UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND PRACTICES AMONG UNIVERSITY LEARNERS OF

NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN APPLIED LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

By

MICHAEL WILSON
Norman, Oklahoma
2016

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND PRACTICES AMONG UNIVERSITY LEARNERS OF
NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Sean O'Neill, Chair

_____
Dr. Racquel-María Sapién

_____
Dr. Misha Klein

_____
Dr. Gus Palmer

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of the Native American language instructors at the University of Oklahoma. I would like to sincerely thank Mrs. Christine Armer, Mr. Charles Foster, Mr. Freddie Lewis, Mr. Dane Poolaw, Mrs. Martha Poolaw, and Mr. Dillon Vaughn for welcoming me into their classrooms to conduct research. Their tireless dedication to language teaching greatly benefits hundreds of students each year, and I have the highest respect for their leadership and creativity. *Wado*, *yakoke*, and *àhô* to each of you!

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Sean O'Neill for his ongoing guidance and support over the years. It was a great privilege to have him as the chair of my committee, and his wealth of insights continue to inspire me. I would also like to thank Dr. Raquel-María Sapién for her dedication to teaching and serving as an ideal role model for myself as well as others in my cohort. I would like to thank Dr. Misha Klein for challenging me to think deeply about the underlying questions driving my research. Her advice and support have aided me greatly in my academic development. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Gus Pàntháidê Palmer for his encouragement throughout my process of researching and writing. I was honored to work under his tutelage, and his support is a continual source of motivation for me.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This thesis examines language ideologies among university learners of Native American languages. Given that attitudes and beliefs toward these languages can have a direct impact on the learning process, recognizing ideologies present among students provides a means to contest distorted views that perpetuate misconceptions and impede learning. First, a cursory glance of the language courses included in the research will be provided along with a description on the methodology employed in the study. Elucidating theoretical concepts driving the research, language ideologies will be examined to demonstrate ways in which they perpetuate inequality. Viewing OU as a key site for studying language ideologies, a historical sketch on language ideologies that have shaped federal government policies related to Native American languages will be presented. After establishing a context through which to view the research findings, data from the survey used for the present study will be revealed. In presenting the findings, language ideologies present in the university classroom will be identified, interpreted, and contested. The concluding chapter provides final thoughts on the study and proposes ideas for further research. Additionally, the final chapter articulates the need to view Native American language learning as a human rights issue tied to larger efforts aimed at strengthening tribal communities. In order to make this recognition, distorted views imbued with authority must be contested to promote an increased understanding of Native languages and the cultures they represent.

1. Introduction

As of 2016, OU offered courses in four Native American languages, including Cherokee, Choctaw, Kiowa, and Mvskoke Creek. Each of these is spoken in Oklahoma, and like the majority of Native languages in Oklahoma and around the United States, they are all considered to be endangered (Golla 2007). At the time that this research project was undertaken, the first and second semesters of Cherokee, Choctaw, and Mvskoke Creek met for five hours per week. All other Native American language courses, including third semester courses and all levels of Kiowa, were held for three hours per week. OU is among the few institutions in the world to offer multiple Native American language courses each year. This makes it a unique site for studies aimed at understanding university Native American language teaching and learning.

The Native American Language Program at OU faces constraints in the amount of time and exposure to the languages that students are able to receive during their learning process. While the goal of the Native American Language Program is not to produce fluent speakers of Cherokee, Choctaw, Kiowa, and Mvskoke Creek after only three semesters of learning, these courses are a critical component of a well-rounded education at the university. These courses afford students with the unique opportunity to develop an awareness of Native languages to increase their understanding and appreciation for Native culture. In addition, these courses fulfill "foreign" language requirements. As Hinton notes, this is a regrettable label but a good policy (2013: 7). These languages are in no way

foreign—quite the opposite. They are native to Oklahoma, a region previously referred to as Indian Territory.

Before being incorporated into the United States, tribal communities were guaranteed full treaty rights to inhabit the land without federal government encroachment "as long as the grass shall grow" (Debo 1973). Although the grass continued to grow, tribal lands were seen as "too big for the needs of Indians there" (Hinton 2013: 369). Incorporating Oklahoma into the United States facilitated English use as a new primary mode of communication in the region. "Oklahoma," a name derived from the Choctaw language, remains one of the most linguistically diverse areas of the United States due to the number of Native American languages spoken in the region since before statehood. Placing Native American languages into the category of "foreign" is flagrantly false, and it continues to be a problematic label on university transcripts. However, offering university courses in these languages is critical for providing students with the knowledge needed to fully comprehend the cultural diversity that exists in Oklahoma.

1.1 Language Ideologies in the Native American Language Classroom

At OU, students choose to enroll in Native American language classes for a variety of purposes such as connecting with their heritage languages to merely completing requisite coursework needed to earn their degrees (Morgan 2012). Students' prior exposure to Native languages, history, and culture vary widely. Students enrolled in these classes come from numerous academic and geographic

backgrounds. With this in mind, students enrolled in Native American language courses at OU are informed by a vast range of experiences related to their life circumstances. As they enter the classroom, they bring with them knowledge of unique sets of discourses that they have been exposed to in their home communities, as well as ideologies relating to Native languages.

Language ideologies can be viewed as received attitudes and beliefs towards languages that individuals inherit through exposure to social discourse. These ideologies have strong implications for how people behave and interact with speakers of other dialects and languages. In addition, they can have a direct impact on language learning by affecting how much effort they choose to invest in the process. This study was designed to uncover various language ideologies that Native American language students bring with them to the university classroom. This information is of particular interest given that students' attitudes and beliefs about language have a direct impact on their learning process (Saville-Troike 2003: 183). The current study builds off of comparable work conducted by Kickham (2015) aimed at determining patterns related to ideological beliefs among university learners of Native languages at OU in order to examine the implications they have in the classroom and beyond. To my knowledge, no previous studies have been conducted on language ideologies across first and third semester learners of Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa at a university. Consequently, this important follow up study seeks to fill a gap in knowledge among underrepresented groups of Native language learners.

University students have been overlooked in the discussion on Native American language revitalization. This paper seeks to identify ways in which attending Native American language classes at OU might lead to a shift in attitudes and beliefs as students pass through three semesters of studying the languages. This information can contribute valuable information related to an understudied area of inquiry. Additionally, my hope is that this study will provide useful information for Native American language instructors that might allow them to glean insights on students' outlooks as they continue to carry out pivotal roles at the university.

1.2 Methodology

In order to uncover information on language ideologies held by university learners of Native American languages, a survey was developed for distribution in Native language courses at OU. The survey (OU IRB #6104) was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board. Surveys were administered and collected during the first few weeks of the Spring 2016 semester. In order to measure possible changes in attitudes and beliefs over the course of students' progressions through three semesters of Native American language classes, the surveys were conducted only in first and third semester classes. For this reason, six sections Native American Language classes were selected for the survey: Cherokee 1, Cherokee 3, Choctaw 1, Choctaw 3, Kiowa 1, and Kiowa 3.

Before inviting students to participate in this voluntary survey, they were informed that it was completely anonymous and that no private information would

be collected. In addition, students were informed that electing not to participate in the survey would have no affect on their grades in any way. All students invited to complete the survey chose to participate. A total of 123 respondents participated in the survey. This represents half of the students enrolled in first and third semester Kiowa courses. In addition, one quarter of first and third semester students of Cherokee and Choctaw were involved in the study. The five-part survey consisted of a total of twenty-six questions, and it can be viewed in the Appendix section.

The first eight questions of the survey asked for general information about the students including their level at the university, gender, age, home community, language(s) spoken at home, and prior university and non-university languages classes taken. This portion of the survey allowed me to identify the language(s) students regularly use in their homes. In addition, it identified previous educational experiences that could have potentially informed their opinions on how language learning should take place. The second section of the survey focused on students' perceived importance of language learning, their opinions on which languages hold the most prestige, their beliefs related to which Native American languages are the most important to learn, and whether English should be the official language of Oklahoma as well as the United States. These questions were posed to identify ideologies tied to the ranking of languages, which have been present in historical discourses related to Native languages for much of America's history. Finally, questions related to establishing English as an official language

were aimed at recognizing students' stances on this politically charged issue that has negative implications for speakers of minority languages.

In the third section of the survey, participants were asked about other students' attitudes toward learning Native American languages. A prior survey of Native American language learners at OU demonstrated that many students were motivated to enroll in these courses due to their perceived easiness to pass in relation to other languages being offered at the university (Morgan 2012). To follow up on these findings, students in the present study were asked whether the Native American language they were studying was more difficult, easier, or equally as difficult to learn as languages taught in OU's Modern Languages Department. Surprised by prior studies, which found that students viewed Native American language courses at OU to be easy, I sought to explore this area in my survey to determine whether this is truly the case. Finally, this portion of the survey asked students to compare the grammatical complexity of the Native American language they were studying to those taught in the Modern Languages Department.

The role of grammar instruction in the language-learning classroom remains a contested topic in the field of Second Language Acquisition (Brandl 2008). This question sought to assess students' perceived notions of the complexities of the grammatical structures found in the Native languages they were studying. The polysynthetic structures characteristic of the Native languages offered at OU are vastly different from those found in English or other Indo-European languages, and establishing best practices for teaching grammatical concepts to Native American language learners remains an understudied topic.

Another topic of interest related to Native language learning relates to the role of literacy. Scholars such as Gee (1989) and Ong (2012) have challenged notions of literacy with regard to Native American languages. In addition, Neely and Palmer (2009) noted that orthographies for tribal languages have serious implications for language revitalization efforts, and these ideologies often vary widely among speakers of Native languages on how they should, or should not, be employed. With this in mind, survey respondents were asked about the importance of learning to read and write in the Native American languages they were studying. This was aimed at identifying patterns that could potentially add to the conversation the role of literacy, or literacies (Gee 1989), in Native American language learning.

The fourth section of the survey included questions seeking to uncover students' perceptions of the status of Native American languages. As an advocate for Native American language revitalization, I view university courses on Native languages as a part of larger efforts aimed at strengthening tribal communities. Many tribes across the country are presently engaged in language renewal. As Hinton notes, the survival of Indigenous languages, often tied to expressions of self-determination, is to be viewed as a human rights issue (2013: 5). This section of the survey posed questions seeking to uncover students' levels of knowledge related to tribal languages that are spoken today and revitalization efforts seeking to promote their usage. Respondents were asked about the number of Native American languages spoken in the United States as well as the number of people who currently speak the Native American language they are studying. Given that

students have the unique opportunity to study a Native language at a university, this question was posed to ascertain the level of awareness students held towards the community of speakers that use these languages. In addition, I sought to identify students' beliefs about the future of the language they were studying, and respondents were asked whether the number of Native American language speakers was increasing or decreasing.

Anticipating that students might consider Native languages as presently losing speakers, I was interested in students' perceptions of the most common domains of usage for these languages. To address this, respondents were asked about the various contexts that Native languages were regularly used in. According to Field and Kroskrity, the continuous influence that non-Indigenous ideologies impose on Native communities through dominant institutions can often lead to divergent perspectives on language in Native communities (2009: 6). With this in mind, survey questions were included on how Native American languages are perceived by both Native and non-Native students.

The final section of the survey invited students to share information on the most common attitudes and beliefs about Native American languages found in their home communities. This portion sought to explicitly address language ideologies that students brought with them to the Native American language classroom at OU. In this section, 112 out of 123 respondents shared answers about attitudes and beliefs in prose form. This uncovered a range of topics that have strong implications for understanding dominant ideologies present in university Native American language classrooms. Additionally, it demonstrated

ways in which attitudes have shifted as students have progressed from first to third semester Native American language classes.

1.3 Discussion Structure

Before outlining findings from the survey and considering the their implications for Native American language instruction at the university, two chapters are included to provide a context for the research being presented. The following chapter outlines language ideologies as an area of focus within linguistic anthropology. In so doing, I demonstrate that while society shapes discourse, discourse has the ability to shape society. An example of this can be found in early American discourse on Native American identity. As Deloria notes, it is a truism that popular images of "good and bad Indians" in American society reveal more about the people who created them than they do about Native people themselves (1998: 20). For early Americans, dominant discourse on "Indians" defined them along two axes. While characterizing Natives as being free and "noble," they were also labeled as unrefined and unlearned. (Deloria 1998: 20-21). Focused on redefining themselves as something other than British colonists, Boston Tea Party participants donned Indian garb and bellowed choruses of war whoops as they dumped tea into the ocean. In this American "origin story," the positive axis of Indianness was aligned with a romantic spirit of freedom and noble rebellion (Deloria 1998: 3). This included imaginary and symbolic notions of what Native people should be, and these became crystalized into ideologies that presented

themselves as statements of fact. In turn, these ideologies impacted how the federal government devised official policies for Native communities.

Under the guise of helping "unlearned" Natives achieve "progress" through English-only education, dominant ideologies helped to justify the boarding school experience in which Native communities were forced to send their children away from their homes to be indoctrinated into prescribed roles in American society, which included the abandonment of their heritage languages. From this example of ideology in practice, it is clear that harmful discourses are often at the root of unjust practices that are purported to be in a given group's best interests. To develop a more nuanced understanding of how ideologies function in society, three key characteristics of language ideologies are discussed in the next chapter, and the importance of this field of inquiry in relation to Native American language learning at the university is identified.

Chapter 3 offers background information on the Native American language program at OU. A sketch on the history of state-sponsored language ideologies that informed Native American language policies is provided. This identifies ways in which dominant views on Native languages led to their suppression. In turn, this helps to reveal deeply held beliefs towards Native languages in the United States that persist to this day. Finally, shifts in language policies that preceded the establishment of the Native American Language Program at OU are outlined. This provides a historical context through which to view the achievement of having Native American language courses offered at a university. Given the rarity of a university offering several semesters of courses on multiple Native languages,

Chapter 3 highlights the uniqueness of OU as a key site for studying language ideologies among university learners.

After focusing on the importance of understanding students' language ideologies in the Native American language classroom, Chapter 4 offers research findings from the first four sections of the survey. Responses from first and third semester Native American language students are compared to reveal both dominant ideologies and discourse related to Native American languages that are circulating in the classrooms.

Chapter 5 presents findings from the final section of the survey. Quotes from respondents are included to elucidate the most commonly held attitudes and beliefs that they attributed to their home communities. These quotes are grouped into four major categories reflecting the most prevalent language ideologies in circulation among university learners of Native American languages at OU.

In the conclusion, the research findings on university learners of Native American languages are summarized. Limitations in the current study are identified, and alternative methods for use in future studies are suggested. Additionally, new questions that have arisen from the study are presented. Final thoughts on the importance of the current study are included, and the need to consider Native language revitalization as a human rights issue is clearly stated.

2. Language Ideologies

In a real sense, humans are predestined to use language, given that they are born in societies that rely on their usage (Sapir 1921: 4). Although human language is seemingly innate, languages represent social realities that vary widely from each other. In his *Course in General Linguistics* originally published in 1916, Saussure noted that linguistic signs are characterized by their arbitrariness as the bond between *signifier* and *signified* is symbolic in nature (1959). For example, the idea of a "heart," expressed in the Mvskoke Creek word *fēke*, has no natural inner relationship to the succession of phonemes f-ē-k-e. Rather, these successive sounds came to denote "heart" as this sign became established by generations of speakers in a linguistic community.

Saussure pointed out that language has always been an inheritance from the past, and speakers of the world's languages today were not consulted about the signs that are imposed on them through language (1959: 71-72). This is reflected in Sapir's assertion that language is "a mountainous and anonymous work of unconscious generations" (1921: 220). Cultures across the globe have developed sign systems in the form of language to convey concepts that are salient to them based on their life circumstances and experiences. Since languages are products of social interaction, they do not exist apart from cultures informing the communities in which they were developed (Sapir 1921: 207). Consequently, the content of language is intimately related to culture (Sapir 1921: 219).

Giving symbolic expression to culture, languages provide a means of communication that is tailored to local needs. For many Indigenous communities,

knowledge about physical landscapes is uniquely encoded in language. Basso notes that traditional Navajo conceptions of history are spatial rather than linear (1996: 34). In the Navajo language, *placemaking* is a cultural practice that links communities to traditional homelands. Navajo place names contain detailed stories about traditional landscapes, or ethnoscapes, and these convey information related to Navajo history in relation to the land (Basso 1996: 66). Using traditional names for places throughout their communities, Navajo speakers symbolically invoke historical events that tie them to an ethnoscape that bears culturally significant knowledge. Thus, using Navajo to talk about the community's traditional lands helps promote culturally specific knowledge as "wisdom sits in places" (Basso 1996: 121).

Like Navajo speakers, Musqueam communities in Canada speak a language that reflects their local social imagination. Musqueam speakers have a long cultural tradition of fishing, and their language reveals a depth of accrued knowledge related to the natural environment of their region. While taxonomy as a branch of Western science began applying standardized Latin binomial labels to various species of flora and fauna in the 18th century (Harrison 2007: 35), Musqueam communities had long developed traditional taxonomies that encapsulated subtle and sophisticated observations related to their local ecology. Given the cultural significance of fishing, Musqueam speakers devised rich terminology for describing various species of fish. While Western scientists previously grouped steelhead and cutthroat trout as distinct species, the Musqueam language classified them together with salmon. After recent genetic

studies of these "trout" were conducted, Musqueam's traditional taxonomy proved to be correct (Harrison 2007: 43). In this example, it is clear that Musqueam communities encoded nuanced information about fish through their language that reflected knowledge salient to their culture.

Many linguistic anthropologists have noted that language, culture, and thought are deeply interlocked, and language might be claimed to have associated with it a distinctive way of viewing the world (Gumperz & Levinson 1996: 2). Whorf argued that language embeds worldviews onto its users (1956). Similarly, Slobin notes that each language comprises a subjective orientation to the world of human experience, and this orientation can affect the ways in which we think while speaking (1996: 91).   Consequently, language influences perception (Kövecses 2006: 34).   This subjective orientation involves culturally and contextually conditioned expectations, or frames (Kroskrity 1993: 33).

Frames are often evident in metaphoric language. In analyzing ways in which individuals refer to Native languages, Hill notes that metaphoric devices used to refer to these languages are often characterized by *hyperbolic valorization*. This refers to describing endangered languages as "priceless treasures" that are "invaluable" (Hill 2002: 123). In some instances, similar phrases were used by survey respondents in the current study when referring to the Native American languages and their "value". These metaphors might be seen innocuous on the surface, but their usage has the ability to inscribe subjective outlooks on Native languages. According to Hill, hyperbolic valorization yields an entailment that endangered languages are so valuable that they do not have a place in everyday

markets (2002: 125). In addition, this can have strong implications for students of Native languages, particularly for those who are heritage learners. Referring to Native languages as treasures beyond measure could lead students to become hesitant when trying to speak these languages due to a fear of making mistakes in pronunciation or grammar. While the intention behind the language of hyperbolic valorization may be well intentioned, it projects a subjective orientation that can alter individuals' perceptions on Native languages.

Views related to the subjective orientation of languages were reflected in a major development that occurred during the 1960s and 1970s known as the "linguistic turn." In this important intellectual shift, linguists, historians, and philosophers began to view language as the constitutive agent of human consciousness and the social production of meaning. Consequently, this view considers that apprehension of the world arrives only through the lens of the precoded perceptions found in one's language (Spiegel 2005: 2). With this in mind, it is clear that language is not to be seen as a neutral medium through which knowledge can be transmitted and received since it is tied to the cultural contexts in which it is produced and used.

2.1 Discourse: Language Reflects and Shapes Social Order

Language is both a resource for and a product of social interaction (Duranti 1997: 6). To illustrate this, consider the following discursive phrase: *Senyum adalah mahal*. Functioning as a description for an individual who rarely smiles, this Indonesian idiom could be translated as "his/her smile is expensive." While

the literal translation does not serve the same semantic function in English, it may be translated literally into other languages spoken in the Indonesian archipelago to achieve the intended result due to discursive knowledge of the phrase acquired through multilingual social interactions. When individuals are born, they begin the process of being socialized into various overlapping speech communities characterized by ongoing interaction among individuals with shared experiences. Members of these groups acquire knowledge of specific discursive practices that are in circulation within these communities while simultaneously developing ideas about members of other communities (Morgan 2006: 3).

A person's speech community influences which outlooks and beliefs that they are exposed to, and this prolonged interaction with others leads to the formation of shared discourse related to local knowledge, identity, and truth. For some multilingual Native American speech communities, one particular language is not necessarily tied to a corresponding tribal identity (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 18). This is true for some regions of northwestern California that include individuals from the Hupa, Yurok, and Karuk tribes (O'Neill 2013: 238). Traditionally, speakers of these languages held the view that speaking a foreign language in the wrong place was offensive and potentially harmful. For instance, speaking Hupa near the ocean was seen as particularly dangerous since it could cause the ocean to become envious (O'Neill 2013: 239). This outlook reflects deeply held beliefs passed on through discursive practices of a speech community across generations.

Discourse can be seen broadly as meaningful symbolic behavior (Blommaert 2005: 2). According to Hill, it provides the fundamental preconditions for thought, communication, and understanding (Hill 2008: 32). Additionally, discourse refers to ways in which knowledge is organized through the use of language and other semiotic systems, and it is characterized by more than just language—it is a type of social practice (Fairclough 1992: 28). Discourse involves language use relative to social, cultural, and political formations. Through discourse, language reflects social order, but it also shapes social order (Jaworski & Coupland 2014: 3). For instance, in communities with strong oral storytelling traditions, stories told in a heritage language reflect cultural beliefs passed on from previous generations. This has the ability to inform and shape the social order of that group by connecting it to traditional discourses used for moral instruction, maintaining good health, and developing cultural identities (Kroskrity 2012: 4). If oral stories are no longer told in their traditional languages, however, entire genres of communication go out of use, and the means through which to maintain social order through prior discourses related to cultural knowledge and worldviews is threatened by the discourses of neighboring communities.

For Bakhtin, all discourse is multi-vocalic given that all words and utterances echo the words and utterances of others derived from the historical and cultural heritage of a community, as well as the ways these words and utterances have traditionally been interpreted. Because of language, humans everywhere "live in a world of others' words" (Bakhtin 1986: 143). This is evident even when a single person is speaking. Echoes of social diversity can be heard as an individual

switches between registers and dialects in a variety of social contexts, and they can also be observed when ideological clashes are uttered. This clearly demonstrated in the following response offered by a survey respondent when asked about commonly held beliefs in his home community with regard to Native American languages: "Many don't see these languages as important to learn for everyday life, but we don't want these languages and cultures to disappear." Conflicting voices seem evident in this response. Discourse on the desire to maintain Native American languages is invoked alongside competing discourse related to the notion that these languages are not "important."

By echoing multiple voices in a single sentence, the previous example is rooted in exposure to knowledge gleaned from prior discourses. Individuals draw different sets of conclusions over a lifetime based on differing sets of experiences with discourses they are exposed to (Johnstone 2008: 44). Varying experiences determine the source of one's knowledge, and individuals formulate generalizations on the basis of the discourses that have informed them. In addition, individuals interpret new information through the filter of their personal perception that has been shaped by prior discourses (Johnstone 2008: 3).

It is clear that exposure to culturally conditioned discourses is pivotal in informing an individual's points of view and value systems. However, discourse is also deeply shaped by relations to power (Jaworski & Coupland 2014: 2). It should be noted that social power results not just from economic or political coercion but, more subtly, through hegemonic ideas about the naturalness of the status quo to which people assent without realizing it (Johnstone 2008: 54). Institutional

settings are widely responsible for articulating systems of ideas that are prestructured in terms of what is considered "normal" and "appropriate" in particular social settings (Jaworski & Coupland 2014: 6). An example of this can be seen in the American concept of English as a national language. In the study presented in this paper, most Native American students, like respondents from other backgrounds, indicated that English should be established as the official language of the United States. Historically, there was no "national culture" for most Native Americans. Rather, Native people from many communities participated in regional cultural orientations (O'Neill 2012: 84). Consequently, the notion English as a "national language" has emerged through Euro-American hegemonic forces exerting influence over users of other languages. The overlapping spheres of culture and relation to power create attitudes towards language that often become crystalized to form language ideologies as seen in the apparent need for English as an official language among Native and non-Native students.

2.2 Language Ideologies: Distorted Views Imbued with Authority

Since the 1990s, much effort has been made to delimit *language ideology* as a field of inquiry (Kroskrity 2000; Woolard 1998). An early definition provided by Silverstein described "linguistic ideology" as the "set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979: 193). Since Silverstein introduced this term, varying definitions for language ideology have been expounded to emphasize different

facets of these ideologies from their relation to linguistic structure to social dimensions driving their promulgation. Whereas discourse refers to ways in which knowledge is organized through communication, language ideologies denote *systems of belief* with regard to language in society. These ideologies "are prompted by beliefs and feelings about language and discourse that are possessed by speakers and their speech communities" (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 4). In outlining this area of focus that is central to research presented in this paper, three major strands of understanding related to the term will be outlined.

The first common strand in understanding language ideologies is that they are characterized by their relations to power. Often bearing a direct link with social, political, or economic institutions, ideologies can be seen as signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power (Woolard 1998: 7). Irvine defines language ideologies as systems of ideas about linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests (1989: 255). While ideologies related to language reflect communities' attempts at rendering the world more comprehensible (Hill 2008: 34), they also "represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group" (Kroskrity 2006: 501). Central to this first strand is Gramsci's notion of hegemony, which refers to the force of the state to saturate consciousness through the influence of state-endorsed culture and praxis (1971).

Seeing language ideologies as "situated, partial, and interested character of conceptions and uses of language," Errington highlights the partiality of language ideologies, which allow them to color the perceptions of those who subscribe to

them (Kroskrity 2006: 497). Cognitive distortions are ever present in ideologies as selectivity and distortion are essential criteria for ideologies (Woolard 1998: 7). Consequently, by subscribing to a particular ideology, one's perception is characterized by deception. The element of deception is critical to understanding language ideologies given that they are well suited for use by dominant cultures and institutions of power to make oppressive social systems seem natural and desirable in order to mask the mechanisms of oppression (Johnstone 2008: 54).

An example of this might be seen in the following statement: "I can't learn another language—I can barely speak English correctly." This remark reflects the view of "real" English as being aligned with a standard dialect endorsed through institutional support. Silverstein refers to this as the Monoglot Standard. The Monoglot Standard promotes the belief that, if there are two or more variants of a language, only one is "correct" (Silverstein 1996: 284). This differs from the linguist's view that all varieties of human languages are systematic and rule-governed. For linguists, ideas of "correctness" are a social and political, not a grammatical, fact (Hill 2008: 35). Since the existence of the Monoglot Standard reflects a disdain for other forms of language termed as "English," it is clear that this particular ideology could be averse to embracing multilingualism within U.S. political borders. In addition, this ideology might lead one to think that they have no chance of successfully learning another language since they believe they have not fully mastered English.

Another critical component related to language ideologies is their ability to be conceived as objectively true. Rumsey emphasizes this faculty of language

ideologies by referring to them as "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of cultural models of language" (1990: 346). Similarly, Heath defines language ideologies as "self evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group" (1989: 53). Ideology is seen as being derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience and interests of a particular social position, even though ideology so often represents itself as universally true (Woolard 1998: 6).

Received attitudes and notions about language seen as self-evident are often made possible through lived experience. When language ideologies become codified into law, they become structurally implicit. This calls to mind Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* through which power is legitimized through socialized tendencies that guide thinking and behavior (Bourdieu 1977: 6). Similarly, it reflects Berger and Luckmann's notion of the *social construction of reality*. According to this view, as practices gain institutional support, these practices are historicized into "truths" by subsequent generations (Berger & Luckmann 1966: 50). This can be seen in education, for example, when valorizing a single standard dialect as the sole medium of instruction leads to non-standard varieties being tacitly rendered deficient or undesirable. In turn, these conceptions disperse ideology throughout social order (McCarthy 1994: 416). This naturalizing move drains the conceptual of its historical context thus making it appear universally and/or timelessly true (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 58).

This leads to the third strand needed to frame the research presented in this thesis: limited awareness of language ideologies perpetuated at both the individual and societal levels. Even within linguistic anthropology, these ideologies have been overlooked until quite recently. Until the past few decades, language ideologies were dismissed as merely "folk awareness," and, despite their critical contributions to the discipline, prominent linguists such as Boas and Bloomfield once discouraged inquiry into this field as they felt it was unfit for analysis (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 4).

This has certainly changed as attitudes and beliefs about language are now seen as a necessary component of linguistic analysis. As Sapir noted, "the man in the street" often abstains from analyzing "his portion in the general scheme of humanity" (Sapir 1921: 208). According to Silverstein, individuals display widely varying degrees of awareness of their local language ideologies (1979). As language ideologies become naturalized, they rarely rise to discursive consciousness (Woolard 1998: 9). Although often being spoken of as systems of belief, language ideologies cannot necessarily be clearly recognized or articulated by speakers. For Vološinov, ideology does not denote an organized system of signification. Rather, it lacks any logic or unity (1973: 92). For researchers, ideology is "discovered in linguistic practice itself; in explicit talk about language, that is, metalinguistic or metapragmatic discourse" (Woolard 1998: 9).

While individual speakers may find it difficult to clearly delineate the ideologies present in their discursive communities, this is further complicated by the reality that language ideologies are inherently plural. Drawing on Bakhtin's

concept of polyphony, Field and Kroskrity note that just as speakers have multiple voices within their speaking repertoires, they also hold multiple ideologies of language (2009: 6). This is due to the ideologies being grounded in unique social experiences that are "never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale" (Kroskrity 2006: 503). Therefore, language ideologies should not be viewed as a homogenous cultural template. Rather, it is critical to recognize "variation and contestation within a community as well as contradictions within individuals (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 71). Gaining an awareness of language ideologies is necessary to contest them to overcome the inequality that they create.

2.3 Language Ideologies Endorse Inequality

It has been outlined above that language ideologies, rooted in ideas representing the interests of dominant segments of society, are often tacitly accepted and unexamined. Bauman and Briggs noted, "it would be difficult to imagine a time that the power of this process was more apparent than the beginning of the 21st century" (2003: 301). Similarly, Kroskrity argued that the relations between language, polities, and identity have never before seemed so relevant to so many (2000: 1). Yet, as Hill posited, only a minute percentage of people who entertain ideas about language are linguists (2008: 34). Far from being important for linguistic and ethnographic analysis, analyzing language ideologies is critical in overcoming inequality and advocating for social justice.

According to Woolard and Schieffelin, ideologies about language are significant for social analysis given that they are not only about language. Rather,

they "envision and enact links of language to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology" (1994: 56). When these ideologies turn into language policies, they symbolically decide who is and is not valued in society (Cummins 2000: ix). Consequently, inequality among various groups of speakers makes recognizing language ideologies critical in advocating for social justice (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 56). Thus, while recognizing language ideologies related to Native languages held by students has strong implications for the learning process, it is also a critical component of larger efforts aimed at advocating for decolonization and Native self-determination.

As previously noted, the research presented in this paper dwells on recognizing language ideologies held toward Native American languages by university learners at OU. The next section outlines ways in which language ideologies guided federal U.S. government policies toward Native languages throughout the nation's history. While positive changes in policy have occurred in recent years, deeply held language ideologies with regard to Native languages continue to undermine efforts to maintain these languages. According to Hinton, the consequences of state-sanctioned language policies aimed at eradicating Native languages continue to impinge upon them today (2013: 5). As Meek argued, "language endangerment is not just a repercussion of colonial assimilationist tactics—it is an effect of contemporary sociolinguistic practices, ideologies, and disjunctures" (2010: 52). Ideologies that undermine Native languages that persist today perpetuate attacks on Native identity. According to Jacob, the loss of identity

resulting from the loss of language is the source of historical trauma among many Native communities (2013: 10).

Native American language revitalization is a human rights issue as language loss is a critical component of the oppression and disenfranchisement experienced in Native communities. Native American language activists have made efforts to confront language ideologies that might undermine language renewal efforts (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 6). A preliminary step toward challenging language ideologies is exposing them. Raising awareness of both imported and local language ideologies is critical in overcoming the distortion that they cause. According to Romaine, language policies, especially in the system of education, must necessarily take into account the attitude of those likely to be affected (2002). As Meek noted, "educational contexts are prime sites for analyzing the construction of authority in relation to language and circulating language ideologies and discourses that support these constructions" (2010: 52).

"Historically, Western educational institutions have been sites of violence and discrimination for Native people" (Jacob 2012: 180). Despite this history, OU has become a site where multiple Native languages are taught each semester. The next chapter describes the changes in policies that have allowed these courses to be offered at a public institution. In addition, the importance of uncovering language ideologies in circulation among university learners enrolled in these courses is identified.

3. The Native American Language Program at OU: A Key Ideological Site

It is impossible to offer accurate figures for the number of languages of the Americas before European contact (Silver & Miller 1997: 7). According to Mithun, around 300 mutually unintelligible languages are known to have been used north of the Rio Grande before Europeans arrived on the continent (1999). However, this estimate is generally considered low. Many languages may not have been documented due to entire populations of speakers being decimated by diseases originating outside North America. In 1992, Krauss put the number of Native American languages in use at 155 (Arnold 2013: 47). Of the Native languages spoken today, around 40 are used within the state of Oklahoma (Linn 2007: 25).

As the early Spanish grammarian Nebrija noted, "Language has always been the companion of empire" (as quoted in Woolard 1998: 24). From the earliest periods of American history, ideologies toward Native American languages have driven federal government policies with regard to their usage. This chapter will trace the trajectory of state-sponsored ideologies with regard to Native American languages to reveal the historical context out of which OU's Native American Language Program emerged.

3.1 "Manifest Destiny"

According to Woolard, the ideology of *development* is common in colonial efforts, and it often contains implicit ranking of languages that condemns varieties found among the colonized to an underdeveloped status (1998: 21). Colonialism imposes *distinction* as an ideological yardstick against which all other cultural

27

values are measured, including language. This ideological measuring device serves to valorize one group's culture to a level of mystification and devalues those of others (Macendo 2000: 15). For Euro-Americans influenced by Enlightenment ideals, literacy was used in ranking languages and the cultures that they represented. The word "literacy," from the Latin *literature*, was originally used to denote the ability to read and write, and being highly literate meant having a reading knowledge of several classical languages including Latin or Greek, which were afforded the highest levels of prestige. Consequently, early Americans linked literacy with "civilization" (Collins & Blot 2003: 23). Claims were continually made for the superiority of Western culture vis-à-vis "nonliterate," or differently literate, societies (Collins & Blot 4-5). Informed by these ideologies, non-Native settlers in America saw the promotion of English literacy as synonymous to achieving progress and becoming "civilized."

Dominant narratives of American history project an image of a nation developing through an ongoing march towards "progress" since its inception. While progress tends to bear a positive connotation, the U.S. federal government's early notions of this term were distorted by its colonialist aims. A brief reading of Native American history until the late 20th century reveals that the federal government's view of progress was characterized by assimilation. According to this ideology, Native Americans would achieve progress by abandoning their traditions and adopting dominant American outlooks and ways of life, as well as the language of "progress": English. This bears a common characteristic among language ideologies: their ability to be received as common sense. This was

achieved by aligning a term seen as universally desirable, "progress," with the interests of a dominant hegemonic group. Packaging the idea in this manner allowed the ideology to go unquestioned by many Americans.

An early component of the federal government's ideological variety of progress was the doctrine of "Manifest Destiny," which held that the United States was ordained to spread its territorial reach from the Atlantic to the Pacific (Calloway 2004: 266). This doctrine reflected the view that Western "civilization," along with its civilizing language, was destined to extend across the continent. In order to achieve this destiny, federal government policymakers sought to create mechanisms and rationales to divest Native Americans of their traditional homelands (Calloway 2004: 344). Formerly Indian Territory, Oklahoma was the site to which many Native Americans were forcefully relocated by the United States government in the 19th century (Silver & Miller 1997: 8). These communities brought with them Indigenous languages such as Cherokee and Choctaw thus adding to the already diverse collection of local languages, which included Kiowa.

In 19th century America, language abilities were explicitly linked to national loyalty. One's inability to speak fluent English was seen as sign of suspicion or lack of allegiance towards the United States (Morgan 2009: 97). It is a truism that equating a language with a nation is an ideological construct rather than a natural fact (Woolard 1998: 16). In most areas of the globe, it is the norm for neighboring communities to learn each other's languages to connect with each other. In fact, over half of the world's population speaks at least two languages (Tucker: 1998).

Similar to other Western European colonizing efforts, however, this nationalist language ideology had spread to the United States.

The one-nation-equals-one-language argument holds that language is the social glue needed to bind a nation together and facilitate a shared culture (Bauman & Briggs 2003: 320). According to Hinton, Native Americans were primarily treated as "unwanted foreigners" until the end of the 19th century (2013: 40). Given the nationalist language ideologies of the day, it is clear that Native Americans' use of their traditional languages contributed to mainstream Americans viewing them as outsiders. This ideology further facilitated support for the systematic theft of their traditional homelands.

Recognizing the historical ideology of ranking languages based on perceived levels of prestige, the present study included survey questions targeting students' views on which languages are to be ranked most highly. An overwhelming majority of students expressed that languages with long written traditions bear the highest levels of prestige. In addition, the survey addressed the colonial ideology of one-nation-equals-one-language. The results, which are included in the following chapter, show that these colonial ideologies are present among university learners of Native American languages as the vast majority of them indicated a need to establish official languages at the state as well as the national level.

3.2 *"Progress" through English*

In addition to regulating the spatial movement of Native Americans by relegating them to designated areas unwanted by non-Native settlers, the federal government was intent on erasing Native languages in the nineteenth century in hopes that they would adopt a prescribed worldview that endorsed an idealized version of "progress." The federal government felt that uniformity of language would further the march toward progress by eliminating boundary lines that divided Native Americans into distinct nations and "fuse them into one homogeneous mass" (U.S. Congress 1868). "Educating" Native Americans was seen as the key to achieving this.

According to Meek, "a key component of colonial domination is institutionalized education" (2010: 5). In 1867, the Indian Peace Commission called for linguistic erasure by arguing, "through sameness of language is produced sameness of sentiment." It followed, according to the commission, that Native languages should be "blotted out" and substituted with English (U.S. Congress 1868). In the 19th century, the first educational priority was to ensure that Native children could read, write, and speak English (Adams 1995: 21).

Prior to 1907, the Cherokee and Choctaw communities had run their own schools using their tribal languages for instruction. However, Oklahoma statehood led to the closure of these schools by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Silver & Miller 1997: 11). This led to the creation of compulsory boarding schools and English only education for Native children. The first Indian boarding schools that were established by the federal government were run under the auspices of the War

Department and later under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and they were dedicated to the eradication of Indigenous languages along with every other vestige of Native cultures (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 16). Like Cherokees and Choctaws, Kiowa communities were forced to send their children to boarding schools where they were required to speak English (Ellis 2008).

In boarding schools where these children were sent, speaking Indigenous languages was strictly prohibited, and corporal punishment was used to enforce this ban (Adams 1995: 21). After leaving the boarding schools, many Native people chose not to teach their own children their traditional language in order to prevent them from facing the same violence and humiliation they had been exposed to (Duncan 1998: 143). Language education policies for Native Americans have historically exemplified the role of colonial schooling in efforts to eradicate Indigenous languages (McCarty et. al. 2008: 299). This aspect of American history has often been overlooked in mainstream society, but viewing American history from a Native perspective requires rethinking the consensual national narrative (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014: 1). The boarding school period represents one of the most deplorable events in history, and language attrition is a direct result of ideologically driven government policies.

During this era of education, government policymakers urged that no Native students should be permitted to study "any other language than our own vernacular—the language of the greatest, most powerful, and enterprising nationalities beneath the sun" (U.S. Congress 1868). Deeming English as the only appropriate medium of education, the language was meant to ensure future

economic success (Meek 2010: 5). Through English, missionaries and boarding school teachers sought to inculcate the values of financial success among their Native pupils, particularly through vocational trades. According to one educator, this will awaken the desire for personal property and "a pocket that aches to be filled with dollars" (Adams 1995: 23).

Seeing Native cultures as impediments to "progress," the federal government actively encouraged their abandonment. English was presented not only a unifying system of communication but also as a symbol of advancement (Morgan 2009: 86). Western traditions have long viewed literacy as a marker of advancement, and this has historically included only alphabetic literacy (Woolard 1998: 23). This is evident in a statement given by an early member of the Board of Indian Commissioners that "valuable time shall not be wasted in learning a useless language which has no literature and no tradition" (Morgan 2009: 93). This culturally biased statement fails to recognize the long traditions of oral literature present among many Native tribes including the Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa. Failing to recognize different forms of literacy stems from an ethnocentrism deeply rooted in the valorization of Western conventions of literature. These views elevate Western literary conventions as the standard for the evaluation of other modes of narrative, and it espouses a pejorative view of oral traditions as deficient (Kroskrity 2012: 8). This misrecognition and dismissal of oral traditions can be referred to as narrative inequality (Kroskrity 2012: 3-4).

Findings from the current study reveal connections between language learning and economic concerns. As historical federal government policies sought

to inculcate economic values into Native students through English instruction, the results of my survey indicate that the opportunity for financial gain is a determining factor in identifying which languages are the most important to learn. As Shohamy noted, the current political environment encourages students to learn preferred languages considered important in the globalized economy (2006: 77). In Native language learning contexts, however, these views are problematic since improving one's financial status is not a driving force behind studying these languages. In addition, students' knowledge of the current status of the language they were studying was sought to uncover their views on language loss. Survey questions were also included to determine respondents' views on which contexts Native American languages are used in. These were aimed at identifying beliefs related to literacies related to Native languages as well as their most common domains of usage.

3.3 "Moral Development" through English

At the turn of the 20th century, the predominant language ideology held that English was the only language capable of articulating the ideals of the democratic nation of America. In addition, knowledge of English was seen as "a symbol of moral development." This applied to speakers of Indigenous languages as well as newly arrived European immigrants and other minority languages at the time (Morgan 2009: 86). Far from representing a natural state of affairs, these beliefs perfectly demonstrate what Irvine meant in defining language ideologies as "the

cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (1989: 255).

Through policies aimed guiding Native people towards "moral development," the federal government exalted English to a superior status while officially reviling Native languages as insignificant, detrimental, and obsolete. This state-sponsored language ideology helped lead many Americans to believe that Native languages were harmful to the tribal communities that spoke them. Boarding school teachers and missionaries felt that the languages were unrefined, deficient, or "associated with the devil" (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 11). While the opinions of the dominant society varied with regard to educational practices for Native Americans, the "insistence on English as the primary subject and the only language of instruction remained consistent" (Morgan 2009: 98).

Non-Native activists seeking to reform government policies were determined to help "save the Indians from themselves" by advocating for assimilation into dominant society (Calloway 2004: 339). These activists helped to form an Indian Rights Association to "protect the rights and interests" of Native people, and they intently discussed ways to promote "what was best for the Indian" (Calloway 2004: 336). Deemed "Friends of the Indian," these individuals sought to enact changes in policy that would benefit Native Americans. However, through tacitly accepting language ideologies received as common sense, harmful ideologies informed their thinking and guided their decisions. To the "Friends of the Indian," Native languages were seen as "obstacles to progress" (Calloway 2004: 336).

These views show that non-Natives historically spoke for Native Americans when it came to language policies. In many instances, efforts to eliminate Native languages were presented as beneficial for the communities that spoke them by policymakers. The current study devised questions to uncover students' views on how Native American languages were viewed by both Natives and non-Natives in society. Students included fewer responses for the ways in which Native Americans viewed their own languages compared to how non-Natives viewed them. This reflects the lack of Native viewpoints on their own languages as noted previously in policies that imposed non-Native beliefs onto policy decisions without allowing Native communities to speak for themselves on these matters. As the next chapter will demonstrate, none of the students in the survey subscribed to historical ideologies linking languages to moral development. There was no trace of previous discourses that considered Native languages to be "harmful." Rather, views on Native languages were largely positive, particularly among third semester students. An example of this is expressed in the following statement in which a third semester student expressed her beliefs about the Native language she was studying: "It is a great language to learn, and it helps us be able to understand the culture better."

3.4 Flawed Ideologies: Failed Policies

Many Native people were considered still "wards" of the State until a 1924 bill signed by Calvin Coolidge granted all Native Americans American citizenship (Holm 2005: 179). Although Choctaw soldiers, labeled as Code Talkers, used their

Native language to relay critical messages needed to help ensure a United States victory in World War I (Code Talkers Recognition Act 2008), language policies in the United States continued to discourage Native language use and endorse the ideology of progress through English. Yet, it was clear to the federal government that their vision of "progress" was not coming to fruition. Economic conditions for Native Americans were dire, and misguided policies continued to result in high rates of poverty (Taylor 1980: 9). Assimilationist practices had clearly failed (Taylor 1980: 7), and Native Americans resisted vanishing policies by maintaining their languages and cultures in the face of state-sponsored oppression (Holm 2005: 23).

Steps toward repairing disastrous policies were reached with the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) of 1934. This legislation included an admission that previous policies such as the Dawes Act were mistakes, and it allowed tribes to establish local self-government rather than rely on federally appointed leaders (Calloway 2004: 400). While passage of the IRA demonstrated the federal government's willingness to admit that their assimilationist policies had failed, it did nothing to support Native languages. Although tribes such as the Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa maintained their languages, the boarding school experience had lasting effects on these communities. Many Native people felt that using their Native languages would lead to discrimination, and this prevented many from passing them on to their children (Hinton 2013: 41).

In expressing common beliefs about Native languages present in their home communities, several students participating in the survey showed an awareness of

the ethnocentric language policies endorsed by the federal government in the past. This can be seen in the following statement from a respondent: "Increasing the number of Cherokee speakers (and speakers of all Native languages) helps overcome the damage done by the U.S. practices of assimilation and genocide." While many Native families in previous decades prevented younger people from learning their traditional languages in an attempt to shield them from discrimination, several Native students responding to the survey indicated that their families were encouraging them to learn their heritage language. The following statement reflects this shift: "My parents are eager for me to learn Choctaw because we are part Choctaw and are trying to become more involved with and knowledgeable of our tribe."

3.5 Gaining a Voice: Shifts in Native American Language Policies

According to Blommaert, "voice" can be understood as one's capacity to be heard or understood (2005: 4-5). Prior to the 1960s, Native Americans did not have much of a voice in mainstream American society. In the 1960s-1970s, Native activists, including many from Oklahoma tribes, demanded the attention of the federal government. Fighting for civil rights, self-determination, and recognition of sovereignty, Native American activists began to project their voice through organized resistance. Native activists occupied Alcatraz Island as well as the BIA building in Washington D.C. where they established a "Native American Embassy." In 1973, this movement culminated in a siege at Wounded Knee in which U.S. forces were deployed against Native activists seeking to have their voices heard

(Smith & Warrior 1996). Just two years later, the Supreme Court announced a decision to expand a bilingual education act to include Native communities (Hinton 2013: 41). This was the first policy to directly benefit Native languages, and it signaled a shift in outlook towards the importance of Native language education.

The most significant shift in the federal government's stance towards Native languages occurred in 1990. This was the year that Congress passed the Native American Language Act. This legislation "repudiated past policies aimed at eradicating Indian languages by declaring, at long last, that Native Americans were entitled to use their own languages" (Arnold 2013: 45). Recognizing Native Americans' distinct cultural and political rights, the Native American Language Act states that "the status of the cultures and languages of Native Americans is unique and the United States has the responsibility to act together with Native Americans to ensure the survival of these unique cultures and languages" (1990).

Not only did this legislation recognize the rights of Native people to maintain the use of the languages, it pointed out flawed ideologies that drove previous policies. It identified that "there is a widespread practice of treating Native American languages as if they were anachronisms" (Native American Language Act 1990). Furthermore, it posited that acts of suppression against Native languages are in direct conflict with United States government policies of self-determination for Native Americans (Native American Language Act 1990). Finally, the act stated that Native American languages were to be given "the same academic credit as comparable proficiency achieved through course work in a foreign language" (Native American Language Act 1990). This ensured that college

students could officially fulfill language requirements needed to complete their degrees by studying Native American languages.

After enduring policies created to erase their traditional languages for well over a century, the Native American Language Act finally signaled a shift in the federal government's official ideology with regard to the usage of Native languages. With the new legislation's endorsement of establishing Native language courses at public educational institutions to fulfill the same academic credit as foreign languages, the stage was set for offering these languages in university classrooms. The great paradox is that the same instrument used in trying to eliminate Native languages, state-sponsored educational institutions, is now being used to perpetuate and revitalize them (Arenas et. al. 2010: 99).

3.6 The Native American Language Program at OU

In the fall of 1991, OU began offering courses in Native American languages. Initially, these courses were offered through the Continuing Education Department. In 1993, an agreement was reached to expand the program, and the courses began to be housed under the Department of Anthropology (Abell 1993). The following year, the Department clearly outlined the purpose of the program. Native American language classes were dedicated to performing the important community service aim of helping to preserve the languages. In addition, the courses would allow students to "develop a better understanding of distinctive Native American perspectives on the world" (Foster 1994). This statement reflects a deeply held view characteristic of Boasian anthropology that promotes gaining

proficiency in a given language in order to begin understanding the communities in which it is spoken. Boas saw language as one of the most important manifestations of mental life, and he believed that the relationship between linguistic phenomena and ethnological phenomena required special attention (1995: 20).

From the early stages of the Native American Language Program at OU, the Anthropology Department made it clear that the courses provided "an educational resource that is not available at any other university in the world" (Foster 1994). By 1995, 7 Native languages had been offered through the program for college credit including Cherokee, Cheyenne, Choctaw, Comanche, Kiowa, Mvskoke Creek, and Lakota. By the time that the current research study was conducted, thousands of students had passed through multiple semesters of Native American language courses. In the fall of 2016, the Native American Language Program will shift to the Native American Studies Department. The Anthropology Department noted early on that the effort to teach these courses "comes at an important juncture in these communities' histories" (Foster 1994), and this remains equally as true today.

Given the many constraints facing university learners of Native American languages at OU, including the lack of time and exposure to the languages, producing speakers is not the program's goal. However, the language courses serve many critical functions at the university. First, by offering courses on NAL, the university acknowledges, to Native and non-Native students, that knowledge is not merely a "Western commodity." Rather, "the words and thoughts of the

original Native peoples of Oklahoma" provide knowledge that is needed to fully understand the cultural diversity that exists in Oklahoma (Foster 1994). Native American language courses serve an important role in providing students with a well-rounded educational experience by giving a voice to Native people in the university setting.

The Native American Language Program also provides a context where the languages can be promoted. As Shohamy noted, linguistic knowledge should not be confined to preferred languages thought to be important for a globalized world (2006: 77). While dominant and prestige languages are crowding out smaller languages across the globe, the Native American Language Program offers a permanent domain in which the languages can continually be learned and used for communication. Research on Indigenous language education shows that promoting their usage in as many contexts as possible is the best way to ensure their maintenance (McCarty et. al., 2008).

By offering Native language courses at OU, the university addresses several factors needed for successful language revitalization practices by Grenoble and Whaley including providing new domains of usage, creating materials for language education and literacy, and institutional support (2006: 4). In addition, offering Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa at the university alongside language classes taught in the Modern Languages Department helps to imbue them with an esteemed status as they are now associated with higher education. Sapir noted that, like language, education is thoroughly symbolic in nature (1934: 567). Placing Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa language courses in a university provides a

platform from which narrative inequality can be challenged through the presence of Native voices in an institution of power.

3.7 OU: A Key Ideological Site

Silverstein identified institutionalized and interactional rituals as productive *sites* for the enactment as well as the discovery of language ideology (1998: 136). According to Meek, educational contexts are prime sites for analyzing circulating language ideologies and discourses that support these constructions (2010: 108). Students who enroll in Native American language courses at OU come from a range of backgrounds. As they enter these language classes, they bring with them language ideologies informed by their experiences in their home communities. In addition, they are exposed to new ideologies on campus. According to Kroskrity, language revitalization events are often sites in which ideologies emerge (2009). It is important to recognize that educational institutions are sites of both academic and non-academic social interaction (Adger 2001: 512). With this in mind, it is clear students exchange information charged with ideologies as they interact with each other on campus both inside and outside the classroom.

A discourse community can be seen as a group of people sharing similar knowledge, interests, goals, or physical location, and a language classroom provides a unique variety of discourse community (Olshtain & Celce-Murcia 2001: 709). Native American language classes at OU serve as small discourse communities that allow students to develop an increased awareness of Native

cultures. In addition, they are sites of overlapping discourse communities as disparate voices are brought together in one location.

According to Saville-Troike, understanding students' background knowledge and cultural differences helps to facilitate better interaction in a language classroom (2012: 124). As Thomas notes, attitudes play a critical role in the language learning process (2010: 532). In addition, it is useful for teachers to understand these attitudes at the beginning of the semester (Thomas 2010: 547). Consequently, OU is a key site for research on the attitudes and beliefs of university learners of Native American languages. In turn, research findings from this unique context are of interest for university language instructors, and they can inform larger discussions on language revitalization efforts taking place outside of the university setting.

Recognizing that discourses about Native languages have long been instrumental in shaping official policies in the past, understanding university learners' views on these languages can impact their learning process in the present and have strong implications for the future. Considering the significance of OU as a site for identifying language ideologies in the Native American language classroom, the current study was devised to probe common discourses used in referring to these languages. In addition, responses between first and third semester students were compared to identify how beliefs about them might have changed over time. For first semester students entering these classes for the first time, this provided an opportunity to identify possible preconceptions being held with regard to these languages. Additionally, the survey was aimed at recognizing how developing

knowledge of Native American languages impacted students' outlooks by the time they had studied them for a year to reach third semester courses.

Several patterns characteristic of language ideologies were considered in devising the survey presented in this paper. Questions were offered to assess students' awareness of local discourses and beliefs related to Native American languages. As Silverstein noted, individuals often display widely varying degrees of awareness of their local language ideologies (1979). In addition, the study sought to identify instances in which multiple, conflicting ideologies were present. As the results indicate, these were evident among many students, and multiple ideologies were sometimes present among individual respondents. As Rumsey argued, language ideologies often surface as "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of cultural models of language" (1990: 346). With this in mind, the survey included questions aimed at identifying possible notions about learning Native American languages that were seen as objectively true. Finally, the survey sought to identify instances in which discourses about Native languages were characterized by their relations to power.

The following chapter presents research findings that provide insights on university learners of Native American languages at OU. In particular, dominant ideologies present in Native American language classrooms at OU are examined, and popular discourses with regard to Native languages are outlined. Finally, the research traces ways in which attitudes and beliefs about Native American languages have changed between students' first and third semesters in Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa classes at OU. Only by becoming aware of language ideologies

can they be overcome (Field & Kroskrity 2009: 26). These results can help equip those involved with university Native language teaching with a means of better understanding students in order to reach the goal of increasing their knowledge and appreciation of the languages and the cultures that they represent.

4. Research Findings: Sections 1-4

Being a key site for studying language revitalization efforts, previous surveys have been conducted in OU's Native American language classes before the current study. The first survey was conducted in 1995 to assess students' expectations of the courses and determine how the courses could be improved (Fowler 1995). In 2010, a survey was administered to uncover students' backgrounds and motivations for enrolling in Native American language classes at OU (Morgan 2010). This survey found that most students enrolled in these courses had no prior knowledge or exposure to Native languages, and the majority of respondents felt that the languages were "easy to learn" (Morgan 2010). In 2015, Kickham noted that many students, a good portion of them athletes, had been steered into Native language classes by advisors because of their perceived easiness (Kickham 2015).

The present study included questions aimed at recognizing the pervasiveness of these perceptions. Despite students' motivations for enrolling in Native American language classes, including the prospect of fulfilling academic requirements in some instances, I would argue that the opportunity to gain knowledge of Native languages has particularly strong implications. Since students had little or no exposure to Native languages and the cultures they represent in the past, these courses help fill a gap in knowledge that has long persisted in education and perpetuated narrative inequality. Through taking multiple semesters of Native language courses at OU, students are challenged to understand linguistic structures far different from their own which encode

culturally specific worldviews related to the tribal communities in which they are used. As Hymes noted, linguistic diversity is a resource for developing an awareness of the potentialities of forms of life and identities (1996: 59). While exposure to tribal languages presents students with Native forms of knowing, it also challenges students to reflect on their experiences in relation to new information gleaned from the classroom.

To my knowledge, the survey presented in this paper is the first to explicitly assess language ideologies held by students enrolled in first and third semester courses of Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa. The survey included 26 questions overall, and they were divided into 5 sections. This chapter presents the results from the first 4 sections in detail. The complete survey can be viewed in the Appendix.

4.1 General Information Results

The first section of the survey uncovered background information on students enrolled in first and third semesters of Cherokee, Choctaw, and Kiowa. This allowed the survey results to be analyzed based on age as well as the communities that students identify with. Out of the 123 sudents surveyed, 46 of them were enrolled in Cherokee. Students enrolled in Kiowa made up a slightly lower number of respondents with 42. In addition, 35 Choctaw language students participated in the survey. Most of the students participating in the survey indicated that they were Juniors, and slightly over half of the respondents were Sophomores and Seniors. Less than 10% of the students that were surveyed were

Freshman, and no graduate students were identified in the survey responses. Around 83% of the students were from the ages of 18-22, and 11% were 28-35 years in age. Finally, students from 8 different states were represented in the survey responses. These included California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin. Despite the range of states represented, students were found to be predominantly from Oklahoma and Texas given that only 11 respondents were identified from the other states mentioned. Out of the 123 survey respondents, 87 were from Oklahoma and 25 were from Texas.

Anticipating that most students would have received little exposure to Native languages before attending OU, this section allowed me to determine students' prior knowledge of the languages. In addition, it identified previous educational experiences that could have potentially informed their opinions on how language learning should take place. Finally, students were asked to indicate which language(s) they spoke at home in order to recognize their daily linguistic habits.

Students were asked about their prior experience in taking other language learning courses in both university and non-university settings. Only 13 of the students indicated that they had taken other language classes at the university. Of these students, 1 had taken Mvskoke Creek. The others had studied Latin, Spanish, Italian, or German. Nearly 24% of the respondents replied that they had no prior language classes at all. While this may reflect a lack of interest in language learning, some instructor might view having no prior experience in language learning as a positive challenge. Perhaps beginning one's language study in a

Native American language classroom could allow learners to develop a strong interest in learning more about the communities in which the language is spoken.

Approximately 70% of the respondents indicated that they had taken non-university language classes before enrolling in a Native American language course at OU. The most common language that students had previous educational experience with was Spanish. Out of the 123 students responding to the survey, 63 had previously studied Spanish. French was the second most common language that students had studied, and 10 respondents reported that they had taken French classes. Of the 6 remaining students who had taken non-university language courses, 2 had studied Vietnamese, 2 had studied Latin, 1 had studied American Sign Language, and 1 had studied Choctaw. Considering students' prior language learning experience, it is clear that they rarely have exposure to Native languages before entering OU.

This section of the survey also identified the languages that were used in students' homes. Although over half of the students reported that they had studied Spanish in the past, none of them claimed to use it at home. Only 5 out of 123 students stated that languages other than English were used in their homes. One student identified that both Tohono O'odham and Choctaw were used in her home along with English. Two students stated that Vietnamese was spoken in their homes in addition to English, and 1 student mentioned that "some Cherokee" was used at his home along with English. The remaining 98% of the students revealed that only English was used in their households. Given the prevalence of English only households among the respondents, these findings suggest that their attitudes

and beliefs towards multilingualism may be informed by a monolingual bias. As the next chapter will demonstrate, this is evident in many of the students' responses to the survey.

4.2 Section 2 Results

The second section of the survey included a total of 7 questions. The first question was concerned with the importance of language learning, and students were asked if they felt it was "not important," "somewhat important," or "very important." As Thomas noted, these attitudes play a critical role in the language learning process (2010: 532). The responses were nearly uniform among first and third semester students. The most common answer was that language learning is "somewhat important," and 67 out of 123 students offered this response. Approximately 44% of the respondents expressed that language learning was "very important." Only 2 students reported that language learning was "not important."

When asked whether or not it is important for Americans to speak languages other than English, first and third semester students gave nearly identical answers. The answer offered by 104 students, around 85% of all survey respondents, was that it is important for Americans to speak other languages. This may perhaps seem surprising given that the vast majority of students involved in the survey indicated that they use only English in their homes. Only 15% of the respondents noted that they did not feel speaking other languages besides English was important for Americans.

To uncover students' stances on the politically charged issue of language in relation to power, 2 questions included in this section asked students to respond to the notion of establishing English as an official language. The first asked if English should be the official language of the United States. Out of 123 respondents, 110 replied that "yes," English should be the official language of the United States. This response was given by nearly 90% of all respondents. All students from states other than Oklahoma and Texas expressed that English should be the official language of the United States. This reflects a deeply held connection to nationalist language ideologies that have persisted since the early stages of colonialism in America. This outlook remained static over time since responses did not differ between first and third semester students.

The next question asked if English should be the official language of Oklahoma. Eleven fewer students replied "yes" to this item of the survey revealing that around 20% of the students were not in favor of having English as the official language of Oklahoma. The answers for this item were identical between first and third semester students showing the highest level of regularity of any responses on the survey. With the exception of 1 respondent, each student from states other than Oklahoma and Texas marked that English should be the official language of Oklahoma.

Recognizing the historical ideology of ranking languages based on perceived levels of prestige, the next three questions provided lines for students to fill in short open-ended responses related to the ranking of languages. The first of these asked students, "What are the world's three most prestigious languages?" A

total of 12 different languages were identified on this item. English was by far the most common response. Out of the 123 respondents, 113 students, nearly 92% of all respondents, felt that English was among the top 3 languages in the world in terms of prestige. The second most common answer was Spanish, which received 100 responses representing around 81% of all respondents. Nearly 47% of the students included either Chinese or Mandarin reflecting a total of 58 out of 123 responses. The fourth most common answer given was French. This language received 41 responses representing around 33% of students involved in the survey. Other common answers included German with 8 responses, Italian with 5 responses, and Arabic with 3 responses. The other languages mentioned on this item were Cantonese, Hindi, Japanese, Russian, and Swedish. The languages showing the most regularity between first and third semesters were English and Spanish with nearly identical results. One trend was identified between semesters on this item. Fewer students considered French to be among the 3 most prestigious languages in third semester classes compared to first semester classes. These responses demonstrate that an overwhelming majority of students believe that languages with written traditions bear the highest levels of prestige.

In addition to asking about the world's most prestigious languages, students were asked to list the 3 most important languages for Americans to learn. The responses to this item of the survey reflected no change over time between semesters. Approximately 93% of the students, 115 out of 123, expressed that Spanish was an important language for Americans to learn. The second most common answer was English, and this was included by 92 out of 123 of the

students representing 75% of all respondents. Chinese was the third most common response, and this was offered by around 42% of the students. Following the same pattern as the previous question on the survey, French received the fourth most responses with 35 out of 123 stating that it was an important language for Americans to learn. Unlike the previous question, however, this item in the survey included Native American languages in the responses, and 7 students expressed that Native American languages were among the top 3 most important languages for Americans to learn. Seven of the respondents indicated that Native American languages were among the most important to learn self identified as being Native. Receiving a combined total of 20 responses, the remaining languages mentioned in this section were Arabic, German, Italian, Latin and Russian. While a prior question revealed that the majority of respondents believe language learning is important, only 7 out of 123 students listed Native languages as being among the most important languages to learn.

The final item in this section included a two-part question asking students to include which Native American language they felt was most important to learn and why. Designed to probe ideological views surrounding the ranking of languages as in the prior two questions, this question applied these views toward Native languages. The language with the highest number of responses was Cherokee. As later results indicate, this may have a connection to ideologies related to the role of literacy. The next highest number of responses was Choctaw, and Kiowa represented the third highest response on this item. These three languages represented approximately 70% of all responses on this question. This

may be due to the fact that students were most familiar with these languages since they were currently studying them. In addition, these might have been chosen given the level of status they are afforded by being offered in the university. Around 15% of the respondents stated that they were not sure or did not know which Native language was the most important to study. Finally, 11 students responded by positing that they could not choose one Native language over another because they were all equally important. This was a particularly encouraging result that demonstrated students' willingness to challenge the idea that languages could be ranked in a hierarchy of importance. Other languages identified on this section were Seminole and Chickasaw which received 1 and 3 responses respectively.

In responding to this item of the survey, most students chose to complete the second part of the question and offer explanations to qualify their answers. For this item, Cherokee and Choctaw received the most responses. It should be noted that these languages, as well as Chickasaw, are much more widely visible than most other Native languages in Oklahoma. They currently receive attention on TV, often through tribally produced advertisements highlighting Native cultures. For those the choosing Cherokee or Choctaw language for on this item of the survey, by far the most common reason identified was that these were the largest or most influential tribes. Over 25% of all respondents offered this explanation. This is reflected in the following response offered by a student: "Cherokee because it is the largest nation." Similarly, another responded chose "Choctaw. I feel as though there is (sic) many more Choctaws than other tribes."

Some indicated both in their response: "Choctaw or Cherokee. Large tribes." This is the same rationale included by a student who stated, "Chickasaw, most people." The notion of importance of large tribes is also reflected in the following response: "Being in Oklahoma, any of the 5 Civilized Tribe's languages since those dominate the Plains region." This response is interesting given that the 5 tribes the respondent is referring to do not associate themselves with the Plains and are not considered Plains tribes. Another response associated with large tribes is reflected in the following answer "Cherokee. Basis of other languages."

The second most common explanation for choosing Cherokee or Choctaw that was offered revealed that the respondents were heritage learners from those tribes. This was evident in the following: "Personally, Cherokee because I am Cherokee." Similarly, another student chose, "Choctaw, because it is my culture." A total of 9 students in the survey self identified as being Native American with Cherokee and Choctaw being the most common tribal affiliations. This is a significant result as it demonstrates the presence of Native voices emerging from these classrooms. For these students, learning their heritage language certainly provides a link to group and personal identity.

Although no respondents stated that they were Kiowa, many students noted that Kiowa was the most important Native language to study. One student grouped Kiowa with other languages offered at OU, noting that "Kiowa, Cherokee, and Choctaw" were the most the most important languages to learn. It could be reasonably stated that the rationale behind this response was that each of these languages is offered at the university level. However, none of the other

respondents who chose Kiowa mentioned other languages. One student stated that Kiowa was an important language to learn because it "is awesome." Another student answered with, "Kiowa, great teacher." This demonstrates the pivotal role that Native language instructors can fill in helping students developing an interest in Indigenous languages and the cultures that they represent. As previously noted, most of the students entering these courses have limited knowledge of Native languages. Consequently, instructors have the unique opportunity to develop knowledge in these areas to overcome narrative inequality and leave lasting impressions on their students' outlooks.

A common response among third semester students was that no one Native language was more important than any other. This is clear in the following response: "Any or all of them. It's important to preserve them all not just one." In addition, another student mentioned: "They are all equally important so the language won't be lost." This shows a willingness to challenge the notion that Native languages should not be ranked based on their perceived importance. However, it also fails to recognize the need to study severely endangered Native languages that have few remaining speakers. Only one respondent to the survey indicated a concern for studying Native languages that were losing the most speakers.

4.3 Section 3 Results

In this portion of the survey, participants were asked about other students' attitudes toward learning Native American Languages at OU. As prior surveys of

Native American language learners at OU revealed that many students were motivated to enroll in these courses due to their perceived easiness to pass, students were asked whether the Native American language they were studying was more difficult, easier, or equally as difficult to learn as languages taught in OU's Modern Languages Department.   The first question in this section asked students to select the best answer to describe OU students' attitudes toward learning Native American languages.   A total of 5 options were included for respondents to choose from, and these included "very interested," "somewhat interested," "neutral," "not very interested," and "no interest at all." The responses for this item on the survey reflected variation between first and third semester students. For first semester Native American language students, the most common answer was "neutral." With slightly less responses, the second most common answer was that OU students were "somewhat interested" in learning Native American languages. Approximately 35% of the first semester students selected this response. In addition, 10 first semester students felt that OU students were "very interested" in learning Native American languages.   While 3 of the first semester students noted that OU students were "not very interested" in learning these languages, only 1 felt that OU students had "no interest at all."

Third semester students answered with more regularity. None of them felt that there was "no interest at all" in learning Native languages, and only one student from this group marked that OU students were "very interested" in learning these languages.   The most common response from third semester students, representing slightly over 60% of them, was that OU students were

"somewhat interested" in learning Native languages. The remaining 20% marked neutral for this item. While this demonstrates that many students feel there is an interest in Native American language courses among OU students as a whole, it should be noted that only 1 out of 123 respondents indicated that this was due to rumors related to these courses being easy.

The next question asked students to share responses on their perceived view of the grammatical complexity of the Native language they were studying in relation to languages being taught in OU's Department of Modern Languages. Students chose 1 of 3 possible selections for this item including "more grammatically complex," "less grammatically complex," and "equally as grammatically complex." First and third semester students offered nearly identical answers for this item demonstrating no change in perception over time with regard to the grammatical complexity of the Native language they were studying. Most students selected that the Native language they were studying was "equally as grammatically complex" as languages being offered in the Department of Modern Languages. This answer was chosen by 57 out of 123 students representing 46% of all respondents. In addition 35% of the respondents, or 43 out of 123, felt that the Native language they were studying was "less grammatically complex" than those being taught in the Department of Modern Languages. Slightly under 20% of the respondents felt that the Native language they were learning was "more grammatically complex" than other languages being taught on campus. This reveals that the majority of the students involved in the

survey disagree with the notion that Native languages are less grammatically complex than other languages taught at OU.

Following the question on grammatical complexity was an item on how rigorous learning a Native American language was compared to languages being offered in the Department of Modern Languages. Students were asked to select whether the Native language they were learning was "more difficult to learn," "easier to learn," or "equally as difficult to learn." For this item, 73 out of 123 students felt that the Native language they were studying was "equally as difficult to learn" as other languages being offered on campus. This represents nearly 60% of all respondents in the survey. Only 5 students felt that the Native language they were studying was "more difficult to learn" than other languages taught on campus. Similar to the previous item, the notion that Native languages are easier to learn than other languages being offered on campus was a minority view among survey respondents.

The final item in this section offered a yes or no question related to literacy. When asked whether students of Native American languages should know how to read and write in the target language, 110 out of 123 said "yes." There was no variation between first and third semester students. This response might merely demonstrate students' needs in language learning, and many of them might consider writing to be a critical component of mastering new vocabulary in a target language. Another explanation for this affirmative response is that it reflects a deeply held Western predilection for the written word. In many instances, Westerners consider writing to be more authoritative than speaking

(Johnstone 2008: 203). For those students with prior language learning experiences that involved writing, this may have played an important role in how languages were presented to them in the classroom.

4.4 Section 4 Results

The fourth section of the survey included questions designed to uncover students' perceptions of the status of Native American languages. As Hinton noted, the survival of Indigenous languages is most aptly viewed as a human rights issue (2013: 5). This section of the survey posed questions seeking to uncover students' levels of knowledge of tribal languages in use and revitalization efforts aimed at promoting them. Respondents were asked about the number of Native American languages spoken in the United States as well as the number of people who currently speak the Native American language they are studying. This question was posed to ascertain the amount of knowledge students had of communities and speakers of the languages that they were studying.

On the first item included in the section, 36% of the students indicated that they were not sure how many Native languages were spoken in the United States. Approximately 50% of the respondents, or 61 out of 123, estimated that there were 50 or less Native American languages currently being spoken. In addition, 3 students estimated that 51-100 Native languages were spoken while 3 others put the number of languages at 101-150. In the next question, students were asked to include that write how many current speakers there were of the language that they were studying. Answers for this item did not vary based semester, and the

responses revealed that the majority of the students were unsure of how many people currently spoke the Native language that they were studying. These findings reveal a lack of knowledge with regard to the number of tribal languages in use in the United States, and they demonstrate that students have not gained background knowledge on the communities whose languages they are studying. This is problematic as it shows that students lack an awareness of the current status of Native languages and the revitalization efforts being conducted to maintain them. Since Native language classes at OU are a critical part of these efforts, many students are failing to grasp the importance of the current language-learning context that they are a part of.

A question on language vitality was included for the next item on the survey. For this item, students were asked to select whether the number of speakers for the Native language they were studying was "slowly increasing," "rapidly increasing," "slowly decreasing," "rapidly decreasing," or "not changing." The most common response was that the language was "slowly decreasing," which received 65 marks or 53% of all respondents. With the second most responses, 23% of the students marked that the language was "slowly increasing". The third most common answer was that the language was "rapidly decreasing," and this response accounted for 21 out of 123 students, roughly 17% of all respondents. This answer was more common among third semester students as they were responsible for more than half of the students who selected this response.

Anticipating that students might consider Native languages as losing speakers, questions were included in this section to identify students' perceptions

of the most common domains of usage for these languages. Students were given a line to fill in any context that they felt the languages were spoken, and 6 options were included for student to check. Checking all the selections that applied, students chose from the following contexts of use: "daily conversations," "teaching in schools," "storytelling," "praying," "singing," and "tribal meetings." Not a single student wrote in an additional context in response to this item. "Storytelling," "tribal meetings," and "teaching in schools" received the most responses to this item with approximately 60% of the students marking each of them. "Daily conversations" and "singing" received 43% and 45% of the responses respectively. The selection with the lowest number of responses was "praying," which receive a total of 47 marks representing 38% of all respondents. Based on the results, third semester students selected more contexts of use for Native languages than first semester students. The category with the highest number of responses for third semester students was "storytelling" with 41 marks while the most common answer among first semester students was "teaching in schools" with 41 marks.

According to Field and Kroskrity, the continuous influence that non-Indigenous ideologies impose on Native communities through dominant institutions can often lead to divergent perspectives on language in Native communities (2009: 6). With this in mind, survey questions were included on how Native American languages are perceived by both Natives and non-Natives. Students were asked to check all of the following that applied: "important," "unimportant," "prestigious," "not prestigious," "thriving," "threatened," and "no longer used."

Representing around 48% of the respondents, 59 students marked that non-Natives see Native languages as "unimportant." Conversely, 16 students felt that non-Natives view Native languages as "important." While 36 students selected "threatened" for this item, 2 respondents marked that non-Natives believe the languages are "thriving." First and third semester students showed similar answers for "not prestigious," and a total of 23 of them marked this selection. However, more third semester students marked that non-Natives viewed Native American languages as "prestigious" than did first semester students. While only 8% of the first semester students marked this box, 28% of all third semester students indicated that non-Native viewed Native languages as prestigious. The second most common response to this item was that non-Natives see Native languages as "no longer used." A total of 49 students gave this response, and this represents approximately 40% of all respondents.

The following item on the survey asked students to select from the same list of options as the previous question to assess how Native American languages are perceived by Native people. "Important" received the most marks with 77, and "prestigious" received the second most with 60. Similar to the previous item on the survey, there was a variance between first and third semester students with regard to the amount marking "prestigious." For this response, 36% of the first semester students made the selection in contrast to the 61% of all third semester students marking the same box. While "unimportant" received the most responses on the previous item, only 4 students in the survey marked that Native American languages were seen as unimportant by Native Americans.

4.5 Language Ideologies: Sections 1-4

The first 4 sections of the survey revealed a range of language ideologies that students have brought with them to Native language classes at OU. In analyzing these results, it is clear that many of these need to be addressed as they are potentially harmful for language revitalization efforts. However, the results also show that changes in attitudes were present among third semester Native American language students.

Compared to first semester students, students in their third semesters indicated that more OU students show an interest in learning Native American languages. It is evident that this may be a reflection of their views on the topic, and it is possible that more of them have engaged in conversations about this with classmates who are not enrolled in these courses. In addition, the survey results show that more third semester students view Native languages as prestigious than first semester students. It is encouraging to note that several third semester students indicated that not one Native language is more important than another. This reflects a rejection of historical ideologies aligning languages with "progress." Despite this, by far the most common responses indicated that the languages of larger tribes are the most important to learn.

These responses bear a common characteristic related to language ideologies: characterizing languages by their relations to power. In this case, large tribes represent hegemonic forces whose languages are authoritative due to their influence. As Hill noted, numerical reasoning can have an impact of which languages are most valued in society (2002). This may have led some students to

conclude that smaller languages were based on larger ones, namely Cherokee. This was evident in the following response offered: "Cherokee because it is the base of the Native Americans' language." Similarly, another student stated that Cherokee was the "basis of other languages." Cherokee is the sole representative of the Southern branch of Iroquoian languages (Mithun 1999: 418), and no other languages are thought to have descended from Cherokee. Although borrowings from Cherokee are no doubt common among neighboring languages, it is by no means comprises the basis of other Native languages. It is possible that students who made such overstated assertions did so because of the influence they associated with the tribe's size.

It is certainly true that learning the languages of larger tribes would provide learners with a larger group of people to communicate with through the language. However, it is interesting to note that only one student indicated that the most critically endangered languages are among the most important to study. If a Native language had very few speakers, it follows that it would be a high priority language to study and preserve. Only one of the respondents in the survey held this view.

When students offered rankings for which languages were the most prestigious, it appears that many students conflated these with languages that were either relevant to their locale or economically beneficial. As noted in an earlier chapter, "classical" languages such as Latin and Greek were traditionally afforded the highest levels of prestige among Westerners. However, these barely received any responses. By far the most common answers were English and

Spanish. Another common language included was Chinese. Interestingly, many students considered this to be among the most important languages to learn. It seems that perhaps students identified "prestige" not with esteem but with hegemonic force. Mandarin Chinese is the most widely spoken language in the world, and it is also viewed as an important international language for business. Students' responses to this section of the survey reveal an instrumentalist view that potential gains in one's occupational status is a good determiner for which languages should be learned (Lambert 2003).

The current study breaks with previous findings with regard to the perception that Native languages are easier to learn than other languages offered at OU. While some respondents' answers reflected these beliefs, this was a minority view among respondents as a whole. The findings from this survey also reveal that the vast majority of students enrolled in Native language courses at OU have little or no prior exposure to them. While first semester students expressed less of an awareness of the various contexts in which these languages are used, the survey demonstrated that third semester students developed an increased knowledge on the domains in which Native languages are used. Despite this increased knowledge, the overwhelming majority of the respondents showed a lack of awareness for the status of the language they were studying. As previously noted, this is problematic since it seems that students fail to recognize the revitalization efforts taking place to maintain these languages. An area in which Native American language students could benefit greatly is in becoming more knowledgeable about the communities in whose languages they are studying.

Among the most dominant ideologies identified in the survey is the notion that English should be the official language of the United States. As Woolard noted, equating a language with a nation is an ideological construct rather than a natural fact (1998: 16). Over 6,000 languages are spoken in a world comprised of around 250 nations (Hinton 2013: 3). However, nearly a half dozen bills are presented to Congress each year seeking to make English the country's official language (Hinton 2013: 43). In the United States, selecting English as the official language fails to reflect the immense linguistic diversity that is vital to the country. According to Kroskrity, this could be identified as an act of state-sponsored linguistic discrimination (2000).

The English Only Movement is troubling to many communities across the United States, particularly to Native Americans. Advocates of this ideology have cited the knowledge English is necessary to becoming part of the United States (The Ojibwe News 2007). For Native Americans, this is precisely the same argument that drove assimilationist policies aimed at eradicating their languages until the late 20th century. Nevertheless, Oklahoma codified this ideology into law in 2010 by establishing English as its official language (Atkins 2011). Seemingly taking a step back historically, this policy is clearly contradictory. Prior to voting that took place to pass this legislation, one Native language teacher pointed out that the very word "Oklahoma" is Choctaw, not English (The Ojibwe News 2007). In addition, the Great Seal of Oklahoma bears the Latin words "Labor Omnia Vincit" (Atkins 2011). If English is to be the official language of Oklahoma, it reasonably

follows that the State should be renamed and its official motto translated into English to fulfill legal requirements.

Given that the English as an official language ideology has governmental support in Oklahoma, it is understandable that many students would view this as the natural state of affairs. However, as students of Native American languages, it is important that they be made aware of how this ideology harms Native people. Symbolically, languages that are not chosen as official by the government are afforded an inferior status (Hinton 2013: 3). In addition, maintaining languages and cultures outside of those deemed "official" is seen as opting out of mainstream society (Cummins 2000).

Researchers have pointed out that prejudice against foreign languages in the United States is quite high (Hinton 2013) (Gonzáles & Melis 2000). This sentiment can be termed *xenoglossiphobia*, or the fear of foreign languages (O'Neill 2011). Native American languages are impacted by xenoglossiphobia, although many Native people might argue that English is a foreign language in the United States. Xenoglossiphobia has deep roots in American history as noted in the previous chapter, and it led to Native Americans being treated as outsiders in America since they spoke languages other than English.

Exploiting xenoglossiphobia, the official English campaign has been used by neo-conservatives to depict English as being under siege. Meanwhile, promoting the use of other languages is accused of undermining core "American values" (Bauman & Briggs 303-304). As Cummins pointed out, dismissing these assertions as bigoted or racist precludes the possibility of change. Rather, it is through

communication and dialogue that those who see diversity as a threat can be challenged to reflect on their views (Cummins 2000: xiv). Students of Native American languages at OU are well poised to become a part of this critical dialogue through the unique opportunity they have been afforded. Through an awareness of the flaws in the official English movement, they can gain an increased understanding of the harm that this ideology causes.

5. Research Findings Continued: Section 5

This final portion of the survey included lines for students to provide detailed responses to the following open-ended questions: "What are the most common attitudes and beliefs about Native American languages in your home community? Do you agree with these ideas?" Although questions in the preceding sections identified commonly held ideas about Native American languages, this section was the first to be aimed at gathering responses that addressed language ideologies explicitly.

The findings in this section reflected each of the major strands of language ideologies described in Chapter 2. In responding to this section, many respondents evaluated Native languages based on their perceived relations to power. Additionally, some of the responses presented biased statements as commonsense facts. Finally, a great number of students demonstrated limited levels of awareness when attempting to articulate deeply held beliefs and attitudes held in their home communities with regard to language. In some instances, multiple voices were present within a single strip of discourse offered as responses to this section of the survey. The following subsections will outline dominant discourses that were most prevalent among the university learners who participated in this study.

5.1 "There really aren't any attitudes"

Among the most common responses students included in the final section of the survey was that their home communities did not have any attitudes or

opinions related to Native American languages. This is demonstrated in one response claiming that, "There is really no attitude towards it." According to another student, "There really aren't any attitudes that I am aware of." This is not a surprising answer considering previous work on language ideologies shows that individuals display varying degrees of awareness related to their local language ideologies (Kroskrity 2006: 505). While one may find it difficult to articulate their home community's attitudes or beliefs on a given topic, this does not mean that they are not present.

According to Silverstein, there is no possible absolutely pre-ideological view as every system or modality of social signs is infused with *indexicality* (1998: 129). However, when ideologies lay beneath the surface of awareness, covert discourses are spread through indexicality (Hill 1998: 41). The following response includes the assertion that attitudes towards Native languages are neutral, but an explicit instance of indexicality is evident: "The perception (in my opinion) is neutral to Indians, many just think of casinos." While claiming neutrality, this respondent associated Native Americans with the loaded topic of casinos, and this is undoubtedly tied to attitudes held in the respondent's home community. This also reflects a degree of *iconization,* or associating a mental image with a language and its speakers (Gal & Irvine 2000). In addition, this response bears a common strand related to language ideologies by referencing a site of financial power—in this case a casino.

Some students attributed a lack of opinions due to being unacquainted with Native Americans as in the following: "Neutral I guess. I didn't grow up around

many Native Americans." As Meek noted, the dominant American public constructs opinions about Native languages and identities through constructions presented through media (Meek 2006: 4). Perhaps it is through the fact that Native languages are often overlooked that many students felt that there are no attitudes towards them in circulation in their home communities. This was evident in a previous section of the survey in which fewer students offered responses related to Natives' views on their own languages. Along with a lack of knowledge related to the status of the tribal languages students were studying, it is clear that students could benefit from more exposure to Native views on language and culture in the classroom.

5.2 "It is something we never talk about"

It was clear that Native American languages were overlooked in many of the respondents' home communities. Responses falling under this category revealed the discursive practice of social *deletion*, or omitting an entire group of people from daily reality. This is clear in the following responses: "They are looked past," "It is not talked about," and "Native American languages are not discussed." Perhaps it is through this practice of deletion that one student responded, "It doesn't exist." In explaining why Native languages are not given consideration, one student noted that, "I'm from a very white community/family, so we don't talk about other languages much." This reveals another discursive practice related to this category—*erasure*.

According to Hill, erasure refers to a type of inattention to detail that makes contradictory evidence invisible (2008: 5). As being "white" does not preclude one from conversing in or about other languages, the preceding statement naturalizes a flawed notion that "whites" do not talk about other languages. Reflecting a key characteristic of language ideologies, this example is presented as being an objective truism.

Another example of erasure can be found in another response: "They are not as important as English is for us. I do not agree because Choctaw is equally as important to Natives as English is to Americans." While it is encouraging that this student is challenging the notion that Native languages are not important, the respondent displays erasure by failing to identify that Natives are also Americans. Another example can be found in the following: "Never talked about. Probably that it's important for them to be kept alive but unimportant for non-Natives to learn." This response erases the fact that non-Natives are also involved in language revitalization efforts, and it is harmful given that it places the responsibility of these efforts entirely on Native Americans. It is critical to note that most of the comments offered in the final section of the survey were related to this category of responses.

5.3 "A dying piece of history"

A third category of responses reflects many students' perceptions of the role of Native languages in society. Jacob noted that dominant discourses at universities often show a preference for Native Americans being "stuck silently in

history" (2012: 181). Many responses to the final portion of the survey relegated Native American languages to fulfilling prescribed historical roles. This is evident in the following response: "My wife and I both believe that while English should be the United States' official language, tribal languages should be preserved so that people don't lose their history." As another student noted, "I'm sure many believe these languages are no longer useful, but I think these languages are an important part of American history." Several other students offered responses akin to the following: "Choctaw, it has a lot of history," or "Kiowa, a dying piece of history."

These responses are correct in asserting that these Native languages a have long played an important role throughout history, and they each bear accrued knowledge accumulated throughout time immemorial. However, these responses fail to recognize the critical role that these languages are serving in the present and the importance they have for the future of Native communities. This reflects the harmful ideology that Native Americans are a historical group of people. For some, an important source of this ideology was clearly evident: "There are a lot of Native Americans where I am from, and we learn a lot about them in grade school." For someone growing up in a community comprised of many Native people, it seems more reasonable to learn from them through conversations than to learn about them via elementary school curricula.

Related to responses that identified Native Americans and their languages as a part of history were comments displaying what I have termed *monolithization*. Similar to essentialism, which imposes a uniform set of attributes onto individuals identified with a given community (Clifford 1986), monolithization can be seen as

reducing a widely diverse set of communities into a static, monolithic group. This was seen to some extent in previous comments indicating the perception that smaller tribes must be connected to larger tribes who represent the basis of their languages. However, an instance of monolithization can be found more clearly in the following statement: "It is not a topic of conversation as Native American languages are used basically in reservations now." None of the tribes whose languages are offered at OU have reservation lands. Nevertheless, the respondent grouped Native language speakers together as people carrying out their historically prescribed roles on reservation lands.

5.4 "They are interesting but not useful"

After comments associated with deletion and erasure, the most common group of remarks offered in the final section of the survey were related to the perceived "usefulness" of learning Native American languages. This is evident in the following response: "A lot of people believe the languages are not beneficial to learn and that I will never use it. I disagree, I like learning about the culture and the language of the tribe that I belong to." While this respondent reflects an ideology that Native languages are not "useful," it is clear that a connection to tribal identity provided a strong motivation to learn the language. Non-heritage learners did not share this motivation, and this may have been the reason for one respondent's statement that, "They are interesting but not useful." Going one step further, another student offered the following comment: "Not really

relevant/useful, never encountered Native speakers that couldn't also speak English."

The above comment completely misses the point of learning Native American languages, particularly with regard to heritage learners. Native languages represent statements of identity, and they are not merely a neutral means through which information can be exchanged. Heritage languages are not irrelevant for Native people because they are able to converse in English. Rather, the languages are a critical component of cultural identity, which facilitate a sense of personal, well-being (Meek 2010: 150). Like many of the respondents to this survey, the student for offered the previous response spoke only English at home and had no prior language learning experience. Monolinguals often fail to recognize the underlying connections between the speech they use and its relation to their cultural backgrounds. This is one reason why language learning is critical for university students—particularly Native language learning.

One rationale found for failing to recognize connections between language and identity is evident in the following remark: "It isn't necessary to learn and somewhat due to the Native American community being small." This response reveals that the learner is concerned with utility of learning a language that is not spoken by a particularly large group of speakers. Another student voiced the following concern: "My parents think it is not the best use of my language credit." This highlights the instrumentalist aims articulated by Lambert. According to Lambert, a student's efforts are instrumental if "the purposes of language study

reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in

one's occupation" (2003: 314).

6. Conclusion

According to Hill, as language ideologies are put into circulation, they reinscribe distorted versions of reality (2008: 42-43). The purpose of this thesis is to do the exact opposite. By identifying common ideologies revealed through survey responses, the goal is to raise awareness needed to contest these ideologies. As language ideologies often lie beyond one's level of awareness, highlighting them explicitly provides a means through which they can be challenged.

The findings shared in this paper have offered a glimpse into the minds of university learners of Native American languages at OU by uncovering attitudes and beliefs they hold with regard to the languages they are studying. Respondents enrolled in these courses represent communities from all across Oklahoma as well as 7 other states. However, the majority of the respondents noted a lack of exposure to Native American cultures in their home communities. Overall, these students have not had much experience in language learning, and they are overwhelmingly monolingual in English at home. These students are poised to benefit greatly from the language classes they are enrolled in. As Kern notes, "language is not just a tool for communication. It is also a resource for creative thought, a framework for understanding the world, a key to new knowledge" (2008: 367). In Native language classroom, the new knowledge being shared has strong implications, as Native voices have been historically silent in educational institutions. The Native American Language Program has the opportunity to help

overcome narrative inequality. It addition, it is a key site for challenging language ideologies that could undermine language revitalization efforts.

It is clear that many students at OU display a dire lack of knowledge with regard to Native languages and efforts being taken to ensure their renewal. As many students revealed through survey comments, these are topics that are not discussed in their home communities. With this being the case, studying Native languages at OU affords students with an opportunity to fill gaps in knowledge that they may not have known to exist. These courses offer exposure to knowledge that many students may have never encountered, and this offers access to a greater appreciation for the role of Native languages and cultures in today's society. In turn, students are able to take this knowledge with them to communities where popular discourse about Native languages is characterized by silence.

The importance of overcoming silence on the issue of Native language revitalization cannot be overstated. The research presented in this paper indicates an extant ideology that Native languages are often associated with being a part of history. As one student stated, Native language learning "helps overcome the damage done by the U.S. practices of assimilation and genocide." While this is undoubtedly true, it is critical to recognize that these colonialist aims are not merely a part of the past. According to Meek, "language endangerment is not just a repercussion of colonial assimilationist tactics—it is an effect of contemporary sociolinguistic practices" (2010: 52).

While reaching this awareness is vital, so too is developing the realization that Native language revitalization is a human rights issue. Language revitalization

is a critical component of decolonization efforts aimed at cultural renewal and healing for Native people. As Hinton notes, it is a part of larger efforts for Native Americans to retain a sense of identity and determine their own futures (2013: 5). In developing this knowledge, students can come to reflect on ideologies claiming that Native languages are "unimportant" or "not useful" to learn. The ideology evaluates Native languages based on their relations to power, and it suggests that the utility of learning a language is to be measured based on its perceived financial benefits and access to the largest speech communities. This is detrimental to those engaged in Native language revitalization efforts promotes that view that the function of language learning is to further one's financial prospects. As Field and Kroskrity note, the continuous influence that non-Indigenous ideologies impose on Native communities through dominant institutions can have an influence on how Native communities view their own languages (2009: 6).

A close examination of the survey responses offered by third semester students reveals that they are challenging language ideologies that they have had prior exposure to. This is clearly expressed in the following remarks offered by a third semester respondent: "Most people pay no attention to Native American languages in my community. Now that I have been exposed to this language and culture I don't agree." Another student stated, "I believe they are not discussed or learned enough, and they should be seen just as important as any other language."

While these statements are encouraging, it is critical to note two other areas in which students could use improvement. First, the research findings demonstrate that students show a lack of knowledge with regard to Cherokee,

Choctaw, and Kiowa language communities. Many students were unaware of the status of the language that they were studying, and it was evident that they had little awareness of the number of other tribal languages that are currently endangered.

In addition, the vast majority of the students expressed the need to adopt English as the official language of the United States, and it is unclear whether they are aware of the damage that this could cause Native communities. Increasing awareness in these areas might provide more of a context through which students can better grasp the significance of Native language revitalization efforts. In turn, this could encourage students to approach their studies with an increased vigor as well as lead them to becoming advocates for language revitalization after they complete their studies.

6.1 The Need for Further Study

The survey used to gather information on university learners of Native American languages at OU was able to reveal dominant language ideologies present in the minds of students. In addition, changes in attitudes over time were noted demonstrating the pivotal role that these courses serve at the university. However, measuring attitudes and ideologies through a short survey has limitations. As noted previously, ideologies are best "discovered in linguistic practice itself" (Woolard 1998: 9). The surveys were limited in the amount of metapragmatic discourse that they could generate as they included very few open-

ended questions. This has revealed a need for further research as additional questions have been raised.

While most of the questions raised in the survey were aimed at underlying beliefs with regard to languages in general, few were included on beliefs about language learning. As noted in the previous chapter, ideologies related to the "usefulness" of learning Native languages reveal instrumentalist approaches to learning languages. Previous research has been demonstrated that university foreign language students often recognize only formal organizational rules related to grammar as necessary target content for language classes (Drewelow 2012). This jejune understanding of how language learning should be facilitated reflects instrumental learning goals in which language is seen as merely a communicative instrument. In addition, it reflects ideologies related to how languages are learned. Future studies are needed to identify ideologies related to language learning held by university learners of Native languages.

Given the prevalence of official English ideologies present in the minds of students enrolled in Native languages at OU, it would be quite helpful to recognize *why* students believe that English should be declared the official language of the United States. Understanding the rationale behind these beliefs would provide a greater means of challenging them. If given an opportunity to see the one-nation-equals-one-language argument does not represent a natural state of affairs, students might begin to reflect on this ideology that is often received as universally true. Perhaps a short survey targeting students' beliefs on this issue would provide more of an indication for why this is such a deeply held ideology for the

majority of students. However, interviewing students on this topic would allow for more substantive data to be collected.

While ideological trends emerged from the present study more information is needed to develop a more nuanced analysis. Since I was unable to observe respondents in the classroom or ask them follow up questions to their survey responses, the amount the level of analysis that I can draw is limited. Conducting interviews with students would provide more access to information needed to provide more substantive data. In my opinion, a better method might be to interview Native language instructors to determine how language ideologies have changed among their students as they have passed through multiple semesters of classes. The instructors are the experts on this issue given that they are tasked with presenting lessons multiple times each week to students with little or no prior knowledge of Native languages.

Another topic for future study might be probing into how much students share knowledge that they have developed through taking Native language courses with others. Do they use these languages outside of the classroom? Do they inform friends and families about what they are learning in class? As the findings from the current study show, many of the students come from communities in which Native languages are not discussed. Students in these classes have the ability to alter this trend and raise awareness about Native languages in their communities. It would be useful to question students on how they might use the knowledge they have developed through studying Native languages in the future after they have completed their studies.

6.2 Coda

The ideologies that are present in a given society inform worldviews and shape personal outlooks. By identifying these distortions, people are equipped to overcome misconceptions that constrict thought and cloud judgment. All people are caught up in an inextricable web of interconnectedness that extends to the environment as a whole. Lack of knowledge, or ignorance, is responsible for misunderstandings that often give rise to conflict. Given communities' mutual interdependence in societies, one group cannot truly benefit from another group's detriment. Ways of promoting knowledge are critical for reducing conflict in the wider world.

Native American language revitalization is a critical human rights issue as language loss represents an ongoing component of disenfranchisement experienced in Native communities. When Native American communities are marginalized, larger American society suffers as well. The Native American Language Program at OU represents a critical site for challenging ideologies that can undermine efforts aimed at Native language renewal. The ideologies and discursive practices highlighted in this paper reflect varying levels of understanding with regard to the role of Native language learning in society. As Native language classes at OU provide students with an opportunity to challenge dominant ideologies and discourses they have been exposed to, these students are equipped to help shape social order and advocate for social justice for Native language speakers.

References

Abell, Troy D.

    1993   Agreement Concerning the Teaching of Native American Language Courses by Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Graduate Students in the Department of Anthropology on a Self-Support Basis for Five Years (FY 94-FY98). Department of Anthropology.

Adams, David Wallace

    1995   Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press.

Adger, Carolyn Temple

    2001   Discourse in Educational Settings. *In* The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, & Heidi E. Hamilton, eds. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 503-517.

Arenas, Alberto; Reyes, Iliana & Wyman, Liesy

    2010   When Indigenous and Modern Education Collide in the Global Culture. *In* Global Pedagogies: Schooling for the Future. Joseph Zajda, ed. New York: Springer Science+Business Media, 85-110.

Arnold, Robert D.

    2013   "...To Help Assure the Survival and Continuing Vitality of Native American Languages. *In* The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale, eds. Boston: Brill Press, 45-50.

Atkins, Mariann M.

    2011   Making it "Official": A Constitutional Analysis of Oklahoma's Official English Amendment. Tulsa Law Review. 46.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M.

    1986   From Notes Made in 1970-71. *In* Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist, eds. Austin: University of Texas Press, 132-158.

Basso, Keith

    1996   Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bauman, Richard & Briggs, Charles L.

    2003   Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Voices of Inequality. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berger, Peter & Luckmann, Thomas

    1966   The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Bloomaert, Jan

    2005   Discourse: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boas, Franz

    1995   Language, Culture, and Society: A Book of Readings. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre

    1977   Outline of a Theory of Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brandl, Klaus

    2008   Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Calloway, Colin G.

    2004   First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History. Boston: St. Martin's Press.

Clifford, James

    1986   Introduction: Partial Truths. *In* Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. James Clifford & George E. Marcus, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1-26.

Code Talkers Recognition Act of 2008

    2008   P.L. 110–420.

Collins, James & Blot, Richard K.

    2003   Literacy and Literacies: Texts, Power, and Identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, Jim

    2000   Foreword. *In* Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement. Roseann Dueñas González & Ildikó Melis. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press, i-xxviii.

Debo, Angie

    1973   And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Deloria, Philip J.

    1998   Playing Indian. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Drewelow, Isabelle

    2012   Learners' Perceptions of Culture in a First-Semester Foreign Language Course. L2 Journal. 4, 283-302.

Duncan, Barbara R.

    1998   Living Stories of the Cherokee with Stories Told by Davey Arch, Robert Bushyhead, Edna Chekelelee, Maria Junaluska, Kathi Smith Littlejohn, & Freeman Owle. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Duranti, Alessandro

    1997   Linguistic Anthropology. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, Clyde

    2008   To Change Them Forever: Indian Education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893-1920. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fairclough, Norman

    1992   Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Field, Margaret C. & Kroskrity, Paul V.

    2009   Introduction: Revealing Native American Language Ideologies. *In* Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Paul V. Kroskrity, & Margaret C. Field eds. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 3-32.

Foster, Morris

    1994   Native American Language Instruction at the University of Oklahoma. Department of Anthropology.

Fowler, Loretta

 1995 Proposal for Native American Language Program. Department of
 Anthropology.

Gal, Susan & Irvine, Judith T.

 2000 Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. *In* Regimes of
 Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities. Paul V. Kroskrity, ed. Santa Fe:
 School of American Research Press, 35-84.

Gee, James Paul

 1989 Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: An Introduction. Journal of
 Education. 171 (1), 6-32.

Golla, Victor

 2007 North America. *In* Encyclopedia of the World's Endangered
 Languages, Christopher Mosely, ed. New York: Routledge, 1-96.

González, Roseann Dueñas & Melis, Ildikó

 2000 Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English
 Movement. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.

Gramsci, Antonio

 1971 Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York: International
 Press.

Grenoble, Lenore A. & Whaley, Lindsay J.

 2006 Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization.
 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, John J. & Levinson, Steven C.

    1996   Rethinking Linguistic Relativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harrison, K. David

    2007   When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heath, Shirley

    1989   Language Ideology. *In* International Encyclopedia of Communications. New York: Oxford University Press, 53.

Hill, Jane H.

    2002   "Expert Rhetorics" in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who Is Listening, and What Do They Hear? Journal of Linguistic Anthropology. 12(2), 119-133.

    2008   The Everyday Language of White Racism. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

Hinton, Leanne

    2013   Language Revitalization: An Overview. *In* The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale, eds. Boston: Brill Press, 3-18.

    2013   Federal Language Policy and Indigenous Languages in the United States. *In* The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale, eds. Boston: Brill Press, 39-44.

2013   Languages of Arizona, Southern California, and Oklahoma. *In* The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale, eds. Boston: Brill Press, 367-369.

Holm, Tom

2005   The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs: Native Americans & Whites in the Progressive Era. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hymes, Dell

1996   Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis Publishers.

Irvine, Judith

1989   When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. American Ethnologist. 16, 248-267.

Jacob, Michelle M.

2012   We Want a Lifetime of Commitment, Not Just Sweet Words. *In* Living Indigenous Leadership: Native Narratives on Building Strong Communities. Kenny, Carolyn & Fraser, Tina Ngaroimata eds. UCB Press: Vancouver, 179-191.

2013   Yakama Rising: Indigenous Cultural Revitalization, Activism, and Healing. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Jaworski, Adam & Coupland, Nikolas

2014   Introduction: Perspectives on Discourse Analysis. *In* The Discourse Reader. 3rd Edition. Adam Jaworski & Nikolas Coupland, eds. New York: Routledge, 3-35.

Johnstone, Barbara

    2008   Discourse Analysis. 2nd edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kern, Richard

    2008   Making Connections through Texts in Language Teaching. Language Teaching. 41(3), 367–387.

Kickham, Elizabeth A.

    2015   Purism, Prescriptivism, and Privilidge: Choctaw Language Ideologies and Their Impact on Teaching and Learning. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oklahoma.

Kövecses, Zoltán

    2006   Language, Mind, and Culture: A Practical Introduction. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V.

    1993   Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

    2000   Regimenting Languages: Language Ideological Perspectives. *In* Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Policies, and Identities. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1-34.

    2006   Language Ideologies. *In* A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology. Alessandro Duranti, ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 496-517.

    2009   Narrative Reproductions: Ideologies of Storytelling, Authoritative Words, and Generic Regimentation in the Village of Tewa. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 19(1), 40-56.

2012   Sustaining Stories: Narratives as Cultural Resources in Native
American Projects of Cultural Sovereignty, Identity Maintenance, and
Language Revitalization. *In* Telling Stories in the Face of Danger: Languages
Renewal in Native American Communities. Paul V. Kroskrity, ed. Norman:
University of Oklahoma Press, 3-22.

Lambert, W.E.

2003   A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. *In* Sociolinguistics: The Essential
Readings. C.B. Paulston & G.R. Tuckers, eds. Malden, MA: Blackwell
Publishing, 305-321.

Linn, Mary S.

2007   Oklahoma Native Languages at the Centennial. World Literature
Today. 81 (5), 24-25.

Macendo, Donald

2000   The Colonialism of the English Only Movement. Educational
Researcher. 29 (3), 15-24.

Meek, Barbara A.

2010   We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in
a Northern Athabaskan Community. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

McCarthy, E. Doyle

1994   The Uncertain Future of Ideology: Reading Marx. Sociological
Quarterly 35, 415-429.

McCarty, Teresa L.; Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Magga, Ole Henrik

2008   Education for Speakers of Endangered Languages. *In* The Handbook
for Educational Linguistics, Bernard Spolsky & Francis M. Hult, eds. Malden,
MA: Blackwell Publishing, 297-321.

Mithun, Marianne

    1999   The Languages of North America. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, Juliet L.

    2012   Background and Motivation of Students Studying a Native American Language at the University Level. Working Papers in Literacy, Culture, and Language Education. 1, 27-49.

Morgan, Marcyliena

    2006   Speech Community. *In* A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology. Alessandro Duranti, ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 3-22.

Morgan, Mindy J.

    2009   The Bearer of This Letter: Language Ideologies, Literary Practices, and the Fort Belknap Indian Community. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Native American Language Act of 1990

    1990   P.L. 101-477.

Neely, Amber A. & Palmer, Gus

    2009   Which Way Is the Kiowa Way? Orthography Choices, Ideologies, and Language Renewal. *In* Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Paul V. Kroskrity, & Margaret C. Field eds. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 271-297.

O'Neill, Sean Patrick

    2011   Personal correspondence.

2012   The Politics of Storytelling in Northwestern California: Ideology, Identity, and Maintaining, Narrative Distinction in the Face of Cultural Convergence. *In* Telling Stories in the Face of Danger: Languages Renewal in Native American Communities. Paul V. Kroskrity, ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 60-89.

2013   Translating Oral Literature in Indigenous Societies: Ethnic Aesthetic Performances in Multicultural and Multilingual Settings. Journal of Folklore Research, 50 (1-3), 217-250.

Ong, Walter J.
2012   Orality and Literacy: Technologizing the Word. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge.

Olshtain, Elite & Celce-Murcia, Marianne
2001   Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. *In* The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, & Heidi E. Hamilton, eds. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 707-724.

Romaine, Suzanne
2002   The Impact of Language Policy of Endangered Languages. International Journal of Multicultural Studies. 4 (2), 1-28.

Rumsey, Alan
1990   Wording, Meaning and Language Ideology. American Anthropologist. 92, 346-361.

Sapir, Edward
1921   Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. London: Harvest Books.

1934 Symbolism. In Language, Culture, and Society. Ben G. Blout, ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Saussure, Ferdinand de
1959 Course in General Linguistics. New York: Philosophical Society Press.

Saville-Troike, Muriel
2012 Introducing Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shohamy, Elana
2006 Language Educational Policies in Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches. New York: Routledge.

Silver, Shirley & Miller, Wick R.
1997 American Indian Languages: Cultural and Social Contexts. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Silverstein, Michael
1979 Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. *In* The Elements. P. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer eds. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193-247.

1996 Monoglot "Standard" in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony. *In* Brenneis, Donald and Ronald S. Macaulay, eds. The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology. Boulder: Westview, 284-306.

1998 The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary. *In* Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, & Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 123-148.

Slobin, Dan I.

    1996   From "Thought and Language" to "Thinking for Speaking". *In* Rethinking Linguistic Relativity. New York: Cambridge University Press, 70-96.

Smith, Paul Chaat & Warrior, Robert Allen

    1996   Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee. New York: The New Press.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M.

    2005   Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn. New York: Routledge.

Taylor, Graham D.

    1980   The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism: The Administration of the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-45. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

The Ojibwe News

    2007   American Indians in Oklahoma Say English-Only Policy Diminishes Their Tribal Languages. March 16.

Thomas, Juan Antonio

    2010   How Do I Satisfy the General Education Language Requirement? University Students' Attitudes Toward Language Study. Foreign Language Annals, 43(3), 531-550.

Tucker, G.R.

    1998   A Global Perspective on Multilingualism and Multilingual Education. *In* Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education. J. Cenoz & F. Genesee, eds. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 3-15.

U.S. Congress

    1886   Report of Indian Peace Commissioners. January 14, 40th Congress: 2nd Session.

Vološinov, V.N.

    1973   Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Translated by Ladislav Matejka & I.R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee

    1956   Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Edited by John B. Carroll. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Woolard, Kathyrn A.

    1998   Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. *In* Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 3-47.

Woolard, Kathyrn A. & Schieffelin, Bambi B.

    1994   Language Ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology 23, 55-82.

Appendix A: Survey

General Information
1. Level at the university: □Freshman □Sophomore □Junior □Senior □Graduate
2. Sex: □Female □Male   3. Major_____
4. Age: □less than 18 □18-22 □ 23-27 □28-35 □35-45 □ 45-above
5. Home community (city, state): _____
6. Languages spoken at home: _____
7. Non-University language classes taken:

_____

8. University language classes taken:

_____

Part I
9. How important is language learning? □not important □somewhat important
□very important
10. It is important for Americans to speak languages other than English? □Yes
□No
11. English should be the official language of the United States. □Yes □No
12. English should be the official language of Oklahoma. □Yes □No
13. What are the world's three most prestigious
languages?_____
14. What are the three most important languages for Americans to
learn?_____
15. What is the most important Native American language to learn?
Why?_____

Part II
16. Which best describes OU students' attitudes toward learning Native American
languages?
    □very interested □somewhat interested □neutral □not very interested □no
interest at
    all
17. Compared to languages taught in OU's Modern Language Dept., (specific tribal
language) is
        □ less grammatically complex
        □ more grammatically complex
        □ equally as complex grammatically
18. Compared to languages taught in OU's Modern Language Dept., (specific tribal
language) is
        □ easier to learn
        □ more difficult to learn
        □ equally as difficult to learn
19. Students should learn know how to read and write (specific tribal language)?
        □Yes □No

Part III
20. How many Native American languages are spoken in the United States?
_____
21. How many people currently speak (specific tribal language)?
_____

22. As of 2015, the number of (specific tribal language) speakers is: □ slowly decreasing
   □ rapidly decreasing   □ slowly increasing   □ rapidly increasing   □ not changing
23. How are Native American languages perceived by most non-Natives? (check all that apply)
   □ important □ unimportant □ prestigious □not prestigious □thriving
   □threatened
   □ no longer used
24. How are Native American languages perceived by most Native Americans?
   □ important □ unimportant □ prestigious □not prestigious □thriving
   □threatened
   □ no longer used
25. (specific tribal language) is regularly used for: □daily conversations □teaching in schools
   □storytelling □praying □singing □tribal meetings

Part IV
What are the most common attitudes and beliefs about Native American languages in your home community? Do you agree with these ideas?
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix B: IRB Approval Form

The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA

Institutional Review Board for the

Protection of Human Subjects

**Approval of Initial Submission –
Expedited Review – AP01**

Date: December 08, 2015   **IRB#:** 6104

Principal   **Approval Date:**

          Mr. Michael Yona Wilson

Investigato   12/08/2015

Study Title: Language Ideologies and Practices in the Native American

Language Classroom

Expedited Category: 7

Collection/Use of PHI: No

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and granted

expedited approval of the above- referenced research study. To view the

documents approved for this submission, open this study from the *My Studies*

option, go to *Submission History*, go to *Completed Submissions* tab and then

click the *Details* icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- ·   Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.
- ·   Obtain informed consent and research privacy authorization using the currently approved, stamped forms and retain all original, signed forms, if applicable.
- ·   Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications.
- ·   Promptly report to the IRB any harm experienced by a participant that is both unanticipated and related per IRB policy.

- Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.
- Promptly submit continuing review documents to the IRB upon notification approximately 60 days prior to the expiration date indicated above.
- Submit a final closure report at the completion of the project.

If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

Fred Beard, Ph.D.

Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board