ‘stranger’ and that the existing names were ‘well-established’ while the Maori names were ‘long’ (1996: 109). Berg and Kearns (1996: 110) argue that for this editorial the sentiments of community engendered are those of the Pakeha, which essentially excludes the Maori. As discussed in chapter five of this thesis a component of toponymic identity is the notional extent to which a place name can represent a sentiment of community, which essentially includes some and excludes others from consideration as legitimate representatives of place history. It was found in the case study that these sentiments of inclusion and exclusion were frequently referred to in participants’ data, and here too in Berg and Kearns’s case study the references to toponymic identity can be found.

Further in the article Berg and Kearns (1996: 112) note that the most common arguments presented in the submissions to the NZGB were that ‘the existing names are well known, historically accurate…and the most appropriate descriptions of the places’. The last two arguments are essentially sentiments of toponymic identity, in that they relate to the history and descriptive quality of toponyms. The first argument
could be stated to be related both to toponymic identity and dependence, in that ‘well known’ can indicate a perception of mainstream-community ideals of what is appropriate or not, and can also indicate a reliance on the name to express promotional or locational ideals. Thus, the case study presented by Berg and Kearns can be said to include community sentiments which are similar to those expressed in this case study and which can be explained through the use of the theories on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence.

In regards to the politics of power represented by acts of renaming or name restoration, Crocombe (1991: 216-217) asserts that in today’s age the ‘old symbols die hard, and people will resist changes of name to reflect changes of power…like religion, symbolic naming facilitates control’. As has been seen in the South Pacific cases discussed so far, resistance to change was strong and widely publicised. In other countries too the reaction to proposed renaming has been mainly negative, and can be linked to changes in political power. No case study is more evident for this than South Africa, which will now be discussed.

**South Africa**

Durington (2006: 147) notes that in South Africa the ‘social history…has been governed by ideas and control of space…what is made clear by exploring this history is the way in which space has been imbued with meaning conveying either subjugation or freedom depending upon the particular historical conditions’. Thus, in ways similar to the pushing of Indigenous cultural heritage to the peripheries of mainstream Australian history, South Africa has undergone similar processes of creating modern places and spaces. Durington (2006: 149) goes on to note that post-apartheid developments in South Africa ‘rely upon symbolic reinscriptions of geography and social space to assert a new democratic ethos for the country as previous home-lands have been renamed and landmarks associated with the subjugation of apartheid…are reimagined and redefined to symbolically stand for democratic change and a source for tourist income’. Here too comparisons can be drawn between the South African experience and the case study for this doctoral program, in that attempts are being made by Government authorities to redefine the cultural landscape through recognition of Indigenous cultural heritage which had
previously been overshadowed by colonial histories. Important too is the assertion
that the renaming practices in South Africa are not only for the purposes of
symbolically defining a change in political structures, but also for the intention of
capturing the tourist dollar – again two similar themes that were the basis for the
Victorian Government’s proposal to restore Indigenous toponyms in the study area.

A study by Hilterman and Koopman (2003: 1) on the renaming of streets in
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, indicates that throughout 2002 many letters of
objection were written to the local newspaper denouncing proposed toponymic
changes. Hilterman and Koopman note that in South Africa many provinces had
changed their names without public comment since 1994, but when it came to other
features being renamed there was often public comment of some kind. In regards to
streets in Pietermaritzburg the intention was to rename major streets in 2002 to
‘capture the history of the city and the spirit of transformation’ (Hilterman and
Koopman, 2003: 4). The authors contend that the true purpose of the renaming was ‘a
demonstration of the power held and exercised by the ruling political party, in this
case the ANC’.

The public responses to the street renaming proposal were similar again to those
presented in this case study, in that most of the letters to the local newspaper were
negative. The negative letters which could be said to express sentiments of
toponymic dependence on the existing Pietermaritzburg street names contain the
arguments that tourists will be confused (2003: 9), it will cost too much money to
change business and home stationary (2003: 10) and that ‘chaos and confusion’ with
addresses will reign (2003: 15). Other topics raised in the letters include expressions
which can be linked to sentiments of toponymic identity, namely that the existing
names reflect history (2003: 21). Those letters which expressed support for the
proposal indicated similar sentiments to those of the case study, essentially that
‘renaming streets is a step further to achieving complete freedom’ (Hilterman and
Koopman, 2003: 7), here the freedom being sought is from colonial rule, and it could
be argued that in the case study the freedom was from marginalisation. In this sense
the renaming was supported for the positive effects it was perceived to have on
toponymic identity and the links the population made between the history and the
place. Durington notes the resistance of some South Africans to accept name
changes. In similar fashion to some of the reasons explained by participants earlier in this chapter, Durington (2006: 156) in his research found participants who lived in South Africa still referring to the now *Zimbabwe* with its former, colonially-defined name of *Rhodesia*. He posited that it indicated ‘a denial of cultural and political change and instantly gives an individual…status’. This status linked to the person’s conception of ‘my’ community, a notion which can be explained by the theory of toponymic identity, in that the use of toponyms indicates what the person believes to be a symbol of their community identity and therefore defines who is powerful, who is excluded, and what behaviours are normal within that environment.

The article by Hilterman and Koopman (2003: 18) also raises the important issue of consultation, which some of the letter writers indicated had not occurred in an appropriate manner. This concern will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter, as it was also a theme mentioned in many oral history interviews as a flaw in the case study name restoration proposal in 1989/1990. For now though, attention will be given to the case study by Yeoh (1996) which analyses renaming practices in Singapore.

**Singapore**

Yeoh (1996: 298) asserts that the landscape is a ‘text laden with a multiplicity of signs or a cultural form containing a plurality of meanings…which upon interrogation reveals a human drama of ideas and ideologies’. Yeoh (1996: 299) notes that in post-colonial landscapes, such as Singapore, the act of renaming is a ‘tool to divest the landscape of its colonial associations and achieve political legitimation’ and that ‘salvage toponymy’ is the act of restoring historical names ‘as signifiers of heritage, obscuring the loss of cultures and practices’. This notion of historical names being signifiers of heritage in Singapore links to the theory of toponymic identity, wherein the heritage of an area is symbolised and reinforced by the name used to represent the place. Similarly, the argument put by Yeoh of the restoration of historical names providing a nexus through which the loss of culture can be halted, is similar to the arguments put forward by those participants in this case study who supported the name restoration program because it was thought the outcomes would be a wider recognition of the importance of Indigenous cultural heritage.
Yeoh (1996: 301) argues that in post-world war two Singapore the government utilised street and place naming practices to reinforce an idea of Singaporean nationhood to assert a ‘sense of local identity, a sense of place’. This proposition from Yeoh that toponymic acts can be likened to sense of place and identity offers support for this thesis’ contention that in harmony with, but distinct from, place attachment is the construct of toponymic attachment which consists of toponymic identity and dependence which people form with place names to ground their sentiments of history and community and upon which they rely for promotional and identification purposes.

Interestingly in the case of Singapore, the government attempted to utilise toponyms derived from the three main Singaporean cultures of the Chinese, Malay and Indians. Depending on the cultural background of the selected toponyms, those cultures who did not identify with the heritage of the toponym allocated to a street or place would often argue that the names were ‘confusing, ridiculous and prejudicial’ and would then appeal for the ‘reinstatement of English names…which they perceived as neutral if not superior’ (Yeoh, 1996: 301-302). These arguments can be explained through the theories of toponymic attachment in that the notion of ‘confusing’ is a statement of dependence on a toponym to coherently identify the locational attributes of a place, and ‘prejudicial’ is a statement of toponymic identity being conceived as a community which does not include those perceived to be ‘outsiders’. Thus, the case study presented by Yeoh includes indications that the community arguments were framed by sentiments which can be explained through the use of theories on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence.

The case studies presented above are by no means an exhaustive representation of the available literature. Rather, they were selected for their research design methods which, being similar to those utilised for this doctoral research program, allowed for comparisons in community reactions to renaming and name restoration proposals to be made. Other case studies exist, namely in Europe and the Middle-East (Cohen and Kliot, 1992; Rautio Helander, 2006; Puzey, 2008), but their data collection and analysis methods were too dissimilar to allow for ease of discussion and comparison with this program’s data. This is not to say that the theories developed in this thesis are not of relevance to the other case studies, just to assert that for the purposes of this
thesis the key discussion points which could be made from an analysis of these papers would be tangential.

Now that comparisons have been made between this case study and international examples, and it has been found that the theories of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence can be extrapolated to explain resistance to, or support for, other instances of place renaming or name restoration, it is important to examine how renaming programs might be run effectively to garner the maximum of community acceptance possible. What will now be discussed are the opinions of the participants in this research program as to what they perceived to be the fundamental issues with the original proposal and, where possible, what they suggested could be done to ensure that name restoration or renaming programs were supported by the communities who utilise and are attached to the toponyms for identification and dependency reasons.

**Why it didn’t work**
Morgan and Pritchard (2002: 60), in their analysis of the key issues facing the concepts of place branding, posited that ‘some of the misconceptions surrounding the possibilities of destination or country branding spring from the notion that today’s marketers can actually “brand” or “rebrand” a place’. They go on to note that the focus of rebranding a place should be to gradually change existing perceptions, and that many of the key challenges to rebranding are issues outside the control of the marketing people. In the instance of the case study for this doctoral research program, the ‘marketing people’ can be said to have been the Victorian Government who sought to ‘rebrand’ the study area for the dual purposes of officially recognising the important role of Indigenous cultural heritage and increasing tourism in the area. Whereas Morgan and Pritchard assert that the challenges to rebranding are outside the control of the marketing people, based on the data collated from this research program, I would assert that this is not the case and many issues which hindered the acceptance of the name restoration program by the wider population only arose because of the manner in which the Victorian Government handled the process and can be based on the existence of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence amongst the population.
The key issues identified by participants in the research program were that the proposal came from a politician who was not local to the area; the local Indigenous and non-Indigenous population were not consulted about their opinions prior to the proposal being made public; the fact that there were no provisions for dual-naming at the time, which meant that to restore Indigenous names the non-Indigenous names had to be removed; and, there was a lack of wider community understanding or knowledge of Indigenous cultural heritage. Each of these issues will now be examined in detail, with reflection given to participants opinions and how they can be explained through discussion of theories of toponymic attachment, dependence and identity.

‘Outsiders’ pushing their opinions & lack of community consultation
One of the predominant arguments raised by those who opposed the name restoration program in the study area was the sentiment that Steve Crabb, the Minister who proposed the program, was not local to the area, that he represented a constituency in Dandenong (a suburb of the Victorian capital city Melbourne) and was a migrant from Scotland. As reported in the Wimmera Mail-Times (Rename the Dandenongs Too Mr Crabb, 1989), Cr Kevin Dellar of Hamilton City Council, queried whether Crabb would ‘like to change the name of the Dandenongs? Let him try something nearer his own home town, taste public response and then perhaps have a go changing the Grampians name’. The irony of this comment is the fact that the toponym Dandenong is a traditional Indigenous name, for which the original meaning cannot be ascertained (Clark and Heydon, 2002). Irony aside though, is the important argument of Crabb’s perceived illegitimacy as an ‘outsider’ of the local Grampians (Gariwerd) community to rename features in the area.

The concept of inclusion and exclusion from a community, and therefore perceived legitimacy in determining what acts are allowable within the places of the area, were discussed in chapter five and determined to be an underlying component of toponymic identity. The perception of threat to the identity of sections of the community therefore can be argued to have arisen from the fact that Crabb was perceived by some to be an outsider who should not be allowed to make decisions within the study
area. As Don Johns noted in his oral history interview ‘if they say they want to change a place’s name, well the government comes in and says “we’re changing Horsham to Timbuktu”. I mean that would be [met with] outrage’. This perception of threat effectively set up a reaction of resistance amongst some people, which rendered their acceptance of the name restoration proposal to be negligible.

In concert with the perception of ‘outsiders’ pushing their opinions on the local population was a perceptible anger at the lack of initial community consultation which had occurred. This lack of consultation affected both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants in this research program. For the Indigenous participants there was a general disappointment that the name restoration program was announced by the media prior to any effective consultation occurring with the elders involved in the Brambuk cultural centre. As mentioned in chapter one of this thesis, in a research interview with Djabwurrung Indigenous elder Denis Rose, he acknowledged that the first he had heard of the government report in 1989 was when ABC radio rang him and asked for his thoughts on the matter. He admitted during the interview with me that he was unable to articulate a response for that initial media enquiry as he didn’t even trust that they were correct in asserting that the Indigenous names would be restored. When I questioned what he would prefer to see happen should a renaming or name restoration proposal be brought about again, Denis Rose suggested that

I think just a bit more earlier initial consultation…let’s look at it from a realistic point of view…Where I am involved in Lake Condah…got nothing to do with names but it’s about putting water back into Lake Condah. Twenty years ago the opposition was just so strong and…whilst we haven’t got 100% community support now I reckon we’ve got 95% because we tried a different approach, we’ve let people know what our plans are, we’ve invited them in to discuss the issues about putting water back and restoration process again…it’s about working with the community, respecting that we have different and opposing points of view, or thoughts or principles or whatever it might be but, by and large we will win the debate. I would be wholly shocked and surprised if we don’t. But we have got that support, and we’ve made it. Let’s be open and honest and talk about the real issues, the real
impacts that are going to happen and that’s what never happened with
the name restoration
This sentiment of requiring community consultation to be undertaken to ensure an
outcome acceptable to the majority of the population was also expressed by people of
the non-Indigenous community who had been opposed to the name restoration
proposal at the time of the original debate. For example, Richard DeFegely asserted
that the proposal
was sort of dropped on us you see and…you know they’d talk about a
lot of consultation but frankly there was none. The decisions had been
made before it came out into the public arena and that’s the sort of thing
that really sticks in your paw really. Because if they go through a
proper process of consultation then that's fine. But when it's all
predetermined and it's just a front, that's what really sort of upsets you
and that’s what they were doing and that’s why I said it was
preposterous.
It can be seen in these statements that the process of consulting with the community is
perceived by participants to be intrinsically important to the whole name restoration
program. These sentiments of anger and disappointment over the lack of consultation
can be said to be related to community expressions of toponymic attachment, in that
those who felt their identity depended on the toponyms being debated for restoration
or removal keenly asserted their need to be part of the discussions and decision
making processes.

Joseph in his oral history interview asserted that he perceived the name restoration
proposal to be an act of pulling the name ‘out of the hat of Spring Street’ (where State
Parliament is located in Melbourne) and that these programs should be run as a joint-
collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people because he felt ‘that
would bring in a lot of goodwill’. Ian Clark, in his oral history interview expressed
similar sentiments, that
maybe had the government right from the start undertaken some
preliminary research perhaps, but then got the communities to come
together, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and work through, say “this is
what we would like to have achieved, how can we do it, is it desirable?”
Maybe a different process might have achieved a less polarised approach.
Fan (2006) asserts that the ‘internal audience’ is an exceptionally important stakeholder in a ‘rebranding’ campaign which should be consulted and involved in the process from the beginning. He gives an example of the rebranding campaign of Lincolnshire, England, and noted that the promotion by the County Council of the area as ‘one of the best kept secrets in the country’, had been judged a success because the county had the ‘largest net internal migration inflows in the UK’ (Fan, 2006: 11). Yet, despite the migration success, the people who lived in the area prior to the campaign had been excluded from developing the campaign, and had cultivated resentment towards it. The main reason they expressed for their resentment was the notion that promoting the county and increasing the population size would ‘destroy its unspoilt charm and lose forever many of the very qualities that [were] being promoted by the council’. Fan asserts that the important lesson in the Lincolnshire case is that without consulting the local population as to their needs from a promotional campaign, the end product might seem ‘foreign to the domestic audience’ and result in the domestic audience finding the ‘portrayal of their country to outsiders insulting and offensive’. These are all factors which existed in the case study debate, and were discussed by participants as key underlying issues which hindered the acceptance of the renaming proposals. Clearly the link here is to toponymic attachment, and the sense of ownership the community feels towards a toponym will determine the level of involvement they wish to experience in decisions about its application.

Schively (2007: 261) asserts that previous research into effective mechanisms of change involved empowering ‘those who are affected…to exercise greater control over the facility [or change proposal] and its potential impacts’. Schively (2007: 262) indicates that the research shows that it is highly important for the public to be consulted on what they think should be involved in the consultation. On the process of consulting the community, Liam asserted in his oral history interview, that while it is important to consult it is impossible to achieve consensus from a group of 100 people. Thus, he suggested that for consultation to be effective, the Government should get a task force together…to make the decisions and then present it back to the group and, if the group really kick up about it then you need to look at it, but if generally the consensus of the group is “yeah we are really happy with that, that works for us”…lets go with that. You remove the politics of the whole room and you just confine it to one little, impacting group that
can make quick decisions without all the rivalry of everyone getting involved.

Yet, while these suggestions are important to consider, one participant noted that they believed there was adequate consultation undertaken during the name restoration program. Garth Head, manager of the Koori Tourism Unit at the time of the debate, asserted that the information was there, but it was information I think that the bulk of people hadn’t got around to. The use and distribution of material was going on simultaneously and that was going out to the schools. There was a general push with the resources that we had to build awareness and understanding…the people that say that there should have been a more, a greater concentration on, on cultural background or the history and connections and so on is basically convenient recollection, rather than something that is altogether accurate. The material was there. If I had another million dollars you could’ve run a pretty dedicated communications campaign. I’m sure that whilst we would communicate with many tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people, you’d still be given the same feedback which you’re getting now.

Whilst Garth Head’s assertions are interesting, especially in relation to the potentially selective memories of participants in the renaming debate, the underlying issue is that as has been shown at the start of this chapter, the rate of uptake of the restored Indigenous toponyms has been negligible to a degree to indicate that there were serious issues with the name restoration program run by the government in 1989/1990. Morgan, Pritchard and Piggot (2003: 296) assert that in all places which run effective branding campaigns, the common thread between them is the fact that they are ‘based on a vision which is founded on intensive stakeholder, consumer and competitor research and which is expressed with care and discipline’. It could be asserted that because the name restoration program was not fully embraced by the majority of participants in this research program that it was not effective, the cause of which can be partly linked to a lack of constructive community consultation and an ignorance of the levels of attachments the majority of the mainstream community felt to the existing names.
Another issue which arose during the debate, and which was referenced many times by the participants in this research program, was the fact that at the time of the name restoration proposal the State of Victoria had a ‘one name, one place’ policy which did not allow for dual-names. Thus, as has been discussed elsewhere in this thesis, the proposal to restore Indigenous names came at the cost of removing the non-Indigenous names. This issue will now be reflected upon.

**Need to get rid of non-Indigenous names**
The most lucid explanation of why dual-naming was an issue with the name restoration proposal came from Ian Clark during his oral history interview. He explained that because Victoria had the ‘one name, one place’ policy the proponents of the name restoration were not sure whether the Victorian Place Names Committee would accept any dual-naming proposals. In addition, Ian noted that as a researcher for the proposal he discussed the dual-naming possibilities with ‘senior Indigenous representatives’ and they were very clear that whilst they were willing to accept dual naming, they wanted first of all to have their heritage reinstated solely as their Indigenous names. However, they weren’t opposed to dual naming and they were willing to, I don’t know if compromise is the right word, but they were willing to settle on dual naming if that was a way forward. Now, in hindsight, and it’s very easy to say that in hindsight, that was probably a fundamental mistake….

When questioned why pursuing the naming proposal as part of a ‘one name, one place’ policy, which essentially slated the non-Indigenous names for removal, was a mistake, Ian Clark offered this explanation:

> Because what happened was, initially there were some groups who were in favour of some parts of the proposal like renaming the rock art sites, but the longer the debate and the controversy raged, the greater the polarisation and some groups…changed their position and became totally resistant.

The notion of removing the existing non-Indigenous names in favour of reinstating Indigenous toponyms was met with great resistance by sections of the community. As discussed in chapters four, five and six, the arguments raised by those opposed to the
proposal were that removing the non-Indigenous names would remove the links some people felt to the history of the area, and would cause confusion for locational and identification purposes. These arguments are all underpinned by sentiments of toponymic attachment to one degree or another.

In questioning participants in regards to what they perceived needed to occur during the name restoration program for it to be accepted by the majority of the population, a common suggestion was that the government should have considered dual-naming. Many participants perceived dual-naming to be a positive proposition, because as Mary, who vehemently opposed the proposal in 1989/1990, asserted ‘it would certainly be preferable to wiping out the word Grampians. It’s certainly I suppose a compromise’. Brian said that in conjunction with community consultation, dual-naming would have worked, because

If they’d come along…and you know had a few meetings around and explained the situation to the locals…and they said “look we are having international visitors and we want to have an Aboriginal flavour as well as your current heritage”, I don’t think they would have had near the fight, they wouldn’t have had a big fight then, no.

This relative acceptance of Indigenous names, as long as they are tied to non-Indigenous names with which the participant was familiar, indicates that the perception of threat to toponymic attachment is lessened when the proposal is not to remove, but to alter the appearance and use of a name to which people are attached. As noted in the literature by Winkel (1981: 490), ‘stability or relative stability in [home and neighbourhood]…is essential if the person is to work out a satisfying set of relationships both to other people and to…the physical environment’. The idea of relative stability could be likened to dual-naming where the existing officially-recognised name is altered only to adopt a second component. Cameron (1999) asserts that it is important to understand that ‘people need familiar symbols to feel reassured and even to give shape to their existence’. Tigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996: 208) propose that ‘the self can be threatened by unwanted disruptions to emotionally salient places’. Thus, the continued endorsement and use of existing toponyms in tandem with restored or introduced toponyms would allow for the ongoing use of familiar symbols and assist in reassuring people of their sense of place.
When questioned about her sentiments towards the original name restoration program, and how she felt about it now, Anita noted that her opinions had changed over time. She was originally opposed to the proposal, but on thinking about how the name Grampians means ‘a beautiful range that’s obviously like the Grampians in Scotland’ she recognised that ‘we do have to respect the Aboriginal history and that’s why I have said I’d like both names really’. Jason posited that he didn’t have a problem really with dual names, so long as I can always refer to the place as the Grampians or Mount William or the Pinnacle or whatever’. This is an important point, in that dual-names allows for people to ‘pick and choose’ which toponym they would prefer to utilise, because they know that either option will be recognised. In this respect, James asserted that for the ‘benefit of everyone and ease of…change that probably dual names is the way to go’. As stated by Chow and Healey (2008: 371), ‘continuity (both across time and situation) is a defining feature of place attachment and place identity’ and it can be asserted here, based on the evidence available that continuity is also a defining feature of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence. In addition to the issues of consultation and no dual-naming proposal being made up-front (but it was made eventually, and that is how most of the Indigenous names were restored: as dual-names, because the Victorian Place Names Committee agreed to change the long-standing ‘one name, one place’ policy), was the problem that opposers did not connect with the Indigenous names. This lack of connection will now be discussed.

Names have no meaning/difficult to pronounce
As poignantly proposed by Mary during her oral history interview ‘It’s pointless having name changes if you haven’t got sort of an understory there to support it and I mean I think that it is very…important. I mean…I suppose it’s the process that would have to [happen] yeah’. In chapter five attention was given to the lack of general understanding or knowledge of Indigenous cultural heritage in the study area by those who opposed the renaming. It was found that those who had a good understanding of Indigenous cultural heritage were more likely to support the name restoration program than those who did not. As posited by Mary, the proposal to restore Indigenous names could only have worked had there been an ‘understory’, or a campaign of education to promote the importance of Indigenous cultural heritage. As Michelle noted in her oral history interview
I think it’s pointless pointing something out because people are going to go along and just go “Oh” and unless you know something about it, unless you’ve seen other rock art sites, unless you can pick stuff out, it means nothing and I think you need to tell the story. You need to have some sort of representation of the symbolism so this symbol means *der der der der der* and through this you can see that this is someone’s travel from here to there and a waterhole or emu hunting.

Here Mary and Michelle are pointing to the issue that was raised in the letters in 1989/1990, the mainstream perception that Indigenous people did not exist in the area and that therefore there was no reason to reinstate Indigenous names. This issue was discussed in detail in chapters four and five, and linked to the fact that cultural hegemony had pushed Indigenous cultural heritage to the peripheries of mainstream Australian heritage for so long that many people had come to believe, for multiple reasons, that Indigenous cultural heritage was not important. The Indigenous toponyms were therefore not part of their identity in the same way that non-Indigenous, officially recognised names were.

Robert posited that ‘the other problem with Aboriginal names is that a lot of them are very difficult to pronounce. No vowels and what do they actually mean. So what I tried to do is say “put an Aboriginal name there but…people need know what they mean”’. As Steve Crabb had acknowledged in his oral history interview, and many supporters of the proposal had also stated, the name restoration proposal was seen as an opportunity to recognise Indigenous cultural heritage. What Robert, an opponent of the proposal, was stating was that it is not possible to recognise heritage through a renaming exercise alone, what is required is an educational campaign which highlights the ‘meanings’ of the toponyms. As has been explored in this thesis to date, toponyms are capable of carrying multiple meanings, which are developed through both community and personal forces. The meanings develop organically, but are shaped by cultural mores and rules, and these meanings are learnt by the population through various mediums. Thus it stands to reason that if toponymic meaning is developed over time by a singular or group user, for those who do not have an attachment to a name proposed for restoration the meaning will be lacking and the attachment level will be low. This low level of attachment could be explained as a reason for why the case study restoration program was not embraced by the
majority of the population: because the proposed names had no obvious or essential meaning to them.

Indigenous leaders and elders acknowledged that education is a fundamentally important component of any government campaign. Tim Chatfield stated that ‘I think it’s easy to make a statement but then you’ve got to think about the resources and the capacity to be able to accommodate this announcement…if the governments are fair dinkum about cultural heritage in the State of Victoria, they need to pump the resources in to be able to have Aboriginal people to be able to do tourism and the site tours and all that type of stuff’. Lionel Harradine stated that the process would have been improved through ‘education and that’s the only way, it’s gotta be. Aboriginal history has gotta be taught in schools’. Similarly, Joseph, a non-Indigenous participant, acknowledged that he would ‘like to see a lot of these State schools and schools brought art to these art sites and have it fully explained to them so you’ve got to educate the young people. When you educate the young people they then start to appreciate it’.

Effectively, a lesson to be learnt from the case study area, in consideration of the components of toponymic attachment, is the fact that where a name is proposed to be restored or to replace another existing name, the population need to be made aware of the background or meaning of the toponym.

**Creating a Controversy**

Birch (1996: 66) claims that ‘the restoration project was initially motivated by the interests of an exploitative tourist industry’. Based on the research data collected, I would assert that it was not the tourist industry as such which was acting in an exploitative manner. The issue of controversy was not raised by the general public nor by many participants in the research data collection process. Rather, it was discussed by the two key protagonists in the name restoration proposal, and is of such intriguing substance and background that it is worthy of mention in this thesis. This topic of controversy needs to be mentioned for the fact that it highlights how the political use of toponyms, without consideration given to the attachments people form
with toponyms, can have negative consequences rather than the positive outcomes desired.

Steve Crabb, in his oral history interview, when questioned on why there was no public consultation undertaken prior to the government announcement, acknowledged publicly for the first time that the name restoration program was announced in such a manner to ensure that there was ensuing controversy which would create media attention and publicity for the study area. He asserted that

probably what triggered it off with the tourism thing was that I’d been at Kakadu a couple of times and the guys up there told me that they had never advertised Kakadu, ever! They never spent a penny advertising Kakadu, yet everyone knows where Kakadu is. The reason they know where it is is because of the controversy that was created by the uranium mine…so, Kakadu is now, you know, maybe the great Australian icon. I mean, people go there before they die sort of stuff and well somewhere in my fertile way, I thought well we could do with some controversy around the Grampians and so these things all made together and I thought, right there you go, change its name, or put its Aboriginal names back.

When I asked him to clarify whether he proposed the name changes as a way of creating controversy and therefore boosting tourism to the region, Steve Crabb replied simply ‘yes’. In an oral history interview conducted later with Wayne Kayler-Thomson, who at the time of the proposal was both Executive Director of the Stawell and Grampians Development Association and Secretary of the Grampians District Tourist Association, he acknowledged his complicit role in assisting Steve Crabb’s controversy-raising tactic. Wayne Kayler-Thomson noted that while he was comfortable with the name restoration proposal, the people he represented in his professional associations were predominantly opposed, and therefore he stated that he ‘became effectively the spokesperson representing the tourism industry at the local level so when the newspaper articles started to appear, when the talkback radio started to appear I was the one responding to that. So I was effectively taking a stance of fuelling the debate on representing the interest of my constituents effectively’.
Interestingly, he went on to state that given his professional relationship with Steve Crabb, as a tourism lobbyist, when Steve Crabb arrived in the study area one day I walked with him from either his car or helicopter…and basically said to him “Steve, this debate is going to be fantastic to get us publicity. I’ll keep opposing it if you keep pushing it and we’ll use this as a promotional opportunity”. Only he and I were aware of that conversation….It was post that, that we then worked to respond to the opportunities to get it. So, we finished up with either front page, second page, third page, in *The Age* [newspaper], national newspapers, the talkback radio stuff kept on going and so on and that was deliberately the strategy to try and promote it that way.

Essentially, the two men recounted to me in their interviews that they had not only purposefully created a controversy with which to announce the name restoration proposal, but they had also continued to fan the fires of opposition to ensure publicity for the study area. When I questioned Steve Crabb whether in hindsight he believed this controversy-creating strategy to have worked, he stated, without mentioning the Kayler-Thomson scenario of fuelling the debate fire, ‘Ah look…no, to be honest’. Kayler-Thomson offered two opinions on this though. First he stated that the controversy worked for increasing tourism in the area because ‘anything that helps to raise awareness of a destination is always positive from a tourism point of view…“free ink” as we call it, we actually measure it in terms of how much of that you get and it certainly contributes to awareness of a destination, there’s no doubt about that’. Yet, secondly he acknowledged that he couldn’t state whether the controversy ‘actually drew attention of people wanting to come up and actually visit Aboriginal sites or whatever as a result of that’. Further to this, when questioned on whether once the controversy had generated enough publicity, the community acceptance of the proposal would have been different had the proposal changed to utilise dual-names, he acknowledged that this would not have worked because ‘the debate had got to such a point that any acceptance of trying to impose Aboriginal names on what were their names for a long time, based upon European history as well, would not have been acceptable’.
In effect, the two men acknowledged that the creation of controversy to promote the tourism aspects of the area was a flawed concept, because as has been found through the process of developing of the theories of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence, people rely on toponyms to tie them to a sense of place and any interference in these attachments will be met with hostility which cannot be easily reconciled or undone. As Joseph in his oral history interview, when questioned on whether too much bad-will had been created because of the controversy, he asserted that ‘oh very much so, very much so. Which is a real pity because they’ve got so much culture…that they could create a lot of goodwill. It is going to be a hard road ‘cause a lot of people just stopped trusting after that Gariwerd [proposal] came in’. Thus, when the Victorian Government eventually wanted the support of the community to promote the Indigenous names for tourism purposes, they found that the majority of the community were unwilling to do this because their perceptions of interference were too strong to allow them to forgo their toponymic attachment to the non-Indigenous names.

Conclusions
As shown by the outcomes of key aspects of the mental-mapping exercise, participants in this study were more likely to utilise restored Indigenous names for rock-art sites than they were for the National Park itself. Yet, even the rate of uptake for Indigenous toponyms has been minimal, with Steve Crabb conceding that the name restoration program could be considered to not have had the desired impact in the study area.

This chapter has explored how the newly-created theories of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence can be applied to the case study, and international examples, to explore how and why communities might react to name restoration proposals undertaken by governments. Further to this, insight has been given into what issues and factors impact upon the outcomes of name restoration proposals. Participants asserted that the necessary elements of a successful name restoration program include community engagement, educational programs and the intrinsically important requirement of retaining existing names while restoring Indigenous names. Further to this, based on the evidence provided by two key protagonists in the case study, it
can be stated that creating renaming proposal controversy for the purposes of generating ‘free ink’ is not a successful strategy.

The key concepts outlined in this chapter will now be explored holistically, as part of the wider thesis investigations and conclusions, in the following chapter: the conclusion to this thesis.
Conclusions

‘As we evaluate where we have been and what we have gained, we look back into our journey and forward to imagining how our endpoint appears to our readers or viewers. The method of transporting us through our journey differs from what we gain from this journey.

The sense we make of the journey takes form in our completed work’.

(Charmaz, 2006: 181)
Introduction
This doctoral research program began its life with a fundamental question ‘what’s in a name?’ and it seems most appropriate that this conclusion chapter should return to this question and provide details on how it has been answered during the research process. Each chapter of this thesis has included a conclusion section which has summarised the key investigations and outcomes of the enquiry. This chapter will reflect on those conclusions in relation to the key and sub-questions for the doctoral program, which were outlined in chapter one. In addition to this summary of the key findings, this chapter will provide some advice on how name restoration programs might be conducted to ensure maximum community support and acceptance. Further to this, a section of this chapter is devoted to reflection on the research experience and whether the selected framework, as discussed in chapter three, was adequate for the purposes of exploring the thesis question. Finally, the chapter will conclude with some discussion on the limitations of this study and outline where future research might be directed in this study area of toponymic attachment.

Key and Sub-Questions
As outlined in chapter one, the questions for this research program were developed organically, through a process of reflecting on the literature and research data and searching for key issues which might be addressed in regards to the Victorian Government’s proposal in 1989 to restore Indigenous names for, and within, the Grampians National Park. The key question which arose was ‘what is in a place name? Does a toponym only symbolise the meaning(s) of a place, or can a toponym have its own meaning(s)?’. An investigation of the research data, and comparison of the key issues to the existing literature on place attachment, indicated that toponyms can both symbolise place meanings, while holding meanings of their own. The ways in which toponyms hold their own meanings relates to the two constructs of attachment: identity and dependence. It was found that toponyms identify various culturally-constructed meanings, and that people form dependencies with toponyms based on their ability to distinguish one place from the other. The two constructs are essentially correlated, in that the ability to distinguish one place from another relates to the culturally-imbued meanings of the toponyms, but the two constructs can be
distinguished for the fact that a strong sense of identity might not necessarily also mean a strong dependence.

The sub-questions for the research program which guided the development of the final thesis enquiries related to investigating whether toponymic attachment, identity and dependence could be said to exist, and if so, what form they take. As just described, it was found that toponymic attachment, identity and dependence exist, but for the purposes of providing a comprehensive conclusion to this thesis, the key aspects of each of these constructs will now be provided.

**Toponymic Attachment**

For toponymic attachment, the research sub-questions were directed towards investigating what the community reactions to toponymic change were and whether they related to a greater theory on toponymic attachment. In addition, the research program sought to ascertain whether toponymic attachment, if it existed, could be separable from place attachment. The investigation of these questions was outlined in chapter four, which at one point questioned whether it would be possible to create a place without utilising a name. I stated that it might be possible on a small-scale, but not every-day, level and therefore as places have to have names, and sense of place is created through the interactions of humans with a place, *ergo* sense of toponym must exist when humans interact and utilise toponyms. For, without a sense of toponym linking humans to places we might not see a need for creating a name to begin with.

Place attachment was defined in many ways in chapters two and four, but essentially the core of the construct is that it is the ‘bonding of people to places’. The examination of the research data and theories on place attachment showed that the participants in this study formed attachments with toponyms in the study area, whether they were the names as officially recognised in 1989/1990, or the Indigenous names proposed for restoration. Thus, toponymic attachment can be said to exist, and can be described in its most basic form as the ‘bonding of people to toponyms’. Based on the research data it was concluded that the construct of toponymic attachment was linked to, but fundamentally could be separated from, place attachment because the government proposal to restore Indigenous toponyms was
focused solely on changing names for features, not changing the physical aspects of
the places that the name represented. Therefore the sentiments of the participants in
the research were expressions of attachment based on toponymic change not place
change, and were thus principally linked to toponymic attachment not place
attachment.

As the ‘bonding of people to toponyms’ is not an entirely comprehensive explanation
of the theory of toponymic attachment, the research program explored what were
determined to be the two constructs of attachment: identity and dependence. The
outcomes of these investigations will now be outlined.

**Toponymic Identity**

In chapter one the research sub-questions identified that an area of investigation for
this doctoral program was to determine how a toponym might bear identity, what the
components of toponymic identity might be and how it could be distinguished from
place identity. The outcomes of this investigation were outlined in chapter five,
where the existing literature on place identity was utilised to explore the research data
to locate whether the participants had expressed sentiments of place or toponymic
identity.

Various researchers have defined place identity as being a component of personal or
collective identity (Proshansky *et al.*, 1983; Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996;
Hernandez *et al.*, 2007). Place identity is stated to be a construct of meaning, which
defines what should happen in places and how people should behave within them. It
was determined that based on the available literature that place identity is composed
of four key elements: history/memory, community, emotions and actions/events.
Each of these four key elements were examined in relation to the research data in an
attempt to define whether they could be extrapolated to form a new theory on
toponymic identity. In relation to history/memory, it was found that the supporters of
the name restoration proposal were wanting to use restored Indigenous toponyms to
(re)allocate counter-memories to the mainstream-promoted local histories, whilst
opponents perceived the proposal to be an interference with the connections they
made to history through the toponyms. For community it was found that notions of
‘normal’ were determined by mainstream ideology, and that toponyms assist in asserting the status-quo of the dominant cultural group, or in asserting a counter-culture. For emotions, it was found that those who opposed the name restoration proposal were influenced by negative emotions linked to feelings of being invalidated, whilst those who supported the proposals expressed feelings of resistance which were connected to the Indigenous toponyms. In this sense, it was found that toponyms act as an emotional mediating force in personal and community expressions. For actions/events the research investigation concluded that in ways similar to, but distinguishable from, how communities determine which places are important, toponyms act as collective and personal symbols of, or memorials to, identity.

The conclusion of the investigation into toponymic identity concluded that it is an important component of toponymic attachment. Toponymic identity can be defined as a construct through which people link to history, allocate their memories, assert cultural ideologies, assist in expressing personal and community emotions and determine what is culturally important.

**Toponymic Dependence**

Similarly to the investigation into toponymic identity, the research program defined sub-questions to investigate whether people might form dependencies with toponyms, and if so, how toponymic dependence might be constructed and whether it can be distinguished from the dependencies people form with places. The literature on place dependence was not as expansive as that available for place identity, and therefore the research as outlined in chapter six relied heavily on the research data and literature from the domain of tourism studies.

Place dependence is defined by Stokols and Shumaker (1981) to be composed of two factors: the ability of a place to provide facilities for the user, and the comparative qualities of the place. The investigation into toponymic dependence began with an exploration of these two elements of place dependence in three areas: promotion, location and identification. For promotion it was found through the research data that in similar ways to which people are dependent on a place to provide particular facilities, people are also dependent on toponyms to provide particular requirements.
In the case of the name restoration proposal, it was the government who relied on Indigenous toponyms to promote the unique Indigenous cultural heritage of the study area. The opponents of the name restoration proposal indicated that they also relied on the existing toponyms to indicate the non-Indigenous cultural heritage of the study area. For location, I stated that the process of creating place from space requires certain landscape elements to be distinguished from all others and for toponyms to be applied as symbols of the created places and to navigate between places the most common method utilised is that of toponymy. As the research data indicated, participants were dependent on toponyms to assist them in navigating the landscape. The cultural background of the name was not entirely important in this element of location, what was important was the consistent use of toponyms on road signage and maps. Similarly, for identification, the consistent application and use of toponyms was important to research participants for the purposes of service deliveries, such as emergency vehicles.

The element of promotion was strongly linked to the dependency factor of a place providing unique features. Thus, it can be concluded that toponymic dependence is determined by the ability of a toponym to provide a unique representation of a place. Second, the elements of location and identification were strongly linked to the dependency factor of a place having qualities which are comparable to, and distinguishable from other places. Hence, it can also be concluded that toponymic dependence is determined by the needs a person or community has on a toponym distinguishing one place from any other.

**Toponymic Identity and Dependence**

It is important to note that the elements of identity and dependence are strongly correlated, but are distinguishable from each other. In the same way that a person or community might rely on a toponym to identify cultural heritage, they might also depend on that toponym to provide a unique representation of a place of particular cultural importance. Thus, toponymic identity and dependence are best considered as interrelated constructs of toponymic attachment.
**Interference**

In addition to the sub-questions relating to theories of attachment, identity and dependence, the research program set out to determine what the rates of uptake of restored toponyms are, why previously-official names might remain in the lexicon and how a name restoration program might be undertaken so that it doesn’t interfere with toponymic attachment, identity or dependence.

It was found that in the study area, amongst participants in the research program the uptake rate of restored Indigenous names was minimal for the National Park, but more substantial for those features which are readily-identifiable with Indigenous cultural heritage. There were various reasons for why the uptake rate for the National Park was minimal, and this related to both constructs of toponymic attachment. The research data indicated that the participants’ sense of toponym, or toponymic attachment, was made visible during the name restoration program because they were either content with the idea that the toponyms they were attached to for various reasons were being restored, or they were upset that the toponyms they were attached to could be removed from official usage.

Essentially, the constructs of toponymic identity and dependence were equally important factors which determined people’s reaction to the name restoration program. For those participants who continued to utilise the non-Indigenous toponyms, they stated that this was because they did not identify with, nor depend upon, the Indigenous toponyms. For those participants who utilised the restored Indigenous names, they asserted that they did so because they felt it was appropriate to identify and depend upon them. In regards to the final sub-question on how a name restoration program might be undertaken, the answers to this will be addressed in the next section.

**Advice for future naming processes**

The research participants provided wonderful insight into the issues they perceived to have hindered the smooth progression and operation of the name restoration proposal. This advice was outlined in chapter seven, and provides valuable teachings which
those who work in name restoration programs would be well advised to consider. The key findings and recommendations to arise from the research data are as follows:

- Name restorations should be conducted as community-based decision making programs, which allow for members of the local and user community to participate in the decision making process. The community should be invited to discuss which existing names and which proposed restoration names are important to them and why. This process allows all sections of the community to feel a sense of ownership of the program, and is a useful tool in asserting that the naming authority considers the personal and community toponymic attachments to be important.

- In concert with the community-based decision making programs, the naming authority should conduct education programs, which provide the community with details of why certain toponyms are slated for restoration, what the cultural heritage of the toponyms are, and where appropriate, what the general non-mainstream cultural heritage of the area is. This education program is fundamentally important, as it allows for community members who do not identify with, or depend upon, the proposed restoration names, to receive and process information with which they might identify or depend at a future date.

- As people and communities have already formed attachments with the existing officially-recognised toponyms, every effort should be made to retain them where possible. This is not to say that the existing names should be retained forever, but consideration should be given to retaining the existing names as dual-names with the restored names, until such time as the restored names are in the common lexicon and the community have come to accept their usage.

- Naming authorities should never utilise a name restoration program solely for the purposes of promoting the qualities of a place to tourists. As demonstrated in the research data, undertaking name restoration for these purposes alienates the local population who are the ones the authorities will rely upon to welcome and promote the area to tourists. Further, the restoration program
should not be used as a controversy-making issue, as this will limit the uptake rate of the restored names.

Name restoration programs are important, as evidenced by the information provided by participants, as they allow for previously-marginalised communities to have their cultural heritage recognised within mainstream society. The various heated public debates that occur around proposals to restore Indigenous names are not ensured to be squashed completely by the recommendations provided above, but it is obvious that by considering the theory of toponymic attachment, the more a naming authority does to ensure recognition of toponymic attachments, and provides information through which new attachments can be constructed, the proposals will be more widely supported by the affected communities.

Research Program Framework
In the methodology section of chapter three, I outlined the mixed-methodologies framework which underpinned the research for this doctoral program. I asserted that the main methodology relied upon for this research was that of grounded-theory. Grounded-theory was described as a method through which research questions are continually developed as more literature is reviewed and data is collected. As noted in chapter three, Charmaz (2006: 182) provides four criteria through which a study based on grounded-theory should be assessed: credibility, originality, resonance and usefulness. I will now reflect on these criteria to assess whether this doctoral research program has fulfilled its required intentions.

In regards to credibility, Charmaz asserts that strong links need to have been made between the research data, argument and analysis. I would assert that this criteria has been met as chapters four, five and six were written with the express intention of linking the research data to existing literature and providing analysis of the key issues. For originality, Charmaz posits that current ideas should be refined or extended, and I would argue that with the creation of three new theories on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence during the research process this criteria has been met. The criteria of resonance Charmaz defines as the project providing findings which offer participants and communities deeper insights into their lives and worlds. I contend
that the exploration of the underlying reasons for which people supported or opposed
the name restoration proposal, and the formulation of theories based on these reasons,
adequately fulfils this criteria, as the findings provide participants, their communities,
and the wider research audience with explanations of the role toponyms play in
society. Finally, for the criteria of usefulness, Charmaz asserts that the project should
make a contribution to knowledge and be a catalyst for future research. In this regard,
I assert that the exploration of the existence of toponymic attachment, identity and
dependence be considered as an important contribution to knowledge, especially with
the formulation of new theories on these constructs, and the implications that
acknowledging them has for people and communities. Further to this, the formulation
of the theories has opened new avenues for research into the future, which will be
discussed at the conclusion of this chapter.

As can be seen by the justifications outlined above, in regards to the four criteria
through which to assess the usefulness of a project framed by grounded-theory
methodology, it can be stated that this doctoral research program has provided
credible, original, and useful interpretations, arguments and conclusions which
provide a substantial contribution to knowledge. Before consideration is given to the
limitations of this doctoral research program, and future avenues of research, I will
briefly reflect on my role as researcher.

**Learnings of the researcher**

As stated in chapter three, because this research program was positioned mainly
within a qualitative domain, I chose to utilise the first-person narrative method to
explain the research process. Essentially, the use of first-person was to indicate the
key learnings I had made during the doctoral research program, and to be able to
effectively express them to the reading audience.

For those who come to assess this thesis, and perhaps also for those who might read it
in the future, they will have already been through their own PhD experience, and
therefore might understand me when I state that the thesis which is presented here is
only a small indication of the research journey which has been undertaken since 2004.
When I began the research program I had some pre-set ideas about why it was important to restore Indigenous toponyms. I had no research background in geography, and limited exposure to Indigenous cultural heritage, having spent the majority of my undergraduate years on European history and linguistics. Through readings of the literature and interactions with the research participants, my mind was opened to new theories and ways of seeing the world. I came to have a deeper appreciation of Indigenous cultural heritage and how it has been represented in Australia over the past 200 years. I also came to have a deeper understanding of those people in the community whom I would once have considered ‘racist’.

The process of attempting to be an objective researcher is not easy, and sitting in people’s kitchens and interviewing them while they espoused ideas with which I did not affiliate, taught me a very important lesson: that people always form their opinions based on something, and if you can uncover what that something is, you might be able to find new ways for a divided community to connect and find agreeance. Thus, the process of undertaking this research program began as a project to which I thought I would be able to contribute my understandings, and finished as a project which essentially contributed more to expanding my understandings of the world.

Thus, the use of first-person narrative was utilised as a tool through which to convey to the reader the key learnings of the research program, and to express where I believe the findings fill a gap in existing knowledge.

**Limitations/Future research directions**

The old adage came true for this doctoral research program: so much information, so little time! As outlined in chapters two and three, there was a plethora of preliminary literature and research data available for this thesis. Essentially though, I couldn’t write forever, and had to submit the thesis for examination one day, and thus various discussions which could have been included had to be excluded.

Research data were collected in regards to the demographics of the participant population, with the intention of correlating this information to expressions of
attachment, identity and dependence and determining whether factors such as length of residence, prior knowledge of local history or community involvement affected these constructs. Eventually, as the investigations into the existence of attachment, identity and dependence were already extensive, it was thought preferable to retain this data and utilise it for future research papers which will further examine the new theories developed in this thesis.

In addition, as outlined in chapter three, the psychometric evaluation scale developed for this research program was not utilised in this thesis. The data is available and waiting to be used, and will eventually form part of one or two research papers which will explore the quantitative explanations for toponymic attachment, identity and dependence. Similarly, research participants were asked to reflect on the name restoration program of Uluru/Ayers Rock and whether they believed it to have been successful in comparison with the case study. The data on this were extensive and will be useful in forming a paper in the future on dual-naming and the tourism aspects of toponyms.

In regards to tourism, a limitation of this thesis was the lack of research data in regards to tourist perceptions of the toponyms. As the literature on place dependence was limited, it would have been useful to compare government and local perceptions of toponymic dependence for promotional purposes, with the perceptions of tourists visiting the area. This limitation obviously opens up new research avenues in the future.

Based on the findings of this research I believe that there are extensive future research opportunities in the area of toponymic attachment, identity and dependence. The essential starting point is to conduct more investigation into the theories I have proposed in this thesis and examine whether further elements of the constructs are required to be distinguished; whether the theories apply in cases where toponyms are not proposed to be removed or restored; and to determine whether the recommendations made in regards to future name restoration programs do bring benefits to naming authorities and communities.
References

Letters to the Editor and Newspaper Articles:


Grant, L. 1990. Don't Handicap Tourism with Name Changes. The Sun, 05/06/1990.


Reports and Secondary Sources:


Langfield-Smith, Kim, and Andrew Wirth. 1992. Measuring Differences between
1135-1151.

Lev-Weisel, Rachel. 2003. Indicators Constituting the Construct of 'Perceived


Lewicka, Maria. 2008. Place Attachment, Place Identity and Place Memory:
Restoring the Forgotten City Past. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 28:
209-231.

Liamputtong, Pranee, and Douglas Ezzy. 2005. *Qualitative Research Methods*. South
Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Limb, Melanie, and Claire Dwyer, eds. 2001. *Qualitative Methodologies for

edited by Philip Wagner and Marvin Mikesall. Chicago: University of


Lofland, John, and Lori Lofland. 1971. *Analyzing Social Settings*. Belmont:
Wadsworth.

Attachment*, edited by Irwin Altman and Setha Low. New York: Plenum Press:
165-185.

University Press.


———. 2005. For Better or Worse: Exploring Multiple Dimensions of Place


Pretty, Grace, Heather Chipuer, and Paul Bramston. 2003. Sense of Place Amongst Adolescents and Adults in Two Rural Australian Towns: The Discriminating Features of Place Attachment, Sense of Community and Place Dependence in


Tyrrell, James R. 1933. *Australian Aboriginal Place Names and Their Meanings*. Sydney: Tyrrell's Pty Ltd.


Appendix A: Australian Research Council Linkage Grant Proposal

AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL LINKAGE—PROJECTS (ROUND ONE)
APPLICATION FORM FOR FUNDING COMMENCING IN 2004

Project ID: LP0454321

Information on this form is collected in order to make recommendations to the Minister on the allocation of financial assistance under the Australian Research Council Act 2001 and for post award reporting. The information collected may be passed to assessors for the purposes of obtaining a peer review assessment of the application. It may also be passed to the National Health and Medical Research Council, the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Department of Education, Science and Training, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Veterans’ Affairs for the purpose of checking eligibility. In other instances, information on this form can be disclosed without your consent where authorised or required by law.

Total number of sheets contained in this application

PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

A1 INSTITUTION TO ADMINISTER GRANT

Name  University of Ballarat

A2 PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

Chief Investigators (CI), Partner Investigators (PI) and Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship Industry (APDI). Participant details are sought in Part B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person number</th>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>University of Ballarat</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3 SUPPORT BEING APPLIED FOR

A3.1 Type

Tick each relevant box.

- Research Grant (personnel and project costs other than APDI and APAI)
- Linkage Industry Fellowship (LIF)
- Australian Postdoctoral Fellowships Industry (APDI)
- Australian Postgraduate Award Industry (APAI)
- Australian Postgraduate Award Industry - Information Technology & Comms (APAI_IT)
- TOTAL OF APAI + APAI_IT REQUESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Grant (personnel and project costs other than APDI and APAI)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage Industry Fellowship (LIF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Postdoctoral Fellowships Industry (APDI)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Postgraduate Award Industry (APAI)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3.2 Years

Years in which this application seeks support from the ARC

Year 1  X  Year 2  X  Year 3  Year 4  Year 5

A4 PROJECT TITLE

Provide a short descriptive title of no more than 20 words.

What's in a name? Attachment and interference in placename-based identity
‘What’s in a name?’: attachment to placenames in regional Victoria

Project summary

This project aims to research attachment to placenames by looking at the opposition to proposals to change placenames, particularly the renaming of places in and around the Grampians National Park in the early 1990s, and the renaming of Hazelwood North with Churchill. A community will be selected to participate in a study to document the layers of placenames that people are conscious of within a given radius around a central locality, and contrast these mental maps with official registers of placenames.

Key terms: sense of place, rootedness, topophilia, community sentiment, local sentiment, attachment, semiology,
PART E-PROJECT DESCRIPTION

E1  PROJECT TITLE

‘What’s in a name?’: Attachment and interference in placename-based identity

E2  AIMS AND BACKGROUND

Why do conflicts often arise when naming authorities and other interests propose changing long-standing placenames? For example, when the Victorian Government instituted a process in the early 1990s of reinstating Indigenous placenames in and around the Grampians National Park, the proposal met with considerable community opposition. Opposition to the proposal was often framed in terms of the loss of the name being a threat to personal identity and security. This clearly demonstrated that attachment to place also extends to the names of these places.

This project aims to research attachment to placenames by looking at the opposition to proposals to change placenames, particularly the resistance to renaming of places in and around the Grampians National Park in the early 1990s, and the renaming of Hazelwood North as Churchill. A community will be selected to participate in a study that will document the layers of placenames that people are conscious of within a given radius around a central locality, and then contrast these mental maps with official registers of placenames. The phenomena of successive waves of immigration transplanting placenames to ‘new countries’ will also be analysed.

The study underscores the importance of understanding the subjective, emotional, and symbolic meanings associated with placenames and the personal bonds and attachments people form with specific names. Symbolic meanings (what a placename signifies or stands for) may range from the very personal (coming-of-age symbolized in a favoured childhood stomping ground) to the publicly-shared (heritage symbolized in national parks) and may contribute to the formation of emotional bonds with that placename. Similarly, emotional bonds may form with particular placenames because their use has come to symbolize the user’s sense of identity. Such bonds intensify resource management conflicts because different segments of society assign different kinds and degrees of meaning to the same placename.

Emotionality is that dimension of meaning associated with arousal and depth of attachment (Fournier 1991). It can vary from immediate sensory delight to long-lasting and deeply-rooted attachment (Tuan 1974). Place attachment is an emotional or affective bond between an individual, or group, and a particular place (Stokols & Shumaker 1981). Thus, emotionality can be constructed as an indication of the depth of meaning with symbolic and spiritual meanings often associated with high levels of attachment to a place. It is important to know what meanings various individuals, groups, or cultures assign to what pieces of landscape, and to understand the dissonance surrounding these meanings. Meaning is not universal, and need not be constant across time, or the same in all contexts.
Williams (1995: 15) has noted that theorizing about place lacks an understanding of the ideological significance or meaning of a place and region. He stresses the need to be informed by the occupants’ perceptions of place and region, in other words, ‘places must be discovered empirically’. Geographic studies lack an understanding of the ‘ideological significance’ or social meaning of places; that is, how places are understood, experienced, and identified by its inhabitants. Natural resources exist as places that people become attached to because they possess emotional, symbolic, and spiritual meaning. The significance of individual meanings is captured by the concept of ‘place identity’, which ‘arises because places, as bounded locales imbued with personal, social and cultural meanings, provide a significant framework in which identity is constructed, maintained, and transformed (Cuba & Hummon 1993: 112)’. Williams (1995: 20) adds that ‘involvement with and attachment to places represent important mechanisms by which an individual actively constructs and affirms a sense of self. The places we frequent help to communicate to ourselves and to others “who we are”’.

The cultural geographer, Yi-Fu Tuan (1974) has used the term ‘topophilia’ to refer to place attachment, which he defines as:

all of the human being’s affective ties with the material environment. These differ greatly in intensity, subtlety, and mode of expression. The response to environment may be primarily aesthetic … (or be) tactile, a delight in the feel of air, water, and earth. More permanent and less easy to express are feelings that one has towards a place because it is home, the locus of memories, and the means of gaining a livelihood.

In simpler terms, Tuan’s (1977) definition of place attachment is space that has been given meaning. The endowment of some value to a space transforms it into a place. In this context, place attachment can be defined as an affective relationship between people and a particular landscape. Related concepts include terms such as ‘emotional investments’ and ‘emotional linkages to places’ (Sharpe and Ewert 1999: 1). Place attachment has two components: place dependence and place identity. Place dependence refers to the perceived strength of association between people and specific places (Shumaker & Taylor 1983) that is largely dependent on the degree to which the place satisfies individual needs and goals. Place identity, is a sub-concept of self-identity, and suggests that places play an active part in the construction of a person’s identity.

Tuan has argued that when topophilia is compelling, the place can become the carrier of emotionally-charged events, or be perceived as a symbol, and be instrumental in its preservation. ‘The appreciation of the landscape is more personal and longer lasting when it is mixed with the memory of human incidents … homely and even drab scenes can reveal aspects of themselves that went unnoticed before, and this new insight into the real is sometimes experienced as beauty’. Tuan (1980) distinguishes between ‘rootedness’ and ‘sense of place’. He understands rootedness to be the passive preservation of place that results from continued use through custom and lack of a need for change, whereas sense of place has contributed to active preservation movements in the face of their environment changing too rapidly. In the face of rapid change an awareness of something distinctive and unique can emerge, and this awareness is ‘sense of place’. 
The empirical study of place identity proposed in this research will enable the process of ‘individuation’ to be documented. Individuation is the need of people to individualize self-definition, or differentiation of individual identity from society. People create individual meanings that may deviate from those held by primary social groups or community, and it is important to recognize the importance of these highly individualized meanings as people are likely to resist management actions that threaten their individual sense of self through modification of valued places. Sharpe and Ewert (1991: 3) have developed the notion of ‘place interference’, to refer to the loss of the affective bond between a person and a place. They argue that place interference is most prominent in situations where individuals with place attachments have little or no control over the processes causing the interference. This may explain, in part, some of the resistance to government proposals to change place names in the Grampians district of western Victoria in the early 1990s, and why the naming debate ran for some 25 years in the case of Churchill (Legg 1992: 284).

Symbolic and expressive meanings of place can only be discovered through direct contact with the individuals and groups who occupy or use places. Comprehensive mapping of the cultural, symbolic, spiritual and expressive meanings of placenames will require the acquisition of a local knowledge of place and its integration with larger regional and national meanings and values.

There are a variety of techniques that may be used to document place attachment, these range from behavioural mapping (observing people’s use of places), surveying, and key informant interviews. Surveying enables the construction of a broad map or inventory of the emotional intensity individuals’ associate with various places.

**Project Aims**

This project aims

1. To determine the extent to which place attachment was responsible for opposition to the proposed name changes (Gariwerd and Churchill); and
2. To document this attachment and determine its extent
   a. How detailed is it?
   b. How does it compare with official registers of place names?
   c. What does it tell us about the process of naming?
      i. Is it in a state of generational decay and/or is it evolving and responding to generational and residential change as resident populations change?
      ii. What lessons may be learned for Naming Authorities who may wish to implement a policy of reinstating Indigenous names or change existing names or embrace a dual-naming policy?

**E3 SIGNIFICANCE AND INNOVATION**

Attachment to place and placenames are fundamental to personal and community identity. This study is significant in that it is concerned to discover the ideological significance or the meaning of a place, and its role in group affiliation and place-based identity.
Using a particular community, the study will be informed by the occupants’ perceptions of place and region, and by discovering these places empirically, it will show how places are understood, experienced and identified. Participants will reflect a cross section of age, gender, and length of association, in an empirical documentation of place identity and individuation. The study will reveal the convergence between the placenames that people hold dearly with the official Register of Place Names in Victoria.

The results of the study will be significant for naming authorities, and for the academic discourse into place identity and topophilia. It will provide naming authorities, for example, with greater insights into likely community reactions to the implementation of policy directives to reinstate Indigenous names, adopt dual naming systems, or change a longstanding name that may be perceived by authorities to suggest unacceptable racial connotations, such as Mt Niggerhead in eastern Victoria.

**E4 APPROACH AND TRAINING**

Research will proceed in two overlapping stages:

**Stage One (Year 2004)**

In the first year, the researcher will analyse two examples of placename change - Gariwerd-Grampians name changes in the early 1990s, and the renaming of Hazelwood North as Churchill in Gippsland in the 1960s – 1980s (see Legg 1992) – examining, in particular, the rationales given for the name changes and analysing the community reaction to the proposed changes.

In the case of Gariwerd, the chief investigator is in possession of numerous files of public letters to newspapers discussing the proposed name changes and they will serve as an important archive source for this study. The researcher will undertake content analysis of these letters to determine the reasons for opposition to the name change proposal, and arrange these into two clusters: bases of place identity (such as cultural attachment; historical significance; familial roots; self-definition; and threats to recreational users) and non-bases of place identity (such as negative economic impact; the external locus of the impetus for change). Frequency distributions will be calculated.

Members of the ‘Grampians Support Group’, a local pressure group formed specifically to oppose the name changes will be invited to participate in the study. Their perspectives on their reasons for forming the group and for opposing the reintroduction of Aboriginal placenames will complement the published material.

**Stage Two (Year 2005)**

The researcher will choose a community as a study area, and undertake a meticulous program of mapping the placenames that people are aware of within a given radius of the regional centre in question. Comparisons will be made with the official place names register to determine the dissonance between the two domains. Analysis will
also be conducted into the effect of socio-demographic variables (especially age, gender, and length of family residency) on placenames knowledge and retention.

The study will measure placename attachment, using the psychometric approach developed by Williams and Vaske (2002) to measure place attachment. This approach will capture the extent of emotions and feelings people have for placenames, and attempt to explain the opposition to placename change.

E5 INDUSTRY PARTNER COMMITMENT AND COLLABORATION

Role, responsibilities and contribution of Chief Investigator

The University has as part of its long-term strategy, an aim to support rural and regional development through its research and programs. This research project will complement much of that work. Funds are sought through LINKAGE for an APAI for two years (2004-2005). The APAI will be offered to a graduate with at least a first class honours degree in an appropriate discipline and this person would enrol as a full-time Masters student under the supervision of Dr Ian D. Clark, of the School of Business. Dr Clark is a specialist in Victorian Aboriginal placenames and is well placed to liaise with the industry partner and to coordinate all aspects and phases of the project.

Roles and levels of involvement of APAI

The APAI will undertake extensive archival research, especially government files and historic map research. Their involvement will include intensive local place studies, conducting site visits to the key historical places. Research will include consulting local historical archives, published local histories, pictorial collections, and taking advantage of local Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge of the history of the places being studied.

The APAI will work closely with the industry partner. Research staff from the Office of the Surveyor-General, through their extensive knowledge of local resources, will assist the APAI in gaining access to their important resource collection.

Role, responsibilities and contribution of Industry Partner

The industry partner is the Surveyor General of Victoria. The Surveyor General of Victoria is the primary Government authority on Surveying and the Cadastre (land property boundaries and tenure), whose roles and responsibilities are prescribed under a diverse range of Acts and Regulations of Parliament.

The Surveyor General plays a key governance role in Victoria's land administration, planning, surveying regulation, the surveying infrastructure including the survey control (network), the protection of the Victorian cadastre, and industry leadership.

The Surveyor General of Victoria has statutory responsibilities for:

- policy, standards and advice for cadastral surveying and land tenure;
delivery of surveying services to government;  
the administration of the Surveyors Board of Victoria; and  
the custodianship of the geographic names function through the Registrar  
of Geographic Names.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Registrar of Geographic Names

The Geographic Place Names Act 1998 establishes a position of Registrar of  
Geographic Names responsible for:  
- developing and advising the Minister on geographic names standardisation policy  
- maintaining the Register of Geographic Names by registering new or altered names  
  and compiling names not currently registered  
- disseminating public information  
- auditing compliance with guidelines  
- receiving objections on the geographic name determination process  
- establishing Geographic Place Names Advisory Committees as required

The Geographic Place Names Act 1998 places the Registrar of Geographic Names at  
the hub of a network of place naming bodies, (agencies which govern or administer a  
local area), including:

- local government authorities  
- national parks authorities  
- roads authorities  
- other government departments

The Registrar:  
acts as a resource to these bodies and provides advice to the Minister on policy and  
the development of guidelines;  
is responsible for the development and maintenance of the Victorian Geographic  
Names Register;  
is responsible for auditing proposals for new or altered names against the policy and  
procedural guidelines, and registering names, which then become the authorised  
geographic name for official purposes;  
is the focus for data management systems and services which support and facilitate  
the role of delegated agencies. The capacity exists to search on-line the geographic  
place names information system VICNAMES, an integral component of the Land  
Victoria land information system.  
is responsible for the development of geographic naming policy for Victoria,  
through ongoing liaison with national and international  
   bodies. Policy will be derived from the review of name determination cases and  
   liaison with users and beneficiaries of the system. The Registrar will regularly  
disseminate information on place names guidelines and programs.  
is responsible for convening the Geographic Place Names Advisory Committee,  
from a panel of experts in various aspects of place naming,  
as required, to advise the Minister. This group, as well as advising on specific cases  
referred to it by the Minister, and/or the Registrar, will advise on the review and  
development of various aspects of the Registrar's role and programs, and on the  
periodic review of the policy guidelines.
Mr Keith Bell, the Surveyor-General of Victoria, or his representative, will liaise with the CI and the APAI, and help identify critical issues and provide professional advice on the progress of the research.

The partnership with the University will promote the scholarship to underpin our knowledge of placename identity and place attachment, and provide the means for placenames authorities to manage policy implementation in ways that reflect the importance people attach to placenames.

E6 NATIONAL BENEFIT

Placenames are intensely personal and political, and people associate with them in very fundamental ways. This study will provide the Australian nation and naming authorities with greater understanding of the concepts of place attachment and place identity. It will provide the relevant authorities with the tools to aid in the understanding of the grammar of ‘sense of place’ and the way in which proposals to change or modify placenames are seen as attempts to interfere with the placename landscape. These attempts are often perceived as a threat to personal identity and resistance to change is often the result when individuals perceive they have little control over the processes causing the interference.

In the face of economic structural change brought about by globalization, regional communities resist change to (what they perceive is) their heritage, and placenames are a vital part of the superstructure of community. This study will provide the tools to enable naming policies - such as dual naming of Indigenous and non-Indigenous names and the removal of names that are deemed inappropriate - to proceed in ways that are sensitive to regional and local community needs.

E7 COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS

Results will be communicated by way of numerous journal articles produced during the study, and the Masters dissertation that will be presented upon completion. Suitable journals for article submission include Landscape and Australian Geographical Studies. Reports summarizing research outcomes and policy recommendations will also be presented to the industry partner.
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### Appendix B: List of Official Names and Proposed Indigenous Names from Clark and Harradine (1990: 9-17)

#### 1) *JARDWADJALI AND DJABWURUNG NAMES OF LANDSCAPE FEATURES IN THE GRAMPIANS NATIONAL PARK*

(i) Names which are already in use, although unrecognizable in their Anglicized form, and names pertaining to Koories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th>Recommended Name</th>
<th>Recommended Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source of Recommendation</th>
<th>Date of Present Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billywing Road</td>
<td>Billawin Road</td>
<td>Bill-la-win</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billywing Pine</td>
<td>Billawin Pine Plantation</td>
<td>Bill-la-win</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billywing Gorge</td>
<td>Billawin Gorge</td>
<td>Bill-la-win</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomjinna Picnic Ground</td>
<td>Babdjine Picnic Ground</td>
<td>Babdjine</td>
<td>'big toe'</td>
<td>Chauncy 1862</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomjinna Track</td>
<td>Babdjine Track</td>
<td>Babdjine</td>
<td>'big toe'</td>
<td>Chauncy 1862</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreang Camping Area</td>
<td>Bareng Camping Area</td>
<td>Boreng</td>
<td>'river'</td>
<td>Learmonth 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroka Lookout</td>
<td>Buruga Lookout</td>
<td>Buruga</td>
<td>'breaking off'</td>
<td>A Parish in the County of Borung</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brim Creek</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Brim</td>
<td>'well' or 'spring'</td>
<td>Pastoral run 1840's</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buandik Camping Ground</td>
<td>Jardwandjali Camping</td>
<td>Yardwandjali</td>
<td>'no-lip'</td>
<td>A tribal name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buandik Falls</td>
<td>Jardwandjali Falls</td>
<td>Yardwandjali</td>
<td>'no-lip'</td>
<td>A tribal name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullawin Road</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Bullawin</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrong Falls</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Burrong</td>
<td>'darkness'</td>
<td>Surveyor-General 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Old Name</td>
<td>New Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrong Falls Picnic Ground</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Burrong</td>
<td>'darkness'</td>
<td>Surveyor-General 1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konangiedora Creek</td>
<td>Gunangidura Creek</td>
<td>Gunangidura</td>
<td>'guna' = excrement</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrinatwa Gap</td>
<td>Mirrinaduwa Gap</td>
<td>Mirrinaduwa</td>
<td>'a hole in the ground' or 'a cave'</td>
<td>a Parish in the County of Dundas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moora Moora Creek</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Moora Moora</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moora Moora Reservoir</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Moora Moora</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Piccaninny</td>
<td>The Bainggug</td>
<td>Baingook</td>
<td>'child'</td>
<td>Hercus 1886 Of Spanish or Portuguese origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannon River</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Wannon</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartook</td>
<td>Werdug</td>
<td>Werdook</td>
<td>'his shoulder'</td>
<td>Pastoral run name 1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartook Reservoir</td>
<td>Werdug Reservoir</td>
<td>Werdook</td>
<td>'his shoulder'</td>
<td>Pastoral run name 1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarram Gap</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Yarram</td>
<td>'big'</td>
<td>Pastoral run name 1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarram Gap Road</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Yarram</td>
<td>'big'</td>
<td>Pastoral run name 1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) Names of features with English names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Meaning/Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asses Ear</td>
<td>Djibalara</td>
<td>Djibalara</td>
<td>floating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson 1843, Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birges Nose</td>
<td>Galbidj</td>
<td>Galpidj</td>
<td>'he might cut up'</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>First official use 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfellow Rock</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Established by 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Gap</td>
<td>Dirag</td>
<td>Dirak</td>
<td>'turpentine bush'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>First official use 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs Bluff</td>
<td>Budjun Budjun</td>
<td>Boodjun Boodjun</td>
<td>phlegm</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>Earliest listing 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Creek</td>
<td>Ngarriwarrawil</td>
<td>Ngarriwarrawil</td>
<td>'having many black oaks'</td>
<td>Chauncey 1862</td>
<td>Earliest listing 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chataqua Peak</td>
<td>Bim</td>
<td>Bim</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1890's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Pots</td>
<td>Larngibunja</td>
<td>Larngibunya</td>
<td>'lar' = stone</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Earliest listing 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation Creek</td>
<td>Billimina Creek</td>
<td>Billimina</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Mathew 1899</td>
<td>Mathew 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Alton Peak (1009m)</td>
<td>Gurdgaragwurd</td>
<td>Gurtkarakwurt</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1880's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Alton Peak (1022m)</td>
<td>Ngarram Ngarram</td>
<td>Ngarram Ngarram</td>
<td>'big'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1880's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyans Creek</td>
<td>Barri yalug</td>
<td>Parri yalook</td>
<td>parri = running 'yalug' = river hence running water or creek</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>Earliest listing 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Original Name</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenelg River</td>
<td>Bugara River</td>
<td>Bukara</td>
<td>'river'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gog &amp; Magog</td>
<td>Banjin yalug</td>
<td>Banyin yalook</td>
<td>yalug = stream/creek</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Only on recent maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians National Park</td>
<td>Gariwerd</td>
<td>Gariwerd</td>
<td>'The mountain range'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollow Mountain</td>
<td>Wudjub-guyun</td>
<td>Wutjup-guyun</td>
<td>'spear in the middle'</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>Only on recent maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie Falls</td>
<td>Migunang wirab</td>
<td>Mekunang wirap</td>
<td>'blackfish floating on top of the water'</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Earliest listing 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton Peak</td>
<td>Warrirburra</td>
<td>Warrirburra</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Abrupt</td>
<td>Mud-dadjug</td>
<td>Murd-dajook</td>
<td>'a blunt or useless arm'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Cassell</td>
<td>Didjun</td>
<td>Didjun</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Late 1860's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Difficult</td>
<td>Gar</td>
<td>Gar</td>
<td>'pointed nose'</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Lang</td>
<td>Jaranula</td>
<td>Yaranula</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Lubra</td>
<td>Warrinna-burb</td>
<td>Warrinna-burb</td>
<td>burb-hill</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. McIvor</td>
<td>Ngumadj</td>
<td>Ngumadj</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Rosea</td>
<td>Bugiga-mirgani</td>
<td>Bukika-mirkani</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1910's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Stapylton</td>
<td>Gunigalg</td>
<td>Gunigalk</td>
<td>'manure stick'</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Sturgeon</td>
<td>Wurgarri</td>
<td>Wurkarri</td>
<td>'black'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>Mitchell 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakara</td>
<td>M. V.</td>
<td>M. W.</td>
<td>M. C.</td>
<td>M. Z.</td>
<td>R. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duwil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baribial</td>
<td>Partibal</td>
<td>Moora</td>
<td>Moora</td>
<td>Moora</td>
<td>Moora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara Mura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarra Mananjina gadin</td>
<td>Ngarra</td>
<td>Manyangin</td>
<td>'having water'</td>
<td>in one's hand</td>
<td>Red Man Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanangin Niawi</td>
<td>Billawin</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>'mountain stream'</td>
<td>Victoria Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid Reference</td>
<td>Wallaby</td>
<td>Rocks</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Pronunciation</td>
<td>Billawin</td>
<td>'the sun will go'</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>'belonging to the man'</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Wallaby</td>
<td>Rocks</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Recommendation</td>
<td>Robinson 1842</td>
<td>Robinson 1842</td>
<td>Robinson 1842</td>
<td>Robinson 1842</td>
<td>Robinson 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Name</td>
<td>Diadjigaja</td>
<td>Diadjigaja</td>
<td>Diadjigaja</td>
<td>Diadjigaja</td>
<td>Diadjigaja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mt. Difficult Range

| 7323-1-1:313023 | Ngarram Ngarram | Ngarram Ngarram | 'big' | Robinson 1843 |
| 7323-1-1:271995 | Galbidj | Galpidj | 'he might cut up' | Robinson 1843 |
| 7323-1-1:328274 | Nguddingiri | Nguttingiri | unknown | Robinson 1843 |
| 7323-1-1:331951 | Badji-dadjing | Batji-datjing | 'knee-top of arm' | Robinson 1843 |
| 7323-1-1:272993 | Ngillin ngillin | Ngillin ngillin | unknown | Robinson 1843 |
| 7323-1-1:327942 | Mirri-gurag | Mirrigurak | 'hole in the sand' | Robinson 1843 |

2) JARDWAJALI AND DJABWURRUNG NAMES OF LANDSCAPE FEATURES IMMEDIATELY SURROUNDING THE GRAMPIANS NATIONAL PARK

(i) names which are already in use, although unrecognizable in their Anglicized form, and names pertaining to Koories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Name</th>
<th>Preferred Spelling</th>
<th>Recommended Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source of Recommendation</th>
<th>Date of Present Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherriepool</td>
<td>Djarabul</td>
<td>Djarabul</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherriepool Road</td>
<td>Djarabul Road</td>
<td>Djarabul</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatum</td>
<td>Gadim-gadim</td>
<td>Gadim-gadim</td>
<td>'boomerang'</td>
<td>Hercus 1986</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Ming Swamp</td>
<td>retain</td>
<td>Ming Ming</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrinatwa</td>
<td>Mirrinadua</td>
<td>Mirrinadua</td>
<td>'a hole in the ground' or 'a cave'</td>
<td>A Parish in the County of Dundas</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Bepcha</td>
<td>Mt. Bebdja</td>
<td>Bebdja</td>
<td>'white gum country'</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Bepcha</td>
<td>Mt. Bebdja</td>
<td>Bebdja</td>
<td>'white gum country'</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Ground</td>
<td>Picnic Ground</td>
<td>Bebdja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woohlpoor Swamp</td>
<td>Wulbuwa Swamp</td>
<td>Walpuwa</td>
<td>'to burn very fiercely'</td>
<td>Surveyor General 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) **names of features with English names:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Range (West)</th>
<th>Burrunj Range</th>
<th>Burrunj</th>
<th>'darkness'</th>
<th>Surveyor General 1869</th>
<th>1853</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Range</td>
<td>Grimgundidj</td>
<td>Grimgundidj</td>
<td>'gundidj = belonging to'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenisla Swamp (a) 1.</th>
<th>Gardugwil</th>
<th>Gartookwil</th>
<th>'a place full of owls'</th>
<th>Thornly 1869</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenisla Swamp (b) 2.</td>
<td>Ludjug Swamp</td>
<td>Ludjoog</td>
<td>'bare, empty, naked'</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall's Gap</td>
<td>Budja budja</td>
<td>Boodja boodja</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Robinson 1843</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebrook Home Station Waterhole</td>
<td>Budjam budjam</td>
<td>Boojam boojam</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebrook Sheepwash Swamp</td>
<td>Jarragallam</td>
<td>Yarragallam</td>
<td>(y)allam = waterhole</td>
<td>Thornly 1869</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Presumably the swamp area at the junction of Carters Channel and Konangiedora Creek (see Mt. Bepcha 7323-4-2, east of Glenisla).

2. Presumably the swampy area on Red Rock Creek east of Glenisla home station (See Mt. Bepcha 7323-4-2).

(3) **ROCK ART SITES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Recommended Meaning Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenisla I</td>
<td>Billimina Shelter</td>
<td>Billiminaunknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Hands</td>
<td>Wab Manja Shelter</td>
<td>Wep Manya'red painted hands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp of the Emu's Foot</td>
<td>Jananginj Njawi Shelter</td>
<td>Yananginj Njawi'the sun will go'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation Creek 5</td>
<td>Gunangidura Shelter</td>
<td>Gunangidura'Guna' = excrement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Fishes</td>
<td>Larngibunja Shelter</td>
<td>Larngibunya'Lar' = 'stone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Ghosts</td>
<td>Ngamadjidj Shelter</td>
<td>Ngamadjidj'white person'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range 2</td>
<td>Mugadgadjin Shelter</td>
<td>Mugadgadjin'gadjin' = 'water'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Range 3</td>
<td>Burrunj Shelter</td>
<td>Burrunj'darkness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Rock I</td>
<td>Gulgurn Manja Shelter</td>
<td>Gulkurn manya 'hands of young people'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) Traditional Jardwadjali and Djab wurrung names for Pastoral Stations (included for information):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenisla Home Station</th>
<th>Lambrug</th>
<th>Lambrook</th>
<th>'a lot'</th>
<th>Thornly 1869</th>
<th>1843</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moochambilla</td>
<td>Mudjambula</td>
<td>Mujambula</td>
<td>'the two of them pick something up'</td>
<td>Hercus 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Sturgeon Home Station</td>
<td>Dulin gurgundidj</td>
<td>Dulin gurgundidj</td>
<td>'belonging to red resin'</td>
<td>Robinson 1841</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebrook</td>
<td>Buyub budjun budjun</td>
<td>Booyub boodjun boodjun</td>
<td>'pig face phlegm or mucus'</td>
<td>Wilson 1869</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Cover Letters

Ms Laura Kostanski
School of Business
University of Ballarat
Ballarat 3353
(03) 5335 2230

NAME AND ADDRESS
POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT

Renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park

Thursday 12th September, 2006

Dear . . . .,

We are writing to you in regards to the government process of renaming the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park, and areas of the park, during the early 1990s. This government process is currently being studied by Laura Kostanski and Associate Professor Ian Clark at the University of Ballarat. The purpose of the study is to provide an understanding of the factors that affect the introduction of Indigenous names into areas with well-established non-Indigenous place names.

We came across your name during archival research which showed that you were actively involved in the Grampians (Gariwerd) debate at the time and we thought you might be interested in participating in the study. Participation is completely voluntary. As you can understand, placenames are markers of our identity, and as such play a vital role in our day to day lives. Participating in this study will ensure that you can have your say about the past and future naming processes employed by the government. Your knowledge will aid in developing an understanding of the importance of placenames to local residents and visitors. Importantly, your input could lead to the development of new government processes regarding the changing of place names.

Being a participant in this research would require you to complete the enclosed questionnaire (expected to take 15 minutes to complete). The enclosed questionnaire asks you for information regarding your use of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park and its names. The responses you provide during any stage of this research will be treated confidentially, with your personal information provided on the consent forms only available to Assoc. Prof. Clark and Ms Kostanski. In future writings of the research findings your personal details will not be identified in any manner. You are also free to withdraw your consent for this research at any time you choose, up until the data has been aggregated. Information provided by you will be kept for 5 years in secure premises (at the University of Ballarat) accessible only by Assoc. Prof. Clark and Ms Kostanski, after which time the data will be destroyed.
After completing and returning the questionnaire there is the possibility of being involved in a personal oral-history interview with Ms Laura Kostanski. Involvement in this interview would comprise 1 hour of your time, and would centre on questions regarding your role in the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park debate. Information provided during this interview would remain anonymous in any publications resulting from the research. To indicate your desire to be part of the oral-history interview process, please complete your details on the questionnaire, under the appropriate section on the last page.

If you would like to participate in this research project, please sign the consent form overleaf before completing the questionnaire. If you have any queries about answering the questions, please contact Ms Laura Kostanski at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5335 2230. If you have any concerns with this questionnaire or the review in general please do not hesitate to contact Assoc. Prof Ian Clark at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5327 9436.

Thank-you for your expression of interest in this project,

Regards,

Dr Ian Clark
Ms Laura Kostanski
Appendix D: Questionnaire
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Appendix E: Ethics Approval and Final Report

Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC)
Research & Graduate Studies Office

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS APPROVAL FORM

Principal Researcher/Supervisor: I Clark
Associate/Student Researcher/s: L Kostanski
School: Business

Ethics Approval has been granted for the following project:

Project Number: A06-031
Project Title: What's in a name? Attachment and interference in placename-based identity
For the period: 7/6/2006 to 31/10/2006

Please quote the Project No. in all correspondence regarding this application.

PLEASE NOTE:

A final report for this project must be submitted to the HREC Executive Officer on:
30/11/2006

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 7 June 2006

(Executive Officer, HREC)
# Final Project Report

**Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC)**

---

**ALL QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED.**

Please type your responses into the boxes provided. Boxes will expand to fit your response.

---

## Project Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No:</th>
<th>A06-031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>What's in a name? Attachment and Interference in placename-based identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## 1) Principal Researcher Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Associate Professor Ian Clark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Section:</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>(03) 5327 9436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>(03) 5327 9406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:i.clark@ballarat.edu.au">i.clark@ballarat.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## 2) Project Status:

Please indicate the current status of the project:

- [x] Data collection complete
- [ ] Abandoned

**Completion date:** 28/11/06

**Please give reason:**

---

## 3) Special Conditions:

If this project was approved subject to conditions, were these met?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No  

*NB: If ‘no’, please provide an explanation below:

---

## 4) Changes to project:

**Were any amendments made to the originally approved project?**

- [x] No
- [ ] Yes  

*NB: Please provide details:

---
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6) Storage of Data:

Please indicate where the data collected during the course of this project is stored:

The data is now being stored in a locked filing cabinet in Associate Professor Ian Clark’s office on campus at the University of Ballarat.

5) Research Participants:

Were there any events that had an adverse effect on the research participants?

☐ No ☐ Yes *NB: Please provide details:

7) Summary of Results:

Please provide a summary of the results of the project:

A total of 58 people participated in the questionnaire phase of the research project and 45 people participated in the oral-history interview component of the research. The information gathered from participants has been crucial in assisting the development of theories on toponymic attachment, identity and dependence. The results are presented in the doctoral thesis of Laura Kostanski, to be submitted for examination in March 2009.

8) Feedback:

The HREC welcomes any feedback on:
- difficulties experienced with carrying out the research project; or
- appropriate suggestions which might lead to improvements in ethical clearance and monitoring of research.

9) Signature/s:

Principal Researcher: ___________________________ Date: 20/3/2009
Print name: CLARK, IAN D

Other/Student Researchers: ___________________________ Date: 20/3/2009
Print name: KOSTANSKI, LAURA
Appendix F: Oral History Interview Questions

1. When and where were you born?
2. What places have you lived in, and for how long, during your lifetime?
3. Do you feel a part of the community that you currently live in?
4. Where were your parents born?
5. What places have/did they live(d) in, and for how long, during their lifetimes?
6. What is your association with the Grampians region? (how long lived here, what used it for?)
7. What do you think of the Grampians area being a National Park? Were you in favour of this National Park classification?

During 1989/1990 there was a lengthy debate about the proposal to rename the Grampians National Park with its traditional name ‘Gariwerd’. The Government report of May 1990 proposed that

i. 21 incorrectly spelt Aboriginal place names currently in use be corrected, and that a further 10 names currently in use be retained

ii. the Aboriginal names of 44 features which have been given European names be restored

iii. 11 features with Aboriginal names that do not carry European names be adopted

iv. the Aboriginal names suggested for nine rock art sites be adopted.

(If required, show a list of the proposed names)

I would like to ask you a series of questions about this debate and proposal according to what you thought at the time of the debate. Later, I will ask you about what you think about the renaming issue now:

8. Why did you think the government made the proposal to rename the Grampians?

   a. What did you think of the proposal to rename the entire National Park? and, what was your role in the debate?

      i. (If positive response): why did you think that renaming was important?
ii. (if negative response): why did you think that renaming was a problem?

b. What did you think of the proposals to rename sections and specific features of the park? (discuss particulars such as:
   i. anglicised forms of names (Cherrypool being Djarabul)
   ii. history of name use (oldest non-indig names only 154 years old, whilst Indigenous names been around for 5,000 years)
   iii. culturally inappropriate (Mt Lubra, Blackfellow Rock, the Picanniny, Halls Gap (Hall was involved with killing two Indigenous people in July 1841))
   iv. fosters cultural identity

1. (If positive response): why did you think that renaming was important for specific sites?

2. (if negative response): why did you think that renaming was a problem for specific sites?

9. People become very familiar with places over time, and start to become attached to areas like National Parks.
   a. In what ways is the Grampians (Gairwerd) National Park important to your:
      i. family heritage
      ii. lifestyle
      iii. income/profession
   b. In what ways is the name Grampians important to your:
      i. family heritage
      ii. lifestyle
      iii. income/profession
      iv. orientation in the area
   c. In what ways in the name Gariwerd important to your:
      i. family heritage
      ii. lifestyle
      iii. income/profession
iv. orientation in the area

10. Did you think that the renaming would change the identity of the area?
   a. Why? What sort of identity would it change to?
   b. What does the name Grampians mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc)
      i. Do you know the history/meaning of this name?
      ii. What do you know about the colonial history in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area?
         1. Are you aware that Major Mitchell had a policy of utilising Indigenous names for features?
      iii. How and when did you learn about the colonial history (ie was your interested piqued when the debate occurred, but prior to that you didn’t know? or did you have a prior knowledge of the history?)
      iv. Do you have family history/associations with the name?
   c. What does the name Gariwerd mean to you? (ie what is the history of this name for you etc etc etc)
      i. Do you know the history/meaning of this name?
      ii. What do you know about the Indigenous history in the Grampians (Gariwerd) area?
      iii. What names of local clans/languages do you know about?
      iv. How and when did you learn about the Indigenous history (ie was your interested piqued when the debate occurred, but prior to that you didn’t know? or did you have a prior knowledge of the history?)
      v. Do you have family history/associations with the name?

Moving on to more current events and associations with the National Park:

11. Have you ever seen dual-naming signs
   a. for the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?
      i. What do you think of them? Do you want them there, or remove them?
b. For areas/sites within the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?
   i. What do you think of them? Do you want them there, or remove them?

12. In 1991, Jeff Kennet vowed that if elected to Government, he would reverse the decision of the Geographical Placenames Committee to dual-name the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park, and revert the name to ‘Grampians National Park’.
   a. What do you think of the fact that he never did reverse the decision, and now the park is still officially known as Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?
   b. What name do you use now for the park? (if using Gariwerd, ask about when they started to use this name)
   c. (Show map of park with specific areas highlighted) What names do you use for these sites within the park? (if using Indigenous names, ask about when they started to use these names)
   d. What do these names mean to you? (ie do they bring up any memories/history/associations for you?)
   e. Do you have special associations with these areas? (ie what activities do you do there? have you spent a lot of time there as a child? have you been there with family and friends?)
   f. What places in the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park would you show to a tourist/ a friend/acquaintance coming from elsewhere? What places would you not show?
      i. would you show different places to different people?
   g. Does the situation/company (age, degree of familiarity, where the person is from etc.) have an impact on the way you use place names? (official/unofficial slang names)
   h. Have you noticed a change in the way you use place names (e.g. the names you used as a child or right after you’d moved to the region were different from those you use today)?
      i. have you started to use more official/unofficial names?
   i. Do you remember situations etc. in which you have learnt certain place names? (e.g. whilst consulting a map, asking, “listening”, inventing names)
j. Do you think it is possible that a place or placename can have many different meanings, histories and identities for different people? Do you think we should acknowledge these different meanings, histories and identities?

13. At the time of the proposals, there was no government legislation to allow for dual-naming. So, when the proposals were put to the government, it was stated that the Indigenous names should be reintroduced and the Anglo-Saxon names removed.

   a. What do you think of this one place-one name legislation?
   b. Now that we have dual-naming legislation in Victoria, are you more accepting of reintroducing Indigenous names?
      i. Do you think that if we’d had a dual-naming policy at the beginning of the renaming debate, that the issue would not have been as hotly contested?
   c. If we are to use dual-names, which name should be written first (Indigenous/non-Indigenous?)
   d. If we are to sign-post Indigenous names, how should they be written on signs? (ie second name in brackets, have a slash, be in different colours?)

14. With hindsight, what do you think was wrong with the government proposal and processes in particular that generated so much fierce debate at the time?

   a. Are you interested in seeing more processes of Indigenous renaming across Victoria?
   b. if we are to consider Indigenous renaming in the future, what should be different about the government processes?

15. Do you think that the Grampians area has undergone change recently?

   a. what sort of changes?
   b. Are these changes a good thing?
   c. (if not a good thing) Why are these not good changes? What needs to be done?
On the issue of naming:

16. Do you think the renaming of Ayers Rock to Uluru was successful? Why/Why not? Why is it a different story to the renaming of the Grampians?

17. Do place names make a place? (or do names matter in general to you?)
Appendix G: Informed Consent Form

Renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park

Consent Form

Study undertaken by
Assoc. Prof. Ian Clark & Ms Laura Kostanski
School of Business

I, .................................................. .................., of .................................

hereby consent to participate as a subject in the above research study.

The research program in which I am being asked to participate has been explained fully to me in writing and any matters on which I have sought information have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that:

• all information I provide (including questionnaires) will be treated with the strictest confidence and data will be stored separately from any listing that includes my name and address.

• If I decide to participate in the oral-history interview process, this interview will be tape-recorded. The transcript of the interview will be made available to me for approval before being used for research information.

• aggregated results will be used for research purposes and may be reported in scientific and academic journals

• I am free to withdraw my consent at any time during the study in which event my participation in the research study will immediately cease and any information obtained from it will not be used.

• once information has been aggregated it is unable to be identified, and from this point it is not possible to withdraw consent to participate

SIGNATURE: ........................................... DATE: ........................

Name:....................................................................................................

Contact Address:........................................................................................

Contact Phone Number:...........................................................................

If you have any queries about answering the questions, please contact Ms Laura Kostanski at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5335 2230. If you have any concerns with this questionnaire or the review in general please do not hesitate to contact Assoc. Prof Ian Clark at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5327 9436.
Appendix H: Postcard
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### Appendix I: Tables of Questionnaire Data

Question 1.1: How often, if at all, do you visit the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2 months</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple of times an year/ Holidays</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1.2: Have you ever lived in or near the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-question 1.2: If you have lived in or near the National Park, how many years has it been for?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (cont.)</td>
<td>Percent (cont.)</td>
<td>Valid Percent (cont.)</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System 10 17.2
Total 58 100.0
### Question 1.3 What activities do you use the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Walking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Riding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picknicking</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Climbing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Riding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Watching</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang Gliding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Wheel Driving</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-Seeing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(question 1.3.12 in next table)
**Question 1.3: Responses provided for category 12 'Other' activities undertaken in the National Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craft markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Biking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting and Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildflowers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work/business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1.4:** How familiar are you with the areas you use for your activities in the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited knowledge</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>17.2</th>
<th>17.2</th>
<th>17.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good knowledge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive knowledge</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1.5:** How familiar are you with the rest of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>1.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited knowledge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good knowledge</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1.6:** Were you involved in the Grampians National Park renaming debate during 1989/1990?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>56.9</th>
<th>57.9</th>
<th>57.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1.6: Were you involved in the Grampians National Park renaming debate during 1989/1990?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1.7: What did you think of the proposal in 1990 to rename the Grampians National Park 'Gariwerd'?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Supported</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1.8: Overall, do you support the idea of reintroducing Indigenous place names for Victorian places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 4.1: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (cont.)</td>
<td>Percent (cont.)</td>
<td>Valid Percent (cont.)</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4.2: Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 4.3: Where were you born (name of town and country)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adeelaide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ararat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dunedin NZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hamilton Vic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Man, UK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunnunoppan, WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilydale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melbourne Vic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minyip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penshurst Vic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Pirie, SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (Vic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood Vic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherglen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield, England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Arnaud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stawell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stawell Vic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sydney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville, QLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham- England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yallourn Vic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4.4: Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 4.5: What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or Tech.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4.6: Employment Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4.7: For those that are working, an indication of their profession**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 4.8: What is the postcode of your primary place of residence?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3147</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3294</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3314</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3377</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3381</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3926</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postcode</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3053</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3294</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3381</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4.10: How long have you lived in your current community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4.11: Are you actively involved in any community groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4.12: For those who participate in community groups, what type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; Sporting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 4.13:** If you participate in community groups, how frequent is this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J: Questionnaire Participant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number, Pseudonym or Real Name</th>
<th>Response to Question 1.7: What did you think of the proposal to rename the Grampians National Park ‘Gariwerd’?</th>
<th>Response to Question 1.8: Overall, do you support the idea of reintroducing Indigenous place names for Victorian places?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill McGrath</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Newton</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Number, Pseudonym or Real Name (cont.)</td>
<td>Response to Question 1.7: What did you think of the proposal to rename the Grampians National Park ‘Gariwerd’? (cont.)</td>
<td>Response to Question 1.8: Overall, do you support the idea of reintroducing Indigenous place names for Victorian places? (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 12</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 19</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 21</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 22</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 24</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 28</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 33</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 34</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 37</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 38</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 39</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 40</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 41</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 42</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 43</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 44</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 45</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 46</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 47</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 48</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 49</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 50</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 52</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 55</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 56</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Number, Pseudonym or Real Name (cont.)</td>
<td>Response to Question 1.7: What did you think of the proposal to rename the Grampians National Park ‘Gariwerd’? (cont.)</td>
<td>Response to Question 1.8: Overall, do you support the idea of reintroducing Indigenous place names for Victorian places? (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 57</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 58</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard De Fegely</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix K: Oral History Interview Participant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym or Real Name</th>
<th>Political affiliations/roles at the time of the name restoration proposal?</th>
<th>Lives in Study Area</th>
<th>Years living in study area</th>
<th>Support name restoration for the National Park</th>
<th>Support name restoration for Indigenous Rock Art Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Gunn</td>
<td>Archaeologist employed by KTU to assist Ian Clark with name restoration proposal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill McGrath</td>
<td>National Party MLA for Lowan(^1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1980s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Newton</td>
<td>Employee of Parks Victoria</td>
<td>Used to</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Napthine</td>
<td>Liberal Party MLC for Portland*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Rose</td>
<td>Indigenous elder at Brambuk Centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Johns</td>
<td>Council member of Horsham Shire Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6th Generation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Head</td>
<td>Manager of Koori Tourism Unit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Clark</td>
<td>CEO of Framlingham Aboriginal Cooperative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenda Allgood</td>
<td>Mayor of Ararat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not originally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The Labor Party (typically affiliated with left-wing politics) were in government at the time of the name restoration proposal. The Liberal and National Parties (who form a coalition typically affiliated with right-wing politics) were in opposition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym or Real Name (cont.)</th>
<th>Political affiliations/roles at the time of the name restoration proposal?</th>
<th>Lives in Study Area (cont.)</th>
<th>Years living in study area (cont.)</th>
<th>Support name restoration for the National Park (cont.)</th>
<th>Support name restoration for Indigenous Rock Art Sites (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Clark</td>
<td>Lead researcher for the Government's name restoration program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5th Generation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parker</td>
<td>Registrar of Geographic Names</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7th Generation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye Harris</td>
<td>CEO of Brambuk Cultural Centre at time of thesis data collection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerryn Shade</td>
<td>Council member at Ararat Shire Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1970s</td>
<td>Not originally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel Harradine</td>
<td>Indigenous elder who assisted Ian Clark with name restoration proposal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1970s</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1992</td>
<td>Not originally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym or Real Name (cont.)</td>
<td>Political affiliations/roles at the time of the name restoration proposal? (cont.)</td>
<td>Lives in Study Area (cont.)</td>
<td>Years living in study area (cont.)</td>
<td>Support name restoration for the National Park (cont.)</td>
<td>Support name restoration for Indigenous Rock Art Sites (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard DeFegely</td>
<td>Council member at Ararat Shire Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1981</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Crabb</td>
<td>Minister for Tourism, Labor Party*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Chatfield</td>
<td>CEO of Budja Budja Cooperative at time of thesis data collection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>since 1960s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Kayler-Thomson</td>
<td>Tourism representative for Grampians area</td>
<td>Used to 1970s to 1990s</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L: Cover Letters Sent with Transcripts to Oral History Interview Participants

Ms Laura Kostanski
School of Business
University of Ballarat
Ballarat 3353

Participant Name
Participant Address

Renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park

Wednesday 22nd November, 2006

Dear ,

It was fantastic to meet you for an interview regarding your thoughts on the 1990s process of renaming the Grampians National Park, and areas within it. Your information was invaluable in providing an understanding of attachment and identity with the park and its names.

The responses you provided during each stage of this research will be treated confidentially, with your personal information provided on the consent form only available to myself. In subsequent writings of the research findings your personal details will not be identified in any manner. For instance, your name, place of residence and profession will not be disclosed and I will use a pseudonym (made-up name) for you. You are also free to withdraw your consent for this research at any time you choose, up until the data has been put together.

I am very appreciative of the time you took to spend with me and share your views. Please find enclosed the transcript of our interview together. Transcripts can often appear to be strange, as speech is very different to written words. So, please don’t worry if the transcript is hard to read or difficult to follow, this is normal. Also, as the transcript was written by a professional typist, there might be the occasional spelling mistake, especially with names. If you notice any spelling mistakes, please don’t be concerned about them as I will be spending the next couple of months correcting them. If you have any further comments to make, or wish to add to something to the transcript, please contact me by phone or email.

If you have any queries about the research, please contact me at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5335 2230. If you have any concerns with this questionnaire or the review in general please do not hesitate to contact Assoc. Prof Ian Clark at the School of Business, Ballarat University, on (03) 5327 9436.

Thank-you for your help with this project,

Regards,

Laura Kostanski
Appendix M: Mental Map

Link to Appendix M as an A3 Map Page
Renaming of the
Grampians (Gariwerd)
National Park

As you can understand, placenames are markers of our identity, and as such play a vital role in our day to day lives.

Participating in this study will ensure that you can have your say about the past and future naming processes employed by the government.
Questionnaire designed by
Laura Kostanski & Dr Ian Clark
School of Business
University of Ballarat,
PO Box 663 Ballarat Vic 3353.
Phone (03) 5335 2230.
Section 1: Use of the National Park

We would like to know about your use of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park. Here we're asking about the importance of the National Park in your life.

1.1 How often, if at all, do you visit or use the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

[ ] 1 Weekly
[ ] 2 Fortnightly
[ ] 3 Monthly
[ ] 4 Every 2 Months
[ ] 5 Quarterly
[ ] 6 A couple of times a year/During Holidays
[ ] 7 Yearly
[ ] 8 Never

1.2 Have you ever lived in or near the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

[ ] 1 Yes
[ ] 2 No

If yes, during which years?____________________________________

1.3 What activities do you use the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park for?

(You can tick more than one answer)

[ ] 1 Bush Walking
[ ] 2 Horse Riding
[ ] 3 Picnicking
[ ] 4 Rock Climbing
[ ] 5 Bike Riding
[ ] 6 Camping
[ ] 7 Bird Watching
[ ] 8 Hang Gliding
[ ] 9 Four Wheel Driving
[ ] 10 Holidays
[ ] 11 Site-seeing
[ ] 12 Other (please specify) _________________

1.4 How familiar are you with the areas you use for your activities in the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

[ ] 1 Not at all
[ ] 2 I have limited knowledge of areas I use for my activities
[ ] 3 I have good knowledge of areas I use for my activities
[ ] 4 I have extensive knowledge of areas I use for my activities

1.5 How familiar are you with the rest of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park?

(outside of the areas you use for your activities)

[ ] 1 Not at all
[ ] 2 I have limited knowledge of other National Park areas outside of my activity areas
[ ] 3 I have good knowledge of other National Park areas outside of my activity areas
[ ] 4 I have extensive knowledge of other National Park areas outside of my activity areas
1.6 Were you involved in the Grampians National Park renaming debate during 1989/1990?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

If yes, what role did you take?
(You can tick more than one answer)

[ ] Wrote Supportive Letter to the Editor  [ ] Wrote Protest Letter to the Editor
[ ] Wrote Supportive Letter to Govt/Council  [ ] Wrote Protest Letter to Govt/Council
[ ] Attended Local Meetings of Support  [ ] Attended Local Protest Meetings
[ ] Signed Petition supporting changes  [ ] Signed Petition against changes

[ ] Other ____________________________

1.7 What did you think of the proposal in 1990 to rename the Grampians National Park ‘Gariwerd’?

[ ] Supported  [ ] Disapproved
[ ] No Opinion  [ ] Other ____________________________

Why did you disapprove of / support the proposal?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

1.8 Overall, do you support the idea of reintroducing Indigenous placenames for Victorian places?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Please explain why/why not:
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

This section asks you about your familiarity with the names Grampians and Gariwerd. In addition, the section asks you about your feelings for the National Park itself. These questions are important in helping us to understand what the National Park and its names mean to you.

2.1 Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements below describe your feelings about the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park.

(Circle the number which best describes how you feel about each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This National Park says a lot about who I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No other National Park can compare to this one</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I identify with the physical landscape of this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This National Park is the best for my recreational activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The history of this National Park is important to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wouldn’t use any other National Park for my recreational activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This National Park is special to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This National Park means a lot to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am very attached to this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Please indicate the extent to which each statement below describes your general feelings about the name ‘Grampians’.
(Circle the number which best describes how you feel about each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am very attached to the name <em>Grampians</em> for this National Park.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The name <em>Grampians</em> is special to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>No other placename for this National Park can compare to the name <em>Grampians</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The name <em>Grampians</em> means a lot to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The name <em>Grampians</em> says a lot about who I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The history associated to the <em>Grampians</em> name is important to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I wouldn’t use any other placename except <em>Grampians</em> for this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The name <em>Grampians</em> is the best for this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I identify with the name <em>Grampians</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Please indicate the extent to which each statement below describes your general feelings about the name ‘Gariwerd’.
(Circle the number which best describes how you feel about each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The name <em>Gariwerd</em> says a lot about who I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I wouldn’t use any other placename except <em>Gariwerd</em> for this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>No other placename for this National Park can compare to the name <em>Gariwerd</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am very attached to the name <em>Gariwerd</em> for this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I identify with the name <em>Gariwerd</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The history associated to the <em>Gariwerd</em> name is important to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The name <em>Gariwerd</em> means a lot to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The name <em>Gariwerd</em> is the best for this National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The name <em>Gariwerd</em> is special to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: National Park Names

Included with this questionnaire is a map of the National Park Area. We have enclosed this map for you to let us know the names you use in the National Park Area. The map has yellow boxes and symbols on it, indicating areas and features we would like to know the names of.

Instructions for completing the map:
WHERE YOU’RE NOT SURE OF THE NAMES PLEASE WRITE ‘UNKNOWN’ IN THE YELLOW BOXES

1. Please write the name you use for this National Park in the large yellow box at the top of the map.

2. Where you can, identify and write in the yellow boxes
   
   2.1 The name of the Town symbolised by 🏡
   
   2.2 The names of the Mountain Ranges symbolised by 🏚️
   
   2.3 The name of the Mountain Peak symbolised by 🏔️
   
   2.4 The names of the Waterfalls symbolised by 🌟
   
   2.5 The names of the Rock Art Sites symbolised by 🎨
   
   2.6 The names of the Rock Formations symbolised by 🗁️

3. If you use names for areas not detailed on this map, please feel free to mark the area/feature and add its name.
## Section 4: Participant Details

We would like to know about your background. This information is vitally important in helping us understand your personal history in the Grampians area.

**4.1 Age____________**

**4.2 Sex: Male / Female**

**4.3 Where were you born (Name of the town & country)? ________________**

**4.4 Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?**

[ ] ^1 Yes [ ] ^2 No

If yes, which countries do you identify with? (please specify)

______________________________________________________________

**4.5 What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

[ ] ^1 Primary school [ ] ^2 Trade or technical qualification
[ ] ^3 Some secondary schooling [ ] ^4 Tertiary qualification – university degree
[ ] ^5 Completed secondary school

**4.6 Are you:***

[ ] ^1 Full time employed [ ] ^2 Part time/casual employed
[ ] ^3 Retired [ ] ^4 Unemployed
[ ] ^5 Student
[ ] ^6 Other_______________________________

**4.7 If you are working, which of these categories best describes your professional area:**

[ ] ^1 Manufacturing [ ] ^2 Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Mining
[ ] ^3 Retail [ ] ^4 Finance, Insurance, Property
[ ] ^5 Wholesale Trade [ ] ^6 Tourism
[ ] ^7 Construction [ ] ^8 Communication & Utility Services
[ ] ^9 Health [ ] ^10 Government Admin, Defence Forces
[ ] ^11 Education [ ] ^12 Cultural and recreational services

[ ] ^13 Other_______________________________

**4.8 What is the postcode of your primary place of residence?_______________**
4.9 If working, what is the postcode for your place of work? ________________

4.10 How long have you lived in your current community?

[ ] 1 less than 12 Months [ ] 2 1-2 years
[ ] 3 2-5 years [ ] 4 5-10 years
[ ] 5 10-15 years [ ] 6 15+ years

4.11 Are you actively involved in any community groups?

[ ] 1 Yes [ ] 2 No

If you answered NO, please proceed to the questions on the back page. If yes, please indicate which type from the categories below: *(Tick as many as applicable)*

[ ] 1 Heritage Group (including Historical Societies, Museums, Field Naturalists)
[ ] 2 Recreational & Sporting Group (including bush walking, 4WDriving)
[ ] 3 Cultural Group (including art, singing, dancing)
[ ] 4 Service Club (including Rotary, Lions)
[ ] 5 Religious Group

1.12 What is the name of the group you are most actively involved in?

_______________________________________________________

1.13 How often do you participate in this group?

[ ] 1 Daily [ ] 2 Weekly
[ ] 3 Fortnightly [ ] 4 Monthly
[ ] 5 Quarterly [ ] 6 Half-Yearly
[ ] 7 Yearly

[ ] 8 Other_________________________________________________

There are questions on the next page
Thank-you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Your answers are invaluable for this research.

We are also interested in hearing about your history in the Grampians area. We would like to learn about what the place and its names really mean to you, your family and friends. So, if you are interested in participating in a private oral-history interview relating to your experiences, please write your details below and Laura Kostanski will contact you in the next few weeks to organise a time and date for the interview (interview can be in person or over the telephone, which ever you prefer).

Name:_____________________________________________
Address:___________________________________________
Phone Number:_____________________________________

What is the best time to call you?

Email:_____________________________________________

Do you know anyone else who would be interested in completing this questionnaire? If so, please provide their details below and we’ll send them a questionnaire to fill-out.

Relative/Friend’s Name:_____________________________________________
Address:___________________________________________
Phone Number:_____________________________________
Email:_____________________________________________

If you have any further comments, please feel free to write them in the available space below:
Renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park
Last week we sent you a questionnaire about the renaming of the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park.

This postcard is written as a thank-you to those who have already returned their questionnaires and a reminder to those who have not. If you could return your questionnaire by 20th October, we would be most grateful.

If you have misplaced your original questionnaire, please call Laura Kostanski at the University of Ballarat on (03) 5335 2230 to organise for a replacement copy to be sent out to you.

We are relying on your important information to help in understanding the issues involved with renaming areas of Victoria.

From: Laura Kostanski, School of Business, University of Ballarat, PO Box 663, Ballarat Victoria 3353.
Place Names as Registered in 1989 for the Grampians National Park Area

Features identified in the 1990 Submission to the Victorian Placenames Committee prepared by Ian D. Clark and Lionel Harradine for the Koorie Tourism Unit.

LEGEND
- National Park
- Rock Formation
- Town
- Mountain
- Mountain Peak
- Waterfall
- Rock Art Site
- Camping Area
- Gap
- Location
- Lookout
- Picnic Ground
- Place of Interest
Registered Place Names in 2007 for the Grampians (Gariwerd) National Park Area

Based on features originally identified in the 1990 Submission to the Victorian Placenames Committee prepared by Ian D. Clark and Lionel Harradine for the Koorie Tourism Unit.

LEGEND
- National Park
- Rock Formation
- Town
- Mountain
- Mountain Peak
- Waterfall
- Rock Art Site
- Waterfall
- Rock Art Site
- Gap
- Location
- Lookout
- Picnic Ground
- Place of Interest
- Registered Place Name
- Indigenous Name Restored
Language Boundaries of the Gariwerd Region

LEGEND

Jardwadjali Language Area
Djab wurrung Language Area

NOTE: The information for this map was derived from Clark (1990) and is for illustrative purposes only. It is not suitable for Native Title and other land claims.
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Indigenous Place Names for the Gariwerd National Park Area

Features identified in the 1990 Submission to the Victorian Placenames Committee prepared by Ian D. Clark and Lionel Harradine for the Koorie Tourism Unit.

LEGEND

- National Park
- Rock Formation
- Town
- Mountain
- Mountain Peak
- Waterfall
- Rock Art Site
- Camping Area
- Gap
- Location
- Lookout
- Picnic Ground
- Place of Interest
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Questionnaire Participants by Postcodes
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Postcode Area

Postcode Number

Number of Participants Surveyed

Postcodes based on 'Vicmap Admin Postcode' dataset as of February 2007
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The Grampians National Park
Names currently used by participants for park and features

- National Park
- Rock Formation
- Town
- Mountain
- Mount Peak
- Waterfall
- Rock Art Site

**LEGEND**

**SITE 1:**
- Hovea Rocks
- Tripple Falls
- Walykaty Rocks

**SITE 2:**
- Rock Falls
- Manja Falls
- Gulgurn Manja
- Manja
-Ngamadjidj

**SITE 3:**
- Briggs Bluff
- Mt Difficult
- Mt Gar
- Mura Mura
- Roses Gap

**SITE 4:**
- Asses Ears
- Balconies
- Mt Rosea
- Tripple Falls
- Wallaby Rocks

**SITE 5:**
- Fish Falls
- MacKenzie Falls
- McKenzie Falls
- Migunang Wirab
- Mitchell

**SITE 6:**
- Budjabudja
- Halls Gap
- Hells Gap

**SITE 7:**
- Billimina
- Camp of Emu Foot
- Cave of Hands
- Redrock
- Rock Shelter

**SITE 8:**
- Billimina
- Billywing
- Blackfellow
- Buandik
- Camp of Fishes

**SITE 9:**
- Billywing Falls
- Buandik Falls
- Cultivation Creek Falls
- Glen Falls
- Glenisla Falls

**SITE 10:**
- Billimina
- Billywing
- Cave of Hands
- Manja Shelter

**SITE 11:**
- Bagara
- Grampians
- Mt Duwil
- Mt Frederick
- Mt Lubra
- Mt Warinaburb
- Mt William

**SITE 12:**
- Asses Ears
- Chimney Pots
- Chimney Pots
- Culmerton
- The Fortress

**SITE 13:**
- Mt Abrupt
- Mt Abrupt/Picanniny
- Mt Sturgeon
- Mt Zero
- The Picanniny

**SITE 14:**
- Asses Ears
- Case of Hands
- Crater Rock
- The Fortress
- Victoria Falls

**SITE 15:**
- Alpencourt Falls
- Alpencourt Falls
- Bunda Falls
- Bunda Falls
- Bunda Falls

**SITE 16:**
- Birnara
- Birnara
- Case of Hands
- Manja Shelter

**SITE 17:**
- Birnara
- Birnara
- Birnara
- Birnara
- Birnara

**NATIONAL PARK NAMES**
- Grampians
- Gariwerd
- Currewert
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