Inuvialuit language and identity: perspectives on the symbolic meaning of Inuvialuktun in the Canadian Western Arctic

MA Research Proposal, May 2011

Alexander Oehler,
Interdisciplinary Master of Arts (IDIS) student

University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

Abstract: The issue of heritage language revitalization in Aboriginal communities throughout Canada and the United States has been an issue of great concern to Aboriginal communities, and more recently also to departments of education responsible for culturally sensitive curricula in cross-cultural and predominantly indigenous educational environments. This research seeks to focus on the social meaning of Inuvialuktun, a regional Inuit language comprised of three distinct regional dialects traditionally spoken by the Inuvialuit of the northern Northwest Territories, Canada. More specifically, the research seeks to examine the role of current Inuvialuktun language revitalization efforts in the establishment of Inuvialuit collective and individual identities across several age sets. Tying into the sociolinguistic discourse on ancestral language revitalization in North America, this research seeks to contribute a case study from a region that has hitherto been underrepresented in the literature on language and identity. The applied aim of the study is to provide better insight on existing language ideologies and language attitudes subscribed to by current and potential learners of Inuvialuktun in the public school system. Data obtained by the study is intended to aid local and territorial language planners in identifying potential obstacles and opportunities regarding language learner motivation. The project is being conducted in partnership with the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC), the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre (ICRC), the Beaufort Delta Education Council (BDEC), and Aurora College, providing qualitative access to current and potential learners, as well as current and future teachers across several educational contexts.

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

Table of contents

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

1.0 Introduction

1.1 General context

This research proposal is concerned with the revitalization of the Inuit language traditionally spoken in the northern Northwest Territories of the western Canadian Arctic. The Inuit of this region refer to themselves as Inuvialuit, traditionally also referred to as the Mackenzie Delta Eskimo (Pritzker 2000:543). Responding to the drastic societal changes brought about by the government of Canada during the second half of the twentieth century, and confirmed by the discovery of oil by multi-national corporations, a group of visionary Inuvialuit leaders formed the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement (COPE) in the 1970s and protect their people against the exploitative ambitions of southern involvement on Inuvialuit land (Kolausok 2003:178). Under the direction of this committee, Inuvialuit successfully worked toward a comprehensive regional land claims agreement (the Inuvialuit Nunangat), approved in 1984 by the government of Canada, and known today as the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA)(Condon 1996:171). The IFA created the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR), a landmass of some 48,280 square kilometers and home to six Inuvialuit communities (IFA 1987:17). Besides its famed subsurface riches of oil and gas, the ISR is home to linguistic treasure. Three distinct dialects[1] of Inuktitut and Iñupiatun have traditionally been spoken here: Uummarmiutun, Siglitun, and Kangiryuarmiutun (Lowe 1984:v). Inuvialuit

[1] It must be noted, according to Gary Holton at the Alaska Native Language Center, that the term 'dialect,' as used by linguists, carries no implication of lower status as it does in common speech (http://www.uaf.edu/anlc/groups/). I follow COPE-linguist Ronald Lowe's example by using 'dialect' for the three Inuvialuit speech varieties. When referring to 'Inuvialuktun,' I follow the Inuvialuktun Language Committee's use of 'language,' which is being used by Inuvialuit today. According to linguistic classification, Inuvialuktun belongs to two branches within the Eskimo-Aleut language family: IKT (Western Canadian Inuktitut, i.e. Siglitun, Kangiryuarmiutun) and ESI (Northeast Alaskan Iñupiatun, i.e. Uummarmiutun) (Lewis 2009).

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

collectively refer to the speech varieties used by these three distinct linguistic groups as Inuvialuktun.

Although Inuvialuit have been investing systematically[2] in language revitalization since the early 1980s (Osgood 1985a:viii; Kolausok 2003:205), daily use of the language remains weak. Based on the Canadian census of 2006, and Northwest Territories statistics for 2004-2007, Lois-Jacques Dorais reports that only 20% of Inuvialuit in the ISR claim Inuvialuktun as first language, with 24% reporting Inuvialuktun as their main language at home (2010:293). Out of the six Inuvialuit communities in the ISR, the geographically isolated and ethnically relatively homogenous communities of Tuktoyaktuk and Ulukhaktok each had 33% of residents reporting Inuvialuktun as home language, while the ethnically mixed communities of Inuvik and Aklavik had only 18 % of residents reporting Inuvialuktun as home language (Dorais 2010:293). In contrast, the two ethnically homogenous and geographically isolated communities of Paulatuk and Sachs Harbour reported no individuals with Inuvialuktun as home language (Dorais 2010:293). Based on the 2006 Aboriginal Children's Survey, Heather Tait et al. report that 38% of Inuvialuit children between the ages of 2 and 5 in the ISR were able to understand Inuvialuktun, while 16% were able to express their needs in the heritage language (Tait et al. 2010:7). Of all Inuvialuit children under the age of 6, only 13% were living in homes where Inuvialuktun was spoken to them most often (Tait et al. 2010:8). At the same time, 60% of Inuvilialuit parents thought it very important that their children speak and understand Inuvialuktun (Tait et al. 2010:11).

[2] For more information regarding language revitalization preceding COPE efforts, see:

1.1.1 Defining the problem and purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to ask what are contemporary Inuvialuit perceptions of Inuvialuktun and how do these perceptions relate to Inuvialuit identity? More specifically put, do Inuvialuit consider it necessary to maintain their heritage language in order to keep alive their ancestral identity in a social environment that has been permeated by the monolingual use of English in all spheres of public and private life? To obtain this insight, I am proposing to study three different age groups of Inuvialuit, attending three different educational institutions in the town of Inuvik. Relevant questions seem to be: what is the symbolic value of Inuvialuktun in relation to cultural identity? Does language re-acquisition solidify Inuvialuit identity? Do the role of heritage language and its acquisition fluctuate between generations or between life stages? What language attitudes and ideologies are present among Inuvialuit, and what do they tell us about potential obstacles and/or opportunities regarding language learner motivation? As evident in the last question, a more applied aim of this study is to shed light on the place of Inuvialuktun in the lives of current and potential learners in order to aid local Inuvialuit language planners, such as the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre, in identifying potential strategies for language learning motivation.

1.1.2 Contextualizing: necessity and importance of this study

The larger context of this study is the accelerating decline of minority languages through assimilative processes that has been popularized by linguists since the early 1990s (e.g., Robins and Uhlenbeck 1991; Brenzinger 1992; Krauss 1992; Crystal 2000; Nettle and Romaine 2000; Dalby 2003, Harrison 2007). In response to this loss of linguistic diversity, there have emerged in recent years many voices speaking on behalf of the protection and maintenance of minority languages. The rational for linguistic

advocacy has ranged from claims of loss in environmental, medical, philosophical, and artistic systems of knowledge, to the demise of unique human cognitive models (Hale 1998:193; Hinton and Hale 2001:4-5), and from the loss of diversity in the ways the world is seen (Nettle and Romaine 2000:66) to an increased threat to democracy at large, and minority rights in particular (Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2009:325). Many of these arguments for linguistic diversity share a common foundation in linguistic ecology (e.g., Maffi 2001; Harmon 2002; Romaine 2008), a model that compares human languages to ecological systems, and in which the loss of diversity is seen parallel to the consequences of homogenization in ecosystems. This view is not unchallenged today (e.g. Edwards 2009:232). If, however, we accept that each of the above listed attributes of minority languages are integral to the identity of their speakers, then we must ask whether it is possible to maintain a minority identity in the absence of an ancestral heritage language.

Many language specialists today agree that language and ethnoculture are inseparable entities, and that the loss of language invariably leads to a loss in traditional knowledge and epistemology – cornerstones of traditional indigenous identities. One of the best-known proponents for this inseparability of language and ethnoculture, or "rooted identity," is Joshua Fishman (1991: 4). While Fishman does not deny that even Diaspora societies can have sustained "ethnocultural label-maintenance and self-concept-maintenance," he argues that their ability to regulate cultural contact and cultural change begins to crumble in the absence of heritage languages (1991:17). While an increasing number of Inuit make a diasporic presence in urban centers of southern Canada, the Inuvialuit population of this study is at home in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, their ancestral territory. Is it possible, then, for Inuit cultural self-regulation to weaken in the face of ancestral language loss? In the case of Canadian Inuit, linguist Louis-Jacques

Dorais suggests that losing the heritage language is likely to lead to "individuals who would be nominal Inuit but whose thinking and behavior would be indistinguishable from those of Euro-Canadians" (Dorais 2010:272).

At the same time, the importance of non-linguistic factors in identity maintenance (e.g. specific foods, traditional practices, narratives, beliefs, etc.) has been reported for North American Indigenous populations (e.g., Dorais and Sammons 2002; Kwatchka 1992, 1999; Tulloch 1999; 2004; Nicholas 2010). Here the argument seems to be that much of an ethnoculture can be maintained through the keeping of traditional practices. Authors who point out the importance of non-linguistic factors, however recognize the importance of language, especially in regard to the maintenance and inter-generational transmission of narratives and beliefs (e.g. Nicholas 2010). Whether language is seen as the primary pillar of ethnocultural identity, or whether non-linguistic means are considered equally important, success or failure of revitalizing a dying language is dependent upon potential learners' attitudes toward their heritage language. To better understand the place of a heritage language in the lives of individuals, it is paramount to establish what are some of the existing ideologies that govern language attitudes.

1.1.3 Rational: applicability to Northwest Territories

In the Northwest Territories there exists a shared desire to protect and revitalize Aboriginal languages. This desire is paralleled by a nationwide, statistical observed, trend in indigenous individuals acquiring an Aboriginal language as second language, rather than as mother tongue (Norris 2007:20). Honorable Jackson Lafferty, Minister Responsible for Official Languages in the Northwest Territories, stresses the importance of protecting heritage languages within the territory because they are "the foundation of northern cultures" (from the introductory words to the *Northwest Territories Aboriginal*

Languages Plan) (ECE 2010:2). The language plan emphasizes that many scholars of language, identity, and cultural heritage from around the world echo the minister's concern in their research findings. It reiterates that many of these scholars see the loss of heritage languages as leading to the loss of 'worlds of knowledge,' because Indigenous ways of knowing are embedded in Aboriginal languages. The Government of Northwest Territories has consequently taken an ideological stand within the sociolinguistic debate mentioned above.

According to the Northwest Territories' *Official Languages Act of 2008-2009,* Inuvialuktun is an official language in need of revitalization. Strategic language planning, as engaged by the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre in Inuvik, represents a practical response to the voiced concern over language and heritage loss in the territory. However, reviving a heritage language is a grand task, calling for a need to network with language specialists on multiple levels. Research in New Zealand and North America has shown that successful language planning, and "effective promotion strategies to encourage [Aboriginal] language use," are reliant on in-depth knowledge of local language attitudes (King 2009:106). Such research shows that language planners benefit from a detailed knowledge of how potential learners view their own heritage language. It is precisely here that the rational of this proposed study is anchored.

1.2 Theoretical perspectives

1.2.1 Symbolic interactionism

My theoretical approach is guided by Herbert Blumer's (1969) qualitative paradigm of symbolic interactionism. For Blumer, a person develops meanings of things based on how other people view him or her in relation to the thing, but also as the result of internal communication with the self (Blumer 1969:4-5). Through the social act of

communication with the self, a person "selects, checks, suspends, regroups, and transforms" the meanings of things in relation to the circumstances she finds herself in (1969:5). This interpretation becomes "a formative process" in which meanings are flexible tools guiding individual action (Blumer 1969:5). With language as the object of study, a person's relationship to it grows from how the person perceives others to see her in view of that language, and from the personal process of interpretation of these perceived meanings. Using the terms of sociolinguists, we might speak of circulating language ideologies and/or perceived language attitudes that play upon the minds and actions of potential and current language learners. To better understand how these meanings, attitudes, and ideologies (which often are of hegemonic nature) come to act upon a person, I will employ Pierre Bourdieu's (1998) concepts of 'symbolic power' and 'symbolic violence.'

1.2.2 Symbolic power and violence

For Bourdieu, symbolic capital is "perceived through categories of perception that are the product of the embodiment of divisions or of oppositions" (Bourdieu 1998:47). These divisions can be imposed by a powerful entity on a less powerful individual, constituting an act of symbolic violence. In John B. Thompson's introductory elucidation of Bourdieu's concept, symbolic power is dependent upon "active complicity" by the oppressed (1991:23). The idea being, that "[d]ominated individuals are not passive bodies to which symbolic power is applied, as it were, like a scalpel to a corpse" (1991:23). Instead, it is absolutely necessary that the subjugated themselves are firm believers in the legitimacy of the powers that be. The reason why the oppressed accept symbolic power to work against them is summed up in what Bourdieu calls *mèconnaissance*

('misrecognition') of power, meaning that the disadvantaged interpret 'invisible power' exercised against them as something legitimized by a shared belief, rather than identifying it as being arbitrary and thus rejecting it (Thompson 1991:23; Bourdieu 1991:60). Symbolic violence, then, takes place when the dominated individual—in service to the oppressor—inflicts judgment upon self. Thus, we may say, symbolic violence is one way through which hegemony is perpetuated.

In other words then, symbolic power can function only where all people share a common belief in the legitimacy of the institutions that uphold the class order. To Bourdieu, "[o]ne only preaches to the converted" (1991:126). What he means is that, in order to derive personal fulfillment, external recognition, and justification of purpose from a role assigned to oneself by an accepted institutional framework, the framework itself must be embraced by all others, the "*consensus omnium,*" or else the assigned role is subject to laughter and belittlement (Bourdieu 1991:126). But Bourdieu's concept of symbolic power is perhaps most clearly illustrated in its ability to exert itself through invisible violence, which takes place in the mundane day-to-day activities of people. These acts are violent because they demand of the dominated party "an attitude which challenges the usual dichotomy of freedom and constraint" without being visible or audible to those who are not predisposed to submission (Bourdieu 1991:51). Consequently, it is not the dominating party that visibly or even consciously intimidates the dominated, but rather it is their mere presence that is interpreted as intimidating by the oppressed, resulting in self-censorship. "Thus, the modalities of practices, the ways of looking, sitting, standing, keeping silent, or even of speaking ('reproachful looks' or 'tones', 'disapproving glances' and so on) are full of injunctions that are powerful and hard

to resist precisely because they are silent and insidious, insistent and insinuating" (Bourdieu 1991:51).

As is evident in Caskey Russell's (2002) work cited in the literature view below, Bourdieu's conceptual framework of symbolic power lends itself very well to a critical analysis of the traumatic residential school experience of the parent and grandparent generations for whom symbolic violence was manifested to its maximum. But as becomes evident through the contemporary ethnographic examples (e.g. Wyman 2009; Lee 2009; Nicholas 2010, etc.) cited below, symbolic power as a concept is also quite applicable to the current situation of Aboriginal language learners who are bombarded by ideologies that are either condoning or condemning the sway of a dominant culture which is felt in every sphere of contemporary indigenous town life. Furthermore, many of the dynamics observable in the interplay between majority and minority cultures find counterparts in contemporary indigenous culture itself, particularly in the inter-generational context.

2.0 Literature review

2.1 Sociolinguistics as a field of study

In his introduction to "Society and Language Use," Jürgen Jaspers summarizes the history of the discipline of Sociolinguistics, following it to some of its more recent pursuits. In his view, what sets sociolinguistics apart from 'formal' linguistics is its essential concern with "the analysis of systematic linguistic variation," making it a primary tool in the study of society itself (Jaspers 2010:1). Although the study of society has flourished for decades, sociolinguistic inquiry became more prominent only in the 1960s and 70s as a departure from formal linguistics, thanks to such advocates as Labov, Fishman, Gumperz, Halliday, and Hymes. The various branches of this new field of study

shared at least three main spheres of interest: a) social deviation from standard language use, b) symbolic and indexical aspects of language, and c) intricate structure in non-'elite' language use. Some sociolinguists later added to this list an interest in linguistic hybridity and flexibility, especially as can be found at the margins of social boundaries.

Late modernity, as Jaspers puts it, (or postmodernism) has brought to social linguistics, among other things, discourse theory. This field of study shows how power relations are established through discourse in which participants decide who is granted voice, and who is not. Such decisions are guided by ideologies about what is and isn't appropriate language, granting some speakers more space than others, often based on differences in value attribution to language varieties. Here Jaspers points to a series of pertinent authors (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 2003; Blommaert 2005; Coupland 2010; Kroskrity 2010). Another newer tendency is to ethnographically observe "small-scale 'communities of practice'" in the "cosmopolitan or global city" (Jaspers 2010:13), observations that no longer are focused on identities as the product of mono-ethnic influence, but rather as the result of the influence of mixed forces. The global city is also an area in which diaspora and transnational experiences are seen to forge language behavior and formation of identities, being another aspect increasingly studied by sociolinguists. Jaspers refers to several authors here (Buchholz & Skapoulli 2009; Harris et al. 2002; Heller 2007; Keating & Solovova 2011). As well, the global flow of commodities and stylistic influences of various forms of media (e.g. contemporary musical styles and their accompanying lyrics) on local language and identity has been of interest to several authors (Alim et al. 2009; Buchholz 1999; Cutler 1999).

Post-structural thought also has challenged sociolinguists to re-think previously assumed general relevance of categories of identity. It has encouraged researchers to

examine how identities and relationships in society actively reinterpret shared heritage and its associated language uses (Buchholz & Hall 2004; Rampton 1995). Finally, today's sociolinguists like to frame their discipline's agenda as broadly as possible, making their field truly interdisciplinary. This can be seen in Blommaert's definition of the discipline's aims: "[human discourse comprises] all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural and historical patterns and developments of use" (Blommaert 2005:3 in Jaspers 2010:15-16).

2.2 Language in society

2.2.1 Language inequality

In a chapter on "Language dominance and minorization," Donna Patrick discusses ways in which language majority and minority groups maintain each other within larger structures such as the nation state. She shows how 'language dominance' is the outcome of a hierarchy that is established in the attribution of different values to languages and their varieties, as well as to those who speak them. Patrick points to other authors who have examined these language hierarchies in greater detail (e.g., Grillo 1989; Gal 1989; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994; Silverstein 1998). While the creation of social boundaries is foundational to the creation of value hierarchies, the boundaries themselves are not static, but flexible. Consequently, the construction of individual identity often encompasses multiple and contradictory allegiances to both minority and majority groups. One way in which this can occur is through the 'naturalization,' or universal acceptance, of a dominant language, which is accomplished through hegemonic ideological processes. The representation of a majority language as justifiably dominant, is often accompanied by the representation of minority languages as homogenous, structurally inferior, and belonging to the past.

These tendencies in the minorization of some languages and the naturalization of others are not new. In fact, the promotion of unification and standardization of a dominant language variety has been attributed, among others, to German and French romanticist thinkers, such as Herder (1744-1803) ("one nation, one culture, one language") (in Patrick 2010:179) and Abbé Grégoire (1750-1831) (universalization of French to socially transform linguistic minorities within the state) (Baumann & Briggs 2003; Gal 2006; Grillo 1989; Dorian 1998). To show what some of these "Western dominant-language ideologies" (Patrick 2010:179) are, Patrick lists five prominent ones: 1) the 'ideology of contempt,' which sees minority speakers and their language as "barbarous" (Grillo 1989:173-174); 2) the belief that some languages embody progress, lending themselves to modernity, while others do not (Dorian 1998:10); 3) that monolingualism is most efficient for the state, and that if minority languages are to persist, they must be modernized to the standards of the dominant language (Blommaert 1996:210-211); 4) that state integrity is dependent upon keeping accepted languages to a minimum (Blommaert 1996:210-211); and 5) that multilingualism is cognitively inhibitive to speakers (Dorian 1998:11-12).

While the minorization of smaller languages has been discriminatory in many ways, minority language maintenance has served minority groups in maintaining their cultural identities. However, the flexibility inherent in identity has often led to ambiguity in regard to membership and inter-group relations. Clearly, many indigenous and other minorities within nation states have larger issues to be concerned with, yet minorities have used language to attain greater social mobility, self-regulation of their communities, and more social equality within the nation state.

2.2.2 Language ideologies

Paul V. Kroskrity (2010) provides a good definition for 'language ideologies,' briefly summarizes its disciplinary history, and then provides four ways of looking at language ideologies. For Kroskrity, 'language ideologies' are "beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other groups, and nation states" (Kroskrity 2010:192). More simply put, language ideologies' attempt to rationalize the ways in which language is being used. However, in any given language situation, there usually exist many ideologies, each of which belongs to a particular context, and is drawn upon by the individual in relation to their social and cultural position. This perspective on language and behavior is relatively recent to linguistics and anthropology.

Michael Silverstein (1979) was, according to Kroskrity, among the first to popularize a focus on language ideologies in linguistics and anthropology. By drawing on Benjamin Lee Whorf's work, Silverstein pointed to the role of cultural ideology in justifying and directing the structure of language. Unlike Boasian anthropological linguistics, which favored an etic analysis of language behavior, this new field of study emphasizes the importance of local interpretations and perceptions of language as integral to our understanding of language in general, and language meaning in particular. For Silverstein, language meaning refers to the non-referential functions of language, and with it he opened the doors to an 'ethnography of communication,' a field concerned with the meaning that language attains in relation to "settings, topics, [and] institutions" (Kroskrity 2010:194). By the 1980s these developments were increasingly drawing attention to agency in individuals and groups, as well as to the dual importance of

Marxist materialism and Weberian idealism (e.g. Ortner 1984). Moreover, there have evolved several angles of looking at language ideology in this context.

Kroskrity describes four of these conceptual angles as hegemony, disjuncture, awareness, and mediation: Firstly, he offers the perspective of hegemony in which particular social or cultural groups benefit from a certain perception of language by others, and thus construct or support language ideologies. According Lippi-Green (1997) this can be observed in 'standard language ideology,' which is promoted by many nation states and usually represents the values of an upper middle class rather than those of its various citizens (Kroskrity 2010:196). Secondly, Kroskrity believes it is wise to speak of many language ideologies because individuals subscribe to membership in many social groups, acquiring a bouquet of contradictory ideologies. An example of this is the standardization of Indonesian (Errington 1998, 2000), which seeks to eliminate class structure and increase cultural neutrality, while in actuality it incorporates English words and terms originating from Old Javanese and Sanskrit. Thirdly, Kroskrity points to members' awareness, in that a social or cultural group is to differing degree conscious of language ideologies. This is evident in the concept of 'multisitedness' (Philips 2000), in which individuals tacitly produce ideology in one location (e.g. the home where 'bad language' is to be avoided), while in another location they are not only aware of the ideology, they analyze it too (e.g. in the court system, where behavioral norms are pinned down by law). And finally, he brings the notion of mediation, in which members of various social or cultural groups use language ideologies to bridge social structures and ways of speaking. This can be seen in Irvine and Gal's (2000) example of "how Western European linguists misinterpreted South African Khoisan clicks as degraded animal sounds rather than phonological units…" (Kroskrity 2010:200).

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

2.2.3 Language contact

Li Wei (2010) provides a summary of the causes of language contact, the bilingual acquisition patterns that result, as well as language hierarchy expressed in diglossia, and other consequences of language contact, such as pragmatic language choice theories for bi- and multilingual speakers. Wei asserts that any language contact is primarily a contact between speakers. This contact has a series of possible preceding causes. According to Baker & Prys Jones (1998), and Li Wei (2007), some causes of language contact are: 1) politics, as evidenced in colonization or annexation; 2) natural disaster, resulting in population displacement; 3) religion, motivating immigration to places of spiritual significance; 4) culture, as in the relearning of ancestral languages; 5) economy, evident in people following financial opportunities; 6) education, requiring a new language for access to knowledge; and 7) technology, which favors common terminology. In either case, prolonged language contact leads to bi- or multilingualism in individual speakers. Li Wei goes on to discuss various aspects of sociolinguistic interest in these bi-lingual language settings.

Depending on the socio-historical contact scenario of a given language situation, there have been reported at least six language acquisition patterns, all of which are based on variations of language behavior in the home and the community (for a detailed analysis of these scenarios, Li Wei points to Romaine 1995; Harding & Riley 1986). The functional hierarchy that emerges between different languages within communities is referred to as 'diglossia,' (e.g. Ferguson 1959), and often incorporates high and low language verities, which are used in different social contexts. Language contact can also result in code switching, eventually lead to language shift, or cause the creation of mixed languages. Language contact has been studied by multiple disciplines, beginning in the

1950s with a sociological perspective that stressed language contact's inseparability from a larger "socio-politico-economic process" (Li wei points to Weinreich 1953; Haugen 1966; Fishman 1966). More recently, cultural anthropology has emphasized an ecological perspective of contact that has called attention to "issues of linguistic hegemony, power, ideology, and identity" (Li Wei 2010:130). Combined, we can speak of a sociolinguistic perspective of language contact, which stresses the key linguistic processes of 'maintenance,' 'shift,' and 'creation' (for a detailed taxonomy, Li Wei points to Winford 2003:23-24). Language *maintenance* focuses on how speakers protect their ownership of language by screening incorporation of foreign terms and separating speech domains, while language *shift* looks to perceptions of "ethnolinguistic vitality" (Li Wei 2010:132), i.e. a speaker's perception of the overall feasibility or worthiness to maintain a language, leading to a choice for or against maintaining old linguistic practices. Language *creation* is primarily the field of Contact Linguistics, which focuses on "the structural constraints of lexical borrowing, diffusion, and codeswitching" (Li Wei 2010:133).

Language contact situations are also the context the study of language pragmatics, which emphasize speakers' choice of language in daily life. Two bilingual speakers are able to choose a language for communication, based on a series of possible motivations. Some of these motivations are known to sociolinguists as: 'domain theory' (Fishman 1965), in which the domain (i.e. context) prescribes language choice; 'metaphorical code switching' (Gumperz 1982), in which language is switched to make a communicative point; 'audience design' (Bell 1984), in which the addressee influences language choice in the speaker, regardless of domain; and 'Rational Choice' model (Myers-Scotton 1999), in which speakers choose the language that will afford them maximal benefit. The

multidisciplinary perspectives on language contact have been divided primarily into an emphasis on affects on linguistic structure and theories for language choice in speakers.

2.3 Language and identity

2.3.1 Individual and group identity

In his book "Language and Identity," John Edwards (2009) gives a brief overview of the rise to prominence of identity-related issues in the wider field of cultural and linguistic studies providing a brief summary of social and personal identity in relation to language use. He begins by pointing out that 'identity' began to be featured in social context only in the 1950s and 1960s, largely thanks to Erick Erickson (1968) who placed this 'individual' phenomenon into larger 'social' context. But linguistic aspects of identity came into focus only in the 1980s (Joseph 2004). This may seem ironic, since "[a]ny cursory historical awareness will reveal that times of transition, whether welcomed or imposed, are always times of renewed self-examination," (Edwards 2009:16) pointing to the mechanics at work in defining identities on multiple levels. Examining the differences between personal and social identity, Edwards observes that "[t]he essence of identity is similarity" (Edwards 2009:19), as is evident in its Latin root '*idem,*' referring to constancy in the personality of the individual (acting similarly throughout life), as well as constancy in the nature of the social group (expressed through shared history and tradition).

Edwards believes that because individual personality draws from all elements available to the individual in human society, we cannot draw a clear line between personality and social identity. At the same time, language can be viewed as an indicator of individual personality, especially in terms of a person's 'ideolect' (i.e. combinations of accent, dialect, stress, intonation, etc.)—But such observations are generally of little

significance to studies of society. Yet, a person's ideolect can aid us in understanding an individual's affiliations to larger social groups and identities. Although individual identities constitute group identities (and vice versa), greater attention in history has been given to the simplified and generalized stereotypes that are based on how specific groups are perceived. Countering some of the postmodern, or late-modern, tendencies among sociolinguists, Edwards points to Anthony Smith (1999), who shows that in spite of rising trans-nationalism and cosmopolitanism, national allegiances remain the most powerful and inclusive of all collective identities to date. Edwards shows how this has been related to the fact that modernity largely eliminated the safety that once was found in smaller identities (i.e. church, kinship, even family), leaving individuals without guidance in their construction of "a universe of meaning, or of purpose" (Berger and Neuhaus 1977:167), for which reason "'imagined' ethnonational communities" (Edwards 2009:23) are a natural response.

He goes on to illustrate how groupedness is constructed and maintained, namely by ways of emphasizing ethnonational boundaries more than ethnocultural content, and idea derived from Frederick Barth (1969). As can be seen in ethnonationalism, group consciousness is closely related to favoritism towards its members and negative generalization of those who do not belong. Such social affiliation, and the related actions that strengthen acceptance and belonging to particular groups are sustainable, because they raise the sense of personal worth in individuals. These observations seem to confirm, "social identity *is* self-interest" (Edwards 2009:27).

2.3.2 Language shift and ethnic identity

Joshua Fishman (1991) explains some of the ideological foundations for reversing language shift (RLS). He outlines the debate over whether 'one can be a true member of

one's cultural group without speaking its language' and discusses the ethnocultural agenda of RLS. Finally, he examines the lexical advantages of heritage languages, and looks at RLS as cultural critique. To begin with, Fishman asks, how is ethnic identity impacted by language loss? Because so many ethnic groups (e.g., Jews, Irishmen, Puerto Ricans in the US) have maintained their ethnic identities well past language shift, it is common to believe that it is possible to be, e.g., Jewish, all the while speaking German, rather than Yiddish, or Hebrew. This conviction necessarily leads to a lack of motivation for RLS. Yet, cultural leaders (e.g. Jewish rabbis) are critical of language shift, because it will inevitably loosen a person's connection to the "total ethnocultural pattern" (Fishman 1991:16) of the group, leaving behind a mere "ethno-cultural label-maintenance" (Fishman 1991:17), changing the way in which cultural self-regulation occurs. RLS, then, is an attempt to increase "cultural-self-regulation" (Fishman 1991:17).

Consequently, Fishman clearly establishes that RLS is inseparable from ethnocultural agenda. Most promoters of RLS are unhappy with the state of their minority culture, and want to revert it to something they believe is more in line with their ethnocultural heritage. The motivations for RLS are not efficiency, neither are they rational. Rather, they are irrational (like all cultural differences), but "'authentic,' 'unique,' 'themselves'" (Fishman 1991:20). This is possible only in conjunction with the heritage language that best able to communicate its traditional culture. At the same time, any ethnoculture changes over time, and competitive languages may begin to better reflect many of these changes. But, according to Fishman, the advantages of indigenous lexicality are not so much reflected in general "semantic felicity," as in their pertinence to the "particular brand and content" of a given culture (Fishman 1991:22). This is also evident in the symbolic link that exists between culture and language in the minds of

members and nonmembers. For members, language is often a pivotal element of identity, while in the case of a dying language it can also be symbolic of socio-historical disadvantages and irrelevance.

Finally, Fishman looks at RLS as a cultural self-critique. Proponents of RLS claim that often there exists a difference between ethnic identity and true ethnocultural continuity. Ethnocultural continuity ensures that the "*Gestalt* or 'feel'" (Fishman 1991:27) of what a culture 'ought to be' remain, while identity can amount to a label with content untrue to heritage. In this vane, 'ethnic identity' that has survived language shift cannot stand for the same ethnoculture it once represented. For this reason, proponents of RLS have two ethnocultural goals: 1) to search the past for direction useful in the future, and 2) to reinforce cultural boundaries to increase cultural continuity across generations.

2.3.3 Language and identity in Aboriginal North America

While the study of language in Aboriginal North America makes use of the same methods and angles as applied elsewhere by sociolinguists, Teresa McCarty and Ofelia Zepeda (2010) point out a number of specificities they and others have encountered primarily in the American Southwest and Alaska. Firstly, they emphasize how essential it is to recognize the ties between people and ancestral land, if one wishes to understand issues of language and identity in indigenous communities. For this reason, language revitalization efforts take this relationship serious in their attempt to overcome many of the consequences of colonialism. Further, McCarty and Zapeda show the importance of examining communicative repertoires, language attitudes, and ideologies in contemporary Native youth in order to gauge language shift and retention.

The study of bi- and multilingual tribal communities in North America is much concerned with communicative repertoires, heteroglossia, and translanguaging. McCarty

and Zapeda define 'communicative repertoires' as "the complex ways in which people draw on the language and literacy resources available to them as they take on different identities in different domains of their lives" (McCarty and Zapeda 2010:327, based on Martin-Jones & Jones' (2000:2). For 'heteroglossia' they refer to García's version of Bahktin's definition (e.g. San Diego Bakhtin Circle 2000:19), in which, "language practices are multiple and ever adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain" (García 2009:53) of varying language domains. Close to Bahktin's concept stands the concept of 'translanguaging,' which points out that "'languages are not compartmentalized in a diglossic situation, but rather they overlap, intersect, and interconnect' in a fusion of languages, dialects, and semiotic systems, all of which are part of an individual's and a group's communicative repertoire" (García et al. 2007:10-12). For indigenous youth, not only the linguistic repertoires of the ancestral language and dialects are complex, but also their English repertoires are complex, representing several varieties used at home, in the community, and at school (329).

Another area of sociolinguistic study in North American indigenous communities is that of language attitudes and ideologies. Language attitudes are generally both positive and negative towards ancestral languages and English, and language ideologies are also mixed. English is primarily viewed as the language of survival, of practicality, of social class and prestige, but also as a symbol of conquest and forced assimilation.

Heritage language is perceived sentimentally, as a prime pillar of ethnic identity, as in need of protection, but also as a cause of linguistic shame. On the one hand, this is shame for the language's perceived 'backwardness' when faced by mainstream values. On the other hand, it is shame experienced as a result of individual non-fluency in the language and the inability to satisfy community expectations. Mixed and disjunctive ideologies

inform learners' linguistic attitudes and can lead youth to think they have to make an either/or decision about language practice.

2.4 The effects of residential schooling on Aboriginal languages

2.3.1 Witness accounts

Many scholars have devoted whole books to historical analysis of the residential school era in recent years (e.g. Furniss 1995; Haig-Brown 1998; Miller 1996; Milloy 1999, etc.). In his detailed history of Native residential schools, J.R. Miller (1996) devotes only a few pages to the issue of Aboriginal languages, as do most other scholars. In these pages, he points out that the discouragement of Native languages continues to be remembered as one of the most prominent ways in which cultural assimilation was pressed upon students. Miller takes care, however, to differentiate between government and missionary views of Native languages, drawing on evidence that shows how many missionaries "opposed a total ban on the use of Inuktitut or Indian languages" (Miller 1996:200). He also shows how missionaries were generally supportive of Aboriginal languages, and that it was government policy that pressured them to use an English-only curriculum. A common missionary response was to assign "different languages for different times" (Miller 1996:201). However, even where English-only was to be the policy, it was often not the reality, because: a) principles understood the validity of Native languages, b) often students knew hardly any English at all, and c) many principles simply disagreed with the government's policy. Evidence shows that at some schools students were whipped for speaking their language, while at other schools there were hopes to one day teach the Native language at least from grade five to grade six. Miller also provides examples of cases in which English (or French) was learned more swiftly because it aided students of different linguistic backgrounds to communicate with

each other. Although there are some former residential school students who believe that their experience caused them no harm, the majority of individuals experienced intense cultural alienation through the application of the language policy. Consequently, the treatment of Indian and Inuit children and their use of indigenous languages differed between schools and principles, according to Miller. Focusing on Alaska, and perhaps less forgiving of missionaries, and with more emphasis on negative cases, the following author shows how violence, and perpetual threat, were systematic tools of cultural oppression in the residential school system.

Caskey Russell (2002) discusses various aspects of the relationship between language revitalization and the boarding school experience in the United States, specifically for Tlingit of Alaska. He opens his article by drawing a connection between language, worldview, and spiritual wellness. Because a culture's language is able to comprehend fine tuned aspects of a unique worldview, there likely exists a connection between the "spiritual malaise" of some Aboriginal communities (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer) and language loss. To illustrate this point, Russell points to the various languages that were spoken by adherents to Christianity throughout the ages of church history and how each of them shaped the perception of this world religion. He then moves on to residential schooling as an example of deliberate symbolic violence, which presently is covered up by the dominant culture through 'cognitive dissonance,' an act in which past and present colonizers "whitewash […] past actions" (Russell 2002:98). For Russell, the two primary tools used in the United States to systematically assimilate Indians were religion and education. Both systems were rooted in the fear of applied violence, a violence that was not theoretical, but directly applied through "deliberate separation" of children from their parents and “ritualized shame” as punishment for

conversation in the mother tongue (Russell 2002:99-100). Russell points out that, within an oppressive system, potential violence is sufficient for "… people [to] punish themselves … through a deep sense of shame" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1982 in Russell 2002:100). Shame is rationalized by new ideologies. Schools are a means by which "norms and ideology" are "confirm[ed]" and "inculcate[d]" so far that the student cannot retrace the origin of these values by which she now judges herself (Russell 2002:101). One consequence of such 'mis-education' is that "Indian children have internalized failure..." to the extent that, sometimes "success is equated with being non-Indian." (Russell 2002:101). Paralleling the Inuvialuit experience (see King 1999), Russell shows how for Tlingit "[t]he truly insidious aspect of structural violence is that the promise of Indian education was itself a lie" (Russell 2002:101). This is hardly surprising, given the fact that some school principles possessed little to now knowledge of Aboriginal languages and consequently misjudged these languages as incapable of expressing complex thought[3]. For Russell, bilingualism in the United States is an issue that has less to do with language and more to do with power-relations. For this reason the survival of a language is directly tied to institutional power structures, and the revival of a language largely dependent upon the support of these structures. Looking to the situation among Inuit, the following author shows of how little support these structures were indeed.

2.4.2 An archival perspective

David P. King's (1999) MA thesis is the first historical research focusing specifically on the residential school experience of Inuit. While it does not focus on language per se, it goes into some detail regarding the impact of residential schools on language. The work is based on documents from government and church archives,

[3] Steckley 2008, p. 72 describes a similar example of colonial ignorance regarding expressive depth of Aboriginal languages, focusing on Inuktitut.

concluding that both missionary and state approaches were the result of double standards and ethnocentrism evident in recordings of meetings and other crucial communication on matters of education. Until 1945 education in the north had been neglected by the state and thus lay in the hands of missionaries who generally did not teach applicable life skills. When the federal government took control of education in 1958 a secular approach was taken and curricula from Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario were implemented across the Arctic, perpetuating pedagogical and epistemological discord. Deliberate isolation from Inuit culture and social structure was implemented to prepare students for the coming "new north" which would be dominated by white society (King 1999:15). Four major residential schools were built: Chesterfield Inlet (1955), Yellowknife (1958), Inuvik (1959), and Churchill (1964). Each of the hostels at these schools continued to be run by the Anglican or Catholic churches. In 1970 control went to the territory, but major changes in curricula did not occur. By the 1980s it was public knowledge that a generation of Inuit had been ill prepared for life in either Inuit or southern systems. The schools' effect on Inuktitut was hazardous too, and church and government had been well aware of this fact. Although no language policy existed, Inuktitut was seen as a primitive language unfit for the 'new north.' Northern Affairs had decided against the inclusion of Inuktitut in the syllabus and the language was relegated to short extracurricular lessons. The extent of this neglect becomes most apparent in the extensive measures Inuit activists have to take to bring healing to the victims of this system.

2.4.3 Inuit activism

"Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada" (2007) summarize the residential school trauma for Inuit and lay out the 'Journey Forward,' a series of strategic steps to be taken toward individual and collective recovery from residential school trauma. Language

recovery is listed as a priority in recovery. The text is directed toward survivors, relatives, and those involved in assisting three generations of Inuit children who were separated from their families to attended residential school (those who "went away") (Pauktuutit2007:8). Although residential schools came later for Inuit than for First Nations (1860 in NWT), by 1963, 3,997 Inuit children were attending residential school. Among the motivations listed for parents to allow children to be taken away are fear of family allowance loss, or that children would forcefully be removed. Both had occurred. While many Inuit parents believed education was important, they were often unaware of the abuse that took place. Today 3000 former students survive, many of who live with a perpetual fear of punishment for being Inuit. In some cases this has led to a breakdown in the use of Inuktitut with children. Parents of former students experience great anger and guilt, while many former students feel "they let their family down by being away" (Pauktuutit 2007:11). The 'Journey Forward' attempts to "increase awareness of the negative effects of residential schools for Inuit," point out "access to Inuit-led healing programs," and "restore what was taken away from our families and communities" (Pauktuutit 2007:18-19). It is reported that language loss breaks down communication with elders who carry traditional knowledge. Strengthening language and culture, on the other hand, reduces "non-Inuit policies and structures," while having a "healing effect on school survivors" (Pauktuutit 2007:26). While healing and empowerment through language revitalization are laudable goals, there exist both advantages and challenges in second language acquisition, which often are unique to indigenous communities. As the following study showcases, one of the advantages, in cases where individuals were exposed to an ancestral language at a younger age, is the increased capacity to achieve native-like pronunciation during re/acquisition.

2.5 Heritage language as second language

2.5.1 Psycholinguistics and forgotten languages

In recent years, more research has been conducted on language memory in individuals who were exposed to a heritage language during childhood (e.g. Bowers et al. 2009; Oh, Janet S. et al. 2010; Kit-fong Au et al. 2007; Ventureyra et al. 2004, etc.). Jeffrey S. Bowers, Sven L. Mattys, and Suzanne H. Gage (2009) summarize an experiment conducted to assess whether or not language exposure during childhood can benefit the relearning of a language in adult years, even if the individual has "forgotten" it since (Bowers et al. 2009:1064). Because exposure to language in early life is cardinal for a speaker to develop "native-like competence" (Bowers et al. 2009:1064), implicit memory retained from childhood would give an adult re-learner advantage (especially in pronunciation) over adult new-learners. The participants for this study were all English mother-tongue speakers who had learned either Hindi or Zulu as a second language during childhood. In a pre-test, monolingual English speakers and participants with a language background were asked to match narrated Hindi and Zulu words to English words on paper. Both groups scored similarly, showing the extent to which the participants with language background had undergone language loss. After only 30 similar matching sessions, "2 individuals under the age of 40 with a Zulu background ... and the 1 individual under the age of 40 with a Hindi background […], showed dramatic and selective improvement for the [unique sound] contrasts in their respective "forgotten" language" (Bowers et al. 2009:1066). Although an early life language can be entirely forgotten, "the current findings provide clear evidence of preserved implicit knowledge of a forgotten language" (Bowers et al. 2009:1066). The data also suggests that individuals who have been isolated from the forgotten language for more that 40 years

have no retention of it, this however will need further research to be confirmed. The authors conclude that even minimal exposure to a language and its unique sounds throughout life can help guard against language loss. In the case of residential school survivors who are now attempting to relearn the language of their childhood, these findings are very encouraging. However, as we see in the following analysis, not all research approaches among linguists and educators lend themselves to a Native American language revitalization context in which the heritage language becomes a second language.

2.5.2 The Ancestral Language Acquisition approach

Recent studies in SLA (Second Language Acquisition), language identity, and learner motivation have focused on non-indigenous contexts (e.g. Dörnyei 2010; Ushioda 2010; Kim 2010, Spolsky 2010), as well as indigenous contexts (e.g. Duff & Li 2009; Hornberger 1998, Hornberger 2006). Frederick White (2006) examines whether models developed around SLA are effective for the study of heritage language revitalization. He points out that much of the work in Native American language revitalization has been conducted from an SLA perspective, although SLA has its roots in the study of immigrants' or foreigners' acquisition of English as second language. To illustrate the inapplicability of many SLA concepts to ancestral language acquisition, White applies several of these concepts to a Native American linguistic context. He points out that the idea of a dominant national language (*target language*) is not applicable to Native learners because they are not foreigners and the language they learn is a minority language. Unfamiliarity with the new locality (*social distance*) does not apply to indigenous populations, because they have been here longer than anyone else. Linguistic ghettos (or *social distance*), that might prevent a learner from exposure to the target

language, do not apply to Native learners because even on most reserves the first language is English. The idea that the status of a dominant language positively affects the status of the learner (*social dominance*) falls short in indigenous context, because Native languages are largely considered subordinate. In terms of motivation, a learner's desire to be accepted within an ethnolinguistic group (*integrative motivation*) may exist in the form that she seeks deeper familiarity with her cultural heritage. But the desire to benefit (e.g. economically) from knowledge of the language (*instrumental motivation*) is more unlikely, since English is generally considered the language of utility. Having illustrated shortcomings of SLA in contemporary indigenous language revitalization, White turns to the tribal histories of the Haida of Haida Gwaii (British Columbia, Canada) and New Mexico Tewa (Southwest United States), using Schumann's (1986) acculturation model in SLA to examine the divergent attitudes of the two tribes toward forced acquisition of a dominant target language. However, even here White shows the SLA concepts fall short because they do not account for forced acquisition or active resistance (as in the case of Tewa toward Spanish). White concludes that a new model is needed (ALA, or Ancestral Language Acquisition), which would be able to focus on the specificities of indigenous language acquisition and revitalization, especially within the context of bilingual education in the school system. One such study, which emphasizes the agency of indigenous youth learners as de facto language policy makers, comes from the American Southwest:

2.5.3 Ideologies, motivations, attitudes, agency

Teresa L. McCarty, Mary Eunice, Larisa Warhol, and Ofelia Zepeda (2009) report on a long-term ethnographic study, conducted across seven schools, each of which had significant Native American enrollment. In this study, the researchers were looking to

examine “the impact of Native language shift and retention on American Indian children’s language learning, identity formation, and school performance” (McCarty et al. 2009:292-293). Based on their data, the authors argue that youth’s language behavior is a form of language policy making, taking into account the presence of unequal power relations. McCarty et al. derive this idea from Parsons-Yazzie (1996/1997), who argues that children can be the agents in setting language policy in the home[4]. They also refer to Harrison (2008), who has shown how youth often act "as tiny social barometers [who are] acutely sensitive to the disfavored status of their elders' language..." (Harrison 2007:8 in McCarty et al. 2009:292). In their data, McCarty et al. not only found that there exists a 'continuum' of Aboriginal language proficiency in bilingual Navajo students in some settings, but that there also exist different varieties of English use, as well as forms of translanguaging[5], depending on social context. Within these complicated linguistic ecologies, the authors identify "Indigenous-language insecurity and shame" (McCarty et al. 2009:300) as relating to a fear of ridicule in the presence of elders and peers, much along the lines of other authors cited in this review. However, McCarty et al. also report shame for Aboriginal language use itself, especially in contexts where the status of English is socially ranked higher than that of Aboriginal languages. Shame, based on feelings of inequality, can cause students to conceal the desire to speak or learn a heritage language. In spite of differing forms of shame, there persists a "symbolic link between the Indigenous language and a unique Indigenous identity" (McCarty et al. 2009:302),

[4] My three-year-old son is an example of implicit language policy made at home. While I attempt to speak to him in German only, he recently told me de facto: “Mommy and I speak English.”

[5] To “make meaning, transmit information, and perform identities using the linguistic signs at [the speaker’s] disposal to connect with her audience” (Creese and Blackledge 2010:109)

which leads to disjunctures between existing language ideologies within communities[6]. It is amidst these ideological disjunctures, heteroglossy, hybrid repertoires, and conflicting ideologies that "implicit language policies" manifest themselves (McCarty et al. 2009:302). The authors refer to Hornberger (2006) who suggests that such linguistic ecologies may provide unprecedented "ideological and implementational spaces" (Hornberger 2006 in McCarty et al. 2009:302) that can be used toward the revitalization of Aboriginal languages. Based on Lee (2007), the authors agree that it is necessary to "strategically reposition peer pressure from negative to a positive force" in attempting to create avenues where language can "engage issues of relevance in their everyday lives..." (McCarty et al. 2009:303). How this can be accomplished is seen in the work of Sami rapper Amoc as is illustrated below in Ridanpää and Pasanen (2009). An example of how agency of young language planners is interwoven with activities, time, and space is given in the following study:

Leisy Wyman reports on a longitudinal study of language shift among youth, conducted between 1992 and 2001 in a "Yup'ik village of 600 residents in southwest Alaska" (Wyman 2009:335). Wyman was able to witness the transition between students who were considered the last "real speakers" (Wyman 2009:338) and their younger siblings who assumed English as dominant or sole language of communication. Among Yup'ik language had traditionally been considered part of larger subsistence and land claims, which served as primary markers of identity. Consequently, "adult responses to changing youth practices fed vicious cycles of increasing doubts about reduced resources for bilingualism" (Wyman 2009:336). The author shows how Yup'ik language resources are still formed across varying activities, over time, and in different locations (i.e. in- and

[6] For a current ethnographic exploration of above-mentioned ideological disjuncture in the Yukon Territory, see Meek 2010.

out of school), emphasizing how the educational system continues to influence language retention and loss. After the community's bilingual school program was deemed ineffective in the 1980s, English became the main language of instruction. From then on children began using primarily English after school, shaping the local youth culture. Surrounding communities had been affected similarly, and inter-community mobility of students did not provide better language resources.

Youth were aware of community expectations regarding Yup'ik fluency, an expectation that was accompanied by a growing language ideology that positioned Yup'ik as a marker of ethnic identity, traditional values, and socialization with elders. Although the secondary student population of the village was divided into fluent-, minimal-, and non-speakers by 2001, even speakers who claimed to have 'forgotten' their language were still using Yup'ik terms and simplified Yup'ik demonstratives in English, when referring to the seal hunt. According to the author, such language behavior "counter[s] the common assumption that youth who speak dominant languages in endangered language communities orient away from local practices, physical spaces, and/or marginalized identities" (Wyman 2009:343). Even in younger and less secure generations of Yup'ik speakers, single terms are used as a form of tokenism connecting the speaker to the community and to higher status among peers. These findings leave the reader wondering what will happen when even this Yup'ik tokenism will no longer be part of Yup'ik English speaker's narratives. Will they seize to feel themselves as Yup'ik? The following study provides us with an answer to this question, coming from Hopi youth.

2.6 Language revitalization and indigenous identities

2.6.1 'Lived' versus 'spoken' identity

The study of language and identity, especially in indigenous context, has been a busy field in recent scholarship around the world (e.g., Huss & Lindgren 2010; May 2010; McCarthy 2010; Nicholas 2010; Schiffman 2010). Sheila Nicholas (2010) reports on her research looking into "language shift among Hopi people and, more specifically, the role of the heritage language in the contemporary lives of Hopi youth" (Nicholas 2010:127). The author observes diminishing use and function of the Hopi language as the direct result of modernity (especially the educational system), leading to the question of whether a contemporary Hopi identity can be lived without proficiency in the heritage language. Through a selection of quotes from research participants, Nicholas gives voice to two contradictory, but not mutually exclusive, perspectives. On the one hand she stresses that not only is it a prerequisite to be fluent in the Hopi language to engage in tribal politics, the very cultural knowledge of Hopi is encoded in the language and cannot be transmitted without it. For this reason, young adults find it difficult to teach their children about their cultural heritage in English. Language is also at the heart of Hopi personality and thus, a viable future for the Hopi way of life depends on bilingualism and biculturalism. On the other hand, the author asserts, "there are many ways that one can experience culture, language only being one of them" (Nicholas 2010:142). "I live Hopi, I just don't speak it" is a common quote throughout the article (Nicholas 2010:137). Thus, being Hopi does not require knowledge of the language, because one is Hopi by birthright, and because "thinking, feeling, and acting" Hopi are all based on the ancestral work ethic of "corn as a way of life," which is the foundation of a shared Hopi identity (Nicholas 2010:138, 139). In conclusion, Nicholas finds that the continual importance of

traditional practices, such as engaging in oral tradition, encourages youths to relearn their heritage language, thereby forming an integral part of their identities. While the survival of traditional practices may encourage language revival, there also exist conflicting language ideologies among young re/learners, as the following study reveals.

2.6.2 Disjunctive language ideologies

Tiffany S. Lee (2009) reports on data collected during two studies in the American Southwest, inquiring into the role of heritage language in the lives of Navajo and Pueblo teenagers and college students. In her data she identified themes of respect, shame, marginalization, identity, and agency in relation to heritage language. Her research problem was based on two main questions. Firstly, why did parents, who had been raised in a k-12 Navajo emersion curriculum, choose to raise their own children in English? And secondly, what influenced language choice at home, at school, and in the community? Her research found that a sense of Aboriginal identity, as well as language choice, among youth is influenced by two opposing understandings: a) Aboriginal language retention is paramount to Aboriginal identity, which is called for by the community, and 2) English is essential to larger economic and societal expectations. Lee connects the second point to an agenda of national identity: the state promotes English as a *modern* language and Native languages as *traditional* or reminiscent of the past. This ideology speaks directly to Native youth's ideas about the *relevancy* of their heritage language[7]. Under the theme of respect, Lee found that all participants respected their heritage language—often in relation to an understanding of a shared heritage that is to be

[7] For an excellent commentary on the division of society, in 17th century Europe, into "rural (or aboriginal), lower class, ignorant, old-fashioned, indigenous - in a word, *provincial* - versus urban, elite, learned, cosmopolitan, that is to say, *modern*" class based on language and language use, see Bauman & Briggs 2003:3.

understood in its depth only through the language, as well as out of respect for their elders who spoke the language exclusively.

In terms of shame, the data suggested that language was not a cause, but that shame or embarrassment was felt toward the self for not being able to speak the language. As a result, youths would not participate in community activities that strengthen speaking skills for fear of embarrassment in front of elders. Reversely, the strength of Native identity was found to stand in relation to a speaker's fluency. In terms of marginalization, participants in this study confirmed the Crawford's (1996) hypothesis, stating that "modernity, economic development, and social integration" are stronger causes for language shift than "repressive language policies of schools," because they come from within the community (Lee 2009:316). Participants expressed agency once they had realized the communal denial of language shift, and saw that they were able to influence their families to work against it. Especially when judged for not being fluent in the language, this agency allowed participants to see themselves as good Navajos even if they did not speak the language, because one does not have to be ashamed of learning it and moving one's community toward the same goal. While this notion resembles Nicholas' findings of Hopi identity (above), it is clear that modernization will increasingly push for and inform indigenous identities.

2.6.3 Agency and stereotype deconstruction

Juha Ridanpää and Annika Pasanen (2009) offer a look at how the deconstruction of ethnic stereotypes can contribute to a more dynamic sense of identity. Language revitalization plays a significant role in this effort. Their case study focuses on Inari-Sámi Mikkal Morottaja, son of the Inari-Sámi language activist Matti Morottaja. Mikkal, known as 'Amoc,' is the first rapper to sing in Inari-Sámi. According to the artist, the use

of his language in music is important because it represents the fight for survival and self-preservation. Part of this agenda is to strengthen the pride of young Sámi to "feel proud of their language and culture" (Ridanpää and Pasanen 2009:214). Part of this effort is predicated on the development of new words to express non-traditional 'gangsta'-style lyrics that find their cultural origin in urban North America. By 2005, Mikkal's popularity among young Sámi listeners was accompanied by a growing desire to learn Inari-Sámi, and by a strengthened pride in the community. The authors conclude that pride increased as the result of artistic transcendence of stereotypes of backwardness that exist for Sámi culture among non-indigenous Finns and among Sámi. The authors assert the importance of deconstructing stereotypes, while simultaneously exploiting them in order to reaffirm an identity. By self-consciously appropriating elements of the majority culture without succumbing to their hegemonic sway, the artist does not "'demand' justification for the old tradition through his music, nor does he try to bring the marginalized and partly destroyed heritage back, but rather he is striving to sustain the culture and language through the practice of modern urban culture" (Ridanpää and Pasanen 2009:225-226). In result, Sámi culture and language emerges twice strengthened.

2.7 Language shift and revitalization of Inuvialuktun

2.7.1 General historical background

Prior to the widespread acquisition of English, Inuvialuit used the *Hershel Island Trade Jargon* to trade with international whaling crews[8] (Button 2008:117; Kolausok

[8] Beginning in the 1890s, a series of whaling ships from San Francisco arrived at Hershel Island (Yukon Territory), where whalers would winter in a shantytown that had grown to house a thousand residents by 1894, and from where trade with Inuvialuit was engaged in (Morrison 2003:80-81). By 1906, the 10-20 ships that had arrived annually disappeared, based on a decrease in the price for whale products. However,

2003:204). This trade jargon was "[a] pidgin based on the Iñupiaq and Siglitun Inuktun dialects," for which there exist "data from about 1870 until about 1920" (van der Voort 1996:1083)[9]. Up until 1920 there had been few Inuvialuit with a command of the English language, and the presence of whalers, fur traders, and missionaries had little impact on the vitality of Inuvialuktun (Kolausok 2003:204-205). However, with the rise of significantly larger Inuvialuit business ventures in the early 1940s, the ability to speak English became an asset along with other skills attained through the presence of southerners (King 1999:52).

The relatively early competence of English gave Inuvialuit an edge over federal attempts at regulating Delta affairs, particularly because Inuvialuit were aware of what was going on outside of their region, thanks to understanding English-speaking radio (King 1999:53). In this way, it would seem that knowledge of English as second language served Inuvialuit to their social and political advantage vis-à-vis other northern indigenous populations. However, Inuvialuit were interested in promoting English as second language on their own terms, which differed significantly from the federal coarse of action. Government surveys from the 1950s show that Inuvialuit were in favor of an education system that would further enhance the success of their already blossoming business ventures (King 1999:51). In this context Inuvialuit saw fluency in English as important, and sought an education system that would strengthen Inuvialuit culture and values, for which purpose it was considered essential that children stay with their parents, especially in the winter months when much of the cultural transmission took place (King

---

epidemics had already been introduced, which peaked in 1910 and killed some 97% of coastal (Siglit) Inuvialuit (Krech 1979:113).

[9] Canadian ethnologist Vilhjalmur Stefánsson gives a first-hand account of the jargon in an article published in the American Anthropologist in 1909 (see Stefánsson 1909).

1999:54). As we know from history, this did not occur.

Following the Second Word War, the language situation began to change more dramatically, primarily as a result of implementing English as sole instructional language in residential schools after they had been taken over by the federal government (Patrick & Shearwood 1999:251). The view that English, rather than Inuktitut or French, was the most appropriate choice for an instructional language in Inuit education is voiced by several reports of that time (e.g. Wright 1946; Moore 1947; Lamberton 1948), and is mentioned as late as 1964 (Patrick & Shearwood 1999:251). Although exact statistics reflecting the impact of this path of action seem to be lacking, it has been reported that by the 1950s, competency in the use of Inuvialuktun was lost by a whole generation of children as the result of assimilative pressures put on students in these schools (Kolausok 2003:205). Clearly the traumatic experiences brought upon Inuvialuit children and their families during the residential school era had little in common with previous Inuvialuit suggestions for a better education system in the Delta region.

2.7.2 The Inuvialuktun Language Commission

In the 1970s the Inuvialuit Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement (COPE) began negotiations with the government of Canada over a Western Arctic Land Claim. When the claim was ratified in 1984 as the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA), it created the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR). The IFA summarizes three underlying principles that were of utmost concern to Inuvialuit throughout the land claims process. The first of these principles is "to preserve Inuvialuit cultural identity and values within a changing northern society" (IFA 1987:5). It was largely in response to this urgent concern that COPE founded the Inuvialuktun Language Commission in 1981, which consisted of a committee of fluent Inuvialuktun speakers chosen by members of the three variants of

Inuvialuktun (Osgood 1985a:viii; Kolausok 2003:205).

The Inuvialuktun Language Commission called into life the Inuvialuktun Language Program, an initiative that sought to address the very concerns set forth in the IFA regarding the rapid loss of Inuvialuit language and cultural heritage. However, according to Lawrence Osgood, coordinator of the COPE Inuvialuktun Language Project in 1985, language revitalization activities initiated by the project were at first perceived by Inuvialuit to be coming "from above" and consequently were met with opposition and skepticism during the first years (Osgood 1985b:ix). Over time however, Inuvialuit were increasingly in support of the project's activities, and financial assistance from the Government of Northwest Territories allowed for much needed linguistic research, curriculum development, community summer language camps, and a host of other specialized training courses under the committee's supervision (Osgood 1985b:ix-x). All of these activities were founded on a 'four-phase program,' which included the recoding, analysis, and description of Inuvialuktun dialects, the development of teaching materials and language instructors, the implementation of Inuvialuktun in the school system, and the promotion and oversight of Inuvialuktun into the future (Osgood 1983:xi).

2.7.3 The Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre

The department of Education, Culture and Employment (ECE) of the Government of Northwest Territories (GNWT) maintains a Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC) Program across all NWT communities. The learning centers that are supported by this program are responsible for implementing the department's mandate of teaching and promoting regional Aboriginal languages and culture through the production of educational materials and continuous support of teachers employed by the schools (cf. CEC 2005:34; ECE 2010:53). The Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre (ICRC) represents

one of CEC's Teaching and Learning Centers in service of Inuvialuit culture and language and is supervised by the Beaufort Delta Education Council (BDEC). Although not directly funded through Inuvialuit resources, the center is operated by the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation and receives the majority of its annual funding from federal and territorial sources—primarily out of Aboriginal languages funding. While the ICRC is being supervised by the BDEC, its work is carried out in fulfillment of the mandate set forth by the Inuvialuit Social Development Program, established under Section 17 of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA 1987:70) (C. Cockney to A. Oehler, personal communication, May 17, 2011).

3.0 Methods:

3.1 Ethical considerations

Individual perceptions of identity and language attitudes are very personal concepts that are not easily given adequate voice through statistical surveys. For this reason I am using a qualitative approach focusing on the stories of people and their personal ideas regarding these issues. Clearly, such research requires utmost respect on behalf of the researcher towards all individuals participating in such a knowledge-generating relationship. In my perspective, research is a relationship in which researcher and participant are equal knowledge seekers. Conducting research together is a mutually enriching experience for all involved. In my work I will attempt to follow closely the ethical codes of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC 2010), of the Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies (ACUNS 2003), and of the American Anthropological Association (AAA 2009). But beyond these general guidelines for researchers working in indigenous communities, I

specifically look to the direction given by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute (ITK/NRI 2007).

In designing this research project I have called upon community input from the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre (ICRC), which has already led to re-defining some of the project's objectives (compare first research proposal). While I was initially focusing only on issues regarding language and identity, talking to the staff of the ICRC helped make the study more applicable to language planners of Inuvialuktun by focusing on language attitudes and language learning motivation. This is a new focus that I have the ICRC to thank for. Throughout the remaining period of designing this study, I will rely on further guidance and creative input from ICRC staff to ensure that questions vital to their work will flow into the design. For this purpose I will seek to discuss all questionnaires and interview schedules with Cathy Cockney at the ICRC, remaining open to further changes in the study design. After all, this study seeks to serve Inuvialuit beneficiaries pursuing to learn their own heritage language.

In my fieldwork, which I hope will commence in May of 2011, I will seek creative participation of informants. I do not see my research partners as passive informants or research subjects, but rather as reflexive, knowledge-seeking individuals who possess the agency to derive equal benefit from this project. Because of the relatively small number of interviews and focus groups planned for this study, I hope to be able to familiarize research partners with the concepts of language attitudes and language ideologies, inspiring them to reflect on their own language behavior. Through interviews and focus groups students of Inuvialuktun will explore their own views on language and the role languages and language ideologies take in their lives. As a student of other languages, and most recently having become a learner of Uummarmiutun myself,

this exploration of language and identity is a mutual experience that I seek to share with my research partners.

For data analysis and interpretation, the community will participate in an advising role. I will seek to share all gathered data (both raw and interpreted) with the staff of the ICRC and discuss differences in data interpretation, if they arise. I will make every effort to invite alternative interpretations and analyses of gathered material, and give voice in my final manuscript to counter narratives and/or views of the community that may differ from my own. Sole reason for which the community does not take the role of research manager is that I would like to retain the privilege, as researcher, to give voice to alternative interpretations in the case that such might arise. In all cases, however, I am committed to making every effort to treat all data as non-partisan as possible, to present the community in as good a light as I can, and to give ample room to community voices in their own right.

My communication strategy regarding the research project and its findings aims to include five specific methods recommended by ITK/NRI: 1) presentations in the community and at the schools involved in the study, 2) an informational website containing downloadable documentation regarding the research project, 3) copies of transcripts, audio and video (where applicable) CDs upon request by participants and with the written consent of the respective interviewee, 4) hardcopies of final thesis at all institutions involved, and 5) brochures summarizing the project and its findings, made available at all institutions involved. Besides communication to the community involved, I will also adhere to academic expectations and pursue publication of the project's findings, making due reference to participants where applicable and/or indicated as desired on the project's consent form(s).

3.2 Selecting a community: Why Inuvik?

In 2004, Shelley Tulloch completed her PhD thesis at Laval University focusing on Inuit youth and language attitudes on Baffin Island. The study was intended to inform Nunavut language planners and has inspired this research proposal in many ways. Tulloch chose Iqaluit, the capital of Nunavut, as one of three communities for data collection. In her words, "[t]he intensive contact between English and Inuktitut, and the evident shift from Inuktitut to English taking place among the Inuit of Iqaluit, make the capital city an interesting (and important) starting point for a study of the promotion of Inuktitut." (Tulloch 2004:91). While the language situation in Iqaluit is somewhat unique within Nunavut, the situation in Inuvik represents a heightened tendency for language use across the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (for comparative data between regions of language in Inuit children under six years of age, see Tait et al. 2010:8).

Tulloch chose Iqaluit for many of the same reasons I chose Inuvik. Inuvik is a regional centre with a high turnover of southerners who come here for work, reinforcing English as default in the work place. As a government town, Inuvik offers a relatively large number of waged employments, whereby participation in traditional on-the-land activities is somewhat inhibited. Due to greater access to imports coming in on trucks year-round, as well as a greater variety of public services, the life style of many Inuvik residents is much closer to the culture of southern Canada than it has been in the past (Kolausok 2003:173) and to some extent remains to be in remoter settlements (Lyons 2010:32). Unlike Iqaluit, Inuvik is also home to a significant percentage of Gwitch'in (Dene) First Nation residents, who possess their own official minority language[10] rooted

[10] Gwitch'in is a Na-Dene language and belongs to the Athapaskan-Eyak language family. It has also been referred to as Kutchin, Loucheux, and Tukudh and is currently spoken in the communities of Tsiigehtchic, Fort McPherson, Aklavik, and Inuvik (Lewis 2009). Aklavik and Inuvik fall into the ISR. Like Inuvialuktun, Gwitch'in possesses as modified Latin script.

in the land directly south of the ISR (Heine 2007:46). Besides the presence of more than one local minority language, members of all linguistic groups (Inuvialuit, Inupiat, Gwitch'in, and Euro-Canadian) have intermarried (Lyons 2010:25). All of these reasons potentially increase the diversity in language attitudes and ideologies, making Inuvik a sensible choice for this research.

3.3 Community access: Who are my community partners?

In 2008, I embarked on a preliminary community visit of Inuvik from Prince George, B.C. where I was then studying for a Bachelor of Arts in anthropology at the University of Northern British Columbia. During my ten-day visit, which overlapped with the Great Northern Arts Festival of that year, I was able to connect with several major institutions in town. Especially important was my first encounter with Catherine Cockney at the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre. She kindly introduced me to a series of Inuvialuktun language materials, which the centre had been pivotal in developing. Realizing the potentially negative affects of a researcher showing up in a predominantly Aboriginal community, exclusively for the period of their proposed research, I decided to move to Inuvik with my family two years prior to conducting any research. In January of 2009 we moved into a row house on Mackenzie Road, the community's main street. Our move allowed us to experience the daily life of Inuvik residents throughout the fluctuation of seasons. We were privileged to participate in many public events and make several local acquaintances and even friends.

Throughout the two years of living in Inuvik, I was able to maintain a good relationship with the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Center, as well as to get to know many of the staff at Aurora College. It was clear from the beginning, that the ICRC would be my primary community partner and that Aurora College would play an important role in

any future research project. Coming to know many residents through social gatherings and community participation, I was also introduced to the Inuvialuit Community Corporation's (ICC) language program, as well as the various language offerings provided through primary and high schools, kindergarten, and the Aboriginal Head Start Program. Community access and report thus occurred on multiple levels over an extended period of time during which, I believe, the period of our stay and the visibility of our presence and participation in the community as a family played an important part.

3.4 Epistemological considerations

As an ethnographic observer I come from an interpretive-experiential perspective, which influences the way in which I approach data collection. Following thinkers, such as Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), who distinguished between social and natural reality, I assume that each requires separate methods of exploration. As points out Safia Azzouni (2010), Dilthey made a distinction between 'explaining' [*erklaeren*], fit for natural reality, and 'understanding' [*verstehen*], or 'experiencing' [*erleben*], better fit for the study of social reality (Azzouni 2010:63-64; King and Horrocks 2010:13-14). He also stressed that the 'context of life'[11] [*Lebenszusammenhang*] could not be 'explained,' especially not in positivist terms (2010:63). Instead, it had to be 'experienced' as by a poet who offers an "objectivation of the single and subjective experience" (2010:65). Such a deliberately subjective approach, which according to Dilthey stands closer to poetics than positivist delineation, has also been suggested as a response to the uncovering, in the 1980s, of "an ideology" in anthropology that claimed "transparency of representation and immediacy of experience" (James Clifford 1986:2). Given this direction, I view data collection not as representative of a separate reality, but rather as

[11] Dilthey's 'context of life' in many ways parallels aspects of Native Science as defined by Aboriginal thinker and educator Gregory Cajete (2004:47).

being interconnected with the act of data gathering, arising out of the discourse that research itself produces.

These epistemological assumptions lead a researcher to become a contextual-constructivist observer. The contextualist view states that people experience their own lives in the context of "cultural and historical meaning systems" (King and Horrocks 2010:20), i.e. worldview, or epistemology. The constructionist view adds that language, through which these views are expressed, is not merely referential in nature, but that it has power to shape social reality, because social meaning is produced through discourse (King and Horrocks 2010:21). In this view, the social and historical meaning systems that provide context to social experiences are the product of social discourse. It becomes evident then that a contextualist view ties right into the theoretical paradigms of Blumer's symbolic interactionism, as well as Bourdieu's symbolic power. To give an example of a constructivist perspective, we might refer to Natasha Lyons' explanation of Inuvialuit 'social memory' as the product of social interaction among Elders: "Depending on the individual or group assembled, any set of reminiscences will privilege certain memories at the expense of others" (Lyons 2010:25). Contemporary Inuvialuit identity is in large part based on how Inuvialuit see their past, a view that is 'constructed' through the social discourse of Elders (Lyons 2010:26). This 'constructivist' concept can also be used in relation to interviews, because they are forms of deliberate discourse that shape ideas, rather than merely reproduce perfectly fixed notions. In fact, there is a good chance that interviews will provide the time and space for research partners to think anew about their relationship to Inuvialuktun, thereby generating particular assertions or associations they may not have entertained previously. These new associations and ideas may forever

affect how interviewees view themselves in relation to their language. The interviews in this study must then be seen from a constructivist perspective, in this very sense.

3.5 Population focus: Why three age groups?

This proposed research is a qualitative study focusing on the place of Inuvialuktun in the lives of individual Inuvialuit belonging to three age groups: 16-19, 20-39, and 40-59 years of age. The attempt is not to provide a random and statistically valid population sample. Instead, coming from a constructionist perspective in which I attempt to democratize the research relationship between informants and myself (King and Horrocks 2010:22), I am interested in focusing on a small group of individuals, ethnographically exploring their relationship with Inuvialuktun on a deeper and more personal level. My research emphasis will be on young adults (the 20-39 year-old group), but I will also seek out the teenage and mature groups as a matter of triangulation (without any positivist claim) and to uncover possible generational differences and fluctuations. The teenage age group will be contacted through the Inuvialuktun language program at Samuel Hearne Secondary School (SHSS), and the mature group will be contacted through the Inuvialuit Community Corporation's (ICC) evening language classes. To obtain access to peers who are not currently learning Inuvialuktun, I will rely on snowball sampling, a form of respondent-driven sampling that relies on the recommendation of friends and acquaintances of individuals already participating (Bernard 2006:192).

The primary focus of this study will be on students in the Aboriginal Language and Cultural Instructor Program (ALCIP) II at Aurora College. This educational setting is both of interest and importance because the students currently enrolled in this program will become tomorrow's Aboriginal language instructors to children in NWT's schools. The language attitudes and language ideologies held by these current students, as well as

the source of their own motivation, are likely to influence the climate of their future classrooms. It is paramount, for this reason, that not only the teaching staff know about the motivation of their students, but that the students themselves become aware of the nature and multiplicity of language ideologies influencing their field of study. Consequently, this proposed study seeks to enable students to examine their own attitudes toward Inuvialuktun.

3.6 Data collection

The methods proposed for this research include participant observation, questionnaires, focus groups, and semi-structured interviews.

3.6.1 Participant observation

Participant observation traditionally is a long term process in which the researcher engages in some degree of involvement with the daily routines of participants, while recording in 'field notes' what has been observed during these periods of cultural immersion (e.g., Delamont 2007:206; Bernard 2006:344). It is an activity by which the learning observer attains a deeper understanding of the dynamics at play in the lives of research partners, and of the "consequential presence" of the researcher herself (Emerson et al.1995:3). Preliminary participant observation has been a part of my two-year community immersion prior to this study. It will continue to play a role in this research, both, outside the class room, at public events such as the Muskrat Jamboree, and inside the class room at the various educational sites.

At the same time, it must be recognized that 'observing' and 'recording' have not always been democratic actions within anthropology. Participant observation and the keeping of fieldnotes, with the purpose of eventual social representation trough publication, is a highly controversial enterprise that has led anthropology into a *crisis of*

representation in the 1980s (Delmont 2007:214)[12]. In similar manner, the traditional anthropological canon of 'Inuit Studies' has collided rather harshly with contemporary Inuit representations of self in this "era of Inuit empowerment" (Searles 2006:90)[13]. The use of participant observation in this study must therefore remain as open, transparent, and reflexive as possible for obvious ethical reasons.

3.6.2 Questionnaires

Questionnaires have traditionally been used to obtain statistical data (Bernard 1996:252), but in more recent years have also been used by social scientists to supplement their interpretative-ethnographic observations, especially in the case of specific phenomena with a relatively low variance applied not to a 'universal' (i.e. statistical) reality, but to particular social populations (Gobo 2004:414). Following this example, this research project will not administer questionnaires to a large randomly selected population sample, but to select members of a particular social population. A total of 30 to 40 questionnaires will be handed out to individuals across three age groups, who are currently involved (or not) with the study of Inuvialuktun. In the case of this study, both the phenomenon under study, and the population are demarcated, allowing the questionnaires to be used within a qualitative paradigm.

3.6.3 Focus groups

Focus groups originate from the world of market research, but they are also used widely in academia, among other things for their ability to identify the content and tone for potential questions to be included with questionnaires (Bernard 2006:233). Most importantly, in the words of Macnaghten and Myers, focus groups "generate talk that will

[12] A detailed discussion of this historical moment in the anthropological discipline is available in *Writing Cultures* by Clifford and Marcus, 1986.

[13] For a humoristic but critical Inuit response to past and present 'authoritative' representation of Inuit by non-Inuit in publication, view "Qallunaat! Why White People are Funny," directed by Mark Sandiford with Zebedee Nungak, 2006 National Film Board of Canada.

extend the range of our thinking about an issue…" (2007:68). In this research project, focus groups are to be used with at least two goals in mind: Firstly, focus groups are expected to generate information that may not become apparent through questionnaires or face-to-face interviews. Such data may consist of intra-group communication on the topic of Inuvialuktun, providing a window on language-related discourse among peers. Secondly, focus groups provide an opportunity to explore issues of individual and collective agency in regard to language policy and behavior. To make this research a mutually enriching learning experience, it is planned that focus groups will carry themes such as "Raising the Profile of Our Heritage Language," thus encouraging research participants/co-investigators to become more reflexive advocates on behalf of their heritage language.

3.6.4 Semi-structured interviews

A total of 15 to 20 semi-structured interviews stand at the center of this research. An effort will be made to equally distribute interviews between genders. At the same time, it is understood that a general gender bias may exist in the current language learner population. While I have no control over the distribution of gender in Inuvialuktun classes, I will examine the potential effects of such demographic variations. While interviews may be conducted with current and potential learners, there is an emphasis on current learners, language planners, and future instructors.

Like the static questionnaire, the semi-structured interview is based on a schedule, or outline of questions, which helps direct the course of the conversation. However, unlike the questionnaire, this kind of interview allows the interviewee to pursue questions and issues that go beyond the schedule, while remaining relevant to the topic. As such, the semi-structured interview is a moderated communication in which "actually

conversing with people enables them to share their experiences and understandings" (King and Horrocks 2010:11). At the same time, the moderator recognizes that the semi-structured interview—being a conversation—does not reflect or reiterate the interviewee's world or views as much as it is instrumental in creating them (King and Horrocks 2010:17). In this very sense, the semi-structured interview is a site in which two or more participants co-produce meaning. While this realization of interview-as-conversation democratizes the research process, it also calls for increased reflexivity on behalf of the conversational moderator to analyze her own role in the production of meaning through conversation (Åkerström et al. 2007:321). This responsibility falls to the script interpreter during data analysis.

Some ethnographers argue that interview data is de-contextualized data, because it is not the product of naturally occurring social interaction (e.g., Emerson 1995:140). By tying interview data in with long-term participant observation, ethnographers attempt to re-contextualize such data. In doing so, they produce what some would call "proper ethnography," in which the term "participant observation is used to cover a mixture of observation and interviewing" (Delamont 2007:206). Seen from a contextual and constructionist perspective, the interview itself is very much a social interaction that takes place within multiple larger contexts of which the interviewer is a part, even if not a 'naturally occurring' part. Here the reflexivity and honesty of myself as an observer will come to play in an important way.

3.6.5 Method of analysis

As discussed previously in my ethical considerations, data analysis, or hermeneutics, is a problematic issue for any non-indigenous anthropologist writing about observations made within an indigenous community. To act like Hermes—Greek

messenger of the gods unto man (Bernard 2006:473)—can be highly presumptuous in an age in which the gods speak for themselves. Nonetheless, every qualitative researcher must commit to interpreting the data that she has collected. Where analysis is an open, collaborative process including other research participants, the goal of a democratized research design has likely succeeded. While it is my intention to include local interpretations of data as much as possible, it is understood that the final product will be a production of new meaning based on the subjective interpretation of texts.

All observed data, whether through participant observation, focus groups, questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, or even textual/archival research, will be transferred to a textual database. This database will then be searched for "meanings and their interconnection" following the hermeneutical approach in working with qualitative data (Bernard 2006:475). Because it is paramount for the researcher to recognize "symbolic referents" in order to identify interconnections (Bernard 2006:47), close collaboration with cultural specialists, such as the staff at the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre is anticipated to be of importance in the data analysis of this proposed research.

4.0 Expected results

Given the theoretical standpoints of symbolic interactionism and symbolic power, data gathered and interpreted through this study are expected to shed some light on the connection between language and identity in young Inuvialuit in the town of Inuvik. Among other things, it is expected that this study will: 1) Reveal power differentials between disjunctive ideologies present within the community, 2) illustrate how disjunctive ideologies are reconciled in the individual, 3) show the dynamics of identity formation in relation to language attitudes, 4) indicate how contemporary Inuvialuit identities are shaped between and betwixt polarized concepts of culture, 5) reveal

unexpected motivations for language acquisition, 6) suggest which language attitudes could be expounded on for language promotion, and how others might best be circumnavigated, 7) reveal the extent of current and potential learners' reflexivity and awareness of ideologies, 8) clarify to what extent participants are conscious of their agency as language policy makers in the home, 9) suggest the impact of the residential school narrative on language choices made by young people, and 10) reveal some dynamics of shame in relation to language use. The ten listed result categories would be of value, both to the current sociolinguistic discourse in academia as well as, to the efforts put forth by contemporary language planners. While the data gathered through this study will be specific in terms of time, location, and culture, the general mechanics that are at play in this language scenario are expected to be applicable to other indigenous sociolinguistic contexts in North America.

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

References:

ACUNS
2003 *Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North*. Ottawa, Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies.

Alim, S., I. Awad, and A. Pennycook (eds.)
2009 *Global linguistic flows*. New York, Routledge.

Azzouni, Safia
2010 How Wilhelm Dilthey Influenced Popular Science Writing: Kurd Lasswitz's "Homchen. Ein Tiermaerchen as der oberen Kreide," *In* Historical Perspectives on Erklaeren and Verstehen. Uljana Feest (ed.) New York, Springer. pp. 61-80.

Baker C. and S. Prys Jones
1998 *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Barth, Frederik (ed.)
1969 *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston, Little, Brown.
Bauman, Richard and Charles L. Briggs 2003 *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baumann, R. and C.L. Briggs
2003 *Voices of modernity: language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bell, A.
1984 Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13:145-204.

Berger, Peter and Richard Neuhaus
1977 *To empower people: the role of mediating structures in public policy*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

Bernard, Russell H.
2006 Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Oxford, AltaMira Press.

Blommaert, J.
1996 Language planning as a discourse on language and society: the linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language problems and language planning* 20(3):199-222.

Blommaert, J.
2005 *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Blumer, H.
1969 *Symbolic interactionism: perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 'Sur le Pouvoir Symbolique' (On Symbolic Power), *Annales*, 32(3):405-411.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1991 *Language & Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1998 *Practical reason: on theory of action*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bowers, Jeffrey S.; Sven L. Mattys, and Suzanne H. Gage
2009 Preserved Implicit Knowledge of a Forgotten Childhood Language. *Psychological Science* 20(9): 1064-1069.

Brenzinger, Matthias
1992 *Language death: factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.

Bucholz, M.
1999 You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of sociolinguistics* 3(4):443-460.

Bucholz, M. and E. Skapoulli (eds.)
2009 Youth language at the intersection: from migration to globalization. *Pragmatics* 19(1):1-16.

Bucholz, M. and K. Hall
2004 Language and identity. In *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. A. Duranti (ed.). Oxford, Blackwell.

Button, David
2008 *The role of fur trade technologies in adult learning: a study of selected Inuvialuit ancestors at Cape Krusenstern, NWT (Nunavut), Canada 1935-1947*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Calgary.

Cajete, Gregory
2004 Philosophy of Native Science. In *American Indian thought: philosophical essays*. Anne Waters (ed.). Oxford, Blackwell Publishing Ltd. pp.45-57.

Dorais, Louis-Jacques
2010 *The language of the Inuit: syntax, semantics, and society in the Arctic*. Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press.

ECE
2005 *Building on our success: strategic plan 2005-2015*. Yellowknife,

Department of Education, Culture and Employment.

ECE
2010 *Northwest Territories languages plan: a shared responsibility: October 2010*. Yellowknife, Department of Education, Culture and Employment.

Clifford, James
1986 Introduction. *In* Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography. James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds.). Berkeley, University of California Press.

Condon, Richard G.
1996 The Northern Copper Inuit: a history. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Coupland, Nikolas
2010 'Other' representation. In *Society and language use: Handbook of pragmatics highlights 7.* Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Creese, Angela and Adrian Blackledge
2010 Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(i):103-115.

Crystal, David
2000 *Language death.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Cutler, C.
1999 Yorkville crossing: white teens, hip hop and African American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4):428-442.

Dalby, Andrew
2003 *Language in danger: how language loss threatens our future.* Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Delamont, Sara
2007 Field relations. In In Qualitative research practice (Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman, eds.). London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Delmont, Sara
2007 Ethnography and participant observation. *In* Qualitative Research Practice. Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman (eds.). London, Sage Publications Ltd. Pp.203-217.

Dorais, Lois-Jacque and Susan Sammons
2002 *Language in Nunavut: Discourse and Identity in the Baffin Region.* Iqaluit, Nunavut Arctic College, Language and Culture Program.

Dorian, N.
1998 Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In *Endangered languages*. L. Grenoble and L. Whaley (eds.). Cambridge, Cambridge

Dörnyei, Zoltán
2010 The L2 motivational self system. In *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self*. Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda (eds.). Bristol, Multilingual Matters, pp. 9-42.

Duff, A. Patricia and Duanduan Li
2009 Indigenous, minority, and heritage language education in Canada: policies, contexts, and issues. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(1):1-8.

Edwards, John
2009 *Language and Identity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw
1995 *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Erikson, Erik
1968 *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York, Norton.

Errington, J.
1998 Indonesian(s') development: on the state of the language of the sate. In Ferguson, C. 1959 Diglossia. *Word* 15:325-40. Reprinted in *The bilingualism reader* (2007), Li Wei (ed.) Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 33-46.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.)
1966 *Language loyalty in the United States.* Boston, Mouton.

Fishman, J.A.
1965 Who speaks what language to whom and when? La Linguistique 2:67-88. Reprinted with postscript in *The bilingualism reader* (2007), Li Wei (ed.). Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 55-70.

Fishman, J.A.
1991 *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

Furniss, Elizabeth
1995 *Victims of benevolence: the dark legacy of the Williams Lake residential school*. Vancouver, Arsenal Pulp Press.

Gal, S.
1989 Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:45-67.

Gal, S.
2006 Migration, minorities and multilingualism: language ideologies in Europe. In *Language ideologies, policies and practices: language and the future of*

Europe. C. Mar-Molinero and P Stevenson (eds.). Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 13-27.

García, Ofelia
2009 *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Malden, Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Ofelia, Lesley Bartlettm, and Joanne Kleifgen
2007 From biliteracy to pluriliteracies. In *Handbook of applied linguistics Vol. 5: multilingualism.* Peter Auer and Li Wei (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 207-228.

Gobo, Giampietro
2007 Sampling, representativeness and generalizability. In Qualitative research practice (Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium, and David Silverman, eds.). London, Sage Publications Ltd.

Grillo, R.D.
1989 *Dominant languages.* Cambridge, Cambridge University.

Gumperz, J.
1982 *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Haig-Brown, Celia
1998 *Resistance and renewal: surviving the Indian residential school.* Vancouver, Arsenal Printing.

Hale, Ken
1998 On endangered languages and the importance of linguistic diversity. In *Endangered languages: language loss and community response*. Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), 192-216. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Harding, E. and P. Riley
1986 *The bilingual family.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Harmon, David
2002 *In light of our differences: how diversity in nature and culture makes us human.* Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Harris, R., C. Leung, and B. Rampton
2002 Globalization, diaspora and language education in England. In *Globalization and language teaching*. D. Block and D. Cameron (eds.). London, Routledge. Pp. 29-46.

Harrison, Davin K.
2007 *When languages die: the extinction of the world's languages and the erosion of human knowledge*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Haugen, E.
1966 *Language planning and conflict*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Heine, Michael K.
2007 *Gwichya Gwich'in Googwandak: the history and stories of the Gwichya Gwich'in: as told by the Elders of Tsiigehtchic*. Fort McPherson, Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute.

Heller, M. (ed.)
2007 *Bilingualism: a social approach.* Hants, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hinton, Leanne and Ken Hale, eds.
2001 *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego, Academic Press.

Hornberger, Nancy H.
1998 Language policy, language education, and language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society* 27(4):439-458.

Hornberger, Nancy H.
2006 Voice and biliteracy in Indigenous language revitalization: contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Maori contexts*. Language, Identity and Education*, 5(4):277-292.

Huss, Leena and Anna-Riitta Lindgren
2010 Scandinavia. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia Garcia (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. pp. 255-268.

IFA
1987 *The Western Arctic Claim: Inuvialuit Final Agreement, As Amended*. Inuvik, Inuvialuit Regional Corporation.

Irvine, J.T. and S. Gal
2000 Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, and identities*. P. Kroskrity (ed.). School of American Research Press. Pp. 35-83.

ITK and NRI
2007 *Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities: A Guide for Researchers*. Scot Nickels, Jamal Shirley, and Gita Laidler (eds.). Imuit Tapiriit Katanami and Nunavut Research Institute: Ottawa and Iqaluit.

Jaspers, Jürgen
2010 Introduction – Society and language use. In *Society and language use: Handbook of pragmatics highlights 7.* Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman,

and Jef Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Keating, Maria Clara and Olga Solovova
2011 Multilingual dynamics among Portuguese-based migrant contexts in Europe. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5): 1251-1263.

Ken Hale, Michael Krauss, Lucille J. Watahomigie, Akira Y. Yamamoto, Colette Craig, LaVerne Masayesva Jeanne and Nora C. England
1992 Endangered Languages. *Language* 68(1): 1-42.

Kim, Tae-Young
2010 The sociocultural interface between ideal self and ought-to self: a case study of two Korean students' ESL Motivation. In *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self*. Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda (eds.). Bristol, Multilingual Matters, pp. 274-294.

King, David Paul
1999 *The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit Located in Chesterfield Inlet, Yellowknife, Inuvik and Churchill, 1955-1970.* Canadian Heritage and Development Studies Thesis (M.A.), Trent University.

King, Janette
2009 Language is life: *The Worldview of Second Language Speakers of Māori. In Indigenous language revitalization encouragement, guidance & lessons learned*. Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (eds.). Flagstaff, University of Northern Arizona. pp. 97-108.

King, Nigel and Christine Horrocks
2010 *Interviews in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Kit-fong Au, Terry, Janet S. Oh, Leah M. Knightly, Sun-Ah Jun, and Laura F. Romo.
2008 Salvaging a childhood language. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 58(4): 998-1011.

Kolausok, Eddie D.
2003 The Survival of a Culture. In *Across Time and Tundra: The Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic*. Ishmael Alunik and David Morrison, (co-authors). Vancouver, Raincoast Books.

Krauss, Michael
1992 The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68(1):4–10.

Krech, Shepard
1979 Interethnic Relations in the Lower Mackenzie River Region. *Arctic Anthropology*, 16(2):102-122.

Kroskrity, Paul V.
2010 Language ideologies – evolving perspectives. In In *Society and language use: Handbook of pragmatics highlights 7.* Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company. Pp. 192-211.

Kwachka, Patricia
1992 Discourse Structures, Cultural Stability, and Language Shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 93:67-74.

Kwatchka, Patricia
1999 Language Shift and Local Choice: On Practicing Linguistics in the 21st Century. *Practicing Anthropology* 21 (2):23-27.

Lee, Tiffany S.
2009 Language, identity, and power: Navajo and Pueblo young adults' perspectives and experiences with competing language ideologies. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 8(5): 307-320.

Lewis, M. Paul (ed.)
2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Sixteenth edition*. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com/.

Li Wei
2007 Dimensions of bilingualism. In *The bilingualism reader.* Li Wei (ed.). Oxon, Routledge. Pp. 3-22.

Lippi-Green, R.
1997 *English with an accent: language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London, Routledge.

Lowe, Ronald
1984 *Siglit Inuvialuit Uqausiita Kipuktirutait: Basic Siglit dictionary*. Inuvik, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement.

Lowe, Ronald
1984 *Uummarmiut uqalungiha mumikhitchirutingit: basic Uummarmiut Eskimo dictionary*. Inuvik, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement.

Lyons, Natasha
2010 The wisdom of Elders: Inuvialuit social memories of continuity and change in the twentieth century. *Arctic Anthropology*, 47(1): 22-38.

Maffi, Luisa, (ed.)
2001 *On biocultural diversity: linking language, knowledge, and the environment.* Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Martin-Jones, Marilyn, and Kathryn Jones
2000 Introduction: Multilingual literacies. In *Multilingual literacies: reading and*

writing different worlds, Marilyn Martin-Jones and Kathryn Jones (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamins. Pp. 1-15.

May, Stephen
2010 Aotearoa/New Zealand. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia Garcia (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. pp. 501-518.

McCarthy, Teresa L.
2010 Native Americans. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia Garcia (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. pp. 323-339.

McCarty, Teresa L. and Ofelia Zepeda
2010 Native Americans. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishamn and Ofelia García (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. Pp. 323-339.

McCarty, Teresa L., Mary Eunice, Warhol, Larisa and Zepeda, Ofelia
2009 Indigenous youth as language policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 8(5):291-306.

Meek, Barbara A.
2010 *We are our language: an ethnography of language revitalization in a northern Athabaskan community*. Tuscon, University of Arizona Press.

Miller, James Roger
1996 *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Milloy, John Sheridan
1999 *A national crime: the Canadian government and the residential school system, 1879-1986*. Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press.

Myers-Scotton, C.
1999 Explaining the role of norms and rationality in codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32:1259-1237.

Nettle, Daniel and Suzanne Romaine
2000 *Vanishing voices: the extinction of the world's languages.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Nicholas, Sheila E.
2010 Language, Epistemology, and Cultural Identity: "Hopiqatsit Aw Unangvakiwyungwa" ("They Have Their Heart in the Hopi Way of Life"). *Am Indian Cult Res J* 34(2):125-44.

Nicholas, Sheila E.

2010 Language, Epistemology, and Cultural Identity: "Hopiqatsit Aw Unangvakiwyungwa" ("They Have Their Heart in the Hopi Way of Life"). *Am Indian Cult Res J* 34(2):125-44.

Norris, M.J.
2007 Aboriginal languages in Canada: Emerging trends and perspectives on second language acquisition. *Canadian Social Trends.* Statistics Canada: Catalogue No. 11-008.

Oh, Janet S., Terry Kit-Fong Au, and Sun-Ah Jun
2010 Early childhood language memory in the speech perception of international adoptees. *Journal of Child Language*, 37(5):1123-1132.

Ortner, S. B.
1984 Theory in anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 26:126-166.

Osgood, Lawrence
1983 Foreword. *Kangiryuarmiut uqauhingita numiktittitdjutingit: Basic Kangiryuarmiut Eskimo dictionary.* Inuvik, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement.

Osgood, Lawrence
1985a Foreword. *Siglit Inuvialuit Uqausiita Ilisarviksait: Basic Siglit Inuvialuit Eskimo Grammar*. Inuvik, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement.

Osgood, Lawrence
1985b Foreword. *Uummarmiut uqalungiha ilihaurrutikrangit: Basic Uummarmiut Eskimo grammar.* Inuvik, Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement.

Patrick, Donna
2010 Language dominance and minorization. In *Society and language use: Handbook of pragmatics highlights 7.* Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company. Pp. 176-191.

Patrick, Donna and Perry Shearwood
1999 The roots of Inuktitut-language bilingual education. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 19(2):249-262.

Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada
2007 *Journey Forward: National Inuit Residential Schools Healing Strategy*. Ottawa, Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada.

Philips, S.
2000 Constructing a Tongan nation-state through language ideology in the courtroom. In *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, and identities*. P.

Kroskrity (ed.). School of American Research Press. Pp.229-257.

Pritzker, Barry
2000 *A Native American encyclopedia: history, culture, and peoples*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rampton, B.
1995 *Crossing: language and ethnicity among adolescents*. Essex, Longman.

Ridanpää, Juha and Annika Pasanen
2009 From the Bronx to the Wilderness: Inari-Sámi Rap, Language Revitalization and Contested Ethnic Stereotypes. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 9(2): 213-231.

Robins, Robert H.*, and* Eugenius M. Uhlenbeck*,* (eds.)
1991 *Endangered languages.* Oxford, Berg.

Romaine, S.
1995 *Bilingualism*. Oxford, Blackwell. San Diego Bakhtin Circle (ed.) 2000 *Bakhtin and the nation*. Cranbury, Associated University Presses, Inc.

Romaine, Suzanne
2007 Preserving endangered languages. *Language and Linguistic Compass*. 1(1-2):115-132.

Romaine, Suzanne
2008 Linguistic diversity, sustainability, and the future of the past. In *Sustaining linguistic diversity: endangered and minority languages and language varieties.* Kendall King, Natalie Schilling-Estes, Lyn Fogle, Jackie Lou, and Barbara Soukup (eds.). Washington, Georgetown University Press. pp. 7-22.

Russell, Caskey
2002 Language, Violence, and Indian Mis-Education. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 26(4):97-112.

Šatava, Leoš
2005 *Sprachverhalten und ethnische Identitaet*. Bauzen, Domowina Verlag. Schiffman, Harold F. 2010 South and Southeast Asia. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia Garcia (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. pp. 452-469.

Schumann, John H.
1986 Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7(5):379-392.

Searles, Edmund (Ned)
2006 Anthropology in an era of Inuit empowerment. *In* Critical Inuit Studies.

Pamela Stern and Lisa Stevenson (eds.). Lincoln, Nebraska University Press. pp. 89-104.

Silverstein, M.
1979 Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The Elements*. P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds.). Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society. Pp. 193-248.

Silverstein, M.
1998 Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:401-426.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Minati Panda, and Adjit K. Mohanty
2009 Multilingual education concepts, goals, needs, and expense: English for all or achieving justice? In *Social justice through multilingual education.* Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Ajit K. Mohanty, and Minati Panda *(eds.)*. Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.

Smith, Anthony
1999 *Myths and memories of the nation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard
2010 Second-language learning. In *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia Garcia (eds.). New York, Oxford University Press. pp. 172-185.

SSHRC
2010 *Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. Ottawa, Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.

Steckley, John L.
2008 *White Lies About the Inuit*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stefánsson, Vilhjalmur
1909 The Eskimo Trade Jargon of Herschel Island. *American Anthropologist*, 11(2):217-232.

Tait, Heather, Elisabeth Cloutier, and Evelyne Bougie
2010 *Inuit language indicators for Inuit children under the age of six in Canada: Component of Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 89-643-X*. Social and Aboriginal Statistics Division. Ottawa, Minister of Industry.

Thompson, John B.
1991 "Editor's Introduction*." Language & Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tulloch, Shelley
1999 Language and Identity: An Inuit Perspective. Language and Identity. Papers from the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association, Mount Allison University, Sackville, NB, November 5-6, pp. 106- 116. Moncton, NB: Print Atlantic.

Tulloch, Shelly
2004 *Inuktitut and Inuit youth: language attitudes as a basis for language planning*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Laval University.

Ushioda, Ema
2010 A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self*. Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda (eds.). Bristol, Multilingual Matters, pp. 215-228.

van der Voort, Hein
1996 History of Eskimo interethnic contact and its linguistic consequences. In *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas*. Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Muehlhaeusler, Darrel T. Tryon (Eds.). Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1043-1094.

Ventureyra, Valerie A. G., Christophe Pallier, and Hi-Yon Yoo
2004 The loss of first language phonetic perception in adopted Koreans. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* 17(1): 79-91.

Wei, Li
2010 Contact. In *Society and language use: Handbook of pragmatics highlights 7*. Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren (eds.). Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company. Pp. 127-139.

Weinreich, U.
1953 *Languages in contact: findings and problems*. The Linguistic Circle of New York. (Reissued by Mouton in The Hague, 1968).

White, Frederick
2006 Rethinking Native American language revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly, 30*(1&2*),* 91-109.

Wilson, Shawn
2008 *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, Fernwood Publishing.

Winford, D.
2003 *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Woolard, K and B. Schieffelin
1994 Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:55-82.

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca

Wyman, Leisy T.
2009 Youth, linguistic ecology, and language endangerment: a Yup'ik example. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(5):335-349.

Alexander Oehler, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada. Email: oehler@unbc.ca