6-1-2013

"As Our Elders Taught Us to Speak It": Chinuk Wawa and the Process of Creating Authenticity

Kylie N. Johnson
University of Denver

"As Our Elders Taught Us to Speak it": Chinuk Wawa and the Process of Creating

Authenticity

_____

A Thesis Presented to

the Faculty of Arts and Humanities

University of Denver

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

By

Kylie N. Johnson

June 2013

Advisor: Richard Clemmer-Smith

Author: Kylie N. Johnson
Title: "As Our Elders Taught Us to Speak it": Chinuk Wawa and the Process of Creating
Authenticity
Advisor: Richard Clemmer-Smith
Degree Date: June 2013

Abstract

Chinuk Wawa (also called Chinook Jargon) began as a trading language of the

Pacific Northwest in the late eighteenth century. As it developed, it became the major

heritage language of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, an intertribal nation

located in Oregon. Now, as older speakers of the language pass on, there is an effort by

the Grand Ronde to revitalize this language not only on the Grand Ronde Reservation,

but also in nearby Portland, Oregon. However, revitalization can be a complicated

process, as tribal leaders attempt to define Chinuk to maintain its traditions while

adapting its vocabulary for the twenty-first century. This research thesis examines the

process of creating authenticity through an ethnography of Chinuk Wawa speakers.

Results indicate that revitalization of indigenous languages takes many forms;

authenticity is difficult to maintain as the language is used in a number of environments

and adapted for the twenty-first century.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Languages around the world are being lost, abandoned, and murdered at an extraordinary rate. According to linguist Michael Krauss, only about 600 of the world's 6000 languages are safe from language death (Nettle and Romaine 2000:8). In the early twenty-first century languages are being lost at the rate of one language every two weeks (Nettle and Romaine 2000:8). Most of the world's vulnerable languages are spoken by indigenous populations that are still struggling with the impacts of colonialism in their communities. This issue affects indigenous peoples around the globe, as many of these groups are fighting for the right to speak, teach, and strengthen their languages. Language death is also occurring with many indigenous groups in the United States. This is due to the attempted forcible assimilation of American Indians through military campaigns, educational policies, and the enforcement of Anglo-American values; learning English and abandoning languages was often a necessary part of indigenous peoples gaining citizenship and surviving in their colonized communities (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:60). Centuries of these practices have led to the destruction of indigenous culture, knowledge, and beliefs, often in accordance with language loss (Nettle and Romaine:6).

In the case of many of these languages, loss is the result of what is called a *voluntary shift*: language death that occurs when the language is not being passed onto the younger generation and is mostly confined to ceremonial or religious settings

(Nettle and Romaine 2000:22). However, the term is misleading, as indigenous peoples have historically been ostracized for using their historical languages, coercing indigenous peoples to abandon their "primitive" languages in favor of dominant languages such as English (Nettle and Romaine 2000:21). For the most part, indigenous peoples have had very little choice in whether or not to speak and transmit their languages. There are many terms associated with language loss in indigenous cultures: *language shift*, for instance, is used by linguist Joshua Fishman, indicating the gradual displacement of languages in favor of a dominant language (Hornberger 2010:413). However, this term can be problematized, as it does not indicate any responsibility of colonial systems or people in bringing about the loss of this language. Another possible term is *language death* or *language murder*, very clearly indicating that the loss of this language was unnatural and a direct result of colonial intervention (Hornberger 2010:413). This term is not always used, however, due to its political overtones. The term *language loss* will be used for this research thesis, as it underscores the value of indigenous languages to its communities. Nettle and Romaine argue that "languages not passed onto the younger generation will eventually die out", even as they are recorded or studied (2000:150). Communities facing the death of their indigenous languages see this loss occurring at an enormous cost to their cultures, communities, and sense of indigenous identity (Nettle and Romaine 2000:23).

Nettle and Romaine argue that language is not only a unique means of communication, but also a marker of identity, culture, and knowledge: "As a uniquely human invention, language is what has made everything possible for us as a species: our

2

cultures, our technology, our art, music, and much more. In our languages lie a rich source of the accumulated wisdom of all humans" (2000:14). In many cases, indigenous knowledge is encoded in the language, particularly knowledge relating to the natural environment or social codes; when these languages are lost, the knowledge and rules of the culture can also be lost as well (Nettle and Romaine 2000:25). This cultural knowledge is related to the history of a language community. For indigenous groups, preserving this knowledge is a means of creating ties to the past, allowing to create a definition of their "authentic" culture (Warner 1999:76). When a language is gradually abandoned in favor of a dominant language, there is more happening than the loss of a language: an entire way of knowing is being stigmatized as inferior. Language is a part of a larger social and economic context: control over indigenous languages starts with the control of the social and economic dynamics of those nations (Nettle and Romaine 2000:127). Indigenous peoples are still living with the effect of the history of European colonization, as their indigenous languages are restricted to smaller and smaller groups of speakers in increasingly restricted roles.

Indigenous peoples around the world, however, are fighting to maintain their heritage languages and their cultures. These communities are attempting to revitalize their languages, in order to ensure its survival as a spoken language (Nettle and Romaine 2000:178). In the case of revitalization, the languages cannot survive in their present state, but must be reconstructed rather than simply preserved (Nettle and Romaine 2000:178). These often take the form of language classes, often intended for younger children. However, revitalization is an intergenerational effort, rather than one only for

youth: for example, in the case of Hawaiian language revitalization, parents also had to attend language classes with their children to encourage use of Hawaiian in a home environment (Nettle and Romaine 2000:182). These classes can be a starting point for connecting children and adults alike to their culture and traditions; as a result, many indigenous groups are concerned with maintaining the authenticity of their languages, in order to effectively reconnect to their traditions (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:58). While language classes are a common aspect of language revitalization, using the language in schools is seen only a beginning point. The use of the language at work, in the home, and in the mass media are all long term goals to revitalization, once people begin to speak the language (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:62). Language revitalization is meant to reach all members of the community and impact areas of social life for those members.

Indigenous language revitalization is often considered one of the most vital elements in keeping the culture of an indigenous language alive. The death of a language is often related to the loss of indigenous culture, worldview, and identity for a community (Henze and Davis 1999:5). Language death is associated with the loss of other cultural elements in a group, such as knowledge of kinship systems, biological resources, and traditional ceremonies (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:58). Therefore, enormous efforts have been taken to strengthen indigenous language use in communities. This effort has attracted international attention due to indigenous activism, including the United Nations; in 2006, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a charter designed to protect and clarify indigenous rights throughout the world (United Nations 2008:1). As mentioned in the declaration, the

use of indigenous languages should not be seen as a problem of integration, but as a fundamental right of indigenous communities (United Nations 2008:7). By reasserting the importance of indigenous languages in the discourse, tribes have the opportunity to begin decolonizing other factors in their social and economic lives.

Language revitalization, however, is not a simple process with universal steps for indigenous peoples to follow. Indigenous communities must decide what form their language should take, how to teach this language, and how to incorporate the entire community in the process of revitalization. While elders are often the most vital source of the language, the legacy of suppression of Native languages is still a deterrent for older speakers to speak or teach the language (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:65). School systems are not necessary compatible with traditional language use, according to some indigenous people; without a proper grounding in indigenous goals and attitudes, these classes simply teach the indigenous language from a Western perspective (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:66). Even with a surviving elder community able and eager to teach the language, indigenous communities must face other challenges in the revitalization process. As the Irish language was being revitalized in the late twentieth century, it was done being primarily in schools, leading to very little social use and almost no intergenerational transmission, resulting in a general failure of the revitalization effort (Nettle and Romaine 2000:188). Indigenous peoples must decide how to successfully adapt these languages to the twenty-first century. Many indigenous languages do not traditionally have terms for twenty-first century technology, such as computers or other electrical devices. These groups must decide how to create new

indigenous vocabulary to suit their lives, or adopt these words from the local dominant language. While there are enormous challenges to indigenous language revitalization, the value of these languages to the culture are often seen by indigenous communities as worth the struggles. This thesis examines the ways in which indigenous communities choose to teach their heritage languages, and how these methods may or may not reflect the process of adapting the language while preserving its heritage.

Many indigenous cultures are attempting to revitalize their languages without outside intervention or help. While there are several organizations committed to supporting the preservation of indigenous languages, primarily featuring linguists and other academics, many indigenous peoples have worked largely on their own to revitalize their languages (Nettle and Romaine 2000:189). This has been somewhat intentional on the part of some indigenous groups, as financial aid from state can undermine the sovereignty of Native nations (Nettle and Romaine 2000:190). In any case, government intervention can have limited results, when not connected to a specific revitalization program. For the most part, creating official languages have little impact on the state of indigenous languages. In 1974, the Maori Affairs Act officially recognized the Maori language as the official language of the Maori nation, but because the act required no action for language revitalization, this had almost no effect on the state of the language (Nettle and Romaine 2000:187). The Tlingit of Alaska and the British Columbia area also had a bureaucratic solution to language preservation, in the form of a heritage foundation dedicated to the collection of Tlingit folklore (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998:67). However, because there was not enough community support for the foundation, it was

seen as a failure in its effort to aid Tlingit cultural revitalization (Dauenhauer and

Dauenhauer 1998:67). Language and cultural revitalization efforts can be meaningless

without community action and investment. Therefore, indigenous communities often

devote their efforts to projects and programs that their members can directly participate

in, strengthening a shared sense of identity and culture.

In the twenty-first century, most tribal members do not live in a single area or

their tribal reservation, and in fact largely live in urban areas. Despite their physical

disconnection from their homeland, urban Native people are becoming more involved

with the revitalization of tribal languages. Language can be seen as one of the major

means of anchoring Native culture and identity despite the separation from a tribal

homeland (Lawrence 2004:38). Because indigenous peoples in the city have limited

means of practicing other aspects of culture, such as fishing, participating in ceremonies,

or practicing traditional crafts, language classes can be one way for indigenous peoples to

connect to their heritage. In her analysis of urban Native youth, Bonita Lawrence argues

for more collaboration between urban and reservation indigenous peoples, so that urban

Native peoples can share a closer connection to tribal traditions and reservation people

have greater access to urban technology and resources (Lawrence 2004:239). Such

connections could be made through language learning and information technology,

creating urban Native identities that are just as strong as those of indigenous peoples still

living on the reservation.

Chinuk Wawa is one of the indigenous languages being revitalized by its tribal

group. Also called Chinook Jargon, the language is different from many other indigenous

languages in that it was created as a result of intercultural trade in the Pacific Northwest. It originally began as a trading pidgin between Indian nations of the region, but expanded in speakers as English and French traders settled in the region. Its vocabulary originates from several different families of indigenous languages, including Salish, Nuu-chah-Nulth, and Chinook; it also incorporates French and English words, as well as their grammatical constructions (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:13). This language originated in the eighteenth century, but flourished throughout the region in the early nineteenth century as a result of the international fur trade (Lang 2008:4). While facilitating this trade was its initial use, it became a necessary means of communication in intercultural areas such as Fort Vancouver (Lang 2008:3). Eventually, Wawa became an important lingua franca not only between Europeans and Native peoples, but between different Native tribes as well. A *lingua franca* is defined as a language used as a means of communication between two people or groups who do not share a mother tongue (Nelde 2010:374). At its apex in the middle of the nineteenth century, the language was used from Vancouver, BC, and parts of Alaska, to northern California (Lutz 2008:xi). Its value as an intercultural language increased as traders married Native women, and as different tribal groups intermarried (Lang 2008:5). As more and more American settlers came to the region, however, it was no longer used as a major means of communication, replaced by English (Lutz 2008:24). The language remained in use for tribes forcibly formed by the federal government in the mid-eighteenth century (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444). It has gradually come to be seen as an important heritage language for these particular tribal communities in Washington and Oregon, particularly as other regional

8

languages have died out. However, in its present state, it is highly endangered to the point of being considered nearly extinct (Paul, Simons, and Fenning 2013).

The Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde, a tribal nation located in western Oregon, is the primary group responsible for revitalizing Chinuk Wawa. Like the language, this group is multicultural in origin. It was formed in 1856 from 27 different tribes and bands of the region by the federal government, in their effort to move all Oregon tribes onto one reservation (Zenk 1984:4). When the reservation was formed, over eight distinct languages were spoken by the various tribes and bands, with no clear majority of any one language (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:14). Chinuk Wawa became the major language used in the community, used as a first language in the home for young children (Zenk 1984:8). Since then, it has been defined by the Grand Ronde as their heritage language, and efforts have been made since the late 1970s to preserve the language (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444). Both the reservation and those revitalizing the language in the Portland area are making efforts to ensure the survival of Chinuk Wawa, standardizing it, strengthening it, and spreading it to as many potential speakers as possible.

This research thesis examines how the Grand Ronde is revitalizing Chinuk Wawa both on the reservation and in surrounding cities, and how they work through issues of language revitalization in these settings. Research was conducted in the summer of 2012, working in Chinuk Wawa language classes located both in the Portland, Oregon area, as well as the Grand Ronde Reservation itself. The process of language revitalization and its necessary complications, such as the issue of preserving traditional Native pronunciation

with an English-speaking population, was explored through participant observation and interviews with language teachers and learners, creating an ethnography of Chinuk Wawa speakers in both the city and on the reservation. The researcher examines how the revitalization process resists and is a part of the dominant culture, as Chinuk Wawa speakers come from English-speaking Native and non-Native populations. As authenticity is defined by the Grand Ronde, it can be a means for this group to both connect with its historical roots and resist assimilation by the dominant culture. This research thesis argues that authenticity is not a static state for indigenous languages to return to, but is actively created by a speech community in the present day, especially in the case of a historically widespread language like Chinuk Wawa. In addition to making this argument, this research thesis will attempt to provide insight for larger questions of indigenous language revitalization. How does a community maintain traditional aspects of language while adapting a language to the twenty-first century, incorporating terms for twenty-first century technology? How do urban language learners preserve a non-English pronunciation system that they do regularly encounter, and how does the community standardize the language? How do language learners make the language their own to express their identity while still paying respect to the traditions of the culture? How do these language learners use indigenous languages to reconnect with their traditional identity?

Chapter Two: Background Information

1. Origin of Chinuk Wawa

Chinuk Wawa's origin and spread throughout the region is the subject of a complicated and sometimes controversial narrative. The earliest texts regarding Chinuk Wawa tend to credit European traders with the creation and expansion of Chinuk Wawa. For instance, in Shaw's dictionary of Chinuk, he explores the popular claim at the time that that the language began solely with traders, and was only used between different Native peoples (Shaw 1909:ix). Shaw also believed that the origin of the language was in the Lower Columbia near present-day Vancouver, Washington, moving up through Puget Sound and Alaska (Shaw 1909:ix). However, many modern linguists doubt that this language originated only due to European trading, partially due to the high linguistic diversity of the region before European contact (Lang 2008:45). While there is no clear consensus regarding the exact details of the Chinuk Wawa emergence, Native peoples tend to be credited with the original jargons and pidgins that ultimately led to Chinuk Wawa. For instance, John Lutz credits the Mowchaht and Nuu-chah-nulth for teaching their trading jargon to the European traders during the end of the eighteenth century (Lutz 2008:ix). Lang also describes Chinuk Wawa as a hybridization of the Nootka Jargon, the traditional term for the Nuu-chah-nulth trading language, to the trading jargon of the Lower Columbia at the mouth of the Columbia River (Lutz 2008:ix). The term

"Chinookan" can refer to a number of languages, including Clatsop, Shoalwater, Multnomah and Kathlamet, necessitating a trading pidgin in the area before contact (Hymes 2007:246). These ambiguous definitions and debates regarding the origin of Chinuk Wawa demonstrates the difficulty that the Grand Ronde now has in developing its history and defining the language for this community.

The international fur trade, however, was not only a central component to the beginning of aboriginal and white relations of the area, but a major catalyst for the formation of Chinuk Wawa (Lutz 2008:x). While there was intertribal communication in the Lower Columbia region, Lang believes that there was no single pidgin form of Chinuk before the arrival of European traders, but several decentralized trading jargons instead (Lang 2008:51). In any case, as the fur trade was expanding, the European traders brought the trading vocabulary of the Nuu-chah-nulth to Lower Columbia and the Chinook people (Lutz 2008:x). While trade in the region became focused in Fort Vancouver, controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company, this hybridization of these pidginized languages was necessary, due to the linguistic needs of English and French traders, as well as other cultural groups in the region (Lang 2008:58). These pidgins were also necessary due to the complexity of local Native languages. In the 1830s, missionaries and settlers reported that there are almost no Europeans fluent in Chinook proper or any of the Pacific Northwest languages, due to the abundance of non-English sounds, complex structure, and syntax of the languages (Lang 2008:56). In addition, Chinook proper was protected from outside learners; its full vocabulary and usage would

not have been introduced to slaves and outsiders (Lang 2008:51). Unlike slavery practiced by European colonizers, this form of slavery was not chattel slavery: Chinook people could become slaves due to debt or criminal behavior, and was not considered hereditary (Lang 2008:51). It was generally seen as much more prestigious than Chinuk Wawa as the trading language was being formed. Grand Ronde Chinuk is considered a dialect that has preserved some of these sounds of Chinook proper, and therefore has higher status than other dialects of the language (Lang 2008: 126). Despite its origin as a hybridized trading jargon, Chinuk Wawa quickly became a highly important language in the region as a language of Northwest Native heritage.

New dialects of the language, ones much more heavily influenced by Chinook languages, began to travel back up north with the trade. Several dictionaries were made of Chinuk in the 1820s from various areas of the Northwest, largely by settlers and amateurs rather than professionals, and as a result were often incomplete and rudimentary (Lang 2008:63). These lexicons often reflected the European usage of the language, and often left out much of the Native phonology for the convenience of the European novice (Lang 2008:62). Even after the collapse of the fur trade, Chinuk was evidently used enough in Vancouver, BC that several dictionaries were published in the 1870s, including one commissioned by the Canadian government for parliamentary papers (Lutz 2008:167). The language was so strong in Vancouver BC that, even as more and more English-speaking settlers arrived in the Pacific Northwest, Chinuk was still a major language throughout rural areas in the 1930s (Lutz 2008:219). Today, there are still speakers of the language in the Vancouver, BC area.

Due to its history and its use in the region, Chinuk Wawa borrows its vocabulary from a number of languages from the Pacific Northwest, as well as European languages introduced by traders. Many words in the language are derived from French or English: in many cases, these were adopted words lifted for colonial items, such as new foods, animals, or technologies (Lang 2008:25). However, most of the Chinuk vocabulary comes from Native languages around the area. For instance, in the dictionary released by the Grand Ronde, vocabulary comes from Chinookan, Chehalis, Salishan, Kalapuyan, and Nootkan languages (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012). However, Chinook proper was by far the primary vehicle for adopting words, in order to create a more complete language (Shaw 1909:x). The dictionary confirms this claim, as many important words are from various Chinookan languages from around the area (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012).

Interestingly, Chinuk dictionaries and lexicons were being created at the same time that its major source of vocabulary was dying in the area. In his volume of Chinook texts, Franz Boas explains that the purpose of creating this work is to help preserve old Chinook language, as it was dying by the end of the nineteenth century (Boas 1894:5). Perhaps even more interestingly, Boas's work in the Lower Columbia was primarily conducted in Chinuk Wawa as opposed to Chinook proper, due to the ease of learning and speaking the language (Boas 1894:6). Despite its origin as a trading jargon, the role of Chinuk Wawa expanded beyond trading posts and became a highly important heritage language for Native peoples in the area.

Chinuk Wawa's uses gradually extended beyond intercultural trade. In the interest of creating alliances with local tribes, many traders and settlers married Native women of the area, particularly in the early nineteenth century (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:15). Because these marriages featured two different cultural backgrounds and languages, the local Native language or French was often not the language spoken in the home. Instead, Chinuk became language of the household due to French voyagers and British employed by HBC marrying Native women, largely from Lower Chinook society (Lang 2008:102). This had a major impact on the transmission of Native languages from parents to children in the area. During the fur trade in the 1830s, Chinuk Wawa was used by a number of groups in Fort Vancouver, including children who saw Chinuk as the Native language of the region (Lang 2008:103). Chinuk Wawa became a home language not only in marriages between Native and European peoples, but between Native peoples of different cultural groups. This became necessary when Native peoples from around the country, including Cree and Iroquois peoples, travelled to the region to participate in the fur trade (Lang 2008:100). The language was so popular at the time that missionaries in the 1840s proselytized in Chinuk Wawa through interpreters, despite their goal of "civilizing" the local indigenous population through assimilatory practices (Lang 2008:116). While Chinuk Wawa eventually died out in the twentieth century due to the dominance of English in the region, these uses remained vital in intertribal communities such as the Grand Ronde.

Chinuk Wawa's role as a lingua franca came at the expense of other, smaller indigenous languages in the region. During the nineteenth and early twentieth century,

Chinuk Wawa was seen as an alternative to learning other Native languages of the region due to the ease of learning the simpler grammar and vocabulary of Chinuk (Shaw 1909:x). As a result, in many cases the original tribal languages were not transmitted to the next generation with the same frequency. Other tribal languages died out as a partial result of the dominance of Chinook Jargon and English in the region (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444). The same is true of Chinook proper, the original Chinookan dialects of the Lower Columbia, as it was was eventually replaced by Wawa due to lack of speakers (Lang 2008:137). As other tribal languages suffered from lack of transmission, Chinuk Wawa slowly began to gain status as its own heritage language.

The language became less and less used in the region as the international fur trade collapsed in the 1840s, along with the societal structure of surrounding communities. As previously mentioned, the rise of Chinuk Wawa accompanied the death of Chinook proper, its major parent language. This process began even as Fort Vancouver was being established in the early 1820s: Chinook society was devastated by disease and white settlement, especially from the high concentration of malaria the area (Lang 2008: 138). Chinook culture was also being suppressed in the Lower Columbia by missionaries and white settlers (Lang 2008:125). Due to the continued influx of settlers into the region, Chinook culture was not only destabilized but was also stigmatized. However, Chinuk Wawa continued to thrive in spite of the issues of the Chinook community. The collapse of international fur trade in 1841 effectively ended Chinuk Wawa's time as the major language of the area, especially as more permanent settlers were arriving in the area (Lang 2008: 120). Many Native peoples of the area moved to coastal regions to work in

fisheries, as the social structure of Chinook and other tribes were destroyed due to relocation and death (Lang 2008:120). However, Chinuk Wawa continued to survive in the region, albeit in a more limited sense. Generally, Chinuk largely survived on reservations, particularly the reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde (Lang 2008:134). While the use of Chinuk Wawa may have been limited to much smaller areas, its functions as intercultural communication was still highly valued by the new indigenous communities formed in the middle of the nineteenth century.

2. History of the Grand Ronde Confederation

The Grand Ronde was created as a result of federal intervention. Due to the diverse groups of tribes put together on the reservation, the definition of Grand Ronde, as opposed to other cultural groups in the state, has been murkily defined in government documents and anthropologists in the twentieth century (Kentta and Lewis 2010:476). This confederation was formed in 1857 with the creation of the Grand Ronde Reservation, when twenty-seven tribes from around the state were brought together and located on a single piece of land (Leavelle 1998:434). The concept of an intertribal reservation in Oregon appears to have originated from Joel Palmer, superintendant of Indian Affairs at the time; when he took office in 1853, he proposed a single Oregon Indian reservation, to be initiated over the next two years (Merrill and Hajda 2007:122). This reservation was not formed by a single reservation, but rather by several treaties with many different tribes, such as the Molallas, Umpquas, and Shastas, ratified in 1854 and 1855 (Merrill and Hajda 2007:123). Not all of these treaties were ratified, such as the Tualitan treaty, but an executive order was established to create reservation nonetheless

(Merrill and Hajda 2007:123). The goal of the federal government in creating this confederation was to relocate all of the tribes west of the Cascades onto a single reservation (Kentta and Lewis 2010:476). In addition, this was to alleviate the warfare between tribal peoples and settling whites, as the white population surged from the gold rush and trade during the 1850s (Beckham 2007:220). In particular, the Rogue Indian River Wars were cited as one of the major factors in the government deciding to move tribes onto Grand Ronde Reservation (Beckham 2007:220). The groups gathered at the Grand Ronde were from several different locations, ranging from Southern Oregon to Southwestern Washington. The removal and relocation of these tribes was at times forcible: in particular, the Umpquas were marched north to Grand Ronde by the military, after resisting relocation (Merrill and Hajda 2007:123). This month-long march led to widespread disease, death from exposure, as well as attacks from white settlers of the region (Merrill and Hajda 2007:123).

These groups in the Grand Ronde were highly diverse, and included the Klamath, Klickitat, Tillamook, Chehalis, and other tribes, many of whom were indiscriminately removed from their homeland in 1856 by the federal military (Zenk 1984:3). French and French-Indian were also relocated onto the reservation (Zenk 1984:4). Some of the tribes forced on the reservation were traditionally at war with one another, increasing the tension on the reservation (Merrill and Hajda 2007: 125). At the time of its formation in 1857, the Grand Ronde numbered about 1200, with no more than 100 people in each cultural group (Merrill and Hajda 2007:124). The population spoke several different languages including Takelman, Upper Chinookan, Northern Kalapuyan, Central

Kalapuyan, Southern Kalapuyan, French Canadian, and Mololas (Leavelle 1998:435). In total, there were over 25 dialects present of these languages during the formation of the reservation (Leavelle 1998:435). The three Kalapuyan languages were the only mutually intelligible languages on the Grand Ronde reservation, and no languages on the reservation had a large enough population of speakers to warrant their domination on the reservation (Zenk 1984:5). However, Chinuk Wawa was widely spoken in the area during the creation of the reservation, especially in northwestern Oregon (Merrill and Hajda 2007:122). Therefore, Chinuk Wawa was the necessary lingua franca of the reservation community. However, its role on the reservation became much more vital to following generations of Grand Ronde people.

As people on the Grand Ronde Reservation began to raise children, these children were taught Chinuk rather than their original tribal language, leading the language to become more fully developed. This process has been extensively studied by Henry Zenk, a linguist, current professor at Portland State University, and fluent speaker of Chinuk Wawa. While the generation of relocated members typically spoke at least a few of the indigenous languages represented by the confederation, children were usually only taught Chinuk Wawa as a Native language (Zenk 1988:112). In time, Grand Ronde members were creating a new cultural homeland and identity from many different ancestral tribal beliefs and traditions (Leavelle 1998:437). Chinuk Wawa became the primary means on the reservation through which tribal members communicated with each other. Second generation members of the reservation increasingly saw Chinuk as the "Indian language" on the reservation, as opposed to the white language of English, creating a sense of

community and Native pride despite the hybridized history of both Chinuk and the Grand

Ronde (Zenk 1988:115). Chinuk Wawa was spoken, along with English, in Grand Ronde

reservation schools until 1877, when all Native languages were federally banned in

Indian schools (Merrill and Hajda 2007:132). While Wawa eventually became obsolete

as a trading language due to the widespread establishment of English, tribal members

resisted colonial policies by continuing to speak Chinuk Wawa on the reservation.

Children used Chinuk far more frequently than English on the Grand Ronde Reservation

during the late nineteenth century (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444). Despite this fact,

however, the language gradually began dying out on the reservation starting in the early

twentieth century. By the 1930s, Chinuk Wawa use was increasingly restricted to small

areas of the reservation, particularly to elderly populations (Zenk 1988:114). When the

federally recognized Grand Ronde Confederation was terminated by executive order in

1954, elders continued to speak Chinuk Wawa as a major heritage language (Kentta and

Lewis 2010:476). By the 1970s, Chinuk Wawa was in danger of dying out, particularly

the dialect of Chinuk that preserved local Native pronunciations and vocabulary (Zenk

1984:6).

The status of Chinuk Wawa on the Grand Ronde made it a priority for

revitalization in 1977, even as the Grand Ronde was still considered terminated:

> "Even after English was in universal use, many individuals expressed their unique
> identity as Grand Ronde Indians by speaking Chinuk Wawa on occasion. These
> twin factors, the late survival of Chinuk Wawa-speaking elders in some Grand
> Ronde family households and the persistence of limited symbolic uses, set the
> stage for the language's current revival" (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444).

20

These language classes were conducted as the Grand Ronde were fighting for restoration by the federal government (Zenk 1988:114). Eventually, the Grand Ronde regained its recognition in 1983, due to decades of political activism (Zenk 1988:20). The revitalization of Chinuk Wawa has been conducted by the Grand Ronde since 1977, where the last fluent speakers of the language began teaching language classes. Henry Zenk, a linguist focused on Wawa, assisted in the design of the current program that the Grand Ronde Confederation currently utilizes. As the tribe regained their recognition from the government in 1983, they created even more resources dedicated to the history and revitalization of Chinuk Wawa (Kentta and Lewis 2010: 476). The Grand Ronde currently has immersion programs in Chinuk Wawa in their reservation school, starting in preschool and focused primarily in early education (Johnson and Zenk 2010: 444). However, the focus of the Grand Ronde in revitalization has also spread to surrounding urban areas, largely in Portland Oregon, and Eugene, Oregon. Until the early 2000s, these revitalization efforts were limited to the Grand Ronde reservation and surrounding area, and these urban classes only been made possible through the success of the Grand Ronde's casino (Bernando 2013).

3. Chinuk Wawa's Spread in the Region

The history of Chinuk Wawa caused the language to develop well beyond the boundaries of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde. This is due to the expansion of the fur trading business in the region. As the British-owned Hudson's Bay Company became the leading company throughout the territory, Chinuk Wawa followed traders to Fort Vancouver, which became established as the company's main outpost in 1825 (Lang

2008: 125). As a result of this move, the Nuu-chah-nulth language was no longer the major source of vocabulary for the trading jargon. Instead, a Multnomah dialect of Chinook, spoken throughout what is now Vancouver, WA and Portland, became the new major source of indigenous language (Lang 2008:101). Until the collapse of the fur trade in 1841, people from French, English, Chinook, and other cultural heritages spent over two decades of approximating Lower Chinook and experimenting with the language (Lang 2008:101). This language still survived in Vancouver, BC, however, leading to two separate dialects of Chinuk Wawa: northern Chinuk Wawa and Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa, each with their own lexicons, pronunciation systems, and local languages.

The northern dialect of the language found around Vancouver, BC is very similar to Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa, and has incorporated Chinookan vocabulary into its variation of the language (Lutz 2008).Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa does have differences from this northern dialect of the language. The northern dialect does not use non-English letters in its alphabet, approximating Native sounds through an English alphabet (Lang 2008). There are also different spellings and pronunciations of words in the northern use of the language: words that would be pronounced as "thlush" in the Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa are often pronounced as "kloshe" in Vancouver, BC (Lutz 2008). These differences, while not impeding intelligibility between the dialects, do reflect the different groups of speakers that have used Chinuk historically. While there may be areas with more authority on the language than others, generally Chinuk did not have a direct, central group of speakers until the twentieth century (Lang 2008:xi). Even then, there were still pockets of speakers in other areas of the region speaking dialects of Chinuk.

The language is also written to be ambiguous and amorphous, due to the different cultures using the language for various reasons (Lutz 2008:xi). These groups not only included Native peoples from around the region and European settlers, but Hawaiian and Asian laborers brought to the region (Lutz 2008:xi). Therefore, Chinuk Wawa had a much wider spread than many other indigenous languages of other origins, and is still quite diverse in its populations of speakers today. This diversity can also complicate the revitalization of Chinuk Wawa in the Grand Ronde, as it not only borrowed from so many languages around the region, but it also has been spoken in different variations by several other groups, both Native and non-Native, throughout the Northwest.

Although Chinuk Wawa is an endangered language, its impact is still felt in many Pacific Northwest communities. During the nineteenth century, many regional languages had adopted Chinuk Wawa due to its widespread use, making it in a sense an element of all Northwest Native cultures (Lutz 2008:297). This is somewhat problematic, as the spread of Chinuk Wawa at times destabilized the use of other Native languages in the area. Despite this issue, however, Chinuk Wawa has at times been described as the language of the Pacific Northwest, as it originated from many different languages throughout Oregon and Washington (Lillard 1998:45). While the use of the language has died out in many areas, it still can be seen in many place names around the region, such as Tukwila, Wawa Creek, and Tilikum Place (Lutz 2008:297). These place names range from southern Washington to Vancouver, BC. Even the Washington state motto, "alki" is a corrupted Chinuk word meaning "in the future" (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:57). However, the Grand Ronde is the central community revitalizing the

language. While the reservation community receives the most resources and encouragement to learn the language, the Grand Ronde has been able to afford spreading out to other communities in the area, primarily Eugene and Portland, the central area in which this research project took place. Portland, Oregon, is one of the major urban areas with Chinuk Wawa classes, and metropolitan area where sizable populations of indigenous peoples have settled, both from the regional area and from across the country (Rosenthal 2012: 112). The Grand Ronde also has a number of residents living in the area. There are a number of small communities formed around the teaching and use of Chinuk Wawa in the area, forming the major focus of this research thesis.

One of these speaking communities is at Portland State University, a public university in downtown Portland. Besides having the largest Native enrollment in Oregon, the school features a Native American Students and Community Center, opened in 2003, for activities and resources for Native students from all tribal backgrounds, as well as their allies (Rosenthal 2012:160). This center, designed after cultural elements of the Pacific Northwest and Alaskan region, holds biweekly Chinuk Wawa classes, creating an informal learning environment for students to begin investing in an indigenous language. This space, while not entirely accessible to community members outside of the school due to limited publicity of the language classes, nonetheless allows Indian peoples around the community to socialize, learn about other Chinuk activities throughout the city, and express their indigenous identity.

Chinuk Wawa is not just spoken in classrooms, but has a presence on the Web as well. The online use of Chinuk Wawa reflects the diversity of language speakers and the

dialects within the language. For example, the website "Chaku-Kəmdəks Chinuk Wawa" offers access to workshops, classes, and other resources for individuals to learn Chinuk (Bernando 2013). These weekly classes posted on the website are sponsored by the Grand Ronde, and are in fact the central community of study in this thesis. There are no restrictions on who can participate based on tribal identity or status; however, the website stresses that those who benefit from these workshops and classes are obligated to be a part of revitalization, and become a teacher of Chinuk Wawa in order to support the survival of the language (Bernarndo 2013). Even in an online context, the Grand Ronde is the central group that is teaching the language, both to its own group and to interested people in local urban communities.

The revitalization and documentation efforts of Chinuk Wawa have not been limited to those of the Grand Ronde Confederation, however. These efforts have included both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. For example, Duane Pasco, a Native-style artist in Seattle, published a Chinuk Wawa newspaper, called Tenas Wawa, from 1991 to 1995, dedicated to teaching the Chinuk Wawa language and history of the Pacific Northwest (Lillard 1998: 59). While only 27 issues of the newspaper were printed in Kitsap County, they are now available for purchase on Pasco's website (Pasco 2001). In addition, Charles Lillard, a poet and historian studying the Pacific Northwest, published a novel in which he translated poems of Wawa, provided a history of the language and region, and offered a lexicon of the language (Lillard 1998). These reflect the northern dialect of Chinuk Wawa, with an entirely English spelling system, different pronunciation of key words, and different vocabulary usage. Online communities and sites demonstrate the diversity that Chinuk Wawa still has in the region.

4. Problematizing the Academic Reaction to Chinuk Wawa

Chinuk Wawa has primarily been analyzed from its historical context by linguists and historians, rather than the current usage of the language. Most of this research has been devoted to the Chinook Jargon as a study of interculturalism in the Northwest. This language is also seen as an example of a trading pidgin that became a vital tool of communication in other areas of living for settlers in the nineteenth century. In these studies, the rising dominance of English in the region led to abandonment of Wawa aside from a few isolated communities. Other research has focused on the history of Chinook Jargon from an indigenous perspective, especially on reservations such as the Grand Ronde where Chinuk Wawa served as a lingua franca. However, limited research has been done on the efforts to revitalize the language, especially when looking outside of the Grand Ronde.

It is clear, based on articles regarding the language, that Chinuk Wawa has been denigrated by some academics due to its origins as a trading language. In his article discussing the evolution of trade languages and other jargons, John Reinecke considers trade jargons the least developed forms of marginal languages that are widely spoken (Reinecke 1964: 535). Despite its history of being used in intertribal communication and as a first language for children in multicultural areas, Reinecke chooses to categorize Chinuk Wawa as a trading jargon. In his analysis, he describes trade jargons as generally makeshift forms of communication, and short-lived to the point of their usefulness until populations manage to transition to a standard tongue (Reinecke 1964: 535). While Chinuk Wawa was described as a language that managed to survive beyond its initial

usefulness, or as an unusual jargon in that respect, Reinecke still illustrates the language as only adequate for simple trade (Reinecke 1964: 537). Perhaps most tellingly, the role that Chinuk Wawa has played as a heritage language in certain areas is largely overlooked in Reinecke's article. Chinook Jargon is acknowledged as the trade language of the people in the Northwest and as a possible heritage language; however, Reinecke uses the phrase "a few children of French Canadian *voyaguers* and squaws in Oregon Territory" to describe the remaining native speakers of the language as of the 1960s, before the Grand Ronde revitalization program had begun (Reinecke 1964: 538). The language appears to be seen as inevitably dying in this piece, perhaps due to the termination of the Grand Ronde at the time. This article reflects the traditional historical view of Chinuk Wawa, and it is not one that is accurate in the twenty-first century.

Several authors have created more recent analyses of Chinuk Wawa and its role in indigenous life throughout the Pacific Northwest. However, there are still troubling elements to some of these studies. Although the Grand Ronde have established and standardized their dialect of Chinuk Wawa, their alphabet and spellings are often not represented in the writings regarding Chinuk. It appears that Lutz uses the northern dialect of Chinuk Wawa in his writing: the spelling of certain words in Chinuk throughout this text corresponds to northern pronunciation, and in several places words do not correspond to Grand Ronde definitions (Lutz 2008). This use of dialect is also seen in George Lang's book regarding the history of Chinuk (Lang 2008). Lillard also relies on a northern dialect of Chinuk in order to explore the language (Lillard 1998). In his foreward, Lang mentions that he considered using Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa for

transcribing Chinuk in this book, but decided to use a more northern dialect due to its use in historical accounts of the language (Lang 2008:xiii). However, George Lang does use the term "Chinuk Wawa" throughout most of his book. While John Lutz's work on the history of Chinuk Wawa and Northwest tribal groups has been published over 30 years later than Rienecke's article, the role of the language in the Grand Ronde is still glossed over. At no point in the book is Chinuk Wawa called by its name, and is instead referred to in the traditional English "Chinook Jargon" (Lutz 2008). This term is the traditional academic word for the language, and reflects European-American control over the narrative of Chinuk, rather than the current efforts to revitalize the language. References to Chinuk Wawa as a pidgin can also be seen as an example of European-American categories for the tribal language. As seen in the next chapter, while Chinuk Wawa began as a trading pidgin, it is no less valuable as an indigenous language to its people.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

1. Pidgins and Creoles

Chinuk Wawa can be considered a *creole* language, emerging from the trading

pidgin of the same name used throughout the Pacific Northwest. Unlike many other

indigenous languages, Chinuk is relatively new, developing largely in the eighteenth and

nineteenth century, and draws from a number of languages and language families, some

of which are not indigenous. Regardless of the narrative used to explain the origins of

Chinuk Wawa, it was clearly originally established in the area for intercultural trade.

Pidgins can be defined as a simple auxiliary language used primarily in areas with

multicultural and multilingual communities (Todd 1974:20). Unlike older, standardized

languages that can cover a nearly limitless array of topics and conditions with their

vocabulary, pidgins in their infancy typically only cover a restricted number of situations

(Todd 1974:20). Often formed after a point of contact between different cultures, pidgins

are often utilized for intercultural trading and other types of commerce (Todd 1974:6).

These languages often have a simplified grammar, a limited range of vocabulary, and a

pronunciation system that uses elements from the different languages of the area

(Todd 1974:7). While pidgins may expand their vocabulary and establish a more complex

grammar eventually, for the most part pidgins are developed for largely utilitarian

reasons.

Due to their limited vocabulary, pidgins use vocabulary in different ways than other languages. For instance, the reduplication of certain words in pidgins can be used in place of comparatives, intensifying words without creating a new set of adjectives (Todd 1974:55). This can be seen in Chinuk Wawa, as the reduplication of verbs can both intensify the action of the subject and indicate a haphazard or random approach by that subject (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012). For instance, when the verb "nanich" (to see) is duplicated, it not only intensifies the act of looking in the sentence, but also indicates that one was looking for an extended period of time in a number of locations (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde:171). Pidgins also make use of compound words in order to create new vocabulary, rather than simply borrowing words from other languages or creating a new term (Todd 1974:55). Chinuk Wawa uses compound words frequently, particularly when coining new words for technologies, objects, organisms, or items otherwise not considered part of traditional Chinuk culture (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012). When examining its history, as well as its structural elements and grammar, it is clear that Chinuk Wawa can be seen as a pidgin. However, it quickly became a much more heavily used language in the area, and gradually was seen as a sign of Grand Ronde and Chinook identity.

While Chinuk Wawa is often called Chinook Jargon in academic circles, particularly with earlier historical texts, Chinuk originated as a pidgin language. Pidgins typically have fixed norms of pronunciation, grammar, and semantics in pidgin languages; however, these norms are often not regulated in the same way that standard languages are (Holm 1988:5). The term *jargon* now rarely refers to new or developing

languages, and instead describes a particular specialized terminology of a profession or group (Holm 1988:5). Chinuk Wawa was originally a trading pidgin, but gradually expanded into many other areas of life due to the multilingually diverse nature of the Pacific Northwest (Goodfellow 2002:214). This expansion required a new range of vocabulary from the language, creating a more complex and nuanced form of Chinuk Wawa than originally developed (Lang 2008:5). As seen in chapter two, Chinuk Wawa became the first spoken language for many children born in multicultural households during the beginning of the nineteenth century, and was often the first language of children growing up on the Grand Ronde Reservation.

This led to the development of Chinuk Wawa from a pidgin to a creole. A creole is considered a language that has originated from a pidgin: however, unlike pidgins, creoles are spoken as the first language of a person in a given area (Todd 1974:25). In other words, Chinuk Wawa was a pidgin language until intercultural couples in the Lower Columbia began to have children; because these couples did not speak a common language other than Chinuk Wawa, children in these families usually learned and spoke Chinuk as their first language, leading it to become a creole. This creolization of pidgins does not always happen, but in most cases creoles become native languages of an area or of a community when speakers are broken off from their original homelands and cultural connections (Holm 1988:7). This is seen in the Grand Ronde, as the community was formed by the forced relocation of many different local tribes and bands onto a single source of land.

Creoles often are more complex than pidgins, due to the wider range of needs that speakers have when using the language at home or in social settings (Roberts 2000:256). While there are common differences between pidgins and creoles, pidgins and creoles are not different classes of languages, as they are not structurally different enough from one another (Roberts 2000:266). Like pidgins, creoles are not typically as standardized as traditional languages: there are often differences between the use of a creole by the native and non-native speakers in an area, particularly regarding the pronunciation of native vocabulary (Roberts 2000:268). This is seen in Chinuk Wawa, as there were two established dialects of the language in the nineteenth century, split between whites and American Indians of the area (Johnson and Zenk 2010:444). Non-native speakers may also use these languages for their own purposes outside of home or social life. Missionaries would often translate prayers and texts, as well as sermons with local interpreters, into widely spoken local creoles, beginning in the eighteenth century (Todd 1974:76). These languages often have a wide range of speakers during the height of their popularity, using the language for trade, professional use, intercultural communication, and even home use. However, only a few languages gain the importance that Chinuk Wawa has in its community as a heritage language.

Other pidgin languages have become heritage languages in their local communities. For instance, Hawaiian Creole, developed by the culturally diverse plantation workers brought to the islands, is currently spoken by half a million people in daily conversations (Goodfellow and Alfred 2002:214). While its major indigenous source, Hawaiian, is taught and used in classrooms, the creole form of the language is the

one used by students for social purposes, as it incorporates English vocabulary and pronunciation (Goodfellow and Alfred 2002:214). While this creole differs from Chinuk in that its parent language has not died from lack of speakers, it nonetheless plays a role in expressing a Hawaiian and indigenous identity. In addition, slaves in the Americas used creoles of African languages and French to develop a new language, reflecting many different cultural backgrounds, as well as a nostalgia for their ancestral homelands (Jourdan 2006:144). These groups used the remnants of their ancestral languages as tools of daily communication, partially due to their connection with other African groups (Jourdan 2006:144). These languages serve as a way to strengthen these subaltern communities that were formed by multicultural contact and the ensuing colonization of the Americas. The transformation of a pidgin or creole into a heritage language is aided by the creation of these new social groups that are otherwise not part of the same speech community; isolation from the outside world generates new bounded social worlds, especially when this population is from a diverse range of backgrounds (Jourdan 2006:144).

It appears that creoles and pidgins, while not always repurposed to become the heritage language of a speech community, can become indicators of indigenous identity. Like indigenous languages, pidgins and creoles can represent subaltern communities to some extent, just as the pidgin can represent subaltern languages of the area (Jourdan 2006:135). Unlike standardized or traditional languages, these pidgins and creoles reflect several different cultures at once, as is seen in the formulation of Chinuk Wawa. In Chinuk Wawa, not only are Chinookan languages represented in the vocabulary of the

language, but Nuu-chah-nulth, Salishan languages, French, and English are also seen in the formulation of vocabulary, covering cultures from around the region (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012). In certain situations, preserving and revitalizing a local pidgin or creole can be seen as a resistance to assimilation and hegemony, as these languages can be part of the creation of a new cultural identity (Jourdan 2006:144). However, this process can be problematized, as preserving these new languages can destabilize the transmission of older indigenous languages of the area. In other cases, pidgin or creole revitalization may not indicate political resistance, but an interest in cultural maintenance. In this way, pidgins and creoles can serve the same purpose that many older indigenous languages have to their communities. Pidgins and creoles can be seen as vehicles for vital cultures, although generally used for oral communication rather than written communication (Todd 1974:91). While a pidgin or creole may not retain all of the grammatical elements of an indigenous language, it can still be used as a generation's marker of identity, as older and more complex languages die out (Jourdan 2006:156). While these languages often use vocabulary and grammar of dominant languages in order to aid multicultural contact and communication, these languages exist for certain communities, indigenous and otherwise, as an important sign of heritage and history.

Despite the attempted revitalization of these languages by certain communities, pidgins and creoles are still stereotyped by the public as lesser languages due to their origins. This misconception of pidgins is seen throughout history, both in academic circles and in the popular culture; however, during the twentieth century, communities

from around the world began to show an interest in revitalizing their local pidgins and creoles, taking the place of standard languages of the area (Todd 1974:84). As linguistic study was developed and pidgins were first studied, pidgin languages were often compared to children approximating what were considered "real" languages, due to the flexible pronunciations, limited function words, and narrow morphological change of most pidgins (Todd 1974:29). Even as academics began to see pidgins as legitimate and began to study pidgin genesis, many pidgins and creoles around the world were often considered primitive or childish (Goodfellow 2002:214). As seen in chapter two, Chinuk Wawa is often still discussed as a trading jargon, despite its growth throughout the nineteenth century and its importance to the Grand Ronde today. This dismissal of pidgin languages can be at least partially due to their oral nature: written languages are historically privileged over oral languages in linguistic studies due to the ease of access to texts in the language (Holm 1988:18). The lack of written communication often increases the variability of the pronunciations in pidgins, diminishing their prestige, particularly in this highly literate era (Todd 1974:83). To combat the stereotypes of pidgins and creoles, Chinuk and many other languages originating as pidgins are developing written languages and dictionaries, in order to expand the language beyond its origins and improve its chances of survival in a society so deeply immersed in writing.

Although pidgins and creoles are still often stigmatized by popular society, more communities and scholars are seeing pidgins and creoles as legitimate and valuable languages. Holm describes these languages not as debased or simple, but as new languages serving new cultural communities (1988:18). Not only are these languages

new, but they are continuing to develop and grow in a postcolonial age. In addition to Chinuk Wawa, Goodfellow and Alfred (2002:214) describe the Canadian pidgin language of Michif, primarily spoken by intercultural Métis people of the nation, as a pidgin language that serves as a sign of cultural identity and heritage to its community. While these languages often have unique, multicultural histories, these languages can become important heritage languages, and develop their own complex rules of grammar.

2. Indigenous Languages and Identity

One of the most vital reasons for saving indigenous languages for indigenous peoples is the role that language plays in shaping identity. Language does not just exist as a vehicle of communication, but is an expression of a particular worldview, a particular culture, and a particular history (Warner 1999:69). For many indigenous communities, attempting to recreate indigenous languages as community languages is an attempt to restore indigenous worldviews (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:57). These languages did not die in a vacuum; elements of Native expression, art, and ritual were often lost with the loss of heritage languages (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:23). Teaching indigenous languages can also begin the process of healing from colonialism and its lingering effects. Due to ethnocentric stereotypes about indigenous language, Indian children are inadvertently told that their language is inferior (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:24). Indigenous peoples must combat these stigmatizing elements of popular culture when building their sense of cultural identity, presenting a much more positive interpretation of indigenous culture to their community (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:22).

Indigenous identities are formed not only by shared characteristics but by difference from the dominant culture, including the various traumas of colonization (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:29). The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (2008:278) cites the Indian boarding schools as a colonizing project that created shared histories among indigenous communities. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, indigenous peoples have been working together in order to advance their political and cultural needs; as a result, these communities have come together to express and celebrate an "Indian" identity, rather than a specific cultural identity (Rosenthal 2012:250). By beginning to teach indigenous languages to young people, communities can begin to reassert their identity, and expose their youth to an indigenous perspective (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:23). This process begins to address the relationship between indigenous identity, language, and community. While an Indian identity does not entirely rely on a language or speech community, there is a certain level of interdependence between these three elements (Blair 1995:31). Of course, this interdependent relationship is complicated by the way indigenous identity is often shaped, especially in the twenty-first century. Many indigenous people now are born in a multiethnic or multitribal environment; how individuals and communities balance all ethnic identities in the twenty-first century while preserving an indigenous heritage is a vital issue (Henze and Davis 1999:12).

While revitalization of indigenous languages is often seen as essential to maintaining an indigenous identity, the exact relationship between language and identity is still debated in academic circles. In particular, the process of language revitalization

raises the question of how language is connected to ethnicity (Henze and Davis 1999:9).

Those that subscribe to an essentialist viewpoint believe that a natural relationship exists

between an indigenous group and its language (Henze and Davis 1999: 9). In other

words, those that belong to a specific culture are the ones who have the right to speak that

particular language, and be involved in the revitalization process. Those with a

constructivist perspective believe that language, including indigenous and minority

languages, is a social creation and not necessarily connected to any single group (Henze

and Davis 1999:10). While indigenous peoples may feel a historical connection to a

particular language, it is not necessarily an element of their ethnic identity; the language

can in fact find a new speech community that is not indigenous during the revitalization

process. As languages become revitalized in indigenous communities, tension exists

between people who see a language as an essential part of identity, and those who see

language as a tool to help enforce identity (Jaffe 2001:271). Either the use of same

language creates a shared cultural identity, or a shared identity is already there and

expressed by a language (Jaffe 2001:274). Both the essentialist and constructivist

perspective have problematic elements. On one hand, there is concern that an essentialist

perspective implies that culture is only an extension of ethnicity; this extreme is

biological essentialism, which is not nearly as common as spiritual essentialism (Henze

and Davis 1999:11). Likewise, constructivism is criticized as it tends to diminish the

roles of ethnicity and culture in language preservation and revitalization (Henze and

Davis 1999:11). Due to its history as a multicultural language, Chinuk Wawa is defined

as being especially difficult to be limited to only one or a few cultural groups.

This issue has a practical element, in that it asks who should be learning indigenous languages: the people of that cultural group only, or outside people as well. Is an indigenous language meant to be spoken only between members of a nation, or should it be a more open process between the indigenous population and the dominant society? Tribes must also contend with the history of appropriation and commodification of indigenous and subaltern cultures, especially in the twenty-first century. Is it a problem that language learners are non-native in origin, or is it an asset to language learning? (Henze and Davis1999:16). How does a community define Native without resorting to problematic rules of ethnic essentialism? Indigenous knowledge and culture is often romanticized by the dominant culture, making it an attractive commodity for non-Native peoples rather than a center of identity and history (Nee-Benham 2001:14). Communities must decide as they revitalize their heritage languages how to address these issues of appropriation and commodification.

Several communities struggle with the protection of their heritage language. This can be seen in the Hawaiian revitalization process, where non-Native Hawaiians are learning the language as well as Native Hawaiians. Many Hawaiians report that non-Hawaiians often assume a certain level of privilege when learning the language, making their own process of learning a priority over native speakers (Warner 1999:72). This privilege has the potential to lead to a more serious political impact. There are several who fear that Native Hawaiians are losing the authority to shape and plan their own language revitalization, in favor of non-native speakers (Warner 1999:74). As a result, Hawaiian culture is being to some extent appropriated by non-Natives, leading ethnic

Hawaiians to be silenced on their own language and cultural heritage (Warner 1999:75).

For the most part, it does not seem as though non-Native peoples recognize the potential

harm of their actions. Many people see their active role in revitalization as helpful to the

overall goal of keeping the language alive. However, there are also many in the

community who see this input as paternalistic (Warner 1999:75). The learning of

Hawaiian by non-Hawaiians is often justified by the fact that native Hawaiians are

themselves immigrants of the land, and are therefore no different from other populations

wishing to learn and speak the language (Warner 1999:77). This idea ignores thousands

of years of cultural history and the destruction wrought by colonial policies on the

islands.

However, this appears to be indicative of the mindset of many non-Hawaiians

attempting to understand revitalization of the language. In the political discourse

surrounding funding for language learning, most assume that ethnicity plays no part in

language revitalization (Warner 1999:78). In order for non-indigenous peoples to control

the development and revitalization of the Hawaiian language, the language must be seen

as autonomous and separate from its people of origin (Warner 1999:78). As a result, the

language is often described as the language of the land, not as the language of the people.

This makes the language abstract and a separate entity from culture or society (Warner

1999:79). Many indigenous peoples find this abstraction objectionable, as their culture is

in a sense dehumanized and made an attractive commodity for the dominant culture

(Warner 1999:79). While removing culture from an indigenous language may be an

extreme viewpoint of the constructivist perspective, it nonetheless is a real part of the

discourse surrounding revitalization that many different indigenous peoples must fight against in order to maintain control of their language and maintain self-determination.

Because of its history as an intercultural trading language, Chinuk Wawa has been seen by some as a regional language, rather than as an ethnic language of the Grand Ronde or other groups. As stated previously, many name places from around the region are derived from Chinuk terms. Due to its spread from Vancouver, BC to Northern California, it was not spoken exclusively by the Grand Ronde, but was connected to many different cultural groups. However, like other indigenous languages, Chinuk Wawa incorporates cultural knowledge into its vocabulary: for instance, the terms describing different directions are not created from compass directions, but in relation to the major rivers in the area (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:281). Therefore, one does not travel north or south, but towards the water or away from the water (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012:281). As a result, Chinuk Wawa can be interpreted in a number of ways and be valued for different reasons, similarly to the traditional Hawaiian language.

Indigenous language classes can play a vital role in keeping indigenous cultures alive. Many indigenous communities attempt to inject their own cultural values into language classes, as a larger part of cultural revitalization. In many instances, the formal classroom environment is not just a place of education, but a place to develop cultural identity and community (Nee-Benham 200115). As a result, educators in indigenous classrooms see classes that center around indigenous languages as an opportunity to children their culture and history, allowing students to place greater value in themselves

and in their community (Nee-Benham 2001:15). It is the belief of these educators that immersing children in their ancestry and origins will help them become proud of themselves and their culture (Keahi 2001:58). This pride will in the long run possibly translate into greater use of the language in more environments, and a more sustainable language revitalization process.

These groups must often create their own representation in educational curriculum, especially with written materials (Henze and Davis 1999:18). This must be done in order to prevent translation into English, and in order to augment the selection of materials teachers have to instruct children in their language and culture. Some groups are fortunate enough to have video or audio recordings of elder speakers to help bring some languages back from extinction, as well as strengthen an indigenous understanding of history (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:18). Of course, only teaching the language as a historical artifact will not help children identify languages as their own. As a result, many have argued that learning should be considering the indigenous future as well as the past, balancing the physical, mental, and spiritual needs and goals of the community (Wetere-Bryant 2001:147). Others have argued that, in order for language revitalization to be a successful cultural revitalization, practical skills of the culture should be taught, as well as language instruction (Keahi 2001:59). This cultural knowledge must constantly be revitalized and cultivated in order for long-term survival of indigenous cultures (Harkin 2004:xix). Art, language, rituals, and dances have the potential to all be taught together as a holistic and immersive effort to strengthen traditional indigenous culture.

The process of language revitalization can be a major part of rebuilding and strengthening indigenous communities. The process of revitalization by its nature has a major impact on cultural, educational, governmental, and economic systems in an indigenous community; as a result, the success of revitalization cannot be viewed in a piecemeal way (Henze and Davis 1999:12). Not all indigenous communities have chosen to revitalize their language along with their culture, however. For instance, in the case of the Tigua, tribal members have generally lost their indigenous language, Tiwa (Adams 2009:110). However, other cultural resources considered vital to the community, such as rituals, songs, and dance, were still preserved (Adams 2009:110). While several indigenous communities have revitalized traditional cultural practices without revitalizing their language, language revitalization often connects several aspects of indigenous culture (Henze and Davis 1999:11). Language is seen by some as being cultural indigenous epistemology: indigenous ways of thinking and creating knowledge are often embedded in indigenous languages (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:23). This makes the process of revitalization imperative, as this knowledge cannot be effectively translated into a dominant language.

Globalization theory supports these ideas. Appadurai (2012:569) states that colonialism was a major part of the modern negotiation of identities and nations, creating imagined communities as a part of identity. Individuals and tribes revitalizing Chinuk Wawa have made a conscious decision to have this language represent their indigenous identity, even though it does not belong to any one tribe historically. Globalization clearly has a homogenizing impact on cultures around the world: economic systems have

become increasingly capitalistic and interdependent, colonial languages such as English are spoken by a global audience and dominate global academic discourse, and objects of culture are commoditized and traded around the world (Appadurai 2012:580). However, Appadurai also argues that people living in these imagined communities have the ability to challenge established realities created by those in power (2012:574). One way of resisting assimilation is to use the tools of dominant powers, such as writing systems, technology, and resistance strategies, or the mediascapes of the dominant power, for the purposes of strengthening indigenous culture in resistance to hegemony (Appadurai 2012:575). This can be seen through the use of Western educational systems to teach indigenous languages, history, and culture. In some cases, revitalization programs, such as the Chinuk Wawa program, are funded through participation in financescapes, the global flows of finance and currency (Appadurai 2012:580). While the Grand Ronde is participating in economic systems initially established through colonialism and imperialism, this participation also funds one of their major means of resistance against the dominant culture. However, this process of using tools of the dominant culture as resistance has also been criticized by indigenous peoples. In particular, some tribal peoples see this adaptation of tribal practices as another form of assimilation, as Native children grow up accepting to the dominant colonial system (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:60). Each tribal group negotiates this balance between resistance and adaptation, deciding how best to survive in the twenty-first century while preserving their traditions and culture.

While language can be highly important in cultural revitalization, however, language revitalization alone does not necessarily ensure the survival of certain cultural elements. Language is only part of what builds community and identity, and should be seen through lens of relationships between cultural practices and education (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:38). Therefore, many educational systems of the indigenous community are not just centered around language, but focus on strengthening the community as well. Several indigenous leaders and academics assert that it is vital to create connections between indigenous schools and the larger community, in order to make language revitalization meaningful and successful (Kipp 2000:68). While language revitalization can help preserve other forms of culture, these other forms of culture can also help strengthen language practices (Henze and Davis 1999:8). Language and culture are seen as being in an interdependent web, where one affects the other. Likewise, the strength of educational systems relies on the health of indigenous communities as a whole, as children are impacted by their home life more so than any formal revitalization program (Henze and Davis 1999:15). Children must be able to relate to indigenous languages as a larger part of an identity, and have positive opinions of that identity in order to practice it.

The struggle of resistance to assimilation and the dominant culture is felt by urban Indians on the individual level just as much as the collective level. Of course, one of the most pervasive ideas from the dominant culture is that "real" Indians " – those that practice traditional lifestyles and culture – have effectively vanished by the end of twentieth century (Lawrence 2004:135). While this is an ethnocentric and extremely narrow vision of what Indian culture represents, it nonetheless is a powerful narrative that

many indigenous people in urban environments struggle with. The values and practices of the dominant culture are often seen as those that lead to economic success; as a result, many urban Indians are pressured to accept those values as the only way to effectively live in the urban environment (Lawrence 2004:136). Children that grow up in cities often have a greater exposure to the assimilatory pressure of the dominant culture, making them uncomfortable with an isolated indigenous identity (Lawrence 2004:136). Language revitalization opportunities can help these individuals reconnect with an indigenous identity in an urban environment.

Issues of identity and culture regarding language revitalization of course do not only affect the indigenous individual. Language classes not only help revitalize the larger culture of indigenous communities, but can also be a safe space for community members to express their indigenous identity (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:49). Non-indigenous people are often excluded from language planning, in order to ensure feelings of security (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:50). Many groups are also skeptical about outsiders coming in to evaluate language classes and programs (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:49). For certain activists, language is a gift of the creator to certain indigenous peoples, and intervention from the outside can be a disruption of that gift and relationship it forms between people and culture (Henze and Davis 1999:15). Cosmology is not the only factor in protecting indigenous languages from the outside world. According to the UN Declaration of Indigenous Rights, indigenous peoples should have the right to determine what happens to their language, making them able to revitalize language as they please (United Nations 2008:2). This begins to assert the rights of indigenous peoples as sovereign nations,

rather than racial or cultural minorities. Therefore, the decision to renew an indigenous

language must be made by the speakers of the language themselves, and not outsiders;

attempts by non-natives to revitalize indigenous languages almost always fail (Henze and

Davis 1999:6). Language revitalization is not only a right of indigenous peoples, but also

a way to build community. Local churches often take part learning and teaching

indigenous languages (Blair 1995:35). Other institutions also become involved with

expressing and defining indigenous culture. However groups plan their language

revitalization, community is often a major priority when attempting to strengthen the

language.

Educational systems provide a space for indigenous expression in the

globalization model. Nations such as the Grand Ronde are not only presenting but

rebuilding their pasts through education programs, making the establishment of history

and identity a political negotiation (Appadurai 2012:582). Although the Grand Ronde

was traditionally a group of 27 separate bands, some at war with one another, Grand

Ronde members of the present day identify as Grand Ronde, rather than as Chinook,

Umpqua, or Tillamook. While this process can help strengthen certain aspects of cultural

revitalization, it is also difficult for a tribe to decide how to represent its past, and what

will be defined as its "authentic" roots. The Grand Ronde and Chinook Nation are

currently in the middle of negotiation these pasts, and choosing how to represent

themselves through language and culture.

For the most part, educational systems in America have not been changed to

include and incorporate indigenous or minority languages (Nettle and Romaine

2000:190). In his study of Arapahoe and their recent immersion program on the Wind River Reservation, Greymorning (1997:22) argued that the loss of language is directly tied to the loss of culture, and therefore the loss of tribal identity. Of course, Native languages can still be valued as a means of resistance: "Stigmatizing a language can, under certain circumstances, make it even more valuable as a form of symbolic resistance and organization" (Nettle and Romaine 2000:90). Indigenous peoples are using language revitalization as a means to reassert their right to self-determination; not only are they teaching their languages, but they also determine the best way to teach language from an indigenous perspective. For example, the Nez Perce utilize traditional Coyote stories in classes, not only using grammatical forms of the stories to help teach language, but also sharing traditional Nez Perce culture with young students (Heredia and Francis 1997:50). Indigenous education programs are at their core centered around the ideas and practices of connecting generations, telling traditional stories, and learning how to teach language in indigenous ways (Hornberger 2010:417). How information technology is used in order to meet indigenous goals varies widely based on each nation and on each language being revitalized, as well as the technological needs of the community.

3. The Revitalization Process in Other Languages

Other indigenous nations have made intense efforts to teach and revitalize their heritage languages. One of the most famous successful indigenous language programs has been the Hawaiian immersion program. Hawaiians began revitalizing the language in the late 1980s with preschool and kindergarten programs, receiving state and federal funding to create secondary education programs in the language (Nettle and Romaine

2000:182). One of the largest obstacles to teaching the language, in addition to fighting the English-only policies of the state, was creating the educational materials for classes (Nettle and Romaine 2000:185). It is also notable that, despite the stereotype that bilingualism can lead to limited knowledge of both languages (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000:27), children in the Hawaiian immersion program scored higher on college admission tests than their classmates abstaining from language classes (Nettle and Romaine 2000:183). With its focus on immersion education, the Hawaiian language immersion program is used as a model for tribes starting to create educational curriculum in their native language; language programs in the Grand Ronde have used similar strategies in educational programs, creating a formal program for preschool and kindergarten students, as well as high school and college courses.

Communities have undergone enormous effort to revitalize their heritage languages. As of 2000, over 100 nations have tribal schools, meant to be centers of community and cultural learning (Social Policy 2008:203). While revitalization programs are not just limited to educational classrooms, they are often the major source of language learning in indigenous communities. These programs often have an impact outside the area of language revitalization, and affect education experiences for indigenous youth overall. Studies have shown that local control over educational policies has a positive impact on test score and graduation rates for indigenous youth (Social Policy 2008:203). As a result, indigenous language revitalization is not seen in a vacuum, but is a larger strategy of cultural and social renewal.

However, indigenous language revitalization carries a number of complications and challenges. The sheer number of indigenous languages alone makes the process difficult, particularly in the twenty-first century, as urban Indian populations come from a number of areas. Most indigenous language communities are not homogenous, complicating the process of revitalization (Wong 1999:97). This is especially true in areas with historically high linguistic diversity. Mainstream methods of education are not always sustainable or feasible as a result, particularly in California and Alaska, and indigenous groups generally from informal educational systems (Henze and Davis 1999:17). These communities are not only often diverse, but fragmented. Due to both federal policy and economic opportunities, the migration of Indian peoples to various cities is often seen as a factor behind indigenous language loss; some have argued that a degree of geographic isolation is necessary for effective maintenance of language and culture (Blair 1995:26). As a result of migration, peoples are often states away from tribal homeland where language classes exists, blocking them from many of the resources available for cultural expression. Migration out of reservations and into cities can be considered a major issue in Native communities, undermining the cohesion vital to maintaining indigenous culture and language (Armstrong 2001:37). As a result, many people in urban areas often have limited access to these languages, particularly when migrating across state lines. Even in areas where tribal languages are taught, community is highly difficult to build as a result of language teaching, due to the often limited number of Native peoples in urban dwellings.

Fortunately, indigenous languages can be taught and learned in several different ways, according to the priorities and needs of the local community. For instance, Joshua Fishman, one of the leading linguists in the area of language death and revitalization, has developed a system for language revitalization in an indigenous community. He argues that indigenous communities must begin revitalization by teaching the language as a second language, centering cultural events and activities in the language, and then broadening schooling to adults and elders in order to achieve intergenerational transmutation of the language, and finally culminating in media and government services being conducted in the language (Henze and Davis 1999:5). In this system, schooling in the language being revitalized is done largely in more formal environments before being strengthened in the home.

However, there are several critics of this system of language teaching. Some have argued that this scale of revitalization is too restrictive and rigid for indigenous groups, and that many indigenous peoples want to define the goals and successes of revitalization on their own terms (Henze and Davis 1999:6). The Native-run schools in California, for example, have a different idea as to how to revitalize their culture, centered in its own methods of traditional education. These schools and classes rely on a traditional master-apprentice system in teaching indigenous languages (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:58). With this system, the younger beginning speaker and an older fluent speaker of the language are paired up, spending up to 20 hours a week together and speaking only in the tribal language (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:60). This immersive style of education allows for a

diverse range of environments to speak in, more informal means for learners to speak the language, and stronger community ties between different age groups.

While indigenous languages are typically taught in formal classroom settings, educational programs can be difficult to maintain and initiate. Indigenous peoples struggle to fund separate schools for indigenous children, especially when so much funding comes from the dominant social system. Groups must try and defend their schools, as separate indigenous language instruction funding is seen as special treatment for Native children (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:40). In fact, these schools are often heavily criticized as being ill-equipped for children's needs; some have proposed that young students should to go to city schools for their educational needs, leading them to being separated from culture (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:42). Even when the existence of immersive indigenous language programs is not criticized, there are a number of other issues to contend with regarding the maintenance of these programs. For the most part, these programs can only admit a small number of students each year, due to the restricted numbers of language teachers and resources available to the program (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:41). In many schools, there is a limited time spent in the indigenous language instruction, leading children to have limited exposure to the language (Leonard and Gilmore 1999: 41). This instruction in non-native languages can be a problem when developing indigenous identity (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:25).

Another major issue in indigenous language instruction is simply finding speakers of these dying languages willing or able to teach in a classroom. In some cases, elders from the local area are brought in to teach indigenous languages. However, this is not

without complications; fluent speakers are not necessarily successful or prepared teachers, making the transmission of the language difficult (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:42). These elder speakers must also be trained in order to legally teach, taking up more time and resources (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:43). While elders are often considered experts in the language, this expertise and experience can be intimidating for young students in the language. While some schools deal in immersive teaching, associating terms to images without any element of translation, others attempt to teach the language as close to its older forms as possible, correcting young students in their pronunciation, vocabulary, and sentence construction. However, this criticism can cause young speakers to turn away from the language after a few setbacks (Hinton and Ahlers 1999: 60). Although teaching the language with correction can help preserve the history of a language, as well as its often phonology and grammatical forms, it also can be a difficult and frustrating process to learn the language as a result. This correction is justified in that new learners of a language will most likely be sole bearers of language, especially in small groups, and mistakes will eventually be permanent in the language (Hinton and Ahlers 1999: 60).

Not all elders are bothered by imperfect usage; in fact, many involved in the revitalization movement of Californian languages have been reported as being excited to hear their heritage language being used again (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:60). Of course, the process of language teaching is often a point of concern among many indigenous peoples. For some, the use of Western styles of teaching means that children are adhering to lessons and instruction of the dominant culture, even while teaching the indigenous

language (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:56). Traits seen in the classroom such as individualism, competitiveness, and sole focus on the intellectual process of learning are all seen as Western styles of education to indigenous peoples (Armstrong 2001:37). These educational processes can undermine indigenous culture while strengthening the indigenous language (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:24). The Grand Ronde is one of the groups that use Western styles of education in their community, while attempting to use immersion strategies in order to encourage students to think in Chinuk Wawa. These debates between educational strategies can cause an enormous amount of tension in indigenous communities. However, there are a number of ways in which indigenous languages are taught, leading to several options indigenous communities can to pursue while preserving their language.

Revitalization is not only complicated by the fragmentation of indigenous communities, but the general ideas behind revitalization as well. Effective indigenous language revitalization has different requirements than foreign language learning. Its goals are to strengthen indigenous communities, cultures, and identities through language teaching, rather than simply teaching the language alone (Warner 1999:69). However, indigenous languages are often taught as a second language, still accepting Western worldviews regarding educational practices (Henze and Davis 1999:11). This Western style of education runs the danger of being assimilatory in nature, even as it attempts to strengthen indigenous communities. Indigenous values, cultures, and worldviews are not taught in this educational system, and instead support Western values (Armstrong 2001:37). Many indigenous peoples must contend with and counter the message that, in

order to progress and thrive, non-Western cultural models need to be destroyed for the sake of progress, damaging indigenous identity and pride in mother tongues (Gegeo, Watson-Gegeo 1999:25). The devastation wrought by colonialism has had impacts on indigenous educational systems. Native children have been regularly ranked 1 grade average below children of the same age nationally (Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2008:201). Tribal nations also lag behind national averages in college degrees earned, which is particularly problematic when considering the needs of nations regarding self-governance (Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2008: 263). While these are some of the broader issues tied to language revitalization, there are several other layers and complications found within this process.

There are other ways that indigenous communities are using their cultural values to alter educational practices. The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (2008:200) cited Indian schools as sources of innovation and creativity. Some indigenous language classes follow traditional rules of storytelling to structure their language classes (Wright 2001:139). Other language programs attempt to soften the individualist implications of Western culture and education. Many educators in indigenous communities value cooperative over competitive learning in their classes, as well as interdisciplinary learning (Nee-Benham 2001:5). These educators argue that a less competitive environment will develop the self-esteem of young students and better ensure language learning (Nee-Benham 2001:4). Indigenous communities attempt to create positive feelings about indigenous identity in language in other ways, as well.

For instance, some Alaskan communities have created presentations focused on validating indigenous knowledge, to be conducted during language meetings (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:43). These presentations help to inspire a stronger sense of direction for future language projects in the community (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:43). Many Alaskan communities have also created special workshops, camps, and ceremonies in the community, as part of an effort to cultivate positive feelings about Alaskan Native identity (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:44). Of course, there are some community members who are concerned that many new language learners are not able to appreciate subtleties of certain ceremonies and activities due to limited language skills (Leonard and Gilmore 1999:44). However, despite these concerns, many groups have used cultural revitalization strategies as a way to reintroduce Native languages to both urban and reservation communities.

Of course, educational policies can only play so large a part in language revitalization. While classes are some of the most important places to teach and speak the language, they can only provide a formal, artificial system for learning the language. Many authors and language teachers alike spoke of the need for family involvement in the language, in order for revitalization to be successful. This is in part due to the limitations of language learning in a formal class environment; for example, due to the structural styles of most classes, conversational speaking suffers, as well as the vocabulary becoming more academic and Western (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:56). Home speaking environments do more than just improve conversational speaking and casual vocabulary. Strong family involvement in revitalization is considered to be the key of

revitalization, especially in immersive education; a home environment in which language

learners speak and learn together helps create students with pride in their Native identity,

and is the best way for communities to recover from the dissolving of Native families

with Indian boarding schools (Armstrong 2001:38). Simply put, the formalized classroom

environment cannot be the only venue for speaking an indigenous language if

revitalization is to be successful (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:59). While Chinuk Wawa is

taught primarily in the classroom, there is considerable effort being made by the Grand

Ronde to encourage the use of Chinuk Wawa in home and larger environments.

4. Adaptation of Languages and Authenticity

Authenticity is a major issue of this research thesis, and must be more fully

explored in order to be effectively understood. The term appears to defy a single

definition, as it has been used in many ways for different purposes. In fact, nearly all of

the sources referenced for this thesis do not provide a working definition of authenticity,

even those which discuss the issue of authenticity in indigenous society as a central

theme. Despite its ambiguity as a term, however, it appears to be a major question of

indigenous resistance and revitalization, as peoples from around the world both adapt

their practices to the dominant culture and preserve their traditional lifestyles. One major

issue of authenticity is not just how it is defined, but who defines authenticity. For

centuries, those that defined "authentic" indigeneity were not the indigenous peoples

themselves, but outside academics and the dominant culture (Smith 2012:76). Even

today, urban Native peoples struggle with the maintenance of an "authentic" indigenous

identity while separated from their homeland community (Lawrence 2004:195). For the

purposes of this thesis, authenticity can be defined as the social construction of traditions, history, and heritage created by a community to assert its identity. Authenticity is not a state defined by the history of a group, but is a process that is actively created by the community in the present day. My own definition of authenticity is less important in this research than the definition created by the Grand Ronde. While the Grand Ronde, as a subaltern community, is subject to the perceptions and definitions of the dominant culture, they have control over how to define authentic Chinuk Wawa, and how to support authentic variations of the language. Therefore, the definition of authenticity by the Grand Ronde regarding Chinuk Wawa is much more important to this thesis.

Authenticity can be a major challenge to address throughout the revitalization process, especially in language teaching. In many educational communities, some forms of language teaching regarding revitalization are seen as legitimate, while others are not (Keahi 2001:59). Indigenous language teaching attempts to resolve the challenge of how to preserve indigenous languages without being influenced by dominant languages. The maintenance of indigenous languages can be problematic if indigenous cultures are not involved in the process of preservation. If the dominant society has control over the definition of authenticity in an indigenous language, indigenous peoples will most likely be struck in a static past, divorced from the needs and situations of modern life (Hendry 2005:59). This question of authenticity can also lead to people looking for points in their history when the language was at its "purest" state, with the least amount of influence from colonial or Western culture. This viewpoint has been criticized, as no languages or culture is truly pristine at any point, due to culture being under constant change (Hendry

2005:79). Indigenous peoples must also ask themselves who the revitalization effort is for, and what its ultimate goals are. Is an indigenous community simply trying to protect the language itself, or make it a larger part of their current community? (Henze and Davis 1999:8) These different goals reflect different needs, and very likely different populations for the revitalization process.

Many indigenous communities are engaging with the issues of language change and adaptation, in an effort to keep the language sustainable in the twenty-first century. These groups are hugely concerned with language change, particularly with the explosion of new technologies in the twenty-first. Many tribes are asking themselves how to adopt words for new technologies into the language, and what the process for adopting words should look like (Henze and Davis 1999:17). Some communities are quite informal in coining new words. For example, in the case of master apprentice system in Californian language revitalization programs, there are no authoritative bodies in these communities to discuss new coinings; these new terms are typically agreed upon in small groups between the master speaker and apprentice (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:64). However, this process is often problematized as too chaotic and unsustainable for successful language revitalization. Other groups, particularly in widely spread communities, have a more elaborate method of creating new words and reorganizing the language. It is widely assumed in most communities that some varieties of the language are more pure or authentic than others, despite the inevitable evolution of all languages (Henze and Davis 1999:15). For instance, while revitalizing Mayan languages in Guatemala, tribal members and officials, with the guidance of local linguists, had to create a set of criteria for the

standardization of the language, deciding which dialects to keep and teach in a classroom (England 2003:40). In that case, regional dialects were seen as a vernacular to the language, and were not given the same privilege that other forms of the language were. This is also a necessary process for the Grand Ronde, especially when revitalizing a language as widely spread and with such limited central influence as Chinuk Wawa.

Because of the diversity of certain languages, as well as the damages done by colonial history, maintaining authenticity is often seen as a necessary part of indigenous language and cultural revitalization. Revitalization applies to an indigenous community and culture as a whole, not simply the language. As a result, indigenous peoples are trying to introduce indigenous ceremonies and knowledge with children who are raised from a Western perspective (Wright 2001:137). In many ways, the revitalization of culture and community is dependent on the survival of indigenous language. According to some scholars and indigenous activists, indigenous knowledge is unusually fragile because so much knowledge is wrapped up in dying languages, unlike the knowledge from cultures with world languages (Nee-Benham 2001:6). Therefore, it is imperative to preserve these languages and the knowledge that they contain. For many young people in both cities and reservations, the stories and knowledge that they learn are not a part of their indigenous cultures, but from the dominant culture in American society. Teachers cite popular culture as a major obstacle to finding culturally appropriate material in language learning that children will engage with (Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2008:201). Therefore, indigenous communities must decide how to appeal to children raised in a predominantly Western society while still preserving

their ideas of an indigenous culture. People in the revitalization process must ask themselves what stories to teach from their own culture: those that reflect traditional ways of living, or ones more suited in modern times (Henze and Davis 1999:5). While the young people of reservations and cities must be engaged in order for revitalization to be a successful process, indigenous peoples are concerned that their ideas of indigenous cultures are largely artificial, anchored in food, dance, and rituals, without the bedrock of indigenous cultural values (Henze and Davis1999:8).

This issue is centered around authenticity, as it is necessary to define indigenous language and culture in order to teach its deeper values. The question of what is an authentic language is a major one in all cultural minority groups in the twenty-first century, especially in indigenous communities (Henze and Davis 1999:9). Indigenous languages must also learn how to adapt its vocabulary for the twenty-first century, as new technologies develop. Minority and indigenous languages have to contend with both loan words and the loss of natural words for environment and local resources (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:58). These local words contain a good deal of the indigenous knowledge and culture that is so vital to maintain indigenous culture. However, attempting to conserve the "pure" form of a language is no promise of its endurance or survival (Blair 1995:26). For many indigenous communities, it is difficult to maintain a pure form of language in an advanced state of language death. When a language is close to death, authenticity is often used less rigidly in order for any form of the language to survive (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:64). Of course, there is no clear consensus on how to define authenticity in an indigenous language, or the importance of maintaining authenticity when attempting

to save dying languages. There has always been tension in indigenous communities between those evolving the language and those concerned with purity and authenticity of the language (Henze and Davis 1999:11). Some traditionalists argue that the language should die rather than change and conform to Western culture (Wong 1999:100). However, for many, the question of authenticity is not if the language should change at all, but how it should change in order to stay true to its cultural heritage.

This process of creating authenticity is not just used for coining new words, but for creating a standard variation of an indigenous language in order to reach the same educational standards as foreign languages, as well as simplify communication throughout the community. For instance, certain Inuit languages are revitalizing their language in part by creating a standardized form of their languages to be used in educational programs; however, tension exists between the institutionalized form of the language and its more local varieties (Patrick 2001:69). People in these communities question whether the standardization of the language is worth losing these local expressions and signifiers of community identity. Moreover, some indigenous people and academics are concerned with the overall process of standardization. Some believe that standardizing a language and creating these new coinages can mean that students are still thinking in English and expressing Western ideas when speaking indigenous languages (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:16). Others have expressed the concern that standardization is a slippery slope to assimilation (Patrick 2001:72). Of course, others have argued that without standardization, it is nearly impossible to create a written system of the language, making educational models of the language much more difficult (Henze and Davis:13).

Of course, standardization ties up resources; creating the material for language learning and testing is a very difficult and time-consuming process (Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Devlopment 2008:205). At any rate, it appears that there is great concern in communities as to how the language will be adapted for the modern world. The process of revitalization may not be successful without rooting the language in its historical, social and cultural context (Blair 1995:27).

While there are issues with language adaptation, modern technologies can also strengthen language learning, especially with young people struggling to connect to traditional indigenous culture. Many young indigenous language learners, whether in a rural or urban environment, feel a tension between expressing their cultural heritage and the appeal of the contemporary world with information technologies (Nee-Benham 2001:10). The Internet and other technologies can be considered potential tools of revitalization, particularly with the advancement of communication technology (Henze and Davis 1999:16). While social networking sites, email, and texting may not be considered the ideal or authentic way to use indigenous languages, they nonetheless are often an important means of communication for many young people.

For those who are concerned with learners being dissuaded from language learning by overcorrection, social networking can be a way to experiment in an informal way with the language, potentially freeing students to new forms of expression and self-identification (DePew and Miller-Cochran 2010). This process can be problematized as assimilatory, but it also can be seen as language renewal for a new generation. With online indigenous use, young people can also express their culture in more contemporary

ways and create indigenous communities with tribe members that can potentially be separated by vast distances. Indigenous language learners can express their identity in a number of ways online through social networking, the creation of widgets, blogging, and so on (DePew and Miller-Cochran 2010:290). These tools are useful to students when examining their often complex ethnic and cultural identities, and are ideal for exploring their ideas of the relationship between indigenous culture and the modern world (DePew and Miller-Cochran 2010:273). These trends have the potential to help strengthen indigenous societies in the twenty-first century. Of course, some see technology as the biggest push in modern society to hegemony in the dominant culture (Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2008:304). Recreating and repurposing traditions is a byproduct of the revitalization process and can effectively reflect Indian history and culture (McMullen 2004:267). Although modern technology is a product of Western culture, it can be used through language revitalization as a resistance and as a tool of creating identity.

Chapter Four: Methodology

This research project explored several aspects of Chinuk Wawa revitalization, particularly the creation and maintenance of authenticity in the language. Ultimately, this researcher makes the argument that authenticity is not a static state that indigenous languages or its speakers can maintain, but is actively created by a speech community in the present day. The process of adapting the language through the introduction of coinings, the production and use of the new Chinuk Wawa dictionary, and the maintenance of Native pronunciation are all elements of authenticity that are explored in this research. Research was conducted with this primary question: How is the authenticity of Chinuk Wawa defined by the Grand Ronde, and who participates in that definition? The maintenance of authenticity with an endangered language must also address the issue of adapting the language for modern times and new technologies. How are new Chinuk Wawa words coined, and for what types of vocabulary? How is the adaptation of Chinuk Wawa reflected in the process of revitalization, such as classes and community events? How does the Grand Ronde navigate indigenous language revitalization with a community that speaks English as a first language? Research was not limited to the Grand Ronde reservation, but also was conducted in several Portland communities. How do communities in the Portland area participate (or not participate) in the maintenance

and definition of Chinuk Wawa? How does the Portland community learn about changes in the language and adapt their language teaching? What does the Portland community do to make Chinuk Wawa their own – what differences are there between the Portland community and the Grand Ronde in terms of the use of Chinuk Wawa? These are the major issues and questions that have fueled this research thesis.

The methodology of this research uses linguistic concepts of process and structure to analyze the use of Chinuk Wawa by the Grand Ronde. The code of a language is the socially established rules governing the combination of elements in language in order to create meaning (Johansen and Larsen 2002:15). While the language itself is not a code, these elements are made intelligible and culturally relevant due to the creation of a code (Johansen 2002:16). Code can be split further into two major areas: processual and structural codes. Structural codes are codes concerned with the organization of elements into language (Johansen 2002:18). Processual codes, on the other hand, are the ways in which elements become important and meaningful culturally (Johansen and Larsen 2002:19). By preserving the processual codes of a language, one is working to maintain the authenticity and traditions of a speech community. These codes are informed by the context of culture, and are reinforced in social activities and behavior (Johansen and Larsen 2002:13). Therefore, successful revitalization of indigenous languages must examine the structural and processual codes of their languages in order to survive. Both the cultural content of the language, as well as the structural elements of the language, must be preserved in order for revitalization to be successful.

However, the focus of revitalization may not be equal to both types of codes; some groups may be concerned with the cultural content embedded within indigenous languages, while others may teach the language without the cultural background and teachings. The revitalization of Chinuk Wawa calls to question how to best teach the language in order to ensure its survival into the future. While these communities have the same goal of teaching Chinuk and creating a community of speakers, not all have the same ideas on how to accomplish this goal. Some groups appear to ground the teaching of the language in the processual code and Grand Ronde culture as much as possible, in order to ensure the authentic survival of the language. Other groups, on the other hand, see the survival of structural elements of the language as the primary goal in revitalization, and the cultural content as a secondary goal. This research project explored the tension between these two philosophies, and how these codes impacted the process of revitalization in Chinuk Wawa communities.

This was primarily a qualitative and ethnographic research project. In order to discuss the structure and the process of Chinuk Wawa revitalization, one must examine the ways in which Chinuk Wawa is taught, and the underlying motivations behind those methods. Other topics of study include tensions created within Chinuk Wawa communities concerning the creation of authenticity, the preservation of Native sounds in the language, and the overall strategies to revitalize the language in these communities. Due to practical concerns explained later in the chapter, learning communities in Portland, Oregon were the primary focus of the research project, although the Grand Ronde reservation is still viewed by the researcher as the main center of Chinuk Wawa

revitalization. In addition to using ideas of code and structure to frame this research, a comparative element was also utilized, as each community had unique concerns, interests, and needs to teaching Chinuk Wawa.

This research project relied heavily on participant observation in order to reach its conclusions. There were four populations of study in this research: one was at the Grand Ronde reservation in western Oregon, and the other three were throughout the Portland community. These three communities are where the majority of fieldwork took place during both research periods. One Portland class was sponsored by the Grand Ronde, and taught by a member of the tribe, Eric Bernando. The Grand Ronde paid for this class, hired Bernando as a Chinuk Wawa teacher, and provided office space for the language to be taught in Portland. It does not, however, promote the class as it does the Chinuk Wawa classes located on the reservation. Out of all of the classes in the Portland community, this class had the most connections to the Grand Ronde. The second class was also taught by Eric Bernando, located at St. Andrew's Church in north Portland. The third was through Portland State University, with a small community of Portland State University students and language teachers. The researcher was not only permitted, but was in fact encouraged to learn and speak Chinuk Wawa, as an effort to create more Chinuk speakers in the area. Participant observation, therefore, centered on the researcher learning the language with students, allowing for experience with the structure and construction of Chinuk Wawa. Research was completed primarily in Chinuk Wawa classrooms of each group, but also in other areas, as language teacher planned special events to encourage more Chinuk Wawa use. Primary fieldwork was accomplished from June 13th to August

29th of 2012, in which all interviews were also conducted. Supplementary fieldwork was carried out in the Portland area from November 28th to December 12th of 2012 with the Portland Grand Ronde and St. Andrew's group; unfortunately, due to transportation and scheduling issues, fieldwork with the Grand Ronde reservation and Portland State University groups was not possible.

Interviews were a major aspect of data collection: subjects in these interviews included both language learners and language teachers of each community. Due to the ethical concerns of this research projects, all interview subjects were over the age of 18. Subjects in all four populations were interviewed, with 16 interviews conducted in total. Six of these interviews were done with language teachers from the Grand Ronde, being the only interview subjects in this particular community. Six interviews were taken from the Grand Ronde Portland community, including four language learners and two language teachers. Two interviews were conducted in the St. Andrew's class, both of language learners, as was the case in the Portland State University group. The subjects all had varying experience with the language: some were introduced to Chinuk Wawa as children, and other people were still very new to the language. These interviews were semi-structured in nature, focusing on the subject's experience with the language, thoughts about those experiences, and their use of the language outside of Chinuk classes. In all interviews, interviewees were granted anonymity, but were given the option to waive their anonymity if they so desired. The interviews with language learners were rarely longer than 10 minutes, and were used to ascertain motivations and interest in Chinuk Wawa.

Interviews with language teachers became much more important to the research project, as teachers were often more experienced with the language, both in its structure and the process of teaching Chinuk Wawa. As stated previously, six language teachers were interviewed from the Grand Ronde reservation, and two teachers were from the Grand Ronde Portland community. These interviews illustrated the changes made in the language as time went on, demonstrating the ways in which authenticity can be contested while the language is being preserved. As a result of their expertise and experience, interviews with teachers were often much longer, typically being between 20 and 45 minutes in length. All interviews were conducted with audio recording with the consent of the subject, in order to create an accurate transcription, allowing for a more detailed understanding of the trends and prominent ideas behind the transmission of Chinuk Wawa.

Several steps were taken in order to narrow the scope of this project to one appropriate for a master's thesis. One of the most significant intentional limitations was the locations in which research took place. Eugene, Oregon also has a population of Chinuk Wawa speakers, and have classes in the area sponsored by the Grand Ronde. Based on the interviews of Grand Ronde teachers, this community appears to be structured similarly to the Portland classes in its groups of speakers. This group was not contacted for the purposes of gathering research. It should be noted that this group, unlike two of the groups in Portland, has no apparent online presence, and therefore is perhaps not as expansive in its goals of teaching Chinuk Wawa as are people in the Portland community.

This research project also focuses solely on the Grand Ronde dialect of Chinuk Wawa. Because Chinuk was so widely spoken in the region, there are pockets of speakers in northern Washington, northern California, and in Vancouver, B.C. Several students reported that, when looking up Chinuk Wawa online, they often encountered lexicons of different dialects of the language. These lexicons had different vocabularies, different pronunciations of words, and a spelling system that was based from solely Roman letters, as opposed to the Grand Ronde alphabet. Language teachers explained that, when it came to certain vocabulary terms, speakers in Washington and Vancouver, B.C. often used terms in different ways, with different connotations. While the Grand Ronde has a connection to Chinuk Wawa as a heritage language, other groups still have an interest in the language. For instance, the Chinook nation, a tribal group located near Astoria, Washington, has structures and spaces that are used in Chinuk Wawa revitalization. This group was contacted by the researcher, but due to the need to keep the focus of research narrow, work in the Chinook Nation was phased out of the research design. These different groups and populations indicate a language that is being used and taught by different populations throughout the regions, with limited interaction and communication. While these groups were discussed during data collection, ultimately the Grand Ronde is not working with any other tribal nations to revitalize the language. Therefore, this particular dialect is viewed, for the purposes of this project, as the major means by which the language is being revitalized.

Initially, this research project was much more technologically focused. Before the period of summer research, this project was meant to discuss the use of information

71

technology in language revitalization, and the underlying tensions and attitudes surrounding that use. However, there was simply not enough use of information technology by the Grand Ronde to merit a singular focus by a research project. There are a number of sites by Grand Ronde and Portland communities that outline the history of the language, its use today, and promote the current Chinuk Wawa classes. Nonetheless, the use of these sites is primarily for communication through email and social media, and for students to write in the language via specially-made Chinuk fonts. Most of the process of revitalization occurred in the physical communities of the Grand Ronde and Portland, particularly in classrooms, offices, and less formal settings. As research continued, it was clear that the issue of creating and maintaining authenticity of Chinuk Wawa was a much larger concern in these communities than the use of technology. This shift in research focus did not alter the major research methods or methodology of data collection.

Challenges in the field further limited some aspects of data collection and research. One of the largest issues involved the scheduling of Chinuk classes: at the time of research, both in the summer and the winter, Chinuk classes were not being taught by the Grand Ronde. Therefore, information regarding these classes comes solely from Grand Ronde teachers and staff members, as well as a few community events focused on the language during the time of data collection. In addition, fewer trips were made to the Grand Ronde due to transportation issues and the challenge of scheduling interviews with teachers. As a result of these challenges, the Grand Ronde is somewhat underrepresented, both in terms of field notes and interviews. While there are no interviews from language learners, there were several successful interviews with language teachers in the Grand

Ronde reservation system. These interviews ranged from new Chinuk teachers in kindergarten to much more experienced teachers in the preschool and adult classes. These interviews all manage to paint a portrait of Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa revitalization, including its challenges to maintain authenticity while creating a wide appeal among its general population in both the Grand Ronde and the three Portland communities.

Chapter Five: Data Analysis and Results

This chapter details the observations and analysis of the researcher. Each of the four communities is detailed in their strategies of revitalization, as well as the numbers of students as seen in the initial phase of fieldwork. In addition, this chapter describes the ways in which the Grand Ronde uses and negotiates authenticity, such as the adaptation of Chinuk Wawa through coining, the preservation of traditional pronunciation, and use of Western stories inside the Grand Ronde. These strategies are compared with the Portland communities, as their particular teaching methods are also analyzed. This chapter discusses the different teaching methods the Portland communities and the Grand Ronde reservation classes use regarding Chinuk Wawa. The experience of these classes are also examined, particularly the types of language learned in each class setting and how this reflects the teaching method of each class.

The Portland classes sponsored by the Grand Ronde were the most prolific classes out of the Portland community. These classes were taught once a week, as opposed to the monthly classes at St. Andrew's or the sporadic classes taught at Portland State University. Out of the three total populations, the Grand Ronde Portland classes not only offered the most classes, but also had the most consistent group of learners throughout the summer and winter. While classes rarely had more than 8 people in attendance at a time, all of the Grand Ronde Portland classes had at least 4 members in each class,

indicating a small group of enthusiastic Chinuk students. As is the case with all three

Portland communities, there are no children in these Chinuk classes; for the most part, it

appears that students in the Grand Ronde communityare split evenly between those 18-

25, 25-45, and over 45. This class not only had consistent numbers, but also had the most

Native students in attendance, with 5 out of 12 total students for the class identifying as

Native. While these classes were not as large as some other events in the Portland area,

the Portland Grand Ronde classes had the most consistent numbers for classes, as well as

the most Native students who engaged with their identity through these Chinuk classes.

Due to the consistent weekly classes, this Portland community taught the most

vocabulary in the primary three-month period of fieldwork. Nearly 150 words of

vocabulary were taught, excluding vocabulary terms taught in other classes. Not only

were a large number of words taught, but there was a great diversity to this language as

well: nouns concerning machinery, plants, animals, celestial objects, and family members

were all included in these classes, as well as verbs, adjectives, popular phrases, and

pronouns. Retention of these words benefited greatly from the clear willingness that its

language teachers had to experiment with their language teaching methods. The Portland

Grand Ronde classes were predominantly immersive in nature, where students learn

words by use of images with the object; however, there are a number of ways in which

the language teacher, Eric Bernando, attempted to help students connect vocabulary with

objects. In addition to having several sets of themed Chinuk playing cards and forms of

Pictionary to help teach the language, the Portland Grand Ronde community had at least

one outdoor walk every month during the summer and fall. These events allowed students

to speak the language in a different environment than the classroom, leading to better retention of the vocabulary for the objects, plants, and animals encountered. These walks were open to everyone in the Portland community, and there were often one or two students from the other Portland communities in attendance. Therefore, the Wawa Walks became not only opportunities to speak Chinuk naturally, but to interact with other community members, learn new elements of Chinuk from more experienced students, and engage with a language that has very few speakers in urban areas such as Portland.

That is not to say that Portland Grand Ronde class was entirely immersive in its teaching methods, however. These classes also had time set aside for other, more formal, aspects of language learning. Twice a month, one of the classes was split in half between Eric and his teaching partner, a linguist of local languages. This teacher brought his own Chinuk writing, writings from Grand Ronde elders, and even sacred stories when seasonally appropriate, to the class. Students read these works together, translating them into English and learning about more expressive elements of Chinuk Wawa. The writing teacher also encouraged students to write their own poetry, songs, and stories in Chinuk, and share them with the class. Students not only learned about the more structural and expressive elements of Chinuk Wawa in this class, but also had much more exposure to Grand Ronde culture than in other Portland classes. Out of the three communities in the Portland area, only this class offered any education on the reading and writing in Chinuk; both of the other groups in Portland were far more concerned with preserving the oral aspects of the language. Therefore, the Portland Grand Ronde community offered the most complete experience of Chinuk Wawa revitalization for urban residents of the area.

76

While the Chinuk class offered at St. Andrew's Episcopalian Church had the same language teacher, it had a very different group of language learners. Unlike the Grand Ronde Portland and Portland State University classes that met every week, this class only met monthly. It was also a relatively new class, starting in June of 2012, teaching Chinuk Wawa to its own church members. As a result, the population of these classes is smaller than the Portland Grand Ronde classes, ranging from 2 students to 8 during one particularly busy class. Not only was this class generally smaller than the Portland Grand Ronde classes, but they were also composed of largely older students as well. While the Portland Grand Ronde classes were largely split between students and older learners, 5 members of the St. Andrew's class were over the age of 45, while only two students were between 25 and 45. One student was between 18-25, but only attended one class of Chinuk. There were also no Native students in these classes, meaning that these Chinuk classes served an all-white audience.

Interestingly, this class was meant to be the first step towards creating an indigenous community in the North Portland area. The pastor running the church explained, "Our vision is for a secure and safe welcoming place for indigenous people to celebrate in whatever way they want to, or to meet and discuss – so, we're growing that. And we're all agreed that that needs to be grown and not created." While the revitalization of Chinuk Wawa was a goal of the group, it was secondary to the goal of creating community spaces for indigenous peoples in the area. This group had also invested in networking, with several potential indigenous organizations prepared to spend time and resources building community in the Portland area. The pastor also mentioned

the history of the Episcopalian church regarding indigenous culture: "But across the country, there are deep, deep traditions that go back generations of Native American Episcopalians. So I have a lot of resources there that we can draw on, if we can build a budget and get them in here." Therefore, the church itself, although a Western institution, was seen by these church members as a potential place for building indigenous spaces and culture on a nationwide scale.

Due to this class being held less often than the Portland Grand Ronde class, much less vocabulary was taught in a 3-month span. However, there was a similar variation in the language taught as the Portland Grand Ronde classes. In fact, classes at St. Andrew's often corresponded to lessons being taught at the Portland Grand Ronde office. Eric used some of the same techniques in this class as in the Portland Grand Ronde class, such as bringing small animal figurines to illustrate vocabulary. However, this class was to some extent directed by student interest. Eric often brought enough material to teach class for an hour to an hour and half, and then allowed students to ask him questions about the language and about certain vocabulary. As a result, new words and ideas were learned in the St. Andrew's class that might not have been addressed otherwise in the Portland communities. These words were often spiritual in nature, as students wanted to know the Chinuk words for religious figures and artifacts. While this class served a different population than the other Portland classes, and struggled with creating community for Grand Ronde and Chinuk people, it nonetheless engaged with people interested in Native languages, and approached Chinuk Wawa in a unique way.

Portland State University's Chinuk Wawa classes, on the other hand, had a number of teachers introducing the language to students. Due to the structure of its teaching methods, students are expected to be able to teach beginning classes by the end of their third class. These classes had some of the largest numbers of attendance in the Portland community, reaching 12 students several times throughout the summer. However, class numbers fluctuated the most out of the three Portland communities; while these classes were scheduled every week, there were several weeks in the summer and the winter during which no students attended this class. As opposed to the St. Andrew's class, this class had much younger students for the most part. Out of 12 total speakers, 10 were between 18 and 25, and were often students at Portland State University. However, like the St. Andrew's class, there are fewer Native students in attendance than the Portland Grand Ronde classes, as only 3 out of 12 students and teachers identified as Native. While this group fluctuated in numbers, the Portland State University classes nonetheless showed an innovative method to teaching Chinuk Wawa.

Gameplay was a major aspect of the Chinuk classes at Portland State University, featuring Chinuk Wawa classes based on the Where Are Your Keys (WAYK) method of language teaching. Where Are Your Keys is an immersive style of language instruction. Students take turns having simple, structured conversations with one another. Gradually, these conversations become more complex, as new verbs, phrases, and expressions are added on, allowing students to have more freedom to express themselves and use the games in new ways. While the use of nouns is initially limited to discussing sticks and stones, more objects are gradually added to the language. Eventually, students are

expected to pass their knowledge on by teaching beginner students, usually after the third lesson of learning. Pronunciation was not corrected, as it was believed that students will correct themselves by listening to more advanced speakers. Chinuk Wawa classes have also played board games such as Settlers of Cataan, where students must learn to make bargains in Chinuk Wawa to effectively trade materials and advance on the board.

Vocabulary learned from this class is easily the most limited out of the three Portland communities. Due to the structure of the WAYK method, only verbs, phrases, conjunctions and prepositions were taught to students. More descriptive words were learned in this class only through conversation with other, more experienced speakers in the language. This limitation was purposeful, in order to make sure students are better suited to learn the language through purely immersive means, and so that students are not overwhelmed with too much information at one time. Descriptive words such as adjectives were considered a lower priority in language teaching than the structural elements of Chinuk. However, there was limited learning in this class for another reason: students were encouraged to teach beginners after only a few short classes. With a more experienced teacher to help along, a student worked through beginning vocabulary with new speakers. Teaching might have helped students gain more confidence with certain vocabulary, but also it limited their exposure to more advanced levels of the game. Therefore, it would be a greater challenge for a student from the Portland State University class to participate in a Wawa Walk, or a similar activity with more descriptive terms included in conversations. In fact, students from the WAYK class were almost never in attendance at Portland Grand Ronde or St. Andrew's classes, and none of

them attended Wawa walks. However, this method does allow students to quickly pick up elements of Chinuk Wawa, and learn how to experiment with the structure of the language.

Despite these differences in teachers, populations, and methods of teaching, all groups used an immersive style of teaching, as opposed to one based solely on translation from English. While classes designed to teach a foreign language may provide lists of vocabulary that students are expected to memorize and repeat, Chinuk classes in the Portland area attempted to use new vocabulary in everyday conversations as much as possible. Students were pushed to think as much in Chinuk as possible. Advanced speakers tried not to use English in classes at all, persuading newer speakers to use context in order to understand their conversations. Classes, walks, and activities were generally structured to be informal and fun, while still teaching as much of the language as possible. With the exception of the Grand Ronde Portland writing class, the major emphasis in these classes was on learning to speak the language in a conversational setting, with limited correction on pronunciation.

Two of these classes, Portland State University and the Grand Ronde Portland classes, benefitted from the occasional attendance of Henry Zenk. As stated previously, Zenk is a linguist, spending his career examining the history of the Grand Ronde and their use of Chinuk Wawa. Due to his experience working with Grand Ronde elders, Zenk has become an expert in the language, and is involved with the revitalization movement of the Grand Ronde. Because elder speakers that spoke Chinuk Wawa as a first language have largely passed on, this expertise is highly valuable for the Grand

Ronde attempting to define the authentic version of Chinuk Wawa. In the Portland classes, Zenk provided feedback to students, as well as language teachers, on pronunciation, proper usage of certain words, and historical examples regarding Chinuk. However, he was only at a limited number of classes during the initial stage of fieldwork by the researcher, giving the Portland communities less access to his expertise than the Grand Ronde community.

The Where Are Your Keys method of language teaching was praised for its informality and the speed in which students can learn the language. A handful of interviewees stated that they felt as though they were poor language learners until they began using this style of learning. One student said, "I would say the Where Are Your Keys has been really helpful to me because it's so low-pressure, and so self-regulated, as far as – the pace that you're learning at stay in your comfort zone." These methods of teaching helped bring an element of informality that is designed to make the process of learning Chinuk Wawa enjoyable. In this environment, authenticity was not seen as nearly as much of an issue as it is in the Grand Ronde. However, as is demonstrated later, all three Portland communities have their own role in determining, preserving, and adapting authenticity for the urban population.

Although these Chinuk classes are primarily meant to connect Grand Ronde people in Portland to their heritage language, several Native students of other nations attended these classes; several Native students in the classes were Lakota, Shawnee, or Navajo. Many students in all three Portland communities were also of non-Native origin. It appeared that some individuals in the Portland community were aware of the dangers

of appropriating Chinuk Wawa from the Grand Ronde. One of the hosts in the Portland

community said in his interview,

> "… I know that's a common concern among Indian Country, is how to share cultural things, and language is one of those sensitive things. And I know there's a lot of Native Americans who don't like that. So I just figure that's not my place to decide whether that's right or wrong."

Even though these classes had large white populations at this point, it seems as though

their value as places where indigenous identity and community could be built was more

important than the particular ethnicity of the participants.

Even though the history of Chinuk Wawa is different from many other

indigenous languages, it was still an important marker of identity for those involved in

the revitalization process, particularly on the Grand Ronde reservation. One Grand Ronde

language teacher said of Chinuk, "'Cause I'm really a part of learning my culture – I

want to keep that alive. I want my kids to know the language, to know where they're

from and who they came from." Several other students, even students not from the Grand

Ronde, expressed the same desire. Even though the Chinuk Wawa was not their

indigenous language, strictly speaking, it was nonetheless a way to express an indigenous

identity. Although these communities were not entirely indigenous, they are nonetheless

promising signs of revitalization in an urban environment, with connections to the

reservation community.

Out of these four populations, the most controversial teaching methods by far

were the ones used by the Portland State University group. The WAYK method enjoys

praise from several of its students for its informality and the ease of teaching Chinuk

Wawa. This is true especially of students who had generally struggled with language learning. However, the WAYK method was criticized by people in the Portland community, in part due to the limited way in which Chinuk is taught. Because students were pushed to help teach the language so early on in their own development, students were not able to advance beyond a certain level with the language. It also taught Chinuk Wawa as a language without context or culture: unlike the St. Andrew's class and the Grand Ronde Portland class, the history, culture, and stories of the Grand Ronde were not shared or repeated in this space, focusing solely on the structural codes rather than the processual.

Several teachers, both from the Portland and Grand Ronde area, also expressed concerns about the WAYK method, especially with its lack of connection to more traditional aspects of language and culture. A teacher with the Grand Ronde critiqued the method for not correcting pronunciation and phonology of language students: "Here's my worry: it is that people will learn a little bit, and then they go off and do their own thing, and then it [Chinuk Wawa] starts to get muddy. And I'd like to draw it all back and keep it clean." One of the teachers of the Portland classes expressed a similar concern regarding the teaching method:

> "What I don't like about it, is that it sort of flies in the face of academia, and sort of has this, 'I'm going to thumb my nose at all you people 'cause I can get this done without your high-falutin' ways.' And some misconceptions happen, because the teacher is so busy trying to do things his own way that reinvent the wheel, in some ways."

There was a concern that, with no reference to history, culture, or identity of the Grand Ronde, the WAYK method is removing Chinuk Wawa from all of its cultural meanings, focusing on the structural codes of the language alone.

With some in the Portland community, however, there was less concern about pronunciation and preserving the Grand Ronde culture. Eric Bernando stated, "I think it works very well up to a certain point, which is kind of evident in my class that, you know, using that method can only get you so far." In other words, the WAYK method of teaching was not sustainable due to the lack of fluent speakers in the area. This lack of fluent speakers also complicates the idea that students can correct themselves after listening to "correct" Chinuk being spoken. In terms of maintaining authenticity, the Portland State University group may be seen as being the least connected to the Grand Ronde and its work on revitalizing the language. Other than Henry Zenk occasionally visiting these classes, there were no known Grand Ronde people teaching in these classes, at least during the summer and winter period of fieldwork. This limits the connection that Portland State University to the Grand Ronde, just as the Grand Ronde adapts and determines the future for Chinuk Wawa. Because Portland State University has such limited connections to the Grande Ronde, it may not be able to learn or hear about the new terms coined by the Grand Ronde, teaching an outdated variation of the language to its students.

This may be exacerbated by the notion that in Portland classes, particularly at Portland State University, Chinuk Wawa was not always connected to the Grand Ronde and its culture, at least in the mind of its language learners. In some cases, Chinuk Wawa

was seen as less of the language of the Grand Ronde, and more as the local language of the region. One interviewee said, "I grew up in the Puget Sound, and I've lived here for the past 25 years. So Chinuk is sort of, you know, the language around, in all the street signs and town names, and so kind of connections to the local history, but also respect for the local peoples, whose turf I'm on." Local events at locations such as Fort Vancouver, reenacting the lives of colonizers and local Natives during the international fur trade, illustrate Chinuk Wawa as a historical language of the general area, not as one being spoken today by specific groups of people. Of course, due to the history of Chinuk Wawa, this may not be an entirely incorrect assumption. Because Chinuk Wawa began as a trading language for the entire region, it was widespread and not necessarily considered a true heritage language. Of course, as the Grand Ronde relied on it for intertribal communication, its status began to change. However, it still has the distinction of being seen as a language of the land first and a language of ethnic identity second. This is a major difference from the Grand Ronde, where revitalization of the language is seen as a revitalization of Grand Ronde identity and community.

Chinuk Wawa does have a presence on the World Wide Web, and its speakers have engaged with information technologies. Fonts and scripts in the language were developed so that speakers can easily write online. There appear to be several blogs and social networking sites devoted to the language, as well as various lexicons listing Chinuk Wawa vocabulary. The Portland State University classes have their own Facebook page, where language learners discuss the language and other issues in the Pacific Northwest, written occasionally in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa. Eric Bernando's

site does not feature much Chinuk Wawa, but does list the resources of Chinuk classes in Portland today. A few interviewees mentioned finding Twitter accounts and some Facebook pages regarding the language. Many seemed to be from a different area in the region, such as Vancouver, BC: for instance, nearly all of the lexicons available online are of the northern dialect, or only mention Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa very briefly as an alternative of the language. Due to this preference for northern Chinuk, only about 40 percent of the content of these sites was understandable to speakers from the Grand Ronde.

Some people in the classes have accessed these online lexicons; this can be problematic for language learners, as they are not only from different variations of Chinuk, but use spellings with all-English letters, unlike the lexicon developed by the Grand Ronde. However, based on interviews of the researcher with language learners and teachers conducted during this research thesis, the use of information technologies such as the Internet or programming is often not a major concern with the Grand Ronde or the Portland community. Some interviewees express a discomfort with using online tools. One language student said,

> "… I tend to avoid Chinuk Wawa resources online, 'cause they tend to be written by academics who refer to it as a jargon as opposed to a creolized language, who refer to it as – yeah, who just don't seem to get that it is a heritage language for the Chinook Nation and for the Grand Ronde."

The Grand Ronde also has its own Chinuk and English website, discussing the history of the Grand Ronde, as well as Chinuk Wawa. While this language has an online presence, allowing students to engage with their indigenous identity through the Web, it is hardly

seen as the most important element in creating a sustainable language revitalization program. Instead, most of the resources of the Grand Ronde and the Portland community appear to be devoted to the transmission of the language to as many people as possible, and the creation of an intergenerational speaking community that can pass the language down through informal means to other people in the area.

As stated before, the Grand Ronde did not have any classes available for adults in the summer or during winter break. Therefore, the major point of analysis of the teaching methods of the Grand Ronde was limited to summer events and teacher interviews. Fortunately, there were a few events that were meant to encourage Chinuk use outside of the classroom. These summer events were primarily social, with very little use of Chinuk Wawa by adults. However, there was an effort made by teachers at these events to speak the language to their young students, and if possible to their parents, in order to encourage home use of Chinuk. Once of these events was the Family Literacy Night, a night where Grand Ronde teachers, students, and community members came together to eat food and read picture books in Chinuk to young students. Children also had the opportunity to take specially made versions of these Chinuk Wawa books home with them. Teachers and parents read these books to their children, and then guided them through a coloring activity to reinforce the new words that they learned. This was a much larger event than in the Portland communities, with approximately 30 people in attendance. This event was also highly different than the Portland communities in its focus on children, rather than on adult learners. With 12 students under the age of 18, this event was otherwise split evenly between younger and older adults. Due to its location on

the Grand Ronde Reservation, this event also had much higher numbers of Grand Ronde tribal members than in the Portland community. There were approximately 20 indigenous people at this event, making it one of the few events where Native speakers were in the majority. However, not all people present appeared to be speakers of Chinuk Wawa. While some parents were able to read these picture books to their children in Chinuk, others read to their child in English, leaving the Chinuk to the teachers. For the most part, conversations between adults were conducted in English. However, some of these parents also learned certain words of Chinuk during the event, allowing for some dialogue to take place between children and their parents in Chinuk Wawa.

While Grand Ronde educators discussed their approach to Chinuk Wawa revitalization as a master-apprentice system, there are several differences in teaching from those in other indigenous master-apprentice systems. While the master-apprentice system is based on interactions in pairs, Chinuk Wawa classes on the reservation were often in groups of children, much more like a traditional Western classroom. Although the Grand Ronde is an immersive program, particularly with younger age groups, much of their curriculum was translated from English classes:

> "… the teacher may teach in Chinuk, or sing songs in Chinuk, or maybe do flash cards in Chinuk, or maybe, you know – it's a lot of translating of curriculum. Same with kindergarten and first grade, you know. We're still teaching them math, we're still teaching them handwriting, we actually do some English subjects as far as handwriting goes."

This suggests a more formal and rigid environment than the master-apprentice style of teaching.

The Grand Ronde appear to recognize the formality of their classes, and may be trying to correct it. During the summer period of fieldwork, a Grand Ronde language teacher remarked, "Sometimes the classes are a little bit intimidating, so we've looked at maybe tweaking them a little bit to make them more user-friendly, or whatever we need to make them more low-key." However, due to the differing needs of community members in their language learning, it is unlikely that the Grand Ronde will completely abandon their teaching methods. The Portland community appears to be making similar claims to the Grand Ronde in terms of its style of teaching the language. At one point, a language teacher in the Portland community claimed, "And, yes, we're using the traditional Native American master and apprentice approach. We get around the table and we talk." However, the Portland classes were marked by a much more casual pace of learning, as well as an emphasis on speaking the language, rather than reading and writing. At the same time, a lack of fluent teachers in the area might have made the traditional master-apprentice style of teaching impossible in the Grand Ronde and Portland area. Because there are no elders remaining who learned Chinuk as a first language, the Grand Ronde must rely on linguists such as Henry Zenk to be the authority on the language. Clearly, though, there was an effort in both of these communities to express an indigenous ways of doing things, while still working within the Western model of an education class.

However, the Grand Ronde has a limitation in its educational practices in ways that the Portland community is not. The Grand Ronde teaches immersion classes to preschool, kindergarten, and first grade students. Classes that teach Chinuk Wawa, not in

an immersion style but with more traditional language teaching tools, are also available for other elementary school students and high school students. Because the Grand Ronde is attempting to teach its curriculum in Chinuk Wawa, it must adhere to state and federal standards of education. As seen in other indigenous language systems, this can limit the extent to which the Grand Ronde can use indigenous methods of education to teach Chinuk Wawa. Its system of coinings appears to be partially motivated by the need to create words for certain terms, such as "rhombus", in order to teach state requirements in the language. Even as the Grand Ronde attempts to adapt its teaching methods to meet educational standards, other schools outside of the Grand Ronde have critiqued their program. Children learn the Chinuk Wawa writing system in the Grand Ronde, where there are no capitalizations for proper nouns. As they begin writing in English, however, they may still use the Chinuk Wawa system. One Grand Ronde teacher shared the story of elementary school students refusing to write their names in English, preferring to use Chinuk spelling instead. These students were told that they were spelling their names wrong, and the Grand Ronde program was contacted a number of times by these teachers, attempting to convince the Grand Ronde to teach children to write their names in English over Chinuk. Fortunately, these complaints have largely stopped. However, it clearly demonstrates the issue that the Grand Ronde has obligations to teach Chinuk a certain way, leading to a more formal system of education.

The language itself was used in various ways by students, who were not always concerned with the authenticity of Chinuk Wawa. Several teachers, particularly in the preschool class, have discussed the use of English in their immersion style classes. One

teacher said, """Chin-glish" comes in, where you wing it. It's a mixture of you speaking

Chinuk, and English comes in, and comes out, and drifts in and out. 'Cause we figure that

any exposure to the language that applies is at least sinking in. So we're not afraid to mix

the two." However, students at higher level of language learning appeared to use Chinuk

Wawa more exclusively in the classroom.

Teachers also used stories from the dominant culture to help teach Chinuk Wawa.

One teacher in the Grand Ronde discussed their upcoming play in Chinuk, based around

the story of Henny Penny. As one of the teachers explained:

> "I guess some of the culturally based stuff doesn't hold the interest,
> because we don't have the materials to make – to compete with Henny
> Penny, or another book that we might translate, the pictures and the story.
> So we sort of take what works, and then try and reinterpret it, sometimes.
> We've probably had more success than that, you know, with other means,
> with an old history-based or culturally-based story."

Teachers also mentioned that they would search for popular stories with their students,

such as those featuring Super Mario Brothers, and translate these stories into Chinuk in

order to increase their interest in the language. While this may be seen as somewhat

assimilatory, teachers in this community were working from the assumption that

preserving Chinuk is the highest priority, and other forms of cultural revitalization will

follow from language revitalization. While teachers in the Portland community did not

necessarily agree with the method of using Western stories, they appeared to agree that

traditional teachings do not need to be the entire basis behind revitalization. Bernando

states, "I don't necessarily believe that individuals should be required to, say, know how

to build a canoe. Or how to harvest root vegetables just because they want to learn and

keep the language alive." While these communities were trying to define and maintain

authenticity in the language, there was clearly a pragmatic effort to keep the language

alive and thriving. This appears to indicate that even the Grand Ronde community did not

favor preserving the processual codes of Chinuk at the cost of its structural codes.

The Grand Ronde community used Chinuk Wawa to help identify and strengthen

its community. One teacher in the Grand Ronde reservation area described the events of

the summer to help build a sustainable Chinuk Wawa community:

> "But we're doing Chinuk Literacy Nights, we're hoping to do every other
> month. We're starting – we're doing our Chinuk Family Retreat, which is
> tomorrow. So those things are new. Those things didn't really happen, so
> those are new things that we're working on. It's just a matter of panning
> those out and being able to schedule more and get the interest and the buy-
> in to schedule more."

These events, much more so than classes in the Portland community, focused on

intergenerational speaking, with parents, children, and grandchildren often learning

aspects of Chinuk together in the space. They also built networks of speakers capable of

using Chinuk in more casual settings than a classroom, allowing speakers to incorporate

the language into larger elements of their lives. Chinuk Wawa was incorporated into the

community in other ways, such as maintaining infrastructure on the Grand Ronde

reservation. One of the main teachers of the language described her experience with the

tribal government asking for her assistance: "I get emails from over in the government

center: "Hey, how do I say this? How do I say that? We're going to name a new road; can

you tell me how to say 'dragonfly' in Chinuk?" So I see more interest, I think, in the

language in the community." This signage was visible on the Grand Ronde reservation,

as signs in Chinuk welcomed visitors and pointed out various Grand Ronde buildings. While this may not seem like much, it nonetheless signals recognition in a tribal identity, focused in Chinuk and separated from the dominant culture.

In July, the Grand Ronde made its annual Canoe Journey, where several tribes from Oregon, Washington, and Alaska travel in canoes down the Columbia River and eventually to the Puget Sound. As people camped at nights, games in Chinuk were played, and rituals were practiced, such as blessing the local land. One of the fieldwork events during this summer was one of the Canoe Journey stops, made in the Portland area near the Columbia River. This was the largest Chinuk event in the Portland area during the summer, with nearly 40 people camping at the park during the Canoe Journey. This event was also highly diverse, as it featured Chinook people, those from the Grand Ronde, Alaskan Natives, and a few Maori people. Like the Grand Ronde Literacy Night event, this was an event with a majority of Native people. Card games in Chinuk were led by Eric Bernando, and played by campers as well as students from the Portland Grand Ronde class. This was one of the events in Portland that had children playing games in Chinuk, and acting as students in the class. However, like the Grand Ronde class, many conversations that took place outside of the games were in English. The Canoe Journey not only helped tribes interconnect and network, but also gave them a space to express an indigenous identity and culture in new settings. To examine some of the major processes in revitalization, and the tensions that exist in creating authenticity in an expansive speaking community, one must look beyond these events and at the testimonies of students and teachers themselves.

At the Grand Ronde reservation, great effort was undertaken to help make sure that whole families are learning and speaking Chinuk Wawa. Classes were designed not only for college students and adult speakers, but for elder speakers as well. In addition, several Chinuk Wawa events occurred each year on the reservation to provide a space for parents and children to speak Chinuk Wawa to one another. However, there used to be stronger incentives in place for families to learn the language. A few years ago, parents of preschool program at the Grand Ronde were required to sign a contract, stating that while their child was in the language program, they would participate in adult Chinuk Wawa classes. This way, children and adults could learn the language together, and reinforce Chinuk Wawa at the home setting. However, this contract was recently discontinued due to time constraints. One teacher in the Grand Ronde explained why this decision was made: "Some parents weren't able to uphold it, and they didn't think it was fair for the children to suffer the consequences because of their schedules. So it ended up going to council and they decided to remove it." Several of the teachers in the Grand Ronde wished that the contract could still be in place, as it strengthened the revitalization process and made children much more confident about speaking Chinuk Wawa.

At the same time, these teachers appeared to understand the difficulty for parents:

> "The contract worked, when they did it. But it also was incredibly efforting. And now that we don't have it, I don't see us as ever going back to that degree of asking for that much commitment. So we have to find a way of being reasonable as to what the commitment level is going to be, and that's something that we're kind of looking at. And it's incredibly a work in progress."

While there may not be official contracts for parents of preschool children to sign, there were still a number of opportunities for parents to engage with the language alongside

their children. Interestingly, there were no such concerns in the Portland community, as almost all of the language learners were adults. While small communities of speakers were formed with walks around the Portland area, different classes, and other events, the Portland community did not have the same need to consider parents or children of speakers. However, a long-term goal of the Grand Ronde was to have children speaking and learning Chinuk in the home, at the very least as reinforcement of their education in Chinuk Wawa. Therefore, it is imperative to begin building intergenerational and community networks in Chinuk Wawa in order to have that support for the language.

The creation and maintenance of authenticity in Chinuk Wawa was primarily conducted by the Grand Ronde. The Grand Ronde defined their authentic version of the language through the creation of the Chinuk Wawa dictionary, released in March of 2012. Its title, "As Our Elders Teach Us to Speak it", is the inspiration for the title of this thesis. This dictionary is a compilation of all words, phrases, and syntax in the Chinuk Wawa language, compiled by tribal members and based from elder accounts. In addition, this dictionary offers biographies on elders contributing to the lexicon, as well as stories and writings of these elders. Due to its entry on Amazon.com, the dictionary is accessible to anyone around the world. This dictionary is not just an effort to preserve the language, but a historical and cultural one as well; there are stories written by elders in the dictionary, as well as biographies of contributors and a general history of the Confederated Tribes. This dictionary is especially useful to students that are not in the Grand Ronde area and therefore do not have access to some of the experts in the language, such as Henry Zenk. People in the Portland community used the dictionary as

the authoritative work on Chinuk Wawa. Bernando explained in his interview, "The dictionary helps a lot, because the dictionary basically says, 'All right, we're done with that [changing the language]'. The spelling system is how it's going to be, from now into the future." By creating this dictionary, the Grand Ronde managed to standardize their language and make it accessible for more distant communities with Chinuk speakers. Of course, the new dictionary standardizes only one variety of Chinuk Wawa, and not the entire language itself. Vancouver, BC and other areas in the region may have their own ways of speaking the language; this dictionary is thought to be the definitive work on the Grand Ronde variety of Chinuk Wawa.

Before the release of this dictionary, the process of creating authenticity in the Grand Ronde community was a time-consuming and occasionally frustrating process for educators in the reservation community. In an effort to make the language is as authentic as possible, Grand Ronde has changed the spellings, pronunciation, and vocabulary in many of its lexicons. This was a challenging process for the teachers in the Grand Ronde community, for obvious reasons: "The words seem to always be changing. And at some point you just gotta say, 'We're going to go with what we have'." This became particularly difficult when considering the materials created with older words or older spellings in the language that must be updated in order to stay current. Other teachers had problems with these changes for other reasons. As one teacher said,

> "It makes it difficult for me to learn. 'Cause I'm still kind of at the beginning stages, because every time I learn something, it's something different the next time. So that makes it difficult to learn, I think that's what makes it so difficult for the kids, it's – we're teaching them one thing, and the next week, it's a different word."

While these adaptations were necessary to maintain authenticity, it is questionable how clearly that final version of Chinuk will initially be taught to younger learners of the language.

The Grand Ronde has a formal means of approving new coinings, and is actively working to accommodate its language in the twenty-first century. According to the Grand Ronde teachers, several teachers and staff from the Grand Ronde Cultural Department meet and discuss the necessary words for coining, whether due to technological or educational needs. This department uses Henry Zenk as the provider of potential new words and as the resident expert on the language. One of the teachers said, "Well, he's the one with the most experience, the one who's actually talked to the elders, so he's the one I trust." Zenk provides a number of potential options for a new term of coining to the department. Teachers and staff members then choose the best coining, and then begin to teach that word as the authentic coining. Interestingly, these new coinings are not present in the new Chinuk Wawa dictionary. This was done on purpose, as the dictionary was made to preserve the language as elders spoke it, rather than new forms and adaptations of the language. However, it may complicate the learning process in the Portland communities, as language learners will not necessarily have access to the words that form a major part of their daily lives. These new words often are meant for ideas and objects that were not discussed or did not exist at the time that Chinuk Wawa was developed. Animals from other regions, educational words such as particular shapes and mathematical concepts, and new technologies all are elements of the language that is being adapted and developed by the Grand Ronde.

Although the Grand Ronde is considered the authority on Chinuk Wawa and is the center of new coinings and adaptations of the language, the Portland community experimented with coining as well during the primary research period. For instance, when talking about the upcoming holidays during a class in the winter, the language teacher coined the word, "t'si-lekan" (sweet-cane) as a possible word for candy cane. While reading a story for the writing class in the Grand Ronde Portland office, the writing teacher used a word for panther from a local indigenous language, rather than "thli'il-yuthlqat-up^{h}uch" (black cougar). This experimentation with Chinuk was not limited to language teachers, however: while on a Wawa walk, a fellow student and I observed spider webs, and coined the word "skukúm-haws" (spider-house). Eric encouraged us to play with the language, and assured us that we were not wrong, even if there was an established Chinuk word for the object.

These examples follow similar strategies for word formation in Grand Ronde Chinuk; many new words were derived from compounds of established words, or brought from a local indigenous language that contributed to the formation of Chinuk Wawa. This use of coining was discussed by Portland teachers of Chinuk during their interviews. The Grand Ronde Portland writing teacher discussed his interest in bringing new words from other languages into Chinuk, "There were a gazillion – there was so much terminology about fish, and fish meat, and drying, all that stuff. And my feeling is – things that are so culturally appropriate, it wouldn't be a bad idea to borrow those." At the same time, he acknowledged his own limited role in bringing about these new words. Interestingly, nearly all examples of Portland coining gathered during the summer and winter fieldwork

were from the Portland Grand Ronde classes. This may be due to the fact that these classes happened on a regular basis, creating biased results. The Portland Grand Ronde classes also had the highest number of fluent and advanced speakers, making experimentation with the language easier than with other language speakers. Whatever the reason, the Portland community appeared to model other master-apprentice systems, with a less formal means of coining new words into the language. Whether or not these new coinings will survive to be passed on to other speakers is not relevant to the community of speakers. If official coinings of these words are developed, it is highly unlikely that the Grand Ronde will use the words developed by the Portland communities. This experimentation of the language reflects not a serious effort to codify or standardize Chinuk Wawa, but attempt by the Portland groups to adapt the language to their own lives, and make the language their own. While they most likely will not have control over the language in any official capacity, the Portland area speakers still use Chinuk Wawa to express themselves in creative ways.

All four populations involved acknowledged a lack of necessary contact between the Portland communities and the Grand Ronde reservation community. Nearly all interviewees from both the Grand Ronde reservation and the Portland area said that they had never met any language learner from the other group. The Portland community was left out from the creation of new words, even though they were a major center for Chinuk Wawa revitalization.

One of the language teachers in the Portland area accepted this situation:

> "You know, new coinings need to happen. The language needs to grow, and there needs to be new ways to talk about new things. And I would feel most comfortable if Native folks took the lead on that and I could copy what they say. That's what I would feel most comfortable with."

At the same time, he recognized the nature of the language as one that was often adapted for new situations: "You know, Chinuk Wawa is for invention." In some instances, the process behind coining new words was problematized. Bernando stated, "As we create and coin new words, I hope we have a legitimate process for doing that, and not just a process where a new lexicon comes out, and there are 200 new words that no one knew about."

Some interviewees expressed concern over some of the reasons behind coinages in the twenty-first century; while some words, such as Internet or computer, were seen as entirely necessary to survive, others were seen as possibly assimilatory. For instance, the word pchix in Chinuk refers to both blue and green. Some people in the Grand Ronde community proposed creating coinings that separated green and blue for young children learning the language. In other coinings, English-based words were eliminated from the language. In earlier texts, dance in Chinuk was referred to as "tanis". In the new dictionary, the Chinookan term "ishish" is listed instead (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde 2012: 95). Bernando discussed his unease with these new coinings:

> "I don't see any reason to do that. I don't see any reason for us to create new words when we have old words. Sure, we may not like some of the old words we have – maybe because they're too English, or something else. But I like them all, and I think we need to respect our elders for keeping them alive."

101

Clearly, the process of coining can be controversial, especially when considering replacing older words in the language. This was especially true in the case of some people in Portland who are not given the same authority in creating authenticity as members of the reservation are.

Despite these misgivings, many people in both communities expressed their desire to strengthen the contact between communities and even schedule a meeting to have intercommunity language events. One teacher in the Grand Ronde community stated, "I know that in the past when they had their annual lo'lo, I would get to meet the people in the Portland area. And that was kind of cool – it was fun because they always said things kind of different, and it was kind of funny. But I enjoyed that." One teacher in the Grand Ronde community remarked on the need to connect with other Chinuk speakers to more effectively teach the language: "You know, if we had a bigger network, we could supply the demand. I think there's a bigger demand there than we can supply. Especially here locally." The sentiment to work more closely with the Grand Ronde is also expressed in the Portland area, especially in the Portland Grand Ronde classes. Language teacher Eric said, "I really would like to work more with Grand Ronde and less just, you know, essentially working with [the Portland writing teacher]." There appeared to be progress made on this issue. At the end of the summer period of fieldwork, a meeting was planned for the beginning of fall classes in the Grand Ronde. This meeting concerned the status of the language, and the direction that the Grand Ronde will take language education. As of April 2013, it was confirmed that this meeting took place between the Grand Ronde, the Portland Grand Ronde community, and the Eugene

community. According to one Grand Ronde teacher, there will be more contact between all three groups in the future, allowing for a more standardized form of Chinuk. There may be complications in groups working together, as explained by a Grand Ronde teacher: "…it becomes sort of proprietary. I think that there is sort of the feeling, you know – this is our baby. And there sometimes is the feeling of, 'Well, you're not doing it as well as you should.'" However, this meeting not only allows for the Portland community to have greater access to the cultural resources of the Grand Ronde, but also creates a wider network of Chinuk Wawa speakers engaging with the language. This allows language learners and teachers both to speak the language in new ways, and learn from the knowledge, traditions, and experimentation of both communities.

The Grand Ronde reservation and Portland community classes had different priorities towards Chinuk revitalization. One of the teachers in the Grand Ronde noted some of the differences in the language instruction between communities, leading to differences in pronunciation and speaking style:

> "… They also speak really fast, have you noticed that? And I think that's part of their pronunciation troubles. You can't make all the sounds that fast, you know. It ends up sounding different because you don't have all of those really interesting sounds. It ends up sounding like English with different words."

While this may seem like a small point, these communities had quite different students and ways of approaching revitalization. The Grand Ronde used more formal class structures, corrects pronunciation, and attempts to build community through intergenerational work. The three Portland communities, on the other hand, tended to value informal language learning, with little or no correction in pronunciation, and were

largely based on teaching the individual. Unlike the Grand Ronde, who worked within Western standards of education, the Portland community appeared to be much less concerned with students learning how to read and write in Chinuk. As Eric Bernando stated, "…although I do believe it's important for people to learn how to read and write, language is not going to be alive when all you can do is read and write." Both communities had advantages and disadvantages to their methods of teaching, but both communities were innovating as to how to best teach the language to their respective populations and bring new people into the revitalization process.

The differences in revitalization strategies for these communities appear to come from the different needs of these language groups, and the role they play in maintaining authenticity. The Grand Ronde, seen as a central authority of Chinuk Wawa and responsible for creating an intergenerational community of speakers, must not only regulate the adaptation of the language into the twenty-first century, but accommodate language learners from all ages. This community also benefits from a higher concentration of fluent speakers in the area, as well as a general concentration of resources to teach Chinuk Wawa. On the other hand, the Portland community, attempting to introduce Chinuk to as many people as possible, must work in a variety of settings with both Native and non-Native students, and experiment with language teaching methods in order to create an informal environment for speakers. Although Portland classes do attempt to demonstrate the established pronunciation, the small number of fluent speakers in the area, as well as the policy of limited correction, makes it difficult to demonstrate "correct" pronunciation of the language. The Portland community also must

work with a learning population with sizable non-Native numbers, or is entirely non-Native. Both communities are committed to making Chinuk Wawa a sustainable language that is spoken outside of formal classroom settings, although the classroom is still the major means of revitalization in both communities. Each community has unique resources and advantages, leading to different roles in creating authenticity and preserving the language.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

There is often tension in creating and maintaining an authentic variety of the language while still adapting it to the needs of language speakers in the twenty-first century. The process of creating and maintaining authenticity in Chinuk Wawa is deeply challenging, particularly in the Portland community. As the major center of revitalization of Chinuk Wawa, the Grand Ronde must attempt to preserve the processual codes of the language while growing the structural codes and adapting the language for the future. The Portland community, meanwhile, is working to bring in an element of Grand Ronde culture to language classes that often have a much stronger emphasis on the structural codes of the language. The Grand Ronde and Portland communities must decide how to adapt the language for the twenty-first century, to include both academic and scientific terms.

While revitalization and its processes can be problematized in some aspects, new coinings, standardization of the language, and the use of non-Native educational methods are often seen as necessary to keep the language alive. Despite its attempts to seamlessly transition from the past use of the language to future use, revitalization is almost never a seamless process (Harkin 2004:xx). Questions abound over how to teach the language, when to speak the language, and who to teach the language to. Because technology is evolving so rapidly and is often a major part of daily living today, lexical changes in the

language are necessary in order to avoid code switching to English to talk about technological issues (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:xxix). These changes are therefore not just important to keeping the language appealing to youth, but in order for it to compete as a viable language in daily life of the twenty-first century. For languages to be transmitted successfully and be used outside of the classroom, the languages themselves must account for cultural change and be usable in daily life (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:60). In the case of the revitalization of Californian languages, not only were coinings developed informally between the master speaker and the learner, but students often simplified the grammar of the language in order to us it as much as possible (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:62). The Grand Ronde, through its use of Western stories, its process of creating new coinings, and the encouragement for non-Natives to learn the language, has shown a commitment to change and adapt Chinuk Wawa to ensure its survival. At the same time, its use of cultural stories in writing classes also shows an interest in revitalizing the culture of the Grand Ronde.

Revitalization is a complex and sometimes controversial process, one that demands enormous time and resources by indigenous communities. Because so many indigenous languages are at risk from language death, communities must find ways to teach these languages and somehow reverse these processes. In an ideal situation, language revitalization is an active process by the community that requires the cooperation of elders, tribal leaders, parents, and young people. As we see with the Grand Ronde, however, groups such as the Where Are Your Keys Portland State University class from outside the community can also play a part in providing a teaching space for

107

the language. Tribal leaders and language teachers must develop curriculum, materials, books and resources for students in order for the language to be taught in a classroom setting. Families often attempt to learn and use the language together, encouraging use outside of the classroom and in the home as much as possible. While language revitalization often occurs in classrooms, the long term goals of language revitalization is to create a community in which the indigenous language is spoken in the home, in social interactions and in official settings. However, the language often undergoes a process of standardization as a part of revitalization, in order to assist in the cohesive teaching of the language. This process can stigmatize certain dialects of an indigenous language, and conform to academic regulations at the expense of traditional nuance in the language. If one were conducting future research on the revitalization of Chinuk Wawa, one could study the political implications of this standardization of the language, with the Grand Ronde operating as the central area of Chinuk Wawa revitalization.

With no living elders who spoke and learned Chinuk Wawa as a first language, creating authenticity is a more complicated process than for other indigenous languages. Because creating identity is a process not just determined by the individual, but determined by societal rules, constructing a definitive standard of Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa that is connected to elder use of the language is an important part of building a "real" Grand Ronde identity (Adams 2009: 135). The data from this research clearly demonstrate that authenticity is considered a process in the Grand Ronde, and was never going to be complete, as the language was constantly adapting to new needs of its speakers. These elders would be considered the experts of the language, being able to

explain certain grammatical and expressive rules of the language in person. While tapes and recordings of Chinuk Wawa are still preserved and free for the public, these recordings are not a substitute for a living community of elder speakers who learned Chinuk as a first language. These tapes show a surprising amount of diversity in its language speakers, as pronunciation and the use of certain words vary between them with no clear standard. Therefore, the Grand Ronde has relied on a linguist from the Portland area as an expert in the language, and the main authority in revitalization when adapting Chinuk. This is another instance of outside or academic influence in the Chinuk Wawa revitalization process. Henry Zenk and the Grand Ronde have had to not only adapt the language from its more traditional roots, but have also have had to decide what those traditional roots are; the elder recordings use the Chinuk in diverse and idiosyncratic ways, as would be the case in all human language. Like many other indigenous languages, the Grand Ronde has taken steps to standardize the language into a single dialect that can be defined as correct and traditional. In addition, Professor Zenk generates potential coinings for the language, which are officially approved by the Grand Ronde.

However, as seen in the Portland communities, it is highly difficult to maintain this "authentic" dialect of the language, even with the new dictionary available as a resource. Pronunciation is highly varied in the Portland community, particularly between different groups with differing levels of fluency in the language. In addition, people in the Portland community are willing to make the language their own through new coinings and experimentation with the language. While these coinings may not survive in the same

way that others created in the Grand Ronde community do, they demonstrate the difficulty that the Grand Ronde has in maintaining authenticity and standardization of the language in a diverse and broad community, spread in both urban and rural areas. In fact, one could argue that authenticity of the language was not maintained in these groups. However, despite the challenges the Portland communities faced in teaching Chinuk Wawa, their classes reached new students who were able to engage with a language that they would not have had access to otherwise. Therefore, these classes could be considered successful in transmitting its own variation of the language, regardless of its state of "authenticity". Of course, given the increased attention to communication between the Grand Ronde and these Portland communities, this situation might change and this variation between communities may diminish.

The inclusion of non-Native peoples into Chinuk Wawa classes does not diminish the importance of these language classes to indigenous peoples of the community. These classes still perform a very important function for Native people in the Portland area. Indigenous languages, as seen in earlier chapters, are a major way for peoples to learn about, celebrate, and express their cultural identity and heritage. While peoples may still have and participate in an indigenous identity and community without speaking an indigenous language, the language is often seen as a major part of culture and heritage. For members of the Grand Ronde in both Portland and reservation communities, Chinuk Wawa classes are a way to engage with an indigenous identity, and to create their own indigenous community. Although not all members of classes are Grand Ronde, Native students still see themselves as engaging with an indigenous identity through learning

Chinuk Wawa. While the use of non-Native stories and materials to teach Chinuk Wawa can be problematized as dangerous to indigenous identity, the use of these materials can also bridge the gap between Native and non-Native cultural materials. Although the adoption of new words can leave out members of the Portland community in its process, these new words help Grand Ronde and Native people express the post-modern environment around them in Native terms. Many of these members are not only Grand Ronde, but come from non-indigenous identity and culture as well. Therefore, these groups may have to be willing to bring in new stories and materials in order to secure the structural codes of Chinuk Wawa. The Grand Ronde, both on the reservation and in Portland, has been highly innovative in creating new spaces for people to learn languages and express their indigenous identity. These groups also demonstrate that, even with definitive lexicons available for residents, revitalization is a process that is never complete and needs constant revision. Nonetheless, the value of indigenous languages as sources of community identity, cultural knowledge, and community cohesion make these efforts valuable investments into an indigenous future.

While there are differences in teaching methods between the Grand Ronde and the various Portland communities in the area, the tensions between the communities appear to be limited. The process of revitalization brings up questions about how to properly teach the language, but questions as well about who should be the priority members of the community. Should indigenous peoples attempt to keep the outside population out of its language classes, or should non-Native peoples be welcomed into classes in order to create higher numbers of language speakers, as seen in Hawaiian language classes (Nettle

and Romaine 2000:183)? Chinuk Wawa is a heritage language of the Grand Ronde, but is also a historical language of the greater Pacific Northwest region, from Northern California to areas of Alaska. As seen in the data, some indigenous peoples from other nations considered this language one of the land, and not just one of ethnicity. While the priority of these language classes may be introduce students to their indigenous identity, these Chinuk classes can have value to those who are interested in the history of the Pacific Northwest. Many nations and peoples have a history with the language, including non-Native peoples of European descent. As a part of its revitalization program, the Grand Ronde has spread its revitalization of Chinuk Wawa to nearby urban communities. However, many non-Native and Native peoples of other origins have become majorities in the Chinuk Wawa classes in these communities. As a result, these communities have a different heritage and interest in the language than those in the Grand Ronde reservation community. Based on the data gathered for this research, it appears that many people in the Grand Ronde, especially in the Portland community, do not resent the teaching of the language to non-Native peoples. Based on data collection and research, it appears that even in the Grand Ronde reservation, non-native people are welcomed into language classes and taught Chinuk. While Chinuk classes are not always tied to Grand Ronde culture or to the Grand Ronde members, these groups still form a community of Chinuk Wawa speakers, albeit one with different cultural ties to the language. One of the issues with authenticity that modern indigenous communities must face is not only adapting the language to new ideas and technology, but adapting the cultural stories and traditions to new environments.

Works Cited

Adam, S. K. 2009 Extinction Or Survival?: The Remarkable Story of the Tigua, an Urban American Indian Tribe. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Ah Nee-Benham, Maenette K. P., and Joanne E. Cooper. 2000 Indigenous Educational Models for Contemporary Practice: In Our Mother's Voice. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Appadurai, Arjun.2012 Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *In* Anthropological Theory: An Introductory History. 5th edition. R. Jon McGee and Richard L. Warms, eds. Pp. 567-587. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Battiste, Marie Ann, and James Youngblood Henderson. 2000 Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge. Saskatoon: Purich Pub.

Berg, Laura, and Oregon Council for the Humanities. 2007 The First Oregonians. 2nd ed. Portland.: Oregon Council for the Humanities.

Blair, Heather. 1995 Do Not Go Gentle into that Good Night. Rage, Rage, Against the Dying of the Light. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 26(1): 27-49.

Bernando, Eric. ND Chaku-Kəmdəks Chinuk Wawa.

http://learnchinookjargon.wordpress.com/, accessed January 12, 2012.

The Chinuk Wawa Dictionary Project. 2012 kakwa nsayka ulman-tilixam laska munk-

kemteks nsayka: As our Elders Teach Us to Speak it. Grand Ronde, OR: Confederated

Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon.

Cox, Michelle, Jay Jordan, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, Gwen Gray Schwartz, and

National Council of Teachers of English. 2010 Reinventing Identities in Second

Language Writing. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Dauenhauer, Nora, and Richard Dauenhauer. 1998 Technical, Emotional, and Ideological

Issues in Reversing Language Shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. *In* Endangered

Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects. Leonard Grenoble and Lindsay Whaley,

eds. Pp. 57-73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

England, Nora C. 2003 Maya linguists, linguistics, and the politics of identity.
In Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Symposium about Language and Society. Austin:
April 12-14, 2002. Texas Linguistics Society 45: 33-45.

Goodfellow, Anne, and Pauline Alfred. 2002 Maintaining Indigenous Languages in

North America. Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

Greymorning, Stephen.1997 Going Beyond Words.Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

Harkin, Michael Eugene, and American Anthropological Association. 2004 Reassessing

Revitalization Movements: Perspectives from North America and the Pacific Islands.

Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Heller, Monica, and Marilyn Martin-Jones. 2001 Voices of Authority: Education and

Linguistic Difference. Vol. 1. Stamford, Conn.: Ablex.

Hendry, Joy. 2005 Reclaiming Culture: Indigenous People and Self- Representation. New

York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Henze, Rosemary C., and Kathryn Anne Davis (eds.). 1999 Theme Issue, Authenticity

and Identity: Lessons From Indigenous Language Education. Anthropology and

Education Quarterly 30(1).

Heredia, Armando and Norbert Francis. 1997 Coyote as Reading Teacher. Distributed by

ERIC Clearinghouse.

Holm, John A. 1988 Pidgins and Creoles. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University

Press.

Hornberger, Nancy. 2002 Language Shift and Language Revitalization. *In* The Oxford

Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Kaplan, Robert B., ed. New York, N.Y.: Oxford

University Press.

Hymes, Dell H. 1964 Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and

Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row.

Johansen, Jørgen Dines, Svend Erik Larsen, and Ebooks Corporation. 2002 Signs in use. London: Routledge.

Johnson, Tony A., and Henry Zenk. 2010 A Northwest Language of Contact, Diplomacy, and Identity: Chinuk Wawa/Chinook Jargon. *In* Oregon Historical Quarterly. 444. Academic OneFile.

Jourdan, Christine, and Kevin Tuite. 2006 Language, Culture, and Society: Key Topics in Linguistic Anthropology. Vol. 23. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kentta, Robert, and David G. Lewis. 2010 Western Oregon reservations: two perspectives on place. *In* Oregon Historical Quarterly. 476.

Lang, George. 2008 Making Wawa. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lawrence, Bonita. 2004 "Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Leavelle, Tracy N. 1998 "We Will Make It Our Own Place": Agriculture and Adaptation at the Grand Ronde Reservation, 1856-1887. American Indian Quarterly, (22: 4). 433-456.

Lee, Helen. 2006 Debating language and identity online: Tongans on the net. *In* Native on the Net: Indigenous and Diasporic Peoples in the Virtual Age. Kyra Landzelius, ed. London; New York: Routledge.

Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2013 Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Seventeenth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Accesssed April 27th, 2013. http://www.ethnologue.com.

Lillard, Charles. 1998 A Voice Great Within Us. Vancouver: New Star Books.

Lutz, John S. 2008 Makúk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. 2008 The State of the Native Nations: Conditions Under U.S. Policies of Self-Determination. New York: Oxford University Press.

McWhorter, John H., and Inc. 2000 Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles. Vol. 21. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Nettle, Daniel and Suzanne Romaine.2000 Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pasco, Duane. 2001 Home Page of "Tenas Wawa" Online. http://duanepasco.com/tw/, accessed February 1, 2012.

Rosenthal, Nicolas G., and Ebooks Corporation. 2012 Reimagining Indian Country. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Todd, Loreto.1974. Pidgins and Creoles. London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

United Nations. 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Accessed April 24, 2013. www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.

Waters, Anne. 2004 American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Zenk, Henry. 1984 Chinook Jargon and native cultural persistence in the Grand Ronde Indian community, 1856-1907: A special case of creolization (sociolinguistics, ethnography of speaking). University of Oregon. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Zenk, Henry. 1988 Chinook Jargon in the Speech Economy of Grand Ronde Reservation, Oregon: An Ethnography-of Speaking Approach to an Historical Case of Creolization in Process. International journal of the sociology of language (71). 107-124.