UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

COMMUNITY-BASED ARCHIVES, MUSEUMS AND LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION: A CASE STUDY FROM THE WICHITA AND AFFILIATED TRIBES IN ANADARKO, OKLAHOMA

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

SAPPHIRE HODGES
Norman, Oklahoma
2018

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/299837

COMMUNITY-BASED ARCHIVES, MUSEUMS AND LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION: A CASE STUDY FROM THE WICHITA AND AFFILIATED TRIBES IN ANADARKO, OKLAHOMA

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Sean O'Neill, Chair

_____
Dr. Racquel Sapien

_____
Dr. Marcia Haag

© Copyright by SAPPHIRE HODGES 2018
All Rights Reserved.

This thesis and the efforts that went into it are and have always been dedicated to The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes. And to all others who cherish their language and culture, who fight to hold on to them, and pass them on. I am inspired by your deep commitment to this work and your courage in the face of its challenges.

And to My Mom. Thanks for always being supportive and proud no matter what I choose to pursue.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents iv
List of Tables vi
Abstract vii
Chapter 1 1
1.2 Problems Minorities Face in Traditional Museums and Archives 4
1.3. Community Involvement in Museums, Archives and Language Revitalization 13
1.4 Seeking Solutions with Community-Based Archives, Museums and Language Revitalization 25
1.5 Conclusions 32
Chapter 2 33
2.1 Wichita Recent History 33
2.2 The Wichita Today 49
2.3 A Thumbnail Sketch of the Wichita Language 56
Chapter 3 65
3.1 Revitalizing Languages Without Speakers 65
3.2 Language Ideologies 74
3.3 Survey Methodologies 84
3.4 Participants In A Community 87
3.5 Survey Data 90
3.6 Potential Language Ideologies in the Wichita Tribe 94
3.7 Wichita Language and Religion 97
3.8 Motivations 100
3.9 Obstacles 103
3.10 Who Should Be Involved In Revitalization? 107
3.11 Language Revitalization Programs and Volunteer Work 110
3.12 Archive Responses 117
3.13 Individual Goals 120
3.14 Summary 126
Chapter 4 129
4.1 Introducing the Wichita Archive 130
4.2 Guide to Wichita Documentation and Archival Contents 134

4.3 Creating the archive 141
4.4 The Archive Dictionary 147
4.5 Comparing the Wichita Archive and Traditional Archives 151
3.6 The Wichita Archive as a Community-Based Initiative 154
3.7 Challenges for the Community-Based Archivist 159
3.8 Conclusions 164
Chapter 5 167
5. 1 Background on the Wichita Tribal History Center 167
5.2 The Wichita Tribal History Center as a Community-Based Memory Institution 172
5.3 Museums as a tool for language and culture revitalization 178
Chapter 6 180
References 187
Appendix A 195
Appendix AB Glossary of Terms 227
Appendix B 231
Appendix C Survey Data 233

List of Tables

Figure 1 Nina Simon's (2010) models of visitor participation in a museum…17

Figure 2 Figure 2 Rood's (1996) Verb Classes for Wichita……59-60

Figure 3 Fishman's vitality scale from Lewis and Simon (2009)……..67

Figure 4 'tachira.s' broken down by morphemes from Rood, 1996, p. 597….148

Figure 5 Wichita Phonemes……...197

Figure 6 Wichita Vowels……..…...201

Figure 7 Practice Wichita sounds……202-203

Figure 8 Rood's 4 Verb Classes……205

Figure 9 Review of Rood's Verb Categories with examples……...208

Figure 10 Rood's Verb Categories with examples, and noun or person……210

Abstract

The last fluent speaker of the Wichita language passed away in 2016. According to many common language vitality scales in linguistics, the Wichita language would be considered extinct. However, the discourse about this has been changing in the past decade or two. Languages like Wampanoag and Myaamia have been revitalized even though they no longer had living fluent speakers. It is even argued that these languages were not really extinct because there was significant documentation of the languages and a community of people whose ancestors spoke it. The Wichita language is in a similar situation. It may not be extinct because they have semi-speakers and documentation in a new community archive. They also have several positive language ideologies that are conducive to revitalization. These were discovered when about 50 participants took surveys and the results are expounded on hereafter. The Wichita have already created community-based cultural programs such as their archive and a new museum, which could also be used as tools in language revitalization. With documentation, productive language ideologies, and community-based efforts, the tribe may still be able to revitalize their language.

Chapter 1
Community-Based Language Archives, Museums and Language Revitalization

Introduction

In recent years field linguists have become increasingly aware of the need to change their approach in field work and involve the community more in their work. These models of community-based research in linguistics are finding their way into memory institutions like museums and archives. This is an important movement in language revitalization, one that many researchers believe is both more effective and more ethical. Community-based models can be powerful tools for indigenous communities in independently developing and directing their own revitalization efforts. My interest in community-based museums and language archives is in their potential for positive social change, empowerment for endangered language speakers and as a tool for revitalizing language and culture.

The following is a case study of the Wichita, a Native American tribe based in Oklahoma with a heritage language so endangered that there are no

longer any fluent first language speakers. Such languages are generally thought of as extinct. However, that label may be premature because there are semi-speakers in the community and there is some documentation in a new tribal archive. I will argue that more community-based revitalization activities in the Wichita tribe can still be done even if the entire language cannot be revitalized. My argument is based on language knowledge and ideologies in the tribe, documentation in the archive, and the tribe's ability to create other culturally revitalizing community-based projects, such as their archive and museum. The Wichita's archive and museum may both be useful in education and revitalization of language and culture. Their unique models of these community endeavors may also be useful to other people who are interested in similar projects and they demonstrate how issues in community-based institutions might work. These issues include topics like how many people are involved, who makes decisions, whether or not outside help is ethical or productive, and what some of the advantages and disadvantages might be in community-based work.

I start with a literature review about community-based archives, museums and language revitalization to provide a foundation for how these ideas are implemented in The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes. Problems created when memory institutions are not community-based are outlined. For now the discussion concerns only museums and archives even though other memory institutions like libraries share similar philosophies and practices. Many of the

arguments apply to both archives and museums even if only one is featured in the example or source.

Next there is a discussion of how community-based approaches in linguistics can apply to museums and language archives and how they can solve many of the problems identified.

The Wichita And Affiliated Tribes will be introduced in more depth in chapter 2, including some history that has led to their current situation and a sketch of the Wichita language. In chapter 3 there is an examination of what makes a language "extinct" and how languages without speakers have been revitalized. This chapter also explores the importance of language ideologies and some of the ideologies in the Wichita tribe. I conducted surveys with the tribe about the archive and language revitalization, and community responses to the surveys are given in chapter 3. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss the Wichita archive and museum including how they were built, who was involved and what they contain.

It may be helpful to offer a rudimentary definition of the word 'community.' It will denote at different times a range of groups as it is used in various contexts. In a very loose sense, a community is any group of people who are connected by some meaningful similarity such as a common goal or identity. This 'meaningful similarity' could also be a shared language or

culture, a common ancestor, a hobby, a particular worldview, a political alignment, or perhaps an identity of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality or social class. Most often the word 'community' is used below to refer to groups of Native Americans who are stakeholders in some archive or museum collection such as the Spokane or Wichita tribes. (See 3.4 for a discussion about who might be included in "the Wichita community.")

1.2 Problems Minorities Face in Traditional Museums and Archives

When you visit a museum, archive, or other memory institution, you are generally only presented with one side of any story. Good curators and archivists strive to accurately represent a number of cultures and historical events, but minorities are often overlooked, forgotten or misrepresented. At times they are intentionally left out. The stories presented to you in a museum are those of the majority, the familiar and the powerful members of society. When minorities are included, museums and archives are very influential in how their materials and stories are presented. It is not always in a fair or flattering way.

These institutions can have an impact on their audience in every step of curation. They influence not only the way that we perceive items, but also the

way we perceive whole cultures, races or events. This starts with what objects or subjects are chosen for a collection. As Gaither (1992) puts it:

> Museums are collecting institutions. In amassing the objects and artifacts that will be the basis of their interpretations, museums also signal which materials they regard as important. In the process, they convey to their publics a sense of direction regarding cultural, scientific, and historical interests. (p. 41)

Shilton and Srinivasan (2007) echo this message as it pertains to archives: "Archivists choose which records to preserve and discard, using the power of appraisal to consciously or unconsciously assert chosen narratives as truth while ignoring or reframing others" (p.88).

Even characters from the progressive cartoon *The Pinky Show* tell us that everything about the way objects are presented in museums communicates their importance, emphasizes the museum's authority to decide what is important and "guides the visitor's experience." This includes lining up objects on blank walls with no context, labeling everything with simple, and maybe somewhat vague, academic language and serious fonts. Museums are like "factories where certain values are manufactured and distributed to society" (*The Pinky Show,* 2008). These issues can surface in language documentation and revitalization as well such as when linguists decide independently of communities what to preserve and how to interpret it, what language ideologies or teaching practices to promote or discourage and how they choose to reconstruct a language.

The way items are described and arranged also influence an audience. An interesting and positive example of this was B. N. Goswamy's (1991) art exhibits on *rasas* in the 80s. (Rasa: les neuf visages de l'art Indien, Grand Palais, paris, 1986 and Essence of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum, San Francisco, 1986.) In Indian art, *rasa* is a complex theory about aesthetic experience and the intense, almost divine experiences that art can evoke. There are eight *rasas* that correspond with different colors and emotions: the erotic, the comic, the furious, the pathetic, the heroic, the terrible, the odious, the marvelous and the quiescent.

Goswamy organized the exhibit to help the viewer experience *rasas.* Art was grouped together according to the *rasa* that Goswamy perceived when he viewed it. He disregarded common strategies of arrangement like chronological order and included very little data about when and where objects were created and who created them. His intention was to discourage the type of intellectual conversations that art historians have about that type of information. Instead, he wanted viewers to have an emotional experience with art. When the exhibit was moved from France to San Francisco, the objects were placed in rooms painted completely with the colors that correspond to the *rasas* in *rasa* theory. Goswamy (1991) observed that the colored rooms provided a "palpable heightening of effect, of feeling" (p. 76). He

felt that through these exhibits some viewers were "able to feel the texture of the Indian mind" (p. 75).

It is instructive to note that Goswamy was not only a scholar and a museum director, but also a member of the community he represented. His presentation of Indian *rasas* was not simply a matter of creative and skillful application of exhibition principles. Rather, part of the power of his exhibit came from his native knowledge of the culture that was represented. His exhibition was a representation of himself, his understanding of his own culture and the art history of his people, and his experience with *rasas.* It may have felt foreign to many viewers, but to Goswamy it was correct and personal. He was able to expose non-Indians to new ideas and cultural understandings of the world and bring this knowledge back to Indians who were not familiar with *rasas*. His influence on an Indian's learning experience in the exhibit could have been more authoritative and intimate because he belonged to their community.

Unfortunately, not every community has the advantage of having their own curator or participating in the creation of every exhibit about themselves. In the case of the Wichita tribe, a tribal museum has been built. They will be able to create their own exhibits and act as their own curator or hire one of their choice.

Without a curator, archivist or linguist in the community, the representation and interpretation of identities and cultural objects are often taken up by an outsider. Without insider input, artifacts, documents, photos, art, tools and recordings become decontextualized. When materials are separated from the people, places, and functions that give them meaning there is loss of knowledge. This process occurs in language shift as well; even if words are preserved, their cultural meanings or historical context may be lost without insider knowledge. Even more than that, the community itself can become disenfranchised. Ivan Karp (1992) summed this up well when he labeled the ability to define peoples and society as a source of power. It is "The power to represent: to reproduce structures of belief and experience through which cultural differences are understood" (p. 1-2). Sometimes museums and archives build structures of belief that enforce what the audience already believes. They do not always let minority communities contribute their understanding to the narrative or challenge conventional beliefs. This has been especially true of Native American communities in the United States.

Shilton and Srinivasan (2007) contend that cultural or historical misrepresentation is a form of appropriation.

> …archives have appropriated the histories of marginalized communities, creating archives *about* rather than *of* the communities….In these cases, archivists have created further damage by applying arrangements and descriptions of the "other" to form incomplete and decontextualized representations of cultural groups. (p. 89)

Shilton and Srinivasan's distinction between the prepositions *about* and *of* is aptly chosen. The word *of* conveys ownership and participation. An exhibit or a description *of* a community belongs to them because they participated in its creation and description, and they accept that it fits their identity or perception of themselves. In contrast, exhibits *about* a community are not unlike gossiping behind someone's back. The gossiper can say anything true or not because the person(s) gossiped about are not present. Those gossiped about do not have the ability to respond and cannot agree, disagree or defend themselves. Communities that have no input into exhibits, collections or linguistic descriptions about themselves are in a similar situation. They were not present to make choices about context, meaning, function, presentation or access. They are being talked *about* without any power to change, correct or enhance the dialogue. Mitra (2001) adds that they lose their voice because they are being spoken *for* instead of speaking themselves.

Another problem that minority groups might face when their cultural materials are in exhibits or archives is that of access. Some groups are eager to share stories and artifacts. Others may prefer not to share any cultural materials and knowledge at all. Still others may follow rules of access based on cultural hierarchies or taboos within their own society. For example, some materials may be meant only for women, only for elders, or only for men who have passed initiation ceremonies. In linguistic description, access can be

denied to speakers if the linguist publishes information that is difficult to understand without linguistic training. When access is decided by an outsider, things that are sacred can become common and exploited and private matters are made public. This in turn can hurt relationships within a community or between communities. These practices can cause shame, embarrassment or resentment that may be directed at other community members, other communities or the institutions themselves. As a result, some indigenous communities have become distrustful of institutions like museums and of researchers and it is more difficult to develop good relationships.

There are many responsible curators and archivists who do not mean to cause problems, of course. When materials are sensitive or when access restrictions are specified in contracts, materials may be kept from the public. However, this is not always possible. Museums may be obligated to make their collections public by law or donation contracts. This is sometimes the case when museums receive their collections from private collectors who are not indigenous. Or it may be the case that directors do not realize the cultural significance of items in their possession. There is always risk for making this mistake without community involvement.

Institutions are also conscious of diversity and may try to be fair and tell narratives other than their own in an accurate, respectful manner. However, no one can possibly gather every document or artifact in order to tell every side of every story. And even if one could, we simply cannot break

away cleanly from our biases. Ivan Karp (1992) presents a quandary that curators and archivists must face. Even when they try to respect other cultures and societies…

> Yet they are also members of communities, and bring to their world personal and communal histories that often relate to and interact with the histories of the communities that compose the consistency of their museums. This complex situation creates a postmodern problem for museums. First, they must fashion exhibitions that can present multiple perspectives on the world. Then they must ensure that those perspectives respect but also are critical of not only the museums' own worldview but also the worldview of the people whose lives, culture, knowledge, and objects they are exhibiting. (p.22)

This is a daunting if not impossible task. Marzio (1991) gave another reason why museums might not feature exhibits about (or by) minorities: budgeting. Museums do not always have the funds to create exhibits about minority communities, do the research that must accompany those exhibits or reach out to minorities. Because museums are under pressure to generate revenue, Marzio argues that they are forced to act like commercial, for-profit businesses which forces directors to ask themselves if they can afford exhibits dealing with minorities. Unfortunately, "If a director does not ask that question, he or she should look for another job" (p. 124).

It is of special interest to me that these problems of decontextualization, misrepresentation, appropriation, marginalization, access and conflicting narratives create yet another problem. They work against language and cultural revitalization efforts.

Archives are important in language revitalization in part because documentation is important in revitalization. An integral part of documentation is preservation so that language will be of use for generations of speakers and researchers to come. Therefore, handling metadata well and having a sound plan to safely archive language materials is paramount in any documentation project. Language revitalization is the primary reason that led the Wichita to create their own archive. They wanted to organize the language information they have, preserve it, analyze it for gaps and continue adding to it, and give access of the language materials to their own members. Languages that have almost completely disappeared may be brought back with good archives and documentation processes.

However, documentation alone is not enough to revitalize languages. Materials must be accessible for people to use. A linguist can record and analyze everything there is to know about a language but it will be useless to change the life of any language or speaker if it only gathers dust in an archive. Materials that are decontextualized, appropriated or otherwise divorced from the community to which they belong only exacerbate this problem. This applies to museums and archives as well. They can safely store materials but cultures and languages cannot be revitalized from items that have been stripped of their contextualized meaning and community.

1.3. Community Involvement in Museums, Archives and Language Revitalization

Some of the problems identified when communities are not involved in archives, museum exhibits and language work that pertain to them are decontextualization, misrepresentation, appropriation, marginalization, access, damaged relationships, language loss and conflicting worldviews. A commonality among all the problems is that the community is missing from spaces where they could contextualize their own materials, tell their stories from their own viewpoint and be part of conversations about themselves. Community-based archives and museums seek to fix these root problems. So what is a community-based archive or museum and how might they function?

Linn (2014) compares community-based archives to community involvement by linguists as described by Cameron et. al (1992), Grinevald (2003), Rice (2009) and Czaykowska-Higgins (2009). She begins with Czaykowska-Higgins' five levels of community involvement by a linguist. First, in the Linguist Focused model, the linguist is a detached expert. A small step up from there is the Linguist-Focused Research, where the linguist's research is the focus. More and more linguists are beginning to think of these first two levels as "old school" approaches where a linguist studies the language and interacts with people only for that purpose. In the third stage, Advocacy Research, research is now *for* the community and not just the linguist or a scientific organization. However, the research is still conducted and controlled

by the expert linguist. In the fourth level, Empowering Research, the research is done *with* the community. The community is more involved, their needs drive the decision-making process and the linguist is not the only expert. The fifth level, Community-Based Language Research, is even more deeply set in the community. Here, research is done *by* the community and they are involved in every step from a project's conception. The linguist may act as a consultant or be trained by the community. Theoretical work may still be done by the linguist, but it is not the focus. Whatever work the linguist does will be for the benefit of the community. In Chapter 3 I will discuss more closely how the Wichita archive fits into this model and where there might be room for improvement.

Next, Linn breaks down how some of Czaykowska-Higgins' levels might look in an archive. She explains that Advocacy Research in an archive might entail being a backup repository for Indigenous archives, giving advice, or providing editing skills for an archive grant application. At this level, archivists might be aware of local communities and notify them if they have collections that might be of interest to them. In the Empowering Research model, archivists may train community members on how to use software or community members may be actively engaged in describing collections or deciding who can access their collections. With the community's needs in mind, the linguist or archivist may even help create language lessons or dictionaries. Linn also describes how communities can be involved with the traditional archiving processes of appraisal (choosing what goes into the

archive), arrangement (organizing) and description (ethnographic information and metadata). Finally, an archive can mimic the Community-Based Language Research model in linguistics by creating participatory or Community-Based Archives. It involves "engagement between researchers and communities from the outset and in all steps along the way. Community needs and wishes drive the whole project" (p. 56). This type of research is oriented around practical applications, tangible results in language revitalization, and social changes. The community knows that the archive is not so much a storage box as it is a tool to accomplish their own goals.

In Simon's (2010) well researched book "The Participatory Museum," she gives many examples of participatory museums, often where visitors to a museum interact with exhibits somehow. Like the linguists above, she also explains various levels of participation. It is important to note that Simon wrote for a different audience with different purposes in mind than those for whom Linn and Czaykowska-Higgins wrote. Linn and Czaykowska-Higgins had in mind indigenous communities, cultural and linguistic revitalization and the linguists and archivists who might be involved with these communities or efforts.

In the preface of The Participatory Museum, Simon explains that her book "presents techniques for cultural institutions to invite visitor participation while promoting institutional goals" (Simon 2010). While she

may have targeted a broader audience, her work is directly applicable to our topic and could easily be adjusted to fit community needs.

Simon discusses four models of visitor participation, Contributory, Collaborative, Co-Creative and Hosted. To help institutions assess their goals and plans for visitor participation, she offers questions and suggestions for how to create each model. A summary of this information is given in a chart provided in her book and which I give below:

	Contributory	Collaborative	Co-Creative	Hosted
How much staff time will you commit to managing the project and working with participants?	We can manage it lightly, the way we'd maintain an interactive exhibit. But we ideally want to set it up and let it run.	We will manage the process, but we're going to set the rules of engagement based on our goals and capacity.	We will give much time as it takes to make sure participants are able to accomplish their goals.	As little as possible - we want to set it up and let it run on its own.
What kinds of skills do you want participants to gain from their activities during the project?	Creation of content, collection of data, or sharing of personal expression. Use of technological tools to support content creation and sharing.	Everything supported by contributory projects, plus the ability to analyze, curate, design, and deliver completed products.	Everything supported by collaborative projects, plus project conceptualization, goal-setting, and evaluation skills.	None that the institution will specifically impart, except perhaps around program promotion and audience engagement.
What goals do you have for how non-participating visitors will perceive the project?	The project will help visitors see themselves as potential participants and see the institution as interested in their active involvement.	The project will help visitors see the institution as a place dedicated to supporting and connecting with community.	The project will help visitors see the institution as a community-driven place. It will also bring in new audiences connected to the participants.	The project will attract new audiences who might not see the institution as a comfortable or appealing place for them.

	Contributory	Collaborative	Co-Creative	Hosted
What kind of commitment does your institution have to community engagement?	We're commited to helping our visitors and members feel like participants with the institution.	We're commited to deep partnerships with some target communities.	We're commited to supporting the needs of target communities whose goals align with the institutional mission.	We're committed to inviting community members to feel comfortable using the institution for their own purposes.
How much control do you want over the participatory process and product?	A lot - we want participants to follow our rules of engagement and give us what we request.	Staff will control the process, but participants' actions will steer the direction and content of the final product.	Some, but participants' goals and preferred working styles are just as important as those of the staff.	Not much - as long as participants follow our rules, they can produce what they want.
How do you see the institution's relationship with participants during the project?	The institution requests content and the participants supply it, subject to institutional rules.	The institution sets the project concept and plan, and then staff members work closely with participants to make it happen.	The institution gives participants the tools to lead the project and then supports their activities and helps them move forward successfully.	The institution gives the participants rules and resources and then lets the participants do their own thing.
Who do you want to participate and what kind of commitment will you seek from participants?	We want to engage as many visitors as possible, engaging them briefly in the context of a museum or online visit.	We expect some people will opt in casually, but most will come with the explicit intention to participate.	We seek participants who are intentionally engaged and are dedicated to seeing the project all the way through.	We'd like to empower people who are ready to manage and implement their project on their own.

Figure 1 Nina Simon's (2010) models of visitor participation in a museum

In each of Simon's models, the institution has already been established and already has its own goals and values. This is different from the Community-Based Language Research envisioned by Czaykowska-Higgins where linguists might be hired as consultants or adopt the community's goals as their own. In many cases it would be fair to say that it is the indigenous community that is already established and the linguist or archivist is the visitor.

Visitors are meant to engage with the museum's exhibits in each model in such a way that enhances both the exhibit and visitors' learning experiences. In Simon's Contributory model, visitors might contribute something that the museums ask for. They do not create or build the exhibit, but they participate in novel ways beyond simply viewing materials. She cites for example a project by the Denver Community Museum that asked participants to fill a bottle with memories, perhaps in trinkets or photos. An exhibit was made from all the bottles that were contributed. In Simon's Collaborative model, community members may become temporary employees or consultants to collaborate with the museum on some project. In Simon's Co-Creative model the museum begins to look to the community's goals as well as their own. Finally, the Hosting model features exhibits that are ideally completely built and maintained by members of the community with the museum acting only as a space for exhibits, a guide or perhaps just an institution with which a community can be associated.

Simon mentions that a Hosted model could appeal to communities who do not view the museum as a comfortable place or who do not see it as relevant in their lives. This could apply to indigenous communities who feel alienated by museums. Perhaps the Hosting model could act as a bridge in regaining trust and involvement. While some may feel that the best approach would be synonymous with the most amount of agency and therefore indigenous communities should have free reign with every aspect of their exhibits, it would be wise to remember that museums staff can help community members avoid pitfalls like copyright violations. Simon mentions that museums sometimes offer training both in avoiding legal risks and in successful design principles.

Some communities might appreciate training in museum studies, archival best practices and linguistic analysis. Training could be viewed as a way to learn modern and effective techniques to reach audiences. For example, the Wichita have looked to outside sources for some assistance in building their museum, archive and linguistic documentation. For their own goals and purposes, the Wichita do not seem to have concerns about telling their stories through conventional museum practices. However, others will recognize and resent that museums are a Western invention built on Western principles. For some communities, museums will feel foreign, imperialistic and colonizing. Building a Western style museum could clash with indigenous cultural values,

traditions and practices. Every community is unique and respecting their perspectives will be vital for any measure of success.

Communities that want to create a space modeled after a museum but do not want to receive training in creating Western style exhibits or be associated with any particular institution could consider opening their own as the Wichita have done. The Wichita tribe has chosen to work with outside experts to some extent in creating their museum but every community-owned and run archive or museums will be different. Buccitelli (2004) compares three "native-run" museums, their strengths and weaknesses and describes her experience visiting them. The first two were started and owned by Native Americans as well. First, the Tantaquidgeon Museum established in 1931 is still owned by the Tantaquidgeon family of the Mohegan tribe in Uncasville, Connecticut. Nestled behind their family house, the small museum "comes from modest origins and was undertaken as a labor of love" (p. 14). Unlike many trained curators who prioritize preservation, the Tantaquidgeon family believes that objects have a life span. They allow visitors to handle all the objects to enhance learning and maybe even connect with community ancestors who made the objects. Buccitelli's second museum is the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center in Mashantucket Connecticut. It was funded by the tribe's successful Foxwood Resort Casino and by visitor fees. It makes extensive use of technology and has large, elaborate displays including life size dioramas of Native Americans engaged in

traditional everyday activities in an artificial woodland. These two museums have different origins, goals, procedures, atmospheres, and objects but each of them fulfill a need for the tribe that was not already met by a museum.

Other researchers and archivists have also used various models of community-based or participatory archives. Kate Theimer's (2011) definition of a participatory archive is

> An organization, site or collection in which people other than the archives professionals contribute knowledge or resources resulting in increased understanding about archival materials, usually in an online environment.

For her, the participatory archive does not include opinions, feelings, art or fun. Its purpose is to gather knowledge or resources that will increase understanding about archival materials.

The goals and vision of Huvila (2008) are spelled out in the title of his article "Participatory archive: towards decentralized curation, radical user orientation, and broader contextualization of records management." In his description of decentralized curation, participants from the community have the most knowledge about records so they should share responsibilities for curation. In radical user orientation, findability and usability become priorities over the traditionally higher value of preservation. For Huvila, radical user orientation is more than just using the archive, it is also participating in the archival process. The last principle in his model, contextualization of records

and the archival process, acknowledges the importance of originators, curators and users, and not just the record. Community involvement is taken to a new level because an archivist is not even necessary. Huvila wants to engage users, not archivists, in archival tasks. 'Information managers' can provide tools to work in the archive and help maintain them. Some linguists (including Speas (2009) discussed in chapter 3) have similar theories; linguists are not needed and a community can revitalize a language alone. Though such a goal would be more difficult without any fluent speakers as is the case for the Wichita tribe.

All of these researchers have somewhat different priorities and conceptions of community–based research and archives. Huvila points out for example that in Shilton and Srinivasan's (2008) model in Los Angeles, the community is comprised of South Asians who will share their heritage and identity. But his archive in a Finnish castle has no predetermined community.

> The 'community' is a sum of all individual structures, descriptions, orders, and viewpoints contributed by individual participating archive users whether they are users or contributors, archivists, researchers, administrators, labourers, or belong to marginalized communities or the majority. (p. 18-19)

Despite the differences articulated by each archivist, curator or linguist, they share a dedication to community involvement as a methodology in their practices and in fulfilling community needs. They share the idea that their work can be accomplished by the community and that individuals in the

community should be treated as experts and equals when it comes to narratives about their unique experiences and cultures. Many are advocates for these ideas because they believe this is the most effective and ethical way to work. These are foundational principles that can be used to build a community-based program that is unique in every community.

And because every community is unique, any program that addresses their situations will have to be molded specifically for them. Before starting an archive or a revitalization program, a thorough investigation should be done to assess the circumstances, goals and abilities in every tribe or group. Programs should be frequently reevaluated as they progress because circumstances and needs will change. Grenoble and Whaley (2006) offer a fairly comprehensive list of variables that should be taken into account in the local society, the region, on a national level and sometimes even on a global level. Some of Grenoble and Whaley's variables include language attitudes within the community and the surrounding region, politics and policies, language in education, government support, demographics, religion, literacy rates and human resources in the community. For example, a community that has no funds or government support will need to be approached differently than a community that has funds but negative language attitudes or few human resources. An effort to revitalize endangered languages in India or places in Europe where English may be socially important will need a different

approach than for societies who already speak a dominant language but feel it was forced on them.

Grenoble and Whaley wrote about these variables with revitalization programs in mind, but they could apply to creating community-based memory institutions as well, especially if revitalization is a goal. They will need funds to be built and dedicated community members to be sustained. They require positive attitudes toward language and culture, people with some knowledge of technology or a willingness to learn and possible government support and funds. A few of these concerns were included in the Wichita surveys discussed in chapter 3. One of the reasons that revitalization activities are possible in the tribe is that there are positive attitudes and many people are willing to volunteer or learn new skills for the archive or revitalization.

An archive could also be constructed differently depending on the goals and circumstances of the people who will use it. For example, collections might revolve around particular interests or available documents. One tribe may have very few documents in their language but maybe they have a copy of the Bible translated into their language by missionaries. Early revitalization efforts could be focused on understanding that translation. Another community concerned with preserving cultural knowledge with their language might collect pictures of plants or actual plant specimens with descriptions of them and their uses. Some communities might have collections separated into categories based on cultural rules of access and keep policies restricting

materials to certain groups. One archive could collect documents in languages and dialects that are related to theirs while a neighboring community might speak an isolated language with no confirmed linguistic family. One community might possess all of their language materials while another group might be negotiating ownership of their materials with a local university or museum. Archives might be kept in offices or digitized, available to anyone or highly restricted, maintained by volunteers or paid employees, funded by a grant or paid for by the tribe. Some situations will be more ideal than others. Every situation will need to be carefully analyzed when planning for projects with the potential to impact the entire community.

Additionally, success should be defined based on the abilities of each community. Obtaining goals is partly dependent on setting goals that are realistic and that will not be the same for everyone. Whatever goals a community is able to reach will depend on their own unique definition of success.

1.4 Seeking Solutions with Community-Based Archives, Museums and Language Revitalization

Besides the benefits mentioned in section 2, community-based memory institutions and language revitalization activities could be an answer to the

problems listed in section 1 including decontextualization, misrepresentation, appropriation, marginalization, access and conflicting worldviews. Community-based programs empower communities in several practical ways. Instead of their identity being in the hands of an academic or other outside professional, the community defines themselves and their experiences. They have a choice in what the public learns about them and have the opportunity to speak to the public themselves. They have the opportunity to be involved in decision-making throughout the process. Their needs and customs might direct schemes of organization or presentation, inform description or affect other stages of the process. Communities are empowered when they can return context to cultural materials and their narrative is valued equally with experts' research. In the case of the Wichita museum and archive, they are the experts and authorities themselves even with some outside expertise. They should be able to create more community-based language revitalization programs the way they have created an archive and museum.

Shilton and Srinivasan (2007) assert that archives

> must now explore methods of arrangement and description that resist objectification and instead actively empower the records, projecting voices spoken by and for the community that reflect the original content and knowledge structures of their community creation. (p. 24)

Communities that contribute to archives and museums are also able to limit access, even among their own members. Indigenous people can offer knowledge and context about materials that are at risk of being lost without

them. Community-based archives, museums and revitalization are also an opportunity for repatriation.

Repatriation doesn't have to mean that tribes gain something and another institution loses it. The Plateau Peoples' Web Portal described by linguist Kimberly Christen (2011) is a notable example of digital repatriation that benefits Native Americans, scholars, the local archive and the general public. It was "designed to allow Plateau peoples not only access to their cultural heritage collections at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington, and beyond, but also facilitate the reciprocal curation of these materials"(p. 193). She explains that it was created with several of the community's goals and needs in mind. They wanted tribal members from many different areas to be able to have access to cultural objects and documents and they wanted to contribute their knowledge to the archive. There was a need for materials to be cheaply reproduced and widely distributed. They wanted to ensure their voices would not be dismissed or treated as secondary to the archive's narratives. There needed to be a way for the tribes to exercise their political sovereignty in cultural practice and declare their alternative worldviews. The project's collaborators designed the Portal to fulfill these needs as best as they could in keeping with both the Protocols for Native American Archival Material and the laws by which the museum is bound.

For instance, the museum is obligated to allow the public to access its materials, but the tribe can set restrictions for access on the materials that they upload onto the site. A unique feature of the archive allows for restrictions based on cultural customs and traditions. For the Plateau people, no one knows everything. Some materials are only meant for women's eyes, only for elders or only for adults. The restrictions to access on the site allow tribal members to follow their own traditions and only view what they feel is culturally appropriate.

Christen (2011) responded to the complaint that access is a kind of unfair censorship. She suggests that

> reminding ourselves that censorship itself is practiced within specific political boundaries might help us understand that not every instance of "not seeing" is an abuse of power, but instead a practical implementation of cultural protocols aimed at maintaining specific types of knowledge in a world characterized by human differences. (p. 191)

Tribal members can also log on under their particular tribe and upload material or add description and metadata to material that has been uploaded by scholars or the museums at Washington State University. All of the tribal and academic representatives who collaborated on the project agreed that they did not want to erase scholarly research that had been done. Instead tribes add to the narrative that is already there by correcting mistakes and contributing their point of view. Anyone who uses the site can view objects and read a description for it from the museum under one tab. Immediately

adjacent is a tab for the tribe that shows the same object but with descriptions from community members. For example, I went to the site and viewed a woman's cornhusk bag from the Spokane tribe. Information from the museum indicated among other things the bag's size, its approximate date of creation, and materials that were used to make it. In contrast, members of the Spokane tribe wrote in a casual tone, made guesses and asked questions. They added that it looked like something an older woman would probably wear on a belt and the name of the person who donated the object. Another person commented that she doubted it was from the Spokane tribe at all because the item is listed with a person whose surname is Daniels, which she associates with the Coeur d'Alene tribe (Cornhusk bag). On another page, the museum describes a Yakama storage basket as having geometric designs. Members of the community gave the basket a name in their own language and explained that the geometric shapes are probably a family design (Storage Basket). Information from the museum and the tribe are presented side by side to emphasize that they are equal. Neither is superior as an organization or as a source of knowledge and this can lead to more respect and understanding of indigenous ways of knowing. Both are useful and important.

As will be the case in other institutions, community involvement made the Plateau People's collection richer, more meaningful, and I think, more interesting. Voices from communities outside of own could expand our understanding of other people and teach worldviews that may be unfamiliar.

Archives or museums have the potential to bring communities together by teaching us about each other.

Community members without formal training in these areas can still do a great deal of good work. For example, some of the Wichita tribe's greatest contributions to their own archive is elicitation sessions and songs recorded by tribal members themselves. They may have had some training or experience from linguist Dr. David Rood, a prominent linguist who has worked more with the Wichita language than any other scholar. Much of the language documentation that exists in Wichita and the vast majority of the linguistic analysis on the language is his work. Some work can be done by the Wichita and other tribal members themselves. It takes many long years of studying complicated concepts to be a linguist, but communities may be interested in a much smaller concentration of information and skills - those that pertain to their own language alone. This could make the process of learning relevant information faster. Tribal members have the ability learn a variety of skills in order to meet their own goals.

Stenzel (2014) spent a great deal of her research time in South America in workshops and training community members (on location) how to help with documentation, use equipment and other capacity building. She notes that community members may or may not carry on with linguistic projects without her. However, they have the ability to do so and with that comes greater autonomy. Community members also seemed to be proud of what they

had done together and among the Wa'ikhana, whose language was threatened by language shift,

> a number of people said that they felt their language use had really been strengthened by participation in the project, that they felt more confident and positive about the prospective for maintenance of the language. (p 303)

As with the community contributions in the Plateau People's Web Portal, community involvement in linguistic endeavors and museums can benefit more than just the community in question. Yamada (2007) described training Kari'nja speakers in Suriname to be mutually beneficial; her primary consultant and friend, Chief Mandé, was able to use their work in his teaching efforts and she was able to gain "access to speaker insights" because he had learned enough about linguistics to be able to talk about his language with her (p. 266). She argues that the participatory model enabled her to fulfill both academic requirements and Kari'nja goals.

The practice of including people without academic training in an academic enterprise is not new. Museums have used citizen science for decades with success. For example, the Cornell Lab of Ornithography recruits volunteers to send in information about birds wherever they live. The volunteers are able to learn more about science and birds and the lab benefits from the data they collect. Bonney et. al (2009) states that "Citizen science projects have been remarkably successful in advancing scientific knowledge." The museum's publications using this kind of data include studies about

population changes, the affects of the environment on breeding, and the spread of disease among animals. There is no reason that more curators, archivists, linguists and communities could not imagine and create projects that involve mutually beneficial community involvement.

1.5 Conclusions

This chapter summarizes some of the major problems that marginalized communities face with memory institutions that misrepresent them. Community-based institutions can solve many of these problems and some of their benefits have been described. These arguments are connected to revitalization because community-based efforts could be the most effective way to renew a language and memory institutions often play an important part in that process. The following chapters will on community-based efforts and language activities in the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes.

Chapter 2
A Brief Introduction to The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes

The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes are historically important groups of plains tribes in the United States. They believe they have always been here, in Oklahoma, Kansas and Texas. There are dozens of tribes in Oklahoma today but the others were forcibly relocated from all over the country. The Wichita groups alone are native to the area. Like many Native Americans, the United States has been a source of great suffering, causing among other things, loss of land, life, and language. Today the Wichita may still be lacking in some resources, but they are a resilient people. They have overcome many trials and their numbers are growing. Below is a brief introduction to their recent history, some current situations and a linguistic sketch of the Wichita language.

2.1 Wichita Recent History

The term 'Wichita' comes from settlers and explorers, possibly borrowed from another native language. The Wichita called themselves Kirikir?i:s, meaning "raccoon-eyed." This name refers to the tattoos they used

to have on their faces, especially around their eyes. Both men and women used to have many tattoos on their bodies, the patterns differing in purposes and patterns for each gender. Dorsey (1904) reports reasons for tattoos included memorializing achievements (he mentions a tattoo of bird feet for when a boy kills his first bird) symbolizing legendary figures (men had three stars to represent the mythical guardians of warriors 'Flint-Stone-Lying Down') as a way to distinguish their women from other tribes and as a form of protection for specific body parts.

Traditionally, the Wichita people were semi-sedentary. They lived in villages with sturdy grass houses for part of the year where they cultivated crops like corn, beans, squash and pumpkin. During the fall and winter, people left the village for extended bison hunting trips. During this time, they lived in tipis similar to other tribes and returned to their grass houses again in the spring.

The houses were built solely by the women of the tribe. Holland (2015) gives a thorough description of building the houses. First, a new site for houses would be chosen by a village leader and then people in the tribe helped gather and strip the bark from long poles of cedar wood. Stripping the bark helped keep bugs out of the wood. Upright poles were inserted in the ground in the shape of a circle and they had a Y shape at the top for horizontal poles to be placed. Four longer willow poles were placed outside of the cedar poles. They symbolized the Four Winds or Four Directions in Wichita mythology and were

believed to be the main strength of the household. Horizontal willow poles were tied to the upright poles from bottom to top and the tops of the long poles were secured together and represented the Creator or Great Spirit. With the frame complete next came the very long, thick bundles of prairie grass. The grass was added layer after layer starting from the bottom and working up. It was secured to the frame with small horizontal willow poles and tied with cordage and a long bison needle that was pushed through the grass. The houses were warm and dry and were about 15-30 feet in diameter. There was an eastern and western doorway with a lean-to door and somewhere around 6-12 beds. Various objects were hung on the walls off the floor and a fireplace was in the middle so smoke could escape from the hole in the top. These houses could last several years if well cared for. (Dorsey 1904; Holland 2015.)

The grass houses are still one of the most recognizable symbols of the Wichita. Today visitors to the Wichita History Center can see one standing outside the museum and a grass house is featured on the official seal of The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes. There are not many sources on Wichita history, but it is likely they all include a picture or description of these iconic houses.

Besides building houses, women were also responsible for all the agricultural work and much more. A European in the late 18th century is reported to observe that Wichita women also tanned, sewed and painted hides, erected fences, took care of the house and the children, fetched firewood

and prepared food (Pool, 1988, p. 160). On the other hand, men were the hunters and warriors.

Archaeologists believe that the Wichita have been here for several hundred years at least. The first record of them from outsiders was when the Spanish conquistador and explorer Francisco Vazquez de Coronado encountered them around 1541. Over the next three centuries they dealt with the Spanish and French before their extended relationship with the United States began. Trading with these European groups changed their material culture but they retained their own culture in other ways.

Historian F. Todd Smith wrote the most detailed history of the Wichitas and the Caddos, a group of tribes with which they had close ties, from 1846 - 1901. Most of the following history is from Smith (1996) because the events during this period led to dividing Wichita land into allotments. These events are crucial in understanding the current situation of the Wichita and their worldviews that stem from recent history.

The Wichitas and Caddos speak linguistically related languages though they were probably not mutually intelligible. Included in the Wichita tribes were the Waco, the Toavaya, the Tawakoni and a group often referred to as "Wichita proper" in the literature.[1] Caddo tribes included the Nadaco and the

[1] The Wichita do not use this phrase themselves.

Kichai, the latter of which would come to be associated with the Wichita. In the history that follows, the various tribes now associated with the Wichita and Affiliated tribes may referred to simply as Wichita tribes.

Prior to 1846, the Wichita and Caddo groups had already been forced to move several times. Other tribes were being relocated into their traditional territories in present day Oklahoma. Resources were becoming scarcer and some of the Wichita's new neighbors were unfriendly and possessive of the resources in their new territories. In addition to this, they may have also been fleeing from enemies such as the Osages. Some of the tribes migrated south into Texas which was then annexed by the United States in 1845. Europeans settlers had also been taxing resources like bison and some of the tribes resorted to raiding Texas settlements out of necessity. The livestock that they stole was then sold in illegal markets with other indigenous peoples.[2]

In 1846 the Wichita, Caddo and other tribes signed an important treaty called The Treaty at Council Springs with the United States at Torrey's Trading Post in Texas. According to the treaty, they were now under the protection of the United States of America, they would be given provisions with which to farm, and both sides pledged peace. Any citizen that murdered an indigenous

[2] Smith refers to Native Americans throughout his book as "Indians." This seems reasonable because he was writing about history before they became citizens of the United States. However, the term "Indians" is often considered problematic in a modern context. The term 'Native American' is also problematic in this context because they were not Native *Americans* until they became citizens, making the phrase anachronistic for most of their history.

person would be tried and punished by the laws of the state. Furthermore, the tribes agreed to

> ….surrender stolen property and prisoners and trade only with licensed traders. In turn, the federal government pledged to keep trespassers off tribal land and promised to provide the tribes with blacksmiths, teachers, and "preachers of the gospel." The United States also agreed to set up official trading posts for the Indians and present them with an undetermined amount of gifts in the fall of 1846. (p. 18)

Unfortunately, laws regulating affairs with the tribes could not be applied to Texas so the government did not have legal power to follow through with some of their promises. White settlers continued to encroach into the territory and they were hostile toward tribal interests. In response to settlers moving closer, Wichita and Caddo groups were forced to relocate to other areas. That happened often enough that one tribal leader told the Indian Agent, Major Neighbors, that "he was hesitant to settle and plant corn since the whites might drive his tribe off before harvest time" (p 26). Some of the tribal groups were hostile in return and raids against Texans continued, particularly by the Taovayas. Neighbors knew that many other Wichita and Caddo groups were friendly, hospitable and wanted peace. He met with them and was able to arrange for friendly groups to obtain and return stolen livestock from raids against Texans. The tribe's efforts to show good faith did not win them any favors. The distrust and animosity against them among white settlers intensified and led to bloodshed on both sides several times. For example, in March 1848, Capt. Samuel Highsmith's company of Texas Rangers found a

group of Waco and Taovaya camped by a river. They attacked and 25 indigenous people were killed. In retaliation three white surveyors were killed and scalped a few days later.

During this time Major Neighbors was an invaluable friend to the Native Americans. For years he worked with both tribal members and Texans, fighting for the indigenous people to have their own separate territories from white settlers, calming them and diffusing situations, problem solving, and advocating white settlers and officials for indigenous causes among other things. In 1849 he called for a reservation system in Texas so the tribes could have their own land. For the next half a century a major theme of the tribe's troubles involved searching for a permanent home where they could have their own space to cultivate land in peace. Neighbors' reservation proposal was meant to solve this ongoing problem and protect them from hostile whites and other aggressive tribes. It was partly because of Neighbor's urging that an act was eventually passed in 1854 that gave the government vacant land in the state of Texas for the use of the tribes there. The Wichitas and Caddos were for this plan as they hoped it would end their suffering. The territory set aside for them was named Brazos after the river that ran through it.

In addition to giving the Native Americans land as a permanent home, the reservation system also provided protection and weekly rations from the government in exchange for moving there. The material support of food and occasionally other provisions such as blankets and clothes was not intended to

last forever. The plan was for the tribes to be taught how to farm and live the way that the white man did. They were to be sent teachers, preachers and tools so that they could learn English, become Christian, farm, and raise livestock in the way the Americans considered "civilized." Neighbors was among those who shared this ideology and he believed that he was helping the tribes become self-sufficient.

For their part, the tribes recognized that they would need to use the white man's tools and learn his ways to survive. Pool (1988) asserts that the traditional combination of hunting, herding and horticulture was more effective as a subsistence strategy than the cash crops that white people expected them to produce. However, in their changing world of dwindling resources and with their new dependence on some European material culture, it does not seem that the traditional ways were always possible anymore. They did not give up their own cultures and beliefs, but they recognized that education and farming tools would be a benefit. The Wichita and Caddos were already skilled agriculturalists and they were very willing to settle on the Brazos Reserve and set about planting food. Because these tribes were not hostile and because they were willing to engage in agricultural activities, it seemed that the reservation plan and its goals of assimilation were successful, but it did not last. Texans from the south and hostile Northern Comanches were vehemently against the reservation plan and the reserve people were susceptible to attacks from both sides.

Comanches also attacked and raided Texans. Wichita and Caddo groups fought with the whites against their common enemy and helped return stolen horses. On one occasion in January 1858, a party of Waco warriors tracked raiders from the north. They returned after about a month with 67 stolen horses and two Comanche prisoners who confessed that Comanches, Kiowas and Kickapoos had committed the attacks. This was important because the Wichita and Caddo were often blamed for their actions. The horses were returned to their Texan owners and the reserve tribes offered their assistance and cooperation to demonstrate their friendship and willingness to help eliminate thefts and murders. For a while, the fears of settlers on the frontier was assuaged about the reserve tribes, but in the coming years they were still often feared, despised or blamed for the hostile actions of other tribes.

The distrust among Texans for the reserve tribes was escalated by man named John R. Baylor. He had been dismissed from a position as a Comanche agent by Neighbors for negligence. In retaliation, he attempted to have Neighbors dismissed and replaced by his own friend. To that end, he spread vicious rumors about the reserve tribes and threatened to destroy them. Baylor's men stole cattle from both the tribes and other settlers who refused to help him and carried out attacks that led to several deaths on both sides. The reserve tribes had lost livestock and crops and were afraid for their safety. Eventually it was decided that the Brazos Reserve should be abandoned, and the tribes removed.

On August 1, 1859 the reserve tribes were escorted out of Texas by U.S. troops commanded by Major Thomas along with Major Neighbors. They traveled 150 miles in 17 days, mostly without incident. They had been threatened on the way out and one man, Patrick Murphy chased after them, asserting that they had stolen some of his horses. He was discouraged by Major Thomas who rebuked him and Murphy left without causing further trouble for the time being.

After the reserve tribes arrived safely in Indian Territory, Major Neighbors relinquished his role over to agent Blain and prepared to journey home. The tribes were "greatly saddened by the departure of their old friend, and every warrior shook hands with the major before he left. Some of the older men clung to Neighbors, refusing to let him go." Others cried like children and threw themselves on the ground in grief. Neighbors was so moved that leaving took all his strength (p 78). It may have been better if he had stayed.

On the way home, his party was attacked by an aggressive raiding party and later in the town streets he was shot in the back by the vengeful Murphy's brother-in-law. The two men were not punished for the murder. After devoting himself to the cause of the tribes for thirteen years, Neighbors "was rewarded with death" and the hatful prejudices of white settlers continued against indigenous people (p 78).

A Wichita Agency was established in Indian Territory and the tribes found new homes. Only a few months later the Civil War erupted and more suffering descended upon the Wichitas and Caddos. Smith reports that

> Both tribes were forced to abandon their new home in 1862 and take refuge in Union-controlled Kansas. The Wichitas and Caddos probably suffered more in the five years they spent in Kansas than at any other period in their troubled pasts. They were unable to raise crops successfully or hunt buffalo and were dependent upon the meager rations the weak Union force could supply. Hunger, combined with exposure and disease, caused both tribes to experience great population losses. (p. 70)

In 1864 headmen of the Taovaya, Kadohadacho, Waco, Kichai, Tawakoni, Nadaco, and Hainai tribes sent a heart wrenching letter to President Abraham Lincoln, their "white father." They asked him not to forget his "red children" and to assist them in their time of need. They expected help but the letter went unanswered (p 89).

After the war, the Wichita and Caddo tribes moved yet again. They left Kansas and tried to restart the reservation experiment on the Wichita Agency in Indian Territory. At the same time and unbeknownst to them, the United States was negotiating with their enemies, the Comanches and Kiowas. The Comanches and Kiowas were given land that the Wichita and Caddos believed to be their own. Not only was it a part of their traditional territory, but it was part of their home according to earlier treaties. To the north, land was given to

the Cheyenne and Arapaho, another traditional enemy of the Wichita. The aggressive tribes had agreed to peace but were not quite yet willing to give up their warring or nomadic lifestyle for a sedentary life on a reservation. The Wichita and Caddos found themselves surrounded by the enemies they had fought with U.S troops. Their cooperation and brave deeds were now forgotten.

They settled in the "Leased District," an area that was owned by the Choctaws and Chickasaws and leased by the United States for the use of other tribes. After all their wandering, the tribes were willing to take even a small amount of land as long as they could call it theirs and be assured that it would belong to their descendants.

Life on the reservation progressed according to the United States' goals for reservations: the tribes were to be "civilized." A school was built, for which the tribes were grateful, and they began again to learn the white man's methods of agriculture. These projects did not always go as planned. When the first Riverside School was built in 1871, Wichita tribes refused to let their children attend. Boys from some tribes attended to learn math, geography, English and Bible studies. Later, girls would also attend and students were taught skills that conformed to the gender roles in mainstream society such as sewing for girls and agriculture for boys. When the Wichita did let their children go to school, like some of the other children, the students did not always stay but ran home again.

The Wichita men refused to participate in agricultural activities for some time because culturally that was a woman's role. Pool (1988) argues that when the men did start to participate in farming, it was one of many new practices that lowered the women's economic and social status. Traditionally, Wichita woman had some control in the home and access to plant resources because it was the products of their own work in their gardens and fields.

Wichitas had a matriarchal society. ("loosely maternal" according to Curtis 1908.) After a marriage the man was expected to move in with his wife's family. A household was comprised of a woman, her husband, their unmarried children and their married daughters with their husbands. The oldest woman was the head of the household. Part of a man's standing with his wife and her family depended on fulfilling certain duties like supplying the family with meat. He was even supposed to fulfill any statement that implied a request such as "We are out of food" (Curtis, 1908, p. 41). His relationship with his in-laws were always formal and if his wife told him to go home it constituted divorce (Newcomb 1976; Pool 1988).

Teaching the Wichita the white man's way included trying to change family relationships and gender roles. They were not supposed to live in extended families, practice polygamy, marry and divorce in a way that probably seemed informal or strange to outsiders, or allow women to have dominant roles. Policies were made to forbid women from activities that

whites did not approve of. For example, rations were given to men as the head of household but when they went home, these were turned over to women who distributed them. Rations included cattle that women slaughtered themselves. This was considered "barbaric" and in 1890 the commissioner of Indian Affairs forbade women from even being present at a slaughter (Pool, 1988, p 165).

Also included in the Wichita's European education was learning English. Native languages were forbidden at school and some of the churches. While Smith does not comment on this, it would have contributed to language loss.

Unfortunately, pushing the tribes to practice farming also had disastrous results. They continued to fight starvation because what the agents thought was a temporary drought was actually the natural dryness of the region. The tribes were inclined to plant crops anyway, but it was not good land and they often failed. The tribes had to rely on rations in order to survive.

Despite the fact that the Wichita Agency tribes continued to do what was asked of them, the United States continued to misunderstand them and appropriate their land. In 1878 they caused alarm and outrage among the Wichita and Caddo when they decided to save money by consolidating the Wichita Agency reservation with that of their enemies, the Kiowa and Comanche. By 1887, Congress had decided that reservations were not working, and they passed the Dawes General Allotment Act. The Dawes Act

was meant to break up tribes and tribal ties and teach Native Americans the European value of private property by giving each family their own plot of land. (Traditionally Wichita used communal gardens.) When they received an allotment, they would become American citizens. Perhaps the most successful provision of the act was that after land was allotted to indigenous families, surplus land would be sold to white homesteaders. Between the years of 1887 and 1934, whites gained 86 million acres of tribal land[3] (Smith p. 143). The Wichita and Caddo tribes did everything they could to delay or protest the allotment system but their efforts were in vain. For example, some tribal members refused to choose land for themselves and so plots of land were chosen arbitrarily for about 200 people.

In 1924 an act was passed that allowed the Wichita to bring a suit against the government to obtain compensation for lands wrongfully stolen

---

[3] White homesteaders in Indian Territory were known as "boomers" and according to Smith '96, they pressured Congress to open the area again for white settlement. When the area was indeed opened for white settlement, "sooners" were white people who rushed in ahead of time in the famous land grab that is still reenacted in Oklahoma elementary schools. The pony mascots of The University of Oklahoma, "Boomer" and "Sooner," reference a whitewashed version of history that ignores how painful these events were and still are for Native Americans. All across the nation Native Americans are gaining recognition for their argument that naming mascots after them is offensive, inappropriate and contributes to misunderstandings of them and other negative consequences. Schools including my alma mater, San Diego State University (The "Aztecs,") are considering changing their mascot names or have already done so. I was appalled to learn the meaning of Boomer and Sooner after moving to Oklahoma. I argue that the mascots here at OU are as offensive as human mascots named after indigenous people if not more so because they represent wrongs that were done to them. They are more subtle than human mascots and the history is lost on most of the white people I know but they should be changed. It is important to be aware of this history, the way the actions of boomers and sooners affected and still affects minority indigenous groups.

from them in Texas and Oklahoma. The Court of Claims decided that they did not have "the jurisdiction to pass on the aboriginal title to the lands in question, but they implied that the Wichita claims to it were not sustained by the evidence" (Newcomb 1976). Their attorney withdrew before the Wichita could make an appeal. Because of this, when the Indian Claims Commission Act was passed in 1946 allowing Native Americans to file claims against the government, attorneys thought it would be a poor gamble. One more attempt to be compensated for their lands in 1976 when they joined a case with the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache was equally unsuccessful.

Smith (1996) summed up the fate of these tribes well when he stated that

> ...the reservation period for the Wichitas and the Caddos was a miserable one. Not only did they fail to receive even a modicum of paternal protection from the federal government, but they were also treated callously and forced to relinquish land promised to them, first to tribes they had helped the United States defeat and then to land hungry white settlers. (p. xvi)

The Indian New Deal resulted in two acts that were more positive for Native Americans. These acts, the Indian Recognition Act of 1934 and the Oklahoma Indian Welcome Act of 1936, "sought to promote Native American self-determination, the preservation of tribal cultures, and the retention of Indian-owned land" (p. 154). It also meant that Native Americans could write their own constitutions and bylaws. The Wichitas chose to govern themselves with a more traditional unwritten constitution but their governing rules were approved and adopted by the tribe in 1961.

2.2 The Wichita Today

Today the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes are based in Anadarko, Oklahoma, a city that was named after the Nadaco tribe of the Caddos.[4] Many of the Wichita members are concentrated in this area and in neighboring cities such as Gracemont. Besides the Wichita, the "Affiliated tribes" are the Waco, Keechi and Tawakoni.

Native American tribes have their own ways to determine if someone is a member of their tribe. Wichita rules and regulations for membership were adopted October 1956 but provisions are sometimes made. For example, the blood quantum was lowered recently to 1/32th degree Wichita. According to The Wichita Tribal News, the tribe's newsletter available on their official website, the number of enrolled members has been growing during the time I have been researching this paper. In January 2017 there were 3,071 members of the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes and that number has increased. Below are

[4] Other tribes including the Wichita's old enemies, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache are still headquartered in or around Anadarko. Apaches are in Anadarko whereas Kiowa headquartered are 26 miles away in Carnegie, and Comanche headquarters are 41 miles away in Lawton. I would like to point out a few things about these tribes. First, there are more than one group of these tribes as there are for Wichita and Caddo groups. Not all of the tribes associated with these groups were involved in the histories above. Second, as far as I can tell, any animosity between these tribes has died away long ago.

some selected current statistics for the tribe according to the March 2018 newsletter (p. 10):

Total number of members 3,239
1,286 children up to 18
1,658 aged 19 -54
191 aged 55-65
66 aged 66-74
37 aged 75-89
1 aged 90 +

22 are full blood
58 are 1/32th degree

The male to female ratio is almost exactly 50/50 and enrolled members live in almost every state with over 2,300 in Oklahoma. The only two other states with more than 100 members are Texas and California.

The Wichita tribe keeps their culture alive with several traditional practices and programs. For example, the Kitikiti'sh Little Sisters is a program that was created for young ladies (including children and teenagers up to 18 years old). The participants learn cultural traditions like dancing, beadwork, sign language and proper behavior. Each year the Little Sisters choose a princess to represent the organization. The tribe also chooses a princess every year to represent them at the American Native Exposition. Princesses are chosen based on merit and understanding or practice of cultural activities. She makes appearances throughout the year at special events and past princesses

might also be honorably acknowledged at events like the Wichita Annual Dance. These activities not only help the young girls to learn about their culture, but also to take pride in it. The Young Men's society is a program with similar goals for the young men in the tribe.

The Kitikiti'sh Little Sisters and Young Men's Society are new programs, but an old tradition still important today is the Wichita-Pawnee visitation. Every year the two tribes gather and camp together for a week or two as part of a celebration of their centuries-old friendship. During this time, there are ceremonies, meals, prayers, singing, dancing and other activities and bonding experiences.

The Wichita can be very spiritual people. Traditionally, they had medicine men referred to as doctors or ikiwira:?a who performed sacred dances. There were beliefs in several Gods, the most important of which was the creator, Kinnikaus, "Man never known on earth" (Smith, 1996, p 6). Another important figure was Bright Shining Woman, a goddess who was important in fertility and childbirth. Shamans were said to receive their power from North Star, Bright Shining Woman's husband (Newcomb 1976). They believed revelation from God guided many everyday activities (Curtis 1908). In the 1880s they were swept away for a while with the Ghost Dance movement and with its hopeful promise that indigenous people would one day be united and live at peace, free from trouble. The Ghost Dance was a syncretic religion that combined familiar indigenous beliefs with Christianity. An

important aspect was the performance of the Ghost Dance that led to trances. It was abandoned after a few years when its promises did not come to fruition (Smith 1996). The tribes also practiced peyotism which is still part of the Native American Church. Today religious organizations that are important in the Wichita community include Christian churches, the Native American Church, and possibly other denominations or religions. Both religious and cultural activities might be held at church buildings in town. Most if not all of their community meetings or events are opened with a prayer. While not everyone is religious, this practice is treated with respect by those in attendance.

The tribe also has a population of veterans that are highly respected within the community. When I attended their Annual Dance, the veterans were recognized. There were special songs to celebrate them and other protocols to honor them such as raising and flying the veteran flag.

The Wichita and Affiliated Tribes owns several businesses including a casino, an Inn, a Smoke Shop, a Dairy Freeze, the Wichita Child Development Center, the Wichita Travel Plaza and two I.T. companies located in Houston. They also run several programs to assist members including food distribution, childcare, suicide prevention, (occasional) language classes, and services in health, nutrition, housing and social programs. They have a transportation system of buses that pick people up and travel to a few prominent places in town like the local grocery store. They also have an environmental program

designed to preserve and protect resources, educate people about the land and encourage "enjoyable harmony between human beings and their environment" (Wichita Tribe Official Website).

The Wichita government is comprised of a General Council and an Executive Committee led by an elected president. Currently, the president of the Wichita tribe is Terri Parton. She will serve a four-year term before it is time for elections again.

The state of the Wichita language is dire but there is potential for more revitalization activities. Wichita is a member of the small Caddoan language family along with Kitsai, Caddo, Arikara and Pawnee. These languages are all either highly endangered or no longer have speakers. At one time, there were Waco and Tawakoni dialects of Wichita but by the 1990s, there were no longer any dialect differences among the Wichita tribes (Rood 1996). The language referred to in this paper is Kirikir?i:s, or more commonly called the Wichita language. Kirikir?i:s is the main language that has survived and it is the language of the Wichita community based in Anadarko and neighboring Oklahoma cities. The Wichita community that I refer to includes members of the tribe in Oklahoma and elsewhere. It may also include people who are not enrolled such Native Americans with some Wichita ancestors who are enrolled with other tribes.

When the Riverside boarding school opened, Native American languages were forbidden. These languages were also forbidden in other public spaces like churches. As a matter of fact, Smith (1996) mentions that a Catholic school in the area was attracting more Caddo members in the late 1890s because they allowed students to speak Caddo (p. 135). It seems likely that dividing the land into allotments, effectively separating tribal members, and forbidding Wichita in schools contributed greatly to Wichita language loss over the generations as people were exposed to more and more English. It was believed that the tribe's heritage languages hindered assimilation.

In an interview with Rob Reynolds for *Al Jezeera English*, Doris McLemore, the last fluent speaker of Wichita, attributed language loss to the dominant English-speaking society. "The white people did not value it. They wanted it to be gone. Just like everything else they wanted to annihilate all the Indians"(2010).

McLemore was raised by her grandparents and her grandmother spoke no English. She passed away in August 2016. She was a beloved elder who was very involved with her tribe and her passing was difficult for the community. Beside her there are two elders who are conversational in Wichita and perhaps there are other semi speakers who do not realize the extent or the importance of their abilities.

The Wichita people are surrounded by English at work, school, in the media and other places in the community but there have been efforts to preserve the Wichita language. Several community members have participated in elicitation sessions with linguist Dr. David Rood or with Gary McAdams. Gary McAdams is not a trained linguist, but a member of the Wichita tribe who cares deeply about his language and cultural heritage. He is a former president of the Wichita tribe and currently works as the language and culture coordinator. Elicitations sessions conducted by Rood or McAdams have generally included recording a speaker repeating words and phrases in Wichita. Songs, discussions about Wichita language and culture, and a few language lessons by Dr. Rood were also recorded. Some of these recordings were used to start a dictionary using the software FLEX. The dictionary is still in its beginning phase, but it is a very promising endeavor.

In the past, the community has had its own language classes overseen by tribal members such as Terri Parton, Doris McLemore, Shirley Davilla, and the late Gertie Allenbaugh. They mostly focused on spoken language. McAdams and Jimmie Reeder have also worked with the Little Sisters and Young Men's societies. The classes for the children and youth were often used to prepare for the Oklahoma Native American Youth Language Fair held annually at the Sam Noble Museum in Norman, Oklahoma. Children learn to sing songs in Wichita that they will perform at the fair while wearing traditional regalia. The fair is important as a motivation to create or attend

Wichita classes, but the classes are not promoting fluency and they have not always been well attended.

Another recent development in the efforts to revitalize the language is the Wichita archive. It was started as part of a grant and is still in progress. The archive could potentially offer resources for the tribe to access and create language study materials.

Two of the greatest obstacles to Wichita language revitalization are lack of speakers and lack of funding. Many members lack resources to access the internet, attend classes or visit the archive. There are not necessarily funds to help pay teachers or create teaching materials. Yet another obstacle may be lack of hope or confidence in revitalization. However, with continued work and new programs, these obstacles can be overcome.

2.3 A Thumbnail Sketch of the Wichita Language

The language referred to in this paper is Kirikirʔiːs, or more commonly called the Wichita language. It is the main language that has survived and it is the language of the Wichita community based in Anadarko, neighboring Oklahoma cities and of others who are associated with this community who live elsewhere.

Wichita is a complex polysynthetic language with a rich morphological system. Rood has done the most extensive analysis on the language. The following brief sketch, including all the examples and analysis, are taken from Rood (1996). As he is the expert, any mistakes are mine.

This thumbnail sketch is highly technical and will likely be difficult to understand without linguistic training. However, it is important to me to share information about the language with community members. To this end, I have created another language sketch and attached it as Appendix A. It is meant for the lay-person, so more time is taken to break down grammatical and linguistic concepts. It is easier to read and could possibly be used as a quick reference of some basic Wichita grammatical principles. It also includes a glossary.

The three phonemic Wichita vowels /i,e,a/ all occur in short, long and overlong lengths. Another vowel /o/ is heard but it is actually one of the other vowels when they occur next to a /w/ or some other phonetic environment that changes the position of the vowel. /i/ and /a/ are voiceless when they occur in word final position and /e/ does not seem to appear in this position. Vowels will have a high or low tone and high vowels in word final position will have a falling contour.

Wichita has a very brief inventory of consonants: the stops are /k, k^w,t, ʔ/, the one affricate in the language is the alveolar /c/.[5] The only fricatives are /s/ and /h/ and the approximants are /w, r〜n, y/. Among the reasons that make the Wichita phonological system so unusual is this short list of mostly voiceless phonemes with "no true labials, and no phonemic nasals" except for /kamma/ and /camma˙ci/ which are the verb roots for "grind corn" and "hoe, cultivate." (1996:583) The /r〜n/ is an alveolar flap that becomes nasalized in some environments.[6] The /ɾ/, /w/ and the labialization /k^w/ becomes voiceless in word final position.

Wichita has a split ergative system. Third person number markers and the incorporation of nouns into verbs distinguish ergative from absolutive. However, first and second person are split; some subject pronominals match with transitive and intransitive verbs (like the nominative-accusative system in English) but other intransitive subjects have subject pronominals that are like the object forms of transitive verbs (an ergative-absolutive system like Basque.) Third person pronominals have yet another version of a split system. It is unmarked when non-third-person is used and at other times it is marked for either in focus or out of focus. In focus is normal and out of focus is used for situations where English might use passive sentences or impersonal 'they."

---

[5] The /c/ was used in the American Phonetic Alphabet. The sound is also represented with some variation of 'ts.' I prefer ts but I use Rood's system because it is used by the Wichita. Rood also uses /y/ instead of /j/.

[6] Rood transcribes these separately and I will follow his example except where he uses /r/ or /ř/, I will use /ɾ/.

This might happen when a small character in a story is the subject of a verb, when a named noun is the patient, or to mark the agent of an active verb as indefinite or plural. For intransitive verbs that take transitive object pronouns for first and second persons, only out of focus markers occur.

Rood recognizes four classes of verbs based on number and nominal markers. I have condensed these into a chart below adjusted from Rood 1996.

Class	**Verb Type**	**Semantic Roles**	**First and Second Person**	**Third person**	**Examples**
1	Action and Stative	Agents for action verbs	Subjective case	In or out of focus. Third person number markings use rules for patient inflection.	Hisha *go* Kirah *sing* Tacʔi *be big*
2	Process and Stative	Patients	Objective case	Out of focus and third person number uses patient inflection.	Ac *be cold* Hiya *be hungry*
3	Transitive	Agent and patient	Subjective for agents, objective for patients	In or out of focus if subject and object are both third person, otherwise	ʔiːs *see* Kaʔatc *eat* Irasi *find*

				unmarked. Third person number are subjective for agents and objective for patients.	
4	Impersonal			Singular inflections	Reʔerha *be a village or camp* He.ha *be a creek* Wa.wkʷic *heat lightning*

Figure 2 Rood's (1996) Verb Classes for Wichita

In each of the four verb classes, first and second person markers fit nicely with the semantic roles required by the verb. When there are agents the subjective case is used and when there are patients, the objective case is used. The third person markers are somewhat more complicated as they may be in or out of focus and the marking for third person number will use inflections for patients, agents or objects. In class four, the subjects are usually in focus and only the third person singular inflections occur. It is further divided into process and impersonal verbs, 'rain' being an example of the former and 'to be a creek' being an example of the latter.

Wichita verbs can be independent or subordinate and are inflected for mood, evidential, tense and aspect, though the choices of affixes are far fewer

for subordinate verbs. Each affix with information about tense and aspect includes several meanings about topics such as time, opinion, intention, habitual actions, wishes, commands, obligation, imperfective and perfective actions. For example, *ehe-* is the morpheme used for impersonal, quotative, future reports with unmarked aspect. *Keɾe-* includes all of the same information except it is not quotative. *Kiɾi-* is a prefix that is used with personal reports to express an attitude toward the verb's subject. Under that umbrella it codes information for command, imperfective, future, and something that is not habitual. Wichita speakers create different meanings with combinations of these kinds of prefixes and suffixes for tense and aspect. For example, the future *keɾe-* prefix can be combined with perfective (no marker,) imperfective *-s* and habitual *-ss* suffixes. Used with the verb *ɾrasi* 'cook' these words are *keˈɾárasiki* 'she will cook it," *keˈɾárasis* "she'll be cooking it" and *keˈɾáraskiˈss* 'It will be her job to cook it every time.' *Ehe-* can be combined with these same suffixes with the added meaning of "I heard that..." The future imperative *kiɾi* can be combined with perfective and habitual suffixes for *kiˈɾarásiki* 'and then you must let her cook it" and *kiˈɾárasikiˈss* 'let her always be the one to cook it.' Other moods and aspects are created periphrastically. For example, Rood gives a verbal equivalent for ability, bolded in the sentence below:

Cháh tachiɾincóˈwisiɾi hatákicɾárasikih
*Chah ta-t-**hiɾint͡sówisiɾi** ha....ki-t-a-uc -ɾarasi-iki-h*
Still ind.-1P subject-**be able** subjunctive-1Psubject-refl.-dative-cook-caus.-subordinate
I can still cook my own food

Wichita nouns can be divided into the semantic categories of count nouns and noncount nouns that cannot be plural. Count nouns are further divided into categories for collective and not collective and finally, count nouns that are not collective can be divided into animate, activity and "other" categories. Noncount nouns are divided into categories for liquid and dry mass. Wichita nouns can also be inflected for case (agent, patient, dative) number (singular, dual, plural,) person (first, second, inclusive and third,) focus and definiteness (p. 594)

Modifiers include quantifiers, demonstratives, adjectives and adverbial information they may appear as various types of constructions. A few will be mentioned here. The majority of time and manner modifiers are subordinate sentences. For instance, the word for 'tomorrow,' *hiˑhánthiɾih,* literally translates to 'when it is day.' Adjectives may be "true adjectives" like the verb particle *niwa'c* 'big' or stative verbs constructions like *tac ti'ʔi* 'is big' (p. 595-596). Instrumentals are either nouns with an identifying suffix or body parts marked as instrumentals by location in a verb construction. Locative adverbs are nouns with the suffix *kiyah*, verb particles with the suffix *hɾih,* or a bound morpheme before the verb root. These bound morphemes can be combined as in these examples:

kataska 'in an open area' + *-ʔr* 'in a direction = *kataskeʔer* 'through the yard'
kataskeʔer ' through the yard' + *iwac* 'outside' = *kataskeʔeroˈc* 'out the other way from the yard'

Locative information can also be one of the Wichita demonstratives including *tiʔrih* 'here,' and *harah* 'there.'

Also notable in the context of language revitalization is the fact that Wichita allows for new cultural items in the language. This is often done with derivation. Wichita derivation can transform words both across or within word classes. For example, process verbs can be derived from stative verbs with the roots *ʔahrih* 'become' or *hi* 'do.' While there are several examples of verbs changing into other verbs, it is more common to form nouns from verbs with subordinate verbal inflections like perfective *h*, imperfective *skih*, the past participle *ki,* the debetative ("should" modal) *kara,* and a general participle *na,* among others. The *na* participle appears in the new cultural words below:

ná:saˈkhíʔnnih
na-ur-saˈkhir-ʔi-hrih
Participle-possessive-sun; day-be-locative
"Sunday," literally "when it is his day."

kíriwaréˈsaˈkhíʔnnih
kíri-wa-na-ur-i-saˈkhir-ʔi-hrih
not-already-participle-possessive-extra vowel required by *kíri*-sun; day-ʔi-locative
"Monday," literally "when it is no longer his day."

kínniˈcirizí:hirih
kíri-na-uc-i-riʔi: remaining uncertain
Not-participle-preverb-extra vowel-be harnessed - remaining uncertain
"Automobile," literally "what goes without a harness.

Chapter 3
Community Ideologies and Responses to The Wichita Archive and Language Revitalization

3.1 Revitalizing Languages Without Speakers

"Do you think it is possible to revitalize the Wichita language?"

This was the second question I asked the Wichita people in a voluntary survey distributed at their 2017 Annual Dance. I predicted that many participants might say no because I know the situation is dire. I assumed that they also know because their last fluent speaker had passed away the previous year. To add to that, Rood, the prominent linguist who worked with Wichita more than anyone else in the academic world, had once told them that the language was not savable. In 1992 Rood was approached by the tribe to help create Wichita language lessons that were meant only to delay rather than stop the language from falling out of use. He observed that there were less than a dozen speakers who were all more competent in English than Wichita and that children had no adult models, and no opportunities to speak it in the community. (Rood, 1992, p. 331.) (Nevertheless, Rood helped the tribe reach their goals of creating lessons and they felt that even delaying the inevitable was satisfying.)

Rood had valid, research-based reasons for his gloomy diagnosis. Many scholars and organizations have studied what situations and circumstances led to language revitalization or disappearance. The Wichita language lacked many of the factors needed for revitalization and had many of the circumstances that led to loss. In particular, during the time Rood was assisting the Wichita create language lessons, Fishman (1991)[7] had a scale for determining language vitality. It is still widely cited. Fishman called it the Graded International Disruption Scale and gave 8 determining factors, whose power of disrupting language vitality increase from 1 to 8 where languages are urgently endangered. Lewis and Simon (2009) give a succinct adaptation of it, which is reproduced below.

[7] Fishman's scale has been revisited and re envisioned many times over the years, including Fishman (2001.)

GIDS	(adapted from Fishman 1991)
LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
1	The language is used in education, work, mass media, government at the nationwide level
2	The language is used for local and regional mass media and governmental services
3	The language is used for local and regional work by both insiders and outsiders
4	Literacy in the language is transmitted through education
5	The language is used orally by all generations and is effectively used in written form throughout the community
6	The language is used orally by all generations and is being learned by children as their first language
7	The child-bearing generation knows the language well enough to use it with their elders but is not transmitting it to their children
8	The only remaining speakers of the language are members of the grandparent generation

Figure 3 Fishman's vitality scale from Lewis and Simon (2009)

At the time, the Wichita language was already at a level 8 in Fishman's scale. As Rood predicted, the language has continued to steadily decline since that time.

With all of this information in mind, I wondered about the effect of lack of hope on language revitalization. I did not think that any revitalization programs could be successful (or even started in earnest) without the belief

that they would work.

But the Wichita are either generally unaware of how serious the situation is or they remain optimistic despite the odds. Of 48 people who answered this question, 37 people said yes, 8 people said they did not know if it was possible and only 3 people said no.

The optimism of the Wichita people is not necessarily misplaced. Since the time that Fishman first developed the GIDS language vitality scale, the discussion about what it takes to revitalize a language has been changing. In the mid-nineties, the first Breath of Life- Silent No More workshop was held in California. Originally it was held for Californian tribes who no longer had any living speakers of their heritage languages at all. (It has since expanded somewhat. Dozens of tribes have attended in several states, sometimes representing languages with speakers and sometimes not.) Hinton (2001) explains that those who attend learn and practice skills to use documentation of their languages from libraries and archives to create usable language material. They learn about what resources are available, some basic linguistic skills and terminology, the methodology for teaching or revitalizing languages, how to use some linguistic software or databases, and how to extract language from documented resources that is useful. At the end of the week-long workshop, participants share language materials that they have produced such as a language lesson, a story or part of a new phrase book (p. 420). These

workshops are founded on the premise that languages could be revitalized without living speakers as long as there is sufficient documentation.

Revitalizing languages without speakers, purely from documentation is not a chimerical dream; it has already worked. Two of the most prominent cases of this in Native America are the Wampanoag and Myaamia languages.

The Wampanoag language had no speakers for over 150 years when Jessie Little Doe Baird had spiritual dreams about familiar people speaking a language she did not understand. After a few nights, the people in her dreams invited her to ask others in the community if they would like to have their language again. Baird understands these dreams as visions of her ancestors speaking Wampanoag and part of a prophecy of her people. The prophecy tells of the language being lost and of descendants one day speaking it again. In response, she reached out to others in the community, completed a master's degree in linguistics at MIT so she could further study her language, and started creating language learning tools including a dictionary and grammar reference for the layperson. She started teaching herself and then she and her husband, Jason, learned strategies to raise their youngest daughter as a fluent, first language speaker of both Wampanoag and English (Baird 2016).

The Wampanoag were able to procure a couple grants which they have used to further their language work. Now there are dozens of people learning

the language, language camps, a children's TV show is in the works and they now have classes at a small school taught exclusively in Wampanoag. They have had over 500 students and there are 9 fluent teachers as of 2016 (Baird, 2016). At the rate that this language has progressed, the numbers may already need to be updated!

A large measure of their success is due to the enormous amount of documentation in Wampanoag that they have been able to use. They have the largest collection of native written documents from the 1600s forward, including a translated bible from the 1600s (Baird 2016). This documentation has allowed Baird to study the language extensively without any speakers. Documentation is paramount in this situation, but it is not enough. Baird (2013) stated that (i[8] was) "accepting that i was responsible for, and capable of, making a place for my language to be welcomed back into my community, and that creation of such a place had to begin in my own home" (p. 21).

Without someone determined to use the documentation, the language would still be silent. Also instrumental in the process of Wampanoag language revitalization are community efforts, using the language in the home as well as making places for it in public and using it in a variety of social settings and functions.

[8] Baird only refers to herself with lowercase letters.

The Myaamia tribe was in a similar situation as the Wampanoag. The language had not been spoken by anyone for 30 years when Daryl Baldwin began learning it and teaching it in his home in 1991. Like Baird, Baldwin felt a responsibility to do what he could and decided to take on graduate studies in linguistics. He also started teaching himself the language, and he and his wife, Karen, began the arduous work of teaching all four of their children the language while they were still learning it themselves. There was also enough documentation in Myaamia that the language with its functions and forms was preserved well enough to be revitalized. It would not have been possible otherwise.

Of course, Myaamia does not come from the same origins, culture, or political and historical situation as Wampanoag so not every technique or approach that works for one is possible or culturally appropriate in the other. Baird has been able to start an educational immersion program whereas Baldwin is building one for the future. He does not believe that he will live to see it but he does feel that a community of fluent speakers is in the future for Myaamia. Even though there may not yet be immersion programs, hundreds of people now have some knowledge of the language and roughly 15 are conversational (Leonard 2008). Baldwin has also focused on performing cultural activities completely in Myaamia and has refrained from creating certain politically charged words in Myaamia for the time being "out of fear that forced translations could affect the way in which the culture handles

those ideas" and because there may be something to learn from which words are absent in a language (Baldwin, 2013, p. 9). Not all tribes will share these priorities.

The success of revitalized languages without speakers like Wampanoag and Myaamia has begun to change the discourse on revitalization. Dr. Wesley Leonard is another Myaamia academic who is also a member of the growing Myaamia speech community. He has been influential in the paradigm shift on language revitalization. He argued that languages without speakers still have potential use, and vitality is present in documentation for people with ancestral claims to it. Languages in this situation are not extinct, as many language vitality scales would classify them, but only "sleeping" (Leonard 2008). The distinction is important because extinction is irreversible loss, whereas sleeping languages can be awakened. The Wampanoag and Myaamia languages are both being awakened through documentation and diligence. In both of these particular cases, linguistic training, speaking the language at home and community efforts have also played a significant role.

Like Wampanoag and Myaamia, Wichita would be classified as extinct because the last native speaker has died. But perhaps the label is premature or misleading, because it does not take into account factors such as the linguistic potential from documentation and the language knowledge of living semi speakers if there are any. These factors are a few of many that should be

considered when labeling a language's status and planning language revitalization programs.

Grenoble and Whaley (2006) describe several other salient factors that affect choices and attitudes about language use that should be assessed both prior and occasionally throughout revitalization efforts. These factors are split into the categories of micro variables and macro variables. Macro variables are outside of the community on a regional, national or global scale and have an influence on the community. These could include laws, policies, the globalization of English, education, government support or lack thereof, and mainstream ideologies. Micro variables are on a local level within the community. These could include religion, local attitudes, human resources (the number of people and their skills and abilities), culture, literacy, and finances. All of these variables will have complicated, interconnected relationships and unique affects on a local community.

Because every situation is so unique, there is no one program that will work for every community and language. It is crucial to have a good understanding of these factors in every community. This chapter includes a preliminary case study of a couple of these micro variables, especially language ideologies and to some extent, religion and human resources. As most of the analysis has been spent on ideologies, it is worth expounding on

this topic a little more before examining the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes specifically.

3.2 Language Ideologies

Baldwin and Baird's feelings of responsibility for their language, their desire to pass it to their children, the connection between language and ancestors or spirituality, whether or not a language is called extinct and the attitudes mentioned by Grenoble and Whaley are all examples of language ideologies. Language ideologies have an impact on all language interaction including quotidian everyday tasks, language use in religious ceremonies, proper decorum between world leaders, and the work of language revitalization. One of the reasons for the surveys I conducted with the Wichita was to better understand some of their ideologies that could be directly related to revitalization efforts.

A number of definitions of language ideologies have appeared over the years, each emphasizing some component such as awareness, agency or political perspective in ideologies. A simplified definition offered here is that language ideologies are beliefs and attitudes about language and its use. Kroskrity (2004) explains that these ideologies:

> whether explicitly articulated or embodied in communicative practice, represent incomplete, or "partially successful," attempts to rationalize language usage; such rationalizations are typically multiple, context bound, and necessarily constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker. (p. 496)

Originally, language ideologies were not considered an appropriate or valuable scholarly pursuit by foundational researchers like Franz Boas. It was not until the 70s and 80s that these old attitudes began to change. Silverstein's seminal (1979) article argued that awareness of language can shape its changes and structure. His 1985 article for example explores the use of gendered language including the English pronoun 'he.' Many of us are familiar with the idea that generic 'he' has been disputed on the grounds that it is sexist, despite the fact that it has been used generically for many years. The argument to use "he or she" instead is an overt language ideology with a sociopolitical feminist context. According to Silverstein, this demonstrates a merging of language structure, pragmatics and ideology.

Ideologies can shape more than language use. Policies are also informed by ideologies and they can have a significant impact on people's lives. Field and Kroskrity (2009) remind us of a pertinent example. In 1868 Congress declared that Native American children should learn only English in schools and that their "barbarous" dialects should be completely erased along with the divisions between tribes. They supposed that linguistic uniformity alone could accomplish this goal. The premises that native languages were

inferior and a hindrance to assimilation led to policies pushing for uniformity, and school programs designed to establish English monolinguism. Policies and educational programs like these are arguably one of the most important factors that led to language shift and loss among Native American communities. While many in the current generation have grown out of these ethnocentric and ethnolinguistic ideologies, their effects are still acutely felt by modern Native Americans. Not every policy based on ideologies has had such widespread and devastating affects but this one serves as grave reminder of such a possibility.

Linguists and anthropologists should keep that possibility in mind as their research will certainly contain their own ideologies which can affect the communities with whom they work. A case study from Irvine and Gal (2000) demonstrates this. Their second case study in the paper concerns the way European linguists described Senegalese languages in the 19th century. The Europeans tried to create a map of the languages in the area based on the ideas that groups of people are generally monolingual and languages were native to distinct territories. They assumed the Africans were primitive and people who looked more like Europeans were more intelligent and powerful. They reduced histories and complex social situations into narratives about lighter skinned people conquering others and bringing their languages with them. Any linguistic or cultural data that did not fit with their system was dismissed as some kind of mistake. One consequence of these ideologies is that

it is now difficult to understand the true nature of the languages, identities and relationships of the Senegal peoples at the time. Irvine and Gal report that

> descriptions of each language were impoverished, and, on a more practical level, the languages become indices primarily of ethnicity rather than rank, political status or religious setting...the influence of these earlier representations has been long lasting. (p. 58-59)

Some languages and peoples from the area are still being mislabeled as a result of these ethnocentric practices.

Today linguists have learned from the past but practice the lessons about their attitudes and effect on communities differently. A few examples of the disparate ideologies and practices of linguists will be given partly to illustrate that they do not always agree. This is important for a couple reasons. First, the ideologies of linguists can affect speech communities where they work in many ways. It might have consequences in the work that is done or the viewpoints of other people. Second, it is part of a larger argument emphasized by Kroskrity that ideologies are diverse in any community.

Linguists' attitudes about language are likely to be driven by extensive training in Western Universities, their work or fieldwork experiences, their personal lives and many other factors. Some of these discourses may negatively affect communities and some work to find and eradicate them. For example, Hill (2002) acknowledges researchers' need to use persuasive

arguments about language revitalization with policy makers and grant giving agencies, but she asserts that some of this rhetoric can be harmful to the groups and causes for whom they advocate. She expounds on three themes found in the work of respected linguists (including herself) that she believes "distress and alienate speakers and members of their communities and amplify their distrust of linguists" (p 120).

Hill calls the first theme universal ownership or the idea that all languages belong to everyone. Phrases that imply universal ownership could "be heard not as an expression of universal human value, but as a threat to expropriate a resource" (p122). She recognizes this theme in wording about common humanity or the benefit of languages to the entire world. The second theme is hyper valorization which manifests itself when people refer to languages with terms like "treasures" or "priceless." Hyper valorizing languages frames them as commodities that may only be available to elites and that are unfit for normal, everyday exchanges. It implies that they may be hidden like treasure and difficult to find or use. The final theme is enumeration, or the practice of using disturbing statistics about endangered languages. Examples include statements about languages disappearing at alarming rates, that half the world's languages are endangered or that there are only three speakers of a particular language (p 120). It is an effective strategy for advocacy, but numbers come from censuses which are a form of power. Another problem with enumeration is that numbering languages

requires labeling which are languages and which are dialects. The difference between what is considered a language and what is a dialect can be slippery. Often the distinction is social where the "language" is the social standard and the "dialect" is a variation of that standard. Dialect speakers can be marginalized for not conforming to the standard. Speakers who are aware of ways that numbers have been used against them may fear these kinds of statistics. All three of these rhetorical strategies are used by sincerely well-meaning linguists, but according to Hill they can have negative consequences on the actions and ideologies of others.

Speas (2009) also works to eradicate possible negative outcomes of linguistic work with speech communities. She goes so far as to suggest that perhaps linguists are not necessary in revitalization and that they should not try to change the ideologies and misconceptions in a community. Many if not all linguists will be tempted to do so. They will recognize misconceptions or ideologies that they feel are false or that hinder revitalization and try to help by correcting them. Speas compares this practice to greedy ancestors who tried to "help" Native Americans by assimilating them and erasing their languages and cultures. She gives a list of misconceptions that have been proven false. These include the idea that one must give up one language to learn another, that one needs special training to teach their language to children, that schools can take over the job of teaching a language and that writing is necessary to keep languages alive (p25). Even if linguists believe

these misconceptions are counterproductive, unequal power relationships can be created when linguists try to correct endangered language speakers by forcing their own views on them.

Speas further explains that strongly held misconceptions might not be a detrimental as linguists believe. While we may be quick to assure others of the difference between descriptive, changing, natural language and prescriptive, purist language, she claims that no language has ever been lost due to elders being "overly concerned about the "sloppy" speech of the young" (p28). Perhaps it is not worth so much effort correcting people about the correctness of language usage. Finally, she suggests that linguists could offer assistance in other ways not directly related to linguistic analysis such as setting up archives, mailing flyers, getting coffee for meetings and lobbying legislators (p30).

In opposition to Speas' recommendations, the Myaamia linguist Leonard (2008) maintains that linguistic work ("and hence linguists") might be necessary for languages with no speakers because they may need to be reconstituted. He points out that the work of linguist Costa on Myaamia has been "indispensable to reclamation effort" (p28). In addressing a few concerns that arise in the context of revitalization sans living speakers, he disagrees with Speas on another point related to the "correctness" of languages. Leonard

is against linguistic purism, which he identifies as a significant hindrance to revitalization.

Linguistic purism refers to the concept that there is a correct way to speak a language or that the language must not be changed from its purest or "most correct" form. In some form or another this idea is present in many speech communities. In English some dialects are prized over others as "correct" and valid forms of the language. Dialects such as Hawaiian pidgin or African American Vernacular are thought of as incorrect, slang or evidence of an uneducated person. Among Native American communities fighting to maintain a language, the idea of linguistic purism can acquire a particularly urgent intensity. It might, for example, lead to conflicts among tribal members about which elder's idiolect is more correct, discourage learners who fear they may mangle the language or cause doubt about the validity of a language that no living person has heard or spoken. This concern also appeared a couple times as comments in the surveys I administered to the Wichita. In response to this pressing concern, Leonard points out that while ancient and modern Myaamia culture are different, they are both valid and that all languages change. If a revitalized Native American language is not valid because it has changed he asks of all languages "Are they all extinct?" (Leonard, 2008, p. 13). Shaul (2014) further reminds us that children learning their first language make many mistakes and heritage language learners will be no different. He asks the powerful question "How might a Native American speech community

feel about the death of their heritage language instead (of) the fluent use of the revised form of it?" (p. 27). It is up to the community to answer whether it is preferable to accept that, like all languages, their heritage language is not exactly as their ancestors spoke it or lose the language altogether. Their answer will be informed in part by the language ideologies in the tribe. Whether or not they seem wise to an outsider, it would be a mistake to dismiss them.

Leonard, Hill and Speas all have different views of their work, other linguists and how to revitalize languages. Ideologies are just as diverse and contradictory within speech communities. Kroskrity's (2009) solution is ideological clarification.

> Language ideological clarification is the process of identifying issues of language ideological contestation within a heritage language community, including both beliefs and feelings that are indigenous to that community and those introduced by outsiders (such as linguists and government officials), that can negatively impact community efforts to successfully engage in language maintenance and renewal. (p. 73)

The goal is to identify differing ideologies in order to discuss them and reach resolutions, or at least tolerable disagreements that will not hinder revitalization. Kroskrity (2009) gives several examples of this principle in context. First, in the case of Kiowa heterographia, (from Neely and Palmer 2009) people in the small Kiowa tribe in Oklahoma have a choice of three well

established orthographies. Each of these writing systems has a following but Kroskrity believes that if people come together and recognize their feelings and the reasons for their allegiance to certain writing systems, they can have discussions to produce clarification. This would result in a needed promotion for just one of the orthographies.

Another case of clarification Kroskrity gives comes from Bunte (2009) who wrote about a language theory held by the San Juan Paiute tribe living on the Navajo Reservation. Like many other tribes, they believe that words could "come on the wind" or in other words, that children could learn a heritage language even from rare and passive exposure to a language. Combined with a strong respect for individual autonomy– including allowing children to use English when they prefer it – these beliefs were causing a language shift. Leanne Hinton and Nancy Steele (Karuk) were invited to talk to the community about the Master Apprentice program where adults would have to be much more active in teaching language than they had previously been. Without dismissing or condemning their cultural ideologies, the tribe decided to try the Master Apprentice program as well as return to long traditional story telling sessions for children and adults (p76).

Like any community, the Wichita tribe also have their own complex and possibly contradictory language ideologies. Several of the questions I asked the tribe via surveys were meant to reveal a few of them. The data can be used

by the tribe or anyone they invite to assist them to better understand the community and to plan revitalization.

3.3 Survey Methodologies

In response to these larger questions, I designed a survey that specifically addressed the issue relating to the Wichita archive and language revitalization. The term "revitalization" as it is used throughout the surveys may be thought of in two ways. First, language revitalization may refer to creating new speakers as the Wampanoag and Myaamia tribes have done. Ideally, speakers would be able to communicate in the language in any situation or for any purpose, and children would be learning the language. In a best-case scenario, endangered languages become robust again. I also mention "revitalization activities" which could be any kind of activity whose purpose is revitalization even if revitalization has not yet been realized.

The surveys were available online and at the administration building but the majority were obtained at a community event. I distributed these surveys at The Wichita Annual Dance which has been hosted for over 40 years and welcomes anyone to attend. I was provided with a table where I brought the surveys and allowed interested people to take the survey or ask questions

if they chose. The surveys consisted of multiple choice questions as well as space for participants to write comments, which many of them did.

The surveys were motivated by several general questions. They were meant to gather some of the language ideologies and attitudes in the tribe and find out what they thought language revitalization should be like. Much of the time, research is focused on only one or a few ideologies in a tribe whereas the data here is more wide than deep. The reason for this it that there is not a strong program for language revitalization in the tribe at this time and the information is meant to be part of an analysis of the tribe's situation before such a program is implemented. Recognizing ideologies is but one of many factors to be considered in revitalization but even the preliminary data here could help the tribe find strengths and weaknesses and understand the opinions of tribal members.

The surveys were also meant to find volunteers to help with language revitalization. Besides asking participants about different kinds of activities they would be willing to do, participants were also allowed to give their name and contact information on a separate document at the end of the survey if they wished to be contacted to help or to learn more.

The second survey was about the archive and was created with the same goals in mind. Hopefully, attitudes and potential volunteers would be identified.

Surveys can also be used as a way to spread ideas to the people who are sharing ideas and I tried to take advantage of this. The archive survey began with a brief paragraph explaining the concept of an archive and the first question offered several options for how to use one. Even if participants did not know what an archive is, what they might be used for, or if they were unaware that a Wichita archive existed, they would learn these things on the first page of the survey. The language revitalization survey was full of ideas for language revitalization activities and ways to participate. Even if one does not speak the language or have training in teaching or linguistics there are a myriad of productive and valuable skills that can be used including web maintenance, learning how to use the archive or attending classes, artistic skills, or even babysitting. Anyone could be involved with revitalization.

Finally, the surveys inquired about what people might want in an archive or language revitalization program so that the community could tailor programs to people's needs and interests if it seemed productive.

The results of the surveys were meant to be shared with the tribe so that they could identify volunteers and use the information about ideologies. Data including the names and contact information of those who wanted to

share it and other anonymous information was shared with the tribe in a master list shortly after the surveys were collected.

3.4 Participants In A Community

The first question on the surveys asked for demographic information. 51 people took the language revitalization survey and 49 took the archive survey. Not everyone answered every question and a few participants opted to take only one survey and not both. Of those that answered the demographics questions, 13 participants identified themselves as male and 33 as female.[9] Ages ranged from 5 teenagers to 2 participants in their 70s, with the largest demographic being in their 30s (11 participants) followed by those in their 40s and 50s (9 each.) Additionally, there were 5 participants each in their 20s and 60s.

Participants were also asked to give their relationship to the Wichita tribe. This question was originally meant to make sure that participants were qualified to participate as I was looking for the opinions of enrolled tribal members only. However, the responses caused me to rethink my definition of who could be included in this community. In response to this open-ended

[9] These questions were open ended and simply asked for age and gender without providing any options.

question, many people wrote that they were enrolled but others were Wichita but not enrolled and a few stated that they worked for the tribe.

There were 35 people who stated that they were enrolled members of the tribe. 10 participants stated that they were Wichita or related to people who were Wichita without specifying if they were enrolled or not. A few gave a number such as ¼ which would qualify someone to be enrolled but does not mean that is the case. Wichita relatives claimed by this group included descendants, spouses, and parents or other ancestors. It is a common situation among some Native Americans to claim ancestry with a tribe but not necessarily be enrolled. Many tribes, including the Wichita, have laws stipulating that members can only be enrolled with one tribe so people with a mixed tribal heritage must choose. This also means that sometimes members of the same nuclear family unit are members of different tribes. People might choose to enroll with a certain tribe for a variety of reasons. Perhaps one tribe has preferable benefits or people might identify with one tribe more than another. Others might not make the choice because they were enrolled as children by their parents. Whatever the reason for officially joining a particular tribe, people may still feel strong connections with other tribes or continue to be involved with them. This is the case for some of the Wichita participants. Some of them commented on the surveys that they wanted to learn several native languages or that they wanted their children to learn all of their heritage languages, even if they differed from the parents' own heritage.

Three additional participants said they were employees of the tribe without mentioning if they were enrolled or not. I know at least one of these people is Wichita from personal correspondence with that person. I suspect one of the others may be as well but either way it brings up another point. The Wichita are not an isolated community. Historically the area around Anadarko was home to several tribes including the Kiowa, Comanche, Delaware and Apache. There is still a significant indigenous population along with Caucasians and others. While there are laws regulating enrollment, there are many people associated with tribal members that may be considered part of the community in some way. These will certainly include relatives enrolled with other tribes and it may include friends and employees of the tribe. In a revitalization context, it is possible that the tribe will welcome the contributions of community members who are not enrolled. I cannot comment on how non-enrolled community members are viewed. For the purposes of the survey, every opinion was counted equally because they came from a community event where anyone was invited, and participants were interested enough in the tribe and its well-being to take a survey about language revitalization.

It should also be noted that because that the vast majority of surveys collected were from the Annual Dance and this also indicates something about the demographic of people who participated. They may be more likely to attend community events and are a better representation of people who might be more involved with tribal affairs than those who are not. This is

advantageous in that this group of people will be more likely to attend or help with archival and language revitalization activities. It is a disadvantage because they could be a niche group. People in the community who do not often come to events for whatever reason are not well represented here.

3.5 Survey Data

The first question on the language revitalization survey asked about Wichita language ability on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being not at all and 10 representing fluency. No guidelines of any kind were provided to instruct participants in how to assess their abilities. Therefore, like all the questions on a survey, the responses are self-reported opinions and not informed by any academic theory or definitions of levels of proficiency. This approach is problematic when trying to reveal a speaker's linguistic abilities and yet it underlies the methods used by organizations such as Ethnologue and UNESCO. Yang, Grady, & Yang (2017) point out that one problem with these self-assessed reports is that each speaker may have different ideas about what it means to speak a language.

Within the field of second language research, language assessment tests may be more developed as they have come a long way from Skinnerian

behaviorism in the 1950s to more recent tests that can be done on computers or that acknowledge that both linguistic and social competence are important (Brown 2005). There are also more informal assessments in classrooms. For example, as an ESL teacher I listened for complex or simple sentences with many pauses or fillers in continuous speech and asked comprehension questions like "Are dolphins fuzzy and poisonous?" Students who said yes did not understand something. But even informal assessments like these are not always employed with speakers of endangered languages. Indeed, some speakers might find these assessments offensive or invasive, especially in cases where language proficiency is dictated more by ideology than ability. Sometimes self-assessments are more respectful.

The question on the language revitalization survey I administered does not provide information about social competence, standard pronunciation, the amount of vocabulary a speaker can use or aptitude for creating sentences and handling complex morpheme structures. However, it reveals ideologies and language knowledge that would not appear in more formal assessments. When a language is so critically endangered that it is widely believed to be extinct, this kind of information has its own significance. Some of this information was occasionally revealed when people offered a sentence or two explaining their choice on the scale of 1-10. Several people justified rating their language ability between 1-3 by saying they knew a few words or phrases or that they could sing some hymns or other songs in Wichita. This kind of knowledge

alone would place a speaker very low on any scale in a foreign language classroom setting. However, in a revitalization setting, something like being able to sing songs represents language that still has a social function and is hopeful.

Another reason this question was included was that it might identify some semi-speakers in the community. The term "semi-speaker" could be problematic because various people wide a wide range of language knowledge, from knowing a couple songs in a language to being conversational, could be called a semi-speaker. In this paper, semi-speaker refers to people who are predominantly speakers of English but who may be conversational in Wichita or at least have more working language knowledge than a handful of memorized phrases or songs. Semi-speaker skills might include being able to communicate basic ideas or understand them, being familiar with some basic Wichita grammar or being able to hear and produce Wichita phonemes. Even speakers who use simple fragmented sentences or make numerous mistakes could be important when a language has so few speakers.

Grinevald (2003) wrote that even though semi speakers have less than complete knowledge, they may still know something that more competent speakers do not. She also points out that a good linguistic analysis will include people with a variety of skills and talents including: "story tellers, encyclopedic minds, analytical minds, natural linguists that exist in all human

communities in equally reliable but small proportions "(p. 68). Furthermore, I agree with Grinevald that

> Semi-speakers are key people in situations of language endangerments because they may provide the largest cohort of speakers, and because it is crucially among them that emerge the activists of language documentation and language maintenance or revitalization, as the case may be. (p. 65)

In the case of the Wichita tribe, the only speakers in the community are semi speakers. They are those who do not speak the language fluently, but still have some knowledge of it. These people are invaluable to language revitalization efforts in the community right now, even if they are not confident in their skills or do not recognize the worth of their skills. I wanted to find out if anyone might consider themselves a semi-speaker and assess their willingness to contribute to revitalization.

Forty-five people responded to the question about speaker ability with 24 people placing their skills at 1 or 0. Another 7 people placed their skills at a level 2. When participants placed their skills at a 3 or 4, I started to consider more seriously that they might be semi-speakers. There were respectively 6 and 3 people in these categories. The last person rated himself at a level 6. It's likely that whatever language skills that person has is already recognized by the tribe. The two most prominent semi speakers in the tribe (who did not take the surveys) are also recognized for their conversational skills and have

participated in Wichita language activities in the past. Therefore, even though the Wichita language may be labeled completely extinct, the reality is more complicated. Referring to a language as extinct because there are no fluent speakers is a superficial analysis. While there are no first language speakers left, there are several people with some language knowledge, there are social functions where language is still used such as religious services or dances where singers perform. Finally, there are a handful of semi speakers including a couple who are conversational. These two particular people did not take the surveys but their conversational ability are known in the tribe.

3.6 Potential Language Ideologies in the Wichita Tribe

As previously stated, the second question on the survey asked if participants believed it was possible to revitalize the language. Of the 48 people who answered this question, the majority responded that they did believe it was possible to revitalize the language. 37 people said yes, 8 people said they did not know if it was possible and only 3 people said no.

Many participants offered their reasons for believing it is possible to revitalize the language. These reasons included the work of Rood[10] and Doris McLemore who helped make recordings, other recordings, and the idea that there are still elders speaking the language. Some thought that several elders who all know a little of the language could collectively piece it back together. From a linguistic perspective, language reconstruction takes more than pieces of dispersed knowledge, nevertheless it is valuable.

Other participants mentioned obstacles in response to this question whether they thought revitalization was possible or not. The most common was that there are no fluent speakers left. Several mentioned that it is possible if the tribal members could only be devoted enough to the cause[11]:

- *The information is there we just need to take advantage of it.*
- *If people do it it's possible but people have to stay devoted to it.*
- *There aren't many people left to practice with. We should all try.*
- *Yes, the language can be revitalized with time, effort and perseverance.*
- *If more people learn to speak the language, they could pass it on.*

---

[10] The work here refers to much more than the lessons already mentioned. People were remembering his academic work and the elicitation sessions that he recorded. Rood recorded songs, language classes or discussions, stories and memories of the Wichita way of life.

[11] Throughout this paper I have reworded a few of the comments slightly in an effort to avoid idiosyncrasies that might threaten anonymity. I believe all of the comments remain true to the intended meaning of the participants.

A few pointed to lack of devotion as an obstacle:

- *Past efforts to offer classes have not resulted in much language use.*
- *I think enough of the language is still available and accessible; but there is a lack of effort or understanding on our the people's part.*

While some participants saw problems, others stated the fact that people are willing to try:

- *We are still here. I know I feel that given the opportunity, I would like to learn and hear my native language and I'm sure there are others like me.*
- *People are receptive and have the desire to learn.*

There were also various encouraging, though perhaps vague answers:

- *My children and grandchildren will be able to speak their language.*
- *People are attempting to keep it alive.*
- *People learn new things every day.*
- *Anything is possible.*

The Wichita's optimism in the face of great odds could be a key ingredient in any amount of success if they can keep it through the long years and hard work that revitalization requires.

3.7 Wichita Language and Religion

Language can be intimately tied to religious beliefs and practices the world over. At times, functions like this keep the language alive when other social opportunities have long since disappeared. Hebrew, Latin and Sanskrit have all been prominent examples of language surviving to different extents through religion. One of the questions on the survey read "Is the Wichita language related to religion? How? (For example, is it sacred? Should it be used in church? Does God speak it or did God create it?)"

Aside from the few example suggestions in parenthesis, the question was open-ended with space to comment. 37 people commented on this question. Most of the comments that mentioned religion appeared to deal specifically with Christianity, but a handful also referred to Native American religions.

23 people made some kind of remark affirming that the Wichita language had to do with religion somehow, 6 said they did not know, 4 said no, 1 said it was up to each individual and the remaining 3 did not quite answer the question. (For example, one of them said that it was traditional, another said it helped them feel close to their ancestors.)

The 23 who said it had something to do with religion wrote various explanations for their opinion. Several people said Wichita has to do with religion because there are hymns in Wichita, or because God speaks all languages or created all languages. Some of these comments seemed to be impersonal observations and others were closely tied to sacred, strongly held religious beliefs. The following are examples of both:

- *I believe that God created everything, and the language can be used in church but it's not sacred.*
- *All languages are from God. There is nothing wrong with using a different language.*
- *It can be related to religion when people sing or speak it in the right way. It can be special to sing in the tribal language at church.*
- *Yes, it is spiritual and sacred. When I grew up as a child, church services were in Wichita. The hymns were sung in Wichita and I learned them. The Rock Springs and Baptist Church were established by a Creek missionary and it will be 143 years old this August.*

The first two comments indicate broad beliefs that incorporate a narrative for the Wichita history, language or experience. However, the language does not seem to be a salient part of the religion. The last two comments include meaningful personal experiences that integrate the language into the religion more. These two participants seem to associate the language with the religion because of their experiences with the language in their churches. The last comment supports Smith's (1996) statement that Native Americans in this area may have accepted Christianity more easily because it was introduced to them via other Native Americans. Some tribes still feel that Christianity was forced on them as a form of colonialism that still plagues them. However, religion might be viewed or practiced, it will affect any language that is associated with it.

Another person had stronger beliefs about the connection between the language and the religion.

- *I do believe that it is related to religion. It is a gift God gave specifically to our people. We should use it to praise and worship God for allowing us to live the way He wants. I believe God speaks it and He did create it because He loves us so much.*

This person offered not only personal experiences or historical knowledge, but doctrinal beliefs about how God is related to the language.

There were several other interesting comments in this section including this one:

- *The Wichita language is related to religion but in a contemporary setting. As a tribe and culture, we are deeply invested in it and the role that it played in religion is reflected only in the roles and responsibilities that we are socially assigned. God didn't speak it - giving God a language is a tactic to get people to conform to a particular religion.*

Some people in the tribe seemed to have a positive view of religion and its relation to language. This could be important because it provides a social function for language. While not everyone in the tribe agreed, the picture of language ideologies, what the language means to the tribe and why it is important to revitalize it would not be complete without this information.

3.8 Motivations

Strong motivations are needed to awaken sleeping languages. Baldwin and Baird both felt responsibility and a desire to pass their language to their children. Baird also had religious or spiritual motivation. Another example of strong motivations that fostered dedicated revitalization is found in the Maori case related by King (2009) Her informants expressed four elements that explained their continued commitment to learning their language. She refers to the first as a quasi-religious worldview. The informants felt that learning their language was a spiritual endeavor. The second was a New Age humanism that was demonstrated by informant's experiences of growing and transforming through learning their language. Third and fourth was a connection with Maori ancestors and with the traditional Maori philosophy called kaupapa which includes aspirations for sovereignty. To the Maori the language is an inherent component in these important aspects of life and it has driven their resolute efforts to learn it.

Some revitalization programs have tried to provide incentive, but it may be important to offer the right incentive. For example, in Kazan, efforts were made to raise the prestige of the minority Tatar language by making it an official language of government and business along with Russian. Extra compensation was also offered to Russians who learned the Tatar language. Gorenburg (2005) notes that the program was not very successful and blames the fact that language learning and using was not always mandatory. The study may be missing an ideological analysis. Tatar is difficult and unrelated to

Russian. It used to be forbidden and speakers were shamed for using it. Incentives for using it must overcome these difficulties.

I asked the Wichita participants why language revitalization is important to them. I offered 15 options that I thought could be pertinent and allowed people to add other reasons.

A few people didn't check boxes but wrote in their own reason. One of these had answers that were very similar to some of the options already given

- *Once it's gone, it's gone*
- *Our ancestors spoke it*

A few people chose every option, seemingly indicating that revitalization is really important for every reason. There were 50 people who answered this question and they usually choose many options. The most popular choices were tied to family, identity and culture:

I want my children to know about the culture: 39
It's part of my Wichita identity: 38
I want to learn more about the language or culture: 37
I'm afraid we will lose the language or culture: 37

Many people also said that they thought it was interesting, that they wanted their children to learn the language, that the language has cultural or historical information in it and that it helps them feel closer to their ancestors. The least favorite choices were:

I know someone special who wants me to learn: 14
It's a way to decolonize my life or culture: 20
It's fun: 20

It may be up to the Wichita to decide if their motivations are stronger than their obstacles.

3.9 Obstacles

One of the questions on both the revitalization survey and the archive survey asked people what their obstacles might be. Participants could add their own or choose from pre-existing options. This question could provide more perspective on why people might not come to language classes or visit the archive and it might cause people to consider their own priorities a little. Some of the obstacles revealed were practical and others were ideological.

A popular (and predictable) answer on both surveys was that people did not feel that they had time. A number of people wrote in that they lived out of town or out of the state and some commented that living far away was also a time issue. Others said they did not have a way to get to the archive and this could apply to language classes as well. Some of those who lived out of town hoped that the archive would eventually be offered in some kind of online format so that they could access it anywhere they live. If the archive were online it would benefit not only people who live out of town or out of state. This would overcome obstacles for others in the community including those who might be disabled or lack transportation. The Native American Language Archive at Sam Noble is planning to eventually make their collections accessible online but that could take a few years. Individual tribes with their own copies of archival material could make them accessible sooner.

Another noteworthy response was that people feared they would not be good at speaking Wichita. It might be helpful if language teachers and educators in the tribe were aware of this troubling concern, so they can find tools to help learners overcome this fear.

Similarly, many people who took the archive survey said that they did not know how to use the archive, and a few mentioned they did not know what to do with it or that technology is difficult for them. This is an understandable response as many people are not very familiar with archives. Nicole Umayam

mentioned this as well. Umayam served as a consultant for the tribe when they built their archive and she is familiar with community-based archive models. When I interviewed her for this project (see chapter 4) she pointed out that there is often a gap in technological knowledge among Native Americans who could use it for activities such as language revitalization. Many important principles in archives such as provenance, metadata, copyright laws and organization may be intimidating or strange. The good news is that this is not a difficult obstacle to overcome. Most tribal members will not need to learn these archiving principles in order to benefit from the information and files in the archive. The tribe is already interested in hosting another free workshop to help tribal members learn how to use the archive. People could come and possibly try it for themselves. It could also be helpful to have someone who knows how to use the archive on hand to offer assistance. When the archive is stored in the Wichita History Center, a staff member may be able to fulfill this role.

Several options were not checked at all: "It's not important" "I don't think we can do these things" and only one person picked "I don't think we should do these things."

A few people did not answer the question and several people supplied comments. Some indicated that they had no obstacles and one person said they were willing to learn more about the archive. One person was worried

about how the language is difficult, the tribe is small and that descendants would not know if they were saying the words correctly. A few others had concerns like this as well in other areas of the survey. However, people seemed more worried about this more than sure of it, which could be a positive sign that they are open minded, and the tribe could address this concern.

One person commented that they might not be able to participate because of a disability, but it is possible that the disability in question (and many others) would not hinder participation in revitalization activities. Other obstacles written in included being a caretaker for a family member and not being a member of the tribe. It is the tribe's prerogative to decide matters of access and how much outside help they would like. Anyone who creates an archive can restrict access, but the Wichita have made theirs open access and anyone will be able to use it.

A follow up question on the archive survey inquired what participants would need to be able to visit the archive. The most popular answer with 17 votes was that participants needed someone to help them use it. 13 said they needed some kind of transportation and a handful wanted a babysitter. Others marked 'other' and wrote in that they needed time. Another person requested weekend classes because they work weekdays.

Perhaps it goes without saying that there are probably more obstacles than those listed here, and others will always come up as the tribe advances their goals.

3.10 Who Should Be Involved In Revitalization?

The next question asked participants what kinds of people were needed in successful language revitalization. The options here were:

- Certified teachers
- Certified teachers are not necessary, traditional teaching approaches will work.
- Help from people who might not be members of the tribe
- Tribal members and the skills we have already are enough
- Tribal members should learn special skills
- A mixture of people in the tribe and outside help

This ideological question could indicate whether or not the community values certified teaching, professional training or traditional approaches. It was also important for me because I did not want to overstep boundaries as a guest in the community. I needed to know how my presence would be perceived and what might be expected of me. It is important for future researchers and other outsiders to be aware of these attitudes about their help and their presence.

42 people responded to this question. The results for this question are ambiguous because the votes for options were fairly similar. The most popular choices with 27 votes each was that tribal members should learn any skills needed and that inside help, and outside help would be the best option. The least popular options were that tribal members and any skills they already possess are enough to revitalize the language with 17 votes and only 13 people thought certified teachers are necessary.

So far, the tribe seems to have approached language revitalization with a mixture of outside help and independent work. The language classes in the tribe are taught by tribal members but people from both within the tribe and without have conducted elicitation sessions.

In this case as with others, the tribe may need to identify their own values and design their own approach. I agree with the majority here that an ideal situation would be one in which tribal members learn special skills for revitalization and then they can decide what is best for themselves and choose whether they would like to work independently. Outside help may be very useful at times as well. As noted in chapter 5, The Wichita History Center would not have been possible without various human resources outside of the tribe like the contractors who built the museum or the researchers who shared knowledge about the tribe's past.

With language vitality scales in mind, another question asked what kinds of programs or opportunities the tribe thought were needed for successful language revitalization. According to scales like Fishman's, robust "safe" languages are taught in schools and are used in government, the media, literature, technology and business. The opinions of the Wichita will determine if the language appears in any of those places even if it is only locally. This question was also a way to gauge what the Wichita believe successful language revitalization should look like. This is important because implementing programs into the community that the majority of people believe are necessary for language revitalization could be better received than those that are not.

The most popular answers from this question were that kids should learn the language with 35 votes and there should be workshops or classes in the community with 31 votes. The answers that were least popular were that Wichita should be taught in schools with 17 votes and that the Wichita language should be in the media with 15 votes. More people thought that Wichita should be spoken at home than in school with 27 votes.

A few people checked the option "It can't be done."

3.11 Language Revitalization Programs and Volunteer Work

Much of the survey was meant to discover community ideologies but considerable space was also given to find out what kinds of programs people would be interested in and find potential volunteers.

Questions 3-5 of the language revitalization survey dealt with suggestions for various kinds of programs and skills or other help that tribal members could contribute to a language revitalization program. Each question included several suggestions and room for participants to add more. Most participants responded to this section with enthusiasm and willingness to participate in a variety of ways.

Question 3 asked "Which of the following would you like to see in your community?" followed by 13 options that are all used in other endangered language communities. The options were divided into the categories "programs," "learning materials," and "other materials in Wichita." The programs were language camp, Master Apprentice programs, language classes, Wichita preschool or daycare, workshops for training in how to make Wichita learning materials, and workshops for learning strategies to speak Wichita at home. The learning materials were a website with resources for learning Wichita (grammar lessons, games, recordings, etc.), Wichita language textbooks and other books for learning the language like reference grammars

or a dictionary. Other materials in Wichita that could be checked were dubbed movies or cartoons in Wichita, children's books in Wichita, books with native stories or lessons and books with modern stories in Wichita.

There may be a slight preference for language materials over programs. The two most popular answers were the language resource website and children's books in Wichita with 44 votes each (followed closely by books with native stories and language classes.) The popularity of these choices is consistent with other answers and ideologies in the survey. Several people commented throughout the survey that they lived out of town and or did not have much time. A language website could help solve both of these problems by giving people the luxury of accessing learning materials anytime and anywhere there is an internet connection. However, this would not necessarily provide language partners or keep people accountable for their progress.

The other most popular answer was that people wanted children's books in Wichita. In other parts of the survey, participants commented that they thought children should learn the language and that they are motivated to learn the language in order to pass it on. Wichita children's books would be a valuable tool to help bring Wichita into homes, schools, and perhaps other public spaces to help children learn the language. It would be easy to start small scale projects to create children's books. Even if there is not money to publish children's books, many children could still appreciate books that have

been made by other tribal members. Homemade books in turn are opportunities for others to practice the language including those who write stories or illustrate them and those who read them to children. With help, children could be making picture books too.

The least popular choices were Master Apprentice programs, dubbed movies or cartoons in Wichita and workshops to learn how to make learning materials. One participant had experience with Master Apprentice programs in another tribe and was adamant that this was the most effective way to learn and teach the language. Master Apprentice programs do not necessarily require many people so even a couple people with strong convictions like this individual could be good candidates as apprentices and semi speakers – especially those that might be conversational – would be the ideal masters.

The next questions asked participants about the skills and activities they would be willing to contribute or learn. Many of the options corresponded to the previous question to gage if people were willing to help create the programs and materials in which they expressed interest. I also wanted to communicate that many different roles exist in language revitalization and people can be involved in many ways. For example, along with the option to teach the language, there were also options to do things like cook food for community events.

Many people checked several boxes. In fact, some people seemed so enthusiastic about the idea of language revitalization that they checked every single box in all of these questions.

Skills that people are willing to contribute or activities that people are willing to participate in:

Home, Technical or Artistic Skills
- Preparing food for events (34)
- Art work (26)
- Web design or maintenance (13)
- Other IT skills (11)
- Clerical work (25)

Community leadership
- Discussion leader or teacher (17)
- Organizing events (21)
- Helping kids with activities (36)

Community Participation
- Being a Master in a master apprentice program (4)
- Being an Apprentice in a master apprentice program (22)
- Attend language classes (42)
- Participate in language camp (32)

Language Study Activities
- Use Wichita at home (23)
- Study by yourself (35)
- Send kids to participate in language events and activities (29)

Language Development Activities
- Uploading language projects to a website (19)
- Create language materials (20)
- Writing stories, poems or acting out plays (16)
- Dubbing cartoons, movies or skits (10)
- Working with or adding to the Wichita archive or dictionary (17)
- Create art for books, pamphlets or website (20)
- Playing language games (26)

Skills or activities that people are willing to learn

Linguistic Work
- How to use the Wichita dictionary (37)
- How to do basic linguistic work (26)
- How to write a grant to fund language projects (21)
- How to write in Wichita (32)
- How to bring language into your home (31)

Community leadership or participation
- How to lead a class or discussion group (17)
- How to work with kids for daycare or class (22)

Other community or technical work
- Computer skills (21)
- How to use the archive (30)
- How to prepare food (32)
- How to do any other traditional activities (29)
- Clerical Work (15)

Perhaps one of the trends here is that people are more interested in participating in activities that are already established and led by other people than they are in creating or leading activities themselves. The most popular answers are the activities that most people are probably already familiar with. The most popular choices were:

Preparing food for events 34
Help kids 36
Attend classes 40
Self-study 34
Attend language camp 32

However, some people were willing to learn new skills. For example, only 17 people said they would work with the archive or dictionary but, 37 people said they would learn how to use the dictionary.

The tribe might decide to use the names and contact information from the surveys (that were given with consent by the participants) to plan programs or activities and contact people for help. There are a number of programs that could be built with all of these skills. Maybe language classes with babysitters, language camps with potlucks or kids classes that utilize a community language website. Any one of these ideas could use several different people to contribute different skills for one activity. For instance, a language website would need various people to build the website, create graphic designs, maintain it, and create language materials or lessons to upload. Still other people could teach kids how to use the website or add to it and hopefully anytime children are involved, their parents are involved to some extent as well.

The next question on the survey concerned a language committee. Many tribes have some kind of language committee that leads language revitalization activities. There are many ways to organize and utilize a language committee. Maybe the tribal leadership allows the committee free reign to create goals, plan and oversee activities, recruit their own members or others in the community to lead activities. Some language committees are trusted with the creation of new words that may not traditionally have been part of the lexicon such as Easter, computer, cupcakes, judicial branch or Eiffel tower. A committee may be required to carry out the plans of a tribal

government board, tasked with learning the language themselves, being trained or educated in linguistics, teaching or a number of other duties.

The Wichita tribe does not currently have a language committee, but many people are willing to serve on one. After talking to a representative of the tribe, I edited the question to specify what a committee might look like, though of course it could change:

> This (serving on a language committee) could involve attending meetings at least once a month or more to plan activities or programs, organizing language events, learning how to use the archive or Wichita dictionary online and other language revitalization activities.

According to 51 people who took the survey, 23 said they would be willing to serve on a language committee, 23 said maybe and only 5 said no.

Furthermore, many people in the Wichita tribe would be willing to be involved in language revitalization activities without compensation. Of 51 people who answered a question about compensation, 36 people said they could participate without being paid, 13 people said maybe and 2 said no.

These responses are very auspicious. If people are willing to work for little or no compensation then funds could be spent elsewhere, perhaps in printing language materials, inviting professionals to help train tribal members, hiring tribal employees to help with these activities or other priorities unrelated to

language work. It also means that their motivations could be strong enough to inspire language work even without any immediate economic benefits.

3.12 Archive Responses

The archive survey had similar questions that examined community interest in programs or uses of the archive. The first question on the archive survey asked participants why they would be interested in using the archive. Options were divided into 'Language and Culture,' and 'Other Reasons.' The Language and Culture options included the following:

- To study the Wichita language
- To learn more about Wichita culture
- To create learning materials for the Wichita language
- To find or add words to the Wichita dictionary
- To read what scholars have said about Wichita language or culture
- to watch videos of Wichita language classes or discussions

Other options were

- To listen or learn song in Wichita
- To listen to recordings of elders speaking
- To listen to recordings of friends or relatives
- To look at pictures of people or places
- To find genealogy information

The purpose of this question was two-fold. First, it was a way to gauge interest in different areas and this feedback could then be used

to improve the archive and cater it to the community's interests and needs. For example, if many people said they were interested in genealogy work, an effort could be made to include more of this kind of information in the archive or ask tribal members to help in this area. Secondly, it was a way to inform people who might not be very familiar with archives of many possible activities and types of information for which they can be used. Hopefully this in turn would increase interest in the archive. These responses also tell us something about the tribe's interests in these topics in general.

All of the options were selected to varying degrees. The most popular interests were studying the language and listening to or learning songs in Wichita, followed by learning more about the culture.

The least popular choices were creating learning materials and finding or adding words to the Wichita dictionary. The former is not especially surprising. However, the latter was a bit of a surprise given that the archive and dictionary were well received when Umayam presented it to the community and that the dictionary is a new and valuable tool.

One person wrote in another option; she hoped to find records from a boarding school about family members who attended the school. The tribe could search for these kinds of records if they decided it was within the scope of the archive.

Hopefully the wide range of interests indicated by this first question means that interested individuals might learn to use the archive given the opportunity or incentive. However, it is likely too much to expect people to flock to the archive simply because they have now heard of these possibilities. Some people may still need more motivation or support, or the archive might need more advertising, promotion or accessibility within the tribe.

Participants were also asked if they would be interested in workshops for the archive. One workshop was specifically meant to train people to learn to use the archive and the other was meant to have people test the archive, the dictionary or the manual that accompanies it. The latter was a suggestion of the archive's consultant, Umayam, who wrote the manual. As thorough as the manual appears to be, she felt that it could always use improvement. Still thinking of the archive users, Umayam wanted to make sure that people could easily read and understand the manuals. The responses to these questions were very positive.

Of 49 people, 40 said yes, they would be interested in a workshop to test the archive, 8 said maybe, 0 said no and one person did not answer. Of the same 49 people, 42 said yes, they would be interested in a workshop to learn how to use the archive, 2 said no, 4 said maybe and one person did not answer. These responses indicate a high willingness to learn and be more involved. If they are willing to do the work of learning or attending workshops it is up to

the tribe to provide the workshops or help that is needed for people to be able to do so.

3.13 Individual Goals

At the end of the survey, participants were asked two final open-ended questions. The first of these was to list three language goals they had or were willing to make. Some people had fairly basic, realistic goals:

- *Learn the alphabet, how to pronounce words and basic Wichita words.*
- *To also learn more about my tribe.*
- *To learn Wichita hymns, the names for objects and to be able to pray in Wichita.*

Some people had goals that were general or vague:

- *Speaking, understanding, writing*
- *Learning, speaking, singing.*
- *Eventually learn my languages and others.*

As already noted, the language is important to many people for family reasons. Several people talked about using the language at home or learning it in order to share it with their children:

- *Teach my son the language, learn more Wichita and use Wichita at home.*
- *That my grandchildren will recognize it when they hear it and be able to talk among themselves.*
- *I want to learn Wichita so I can pass it on to my kids.*
- *Learn the language and teach it to my nieces and nephews.*
- *To find out my daughter's name in Wichita. Before my mother passed away, she used to refer to my daughter by a name in Wichita. I can remember what it means but not how to say it.*
- *Have my children learn the language and culture.*
- *Learn more Wichita, teach it to my children and make efforts to help others learn.*
- *Be able to speak my language at home, be able to speak my language to my kids and be able to write.*
- *To learn to speak it in sentences, and with my family or other Wichitas.*
- *To make time to learn the language and be able to use it at home.*

Participants also expressed an interest in learning other Native languages. Most of these people are likely members of more than one tribal community through marriage, ancestors or other relatives. Even if they are

only enrolled in one tribe some of the participants wanted their children to learn all the languages that their ancestors from various tribes spoke. One or two people in other sections of the survey also noted that language programs were stronger in other tribes and they hoped to see the same in the Wichita community.

Other comments in this section demonstrated a willingness to be a part of many of the activities mentioned in the survey. Some were willing to teach or help with other activities as well:

- *To learn to use the archive, to assist others with the knowledge I have, to assist with the development of language learning materials.*
- *My children and I are willing to attend classes or camp.*
- *To be able to have a conversation in Wichita, to be able to teach others the basics and to be able to understand Wichita*
- *I want to learn the language, be able to teach the language and be able to contribute to the growth of the language.*
- *Learn it, help kids learn it and learn to sing it.*
- *To help with classes, volunteer my time to help and have my children learn the language and culture.*
- *Learning words: numbers, animals, people, items/ learn to say the words properly. I would attend these programs.*

- *Learn the language, serve on a committee, write children's stories in Wichita.*
- *To try my best to learn, to help others succeed and to promote the learning of my language.*

These responses are very encouraging and the love that the Wichita have for the language, culture and their family is obvious. One of the responses above even came from a participant who indicated her belief that language revitalization is not possible. With many others, she seemed to be willing to work on it anyway.

The final question on the survey asked participants if any of their opinions about language revitalization had changed since the beginning of the survey. 13 people simply said "no" and 5 more said "no" with some kind of explanation. Several people expressed support for the effort or reaffirmed that revitalization is important to them:

- *I have always felt we needed to start today and not waste another minute.*
- *Go for it! We can't finish something we haven't started!*
- *No I haven't changed any of my opinions. The language is the heart of culture and if we want to become more connected with our culture and our past, our language needs to come back.*

Several people did change or strengthen their opinion or gain a new one:

- *There is a lot to do.*
- *Language experts would be helpful.*
- *I decided I want to learn to sing in Wichita!*
- *I realize the importance of revitalizing our language so that our culture will not be forgotten.*
- *I believe more strongly that we need a strong program to make sure our language and culture is not lost.*
- *Just more determined and excited to learn!*
- *I am more interested in learning how to speak it.*

Some respondents seemed to realize that language revitalization is important or what it might entail for the first time. A couple of them wanted to do something new. These results suggest that revitalization is already important to most of the tribe, that they are worried about losing the language and that they want some kind of program or opportunities to revitalize it. It also seems that people are open minded; some people changed their minds or learned something new. People may be persuaded to help or persuaded that certain kinds of activities are more effective than others. People seemed to be more excited or inspired about language revitalization simply by taking a

short survey. They could be capable of much more than their current involvement or interest.

A few more people added a final thought or expressed a concern:

- *Master Apprentice programs are really successful, I work for a language department in another tribe and we have had success with our modified version of Master Apprentice Programs.*
- *I think favoritism is a problem in the tribe.*
- *Only our current elders can bring the language back.*
- *Yes, I would be willing to give it a chance. But everyone says the words differently, which way is right?*

Several of these comments are types of language ideologies and some of them are common. Some tribal members offered their own solutions for success including the idea that only elders can bring the language back or that the Master Apprentice program is effective. The last comment reveals a concern about a correct way to speak the language, which is common in this situation. It is important to be aware of these types of concerns so that the tribe can address them, but it is up to them how to address them. They may decide any dialect variation is valid or they might try to standardize the language. They are in the best position to make decisions like these because they have a knowledge about the people in the tribe today, the culture and

how the language is used. When concerns like these go unnoticed, they can lead to negative feelings and behavior like confusion, discouragement or lukewarm commitment with no apparent cause.

There was one other question in the survey asking when people would be available to work on language revitalization efforts. This question was added only for the benefit of the tribe and indicated that most people were available evenings and weekends. Several people stated that they could participate at any time or that they were uncertain but would find time because it was important to them.

3.14 Summary

Although the Wichita tribe lost their last fluent speaker, their language is not necessarily extinct. As Leonard points out, languages can be preserved in documentation and there is still potential for people to revitalize them. In the case of the Wichita tribe, there is also a handful of semi-speakers. These factors are generally not taken into account when assessing language vitality, but they should be. A major reason this is important is that it affects language ideologies and attitudes of community members who may want to revitalize the language if it is possible.

In the Wichita tribe, many people believe, despite the odds, that the language can be revitalized. They are also willing to participate in a myriad of activities and roles to assist the process. This includes a couple people who do not believe revitalization is possible. Some tribal members gave reasons for their belief that the language can be revitalized. These included Rood's research, elder's knowledge and the idea that they simply needed to be more dedicated. Tribal members also identified some powerful motivations for revitalizing the language. These motivations are tied to their ancestors and history, their identity, a hunger to learn more about the language and culture, religious reasons and especially their families. Even community members who were not enrolled in the tribe shared many of these motivations. Sharing these personal motivations is another reason that relatives who are not enrolled with a tribe are still part of the community.

Obstacles to revitalization were also identified. Several that appeared many times were that people were afraid they would not be good at the language, some people lived away from Anadarko where the archive and classes are held, and some people said they did not have time. Participants expressed other concerns with revitalization as well. They worried about keeping the language correct and about starting and keeping interest. As long as there is a language to revitalize, there will be obstacles and these obstacles will be in competition with motivations and positive beliefs. Tribes can control

whether they prioritize their obstacles or their motivations. Either can eclipse the other and ideologies could be powerful in overcoming obstacles.

The surveys also sought and identified many people who were willing to serve as volunteers and activities that people wanted to volunteer or participate in. People were willing to serve on a language committee, teach or attend classes, work with the archive, work with kids, help with a website and serve in "behind the scenes" roles such as making food for events. Many people said they were willing to help without being compensated though some were not sure and a few said no. Many people also said that tribal members should learn any skills needed to revitalize the language and some of them were willing to do so themselves.

Community-based language revitalization programs could be built with these ideologies and volunteers. The exact extent to which the language can be revitalized is unclear. Further research could answer more questions, but even with more research there are so many variables, including humans, that cannot be completely predicted. Thus far, the overall results of the surveys in assessing attitudes and community willingness to be involved are positive, and the amount of information in the archives is encouraging. Revitalization is not guaranteed, but there are reasons to be hopeful.

Chapter 4
Creating a Self-Sustaining, Community-Based Wichita Archive

Archival materials can play a key role in language revitalization, especially when there are no speakers. Without living knowledge in the community, documentation is the only source for how a language works and what the words might be. In this chapter the Wichita archive is reviewed for two reasons. First, it is important to know what documentation of Wichita exists in order to understand if it may be revitalized. According to Leonard the language may not even be extinct if there is documentation and people who still claim it as a heritage language. Secondly, it serves as a model for community-based revitalization efforts in the community. The archive is described in some detail for the benefit of the tribes and others who are considering similar projects.

The community already has many successful community-based programs including the Kitikiti'sh Little Sisters, the Annual Dance, several businesses and health and social services. Some of these endeavors are cultural, some are shared with people outside of the community and some of them involve the Wichita language. However, none of them use the language or have the potential to create revitalization to the extent that the archive does.

4.1 Introducing the Wichita Archive

The way in which the Wichita archive was conceived and built fits the highest levels of community involvement in Czaykowska-Higgins' (2009) and Linn's (2014) models. Like their Community-Based Language Research and Archive models, the Wichita were directly involved from the beginning. The archivist consultant they hired had their goals in mind. The whole project was meant to further the tribe's goals and no one else's.

Linn helped to initiate the project. She previously worked at the Native American Language Archive (NAL) at the Sam Noble Oklahoma Natural History Museum (Sam Noble Museum) as a professor, assistant curator and fieldworker and currently works at The Smithsonian. Linn met one of the Wichita tribal members by chance at a conference in Washington D.C. and referred her to one of Linn's former students who was hired by the tribe as the archive's consultants. The hired consultant, Nicole Umayam, was familiar with the concept of community-based archives and it was a foundational principle that drove her decisions and interactions with the tribe. She currently works for a library system in Arizona. Before she left Oklahoma, she invited me to help with the Wichita archive, mostly in processing Rood's incoming accession materials.

I was able to interview Umayam to learn about the Wichita archive and how it was made. Most of the information in this chapter about the archive is informed by that interview.

While I have been referring to the project as the Wichita Archive, Umayam explained that the tribe secured a four-month grant (July to October 2016) under which it was called "The Wichita Language Documentation Project." It is obvious from its name that the archive was not the only goal or even the primary objective. While the archive is valuable in itself, its more important purpose is to be an instrument of language documentation and possibly revitalization. The project was meant to include more than one phase. It would start with creating the archive but eventually move onto analyzing gaps in language documentation once everything was organized and they could look over the whole collection. Then the tribe intended to make new recordings to fill those gaps. These last stages were never completed because Doris McLemore, the last fluent Wichita speaker who was meant to help with the recordings, passed away. It was also part of the plan that the archive would collect materials from Rood and that the NAL would act as a back-up repository for their archive. All of the physical materials will stay in Anadarko in The Wichita Tribal History Center. All of the digital materials will be kept in both Anadarko and the Sam Noble Museum on SeaGate hard drives. Both will have working copies and any changes in the archive will need to be updated in both.

Besides hiring Umayam, the tribe also had an open call for an assistant to be hired. They selected Zach Rice, a recently graduated master's student from The University of Oklahoma. Rice was perfectly suited for this job. He has a background in linguistics studying the Pawnee language and is a member of the Pawnee tribe. The Pawnee language is related to Wichita and the two tribes have been friends for centuries. They still celebrate their friendship every year during the Wichita-Pawnee visitation which includes camping, ceremonies, gift giving, meals, prayers, singing and dancing.

Rice was in a position to be able to understand the procedures at hand and their importance from both an academic and an indigenous viewpoint. Furthermore, he would benefit from learning about the project and he could take those lessons back to his own tribe.

Another integral member of the team working under the grant was Mr. McAdams. He is a prominent member of the Wichita tribe and along with another person is employed by the tribe as their culture and language department. He has taught language classes and participated in elicitation sessions with fluent Wichita speakers. He was involved with several other recordings that are now part of the archive's collection. He was a past president of the tribe and therefore has an intimate knowledge and personal experience with the administration, goals and needs of the tribe. He is still highly involved in many tribal events and pursuits.

Everyone who was involved with the archive had specialized tasks. Rice assisted somewhat with digitization but spent most of his time building the dictionary. Umayam completed most of the other archival processes; she gathered, organized and catalogued all the materials, developed a digitization plan and helped carry out digitization. She also established policies and set up a workflow for continued work on the archive. These tasks will be expounded on in more detail below. Umayam also trained McAdams in archival processes and he gathered and deposited items into the archive. It is his responsibility to continue to work with the archive in the future and share it with others. It still needs descriptions and metadata that they did not have time to add during the grant period. The tribe, including McAdams and President Parton, was consulted in all decisions, updated on progress and ultimately, they were in control. President Parton also legally donated materials to the NAL and promotes the archive within the Wichita community. Her support is critical to the success of the project.

Finally, it should be noted that Rood also agreed to contribute to the project. As the most prominent researcher of the Wichita language in academia, he has over 40 years' worth of materials on the language. Because Rood lives in Colorado, a Dropbox was created for him online to deposit information and materials. Like Umayam, he has also been conscious of the tribe's wishes and careful to fulfill them. Rood's materials will be organized,

described, and given identification numbers and categories to make it easier for community members to find information. Completing these tasks and communicating with Rood and the tribe about his collection has been my task as a volunteer at the NAL. One batch of his materials has is almost completely processed and it is expected that Rood will contribute more in the future as he is able to.

4.2 Guide to Wichita Documentation and Archival Contents

One of the important reasons that the Wichita tribe can carry out revitalization activities is that there is a significant amount of language in their archive. This means that the language is not necessarily extinct and that there are materials from which they can study, create learning materials and reconstruct the language. The following is a description of what is in their collections.

What I have been referring to collectively as "The Wichita Archive" is not actually the name of any archive or single collection. There are two separate collections or archives from different sources with their own names. The first collection is the Wichita Language Project. It is the portion of items that were collected and accessioned from the tribe itself. It is comprised of 160

folders or “items” and many of these have more files inside. The majority of the material in the collection fits into one of two major categories called ‘series’: The Song Project and elicitation sessions.

There are at least 70 folders in the Song Project and they all contain recordings of songs in Wichita. Other files in the archive also include recordings of songs and together they cover a variety of genres. There are hymns, lullabies and traditional or ceremonial songs such as the Gourd dance and the Ghost dance. Some of them were recorded with many people singing and beating drums during an event like the Annual Dance or the Pawnee Visitation. Others were recorded with only one singer.

The elicitation sessions are contained in over 30 folders and each folder has anywhere from 4 to over 1,000 files inside. I counted over 2,700 files of unique recordings from these sessions. The recordings are of isolated words, phrases or sentences. They are alphabetically organized within their folder and named by the English translation of the word or phrase recorded.

Much of the linguistic information from these elicitations sessions is repetitive. Some of the same words may have been recorded at different times and turn up in more than one folder or sentence. Often those who created the recordings were trying to create paradigms the way that some linguists do; they ask for a phrase several times and each time they only change one word. For example, if the linguist is trying to discover all of the pronouns in a

language, they might ask for a simple sentence several times and each time ask for a different pronoun. (I love you, She loves you, He loves you, They love you, etc.) Linguists look at how the changes in each sentence affect other structures or words in the sentence or how changing the position of a word in a sentence might affect things. This method is valuable in isolating a specific feature and learning about how the feature behaves in different environments. However, these sentences can be repetitive because they all feature the same or similar structures and most of the same words, including words that turn up in other paradigms. Even so, there is a significant amount of linguistic information in these recordings.

Along with the elicitation recordings and songs, there are is a useful assortment of other materials. The archive has recordings of stories, including those that are also appear in Rood's contribution and videos of language meetings. Some of these videos are the those produced by Rood and are also in his collection while others appear to be unique. Rood's language lessons as well as a little teaching material created by tribal members are there. The teaching materials and lessons include some worksheets, wordlists, teaching instructions and recordings. One of the recordings features Doris McLemore telling the Wichita creation story in both Wichita and English and in a few others she pronounces Wichita words that the listener is meant to try to repeat.

The majority of the archive contains recordings in Wichita, but there are materials with English as well. The archive also includes some scholarly materials. One of these is a video of a Wichita history lecture by Dr. Earl Elam who visited the tribe and presented the lecture in Anadarko. Additionally, there are at least 24 published papers about the tribe's culture, history or language. 14 of these are by Rood and at least 2 others are about Caddo or the Caddo family and not exclusively Wichita.

The dictionary is an important element in the archive along with a database of words and phrases collected by Rood and his then student, now Dr. Mirzayan, and shared with the tribe in the past. In the database, 492 files are labeled as nouns and 1,567 are labeled word-list-paradigms. The dictionary was created from recordings and transcripts like these.

The second collection is the David Rood Collection. There are several series in this collection with elicitation sessions being the largest. One group of elicitation sessions has 40 items that were recorded front and back on tapes and later digitized. This selection alone has about 40 hours of material. In many of these elicitation sessions, Rood sought vocabulary and grammatical information. He rechecked words that he had learned from other speakers, built paradigms and sometimes recorded cultural information. For example, in one recording he asked a speaker about a word he learned from someone else who used it in the context of tying together larger bunches of grass when

building the traditional grass houses. There are several other elicitation sessions in the collection besides this prominent compilation.

Rood also recorded songs. One CD that Rood created features Wichita singer Stuart Owings who sings a song, translates it and talks about its meaning. There are at least 10 recordings of speakers telling traditional Wichita stories and several of people talking about cultural practices like building grass houses, playing games, smoking and electing leaders. Many of these are fairly short and have transcriptions or partial transcriptions.

There are also videos in Rood's collection that range from a few minutes in length to over an hour. They show elders gathered for Wichita language discussions. The meetings were meant to be an opportunity to practice and capture Wichita but there is also plenty of English conversation. The elders talked about old days, songs they remembered, people they know, or try to respond to Rood's promptings for certain topics in Wichita.

Between the two collections there are recordings of men and women, most of whom are elders. Genres of Wichita language in the collections include recipes, personal narratives, traditional stories, history, natural conversations, elicitation sessions, songs and a few prayers.

Outside of all the recordings and transcripts in the archive, Rood also produced articles and a grammar on the Wichita language. It is the only

descriptive reference grammar on the language. Much of the material that it was taken from is in the archives but the processes behind the language are broken down and explained in the grammar. These linguistic descriptions should also be considered part of the documentation of the language. They could also be used in creating teaching materials and in some ways it might be used as a way to standardize some aspects of the language. For example, the orthography that the tribe uses is from Rood's work. If it works for them, they might not need to create other versions as some tribes have done. Various alphabets can create tension or confusion but if the tribe uses Rood's work as an authority they might be able to avoid those issues. Even if they decided to create their own alphabet or change part of Rood's, they have his research to help guide their choices.

While it is not yet known exactly how much of the Wichita language is preserved in the archives, there are recordings of songs, authentic speech and transcripts. Several genres and functions of language are represented, grammar is explained in Rood's work, and there are at least a few thousand words. The various genres and functions are important in revitalization because speakers will need to be able to use their language in many situations (ideally in every situation.)

Even without a specific, known number of words in the archive, it is certain that there are fewer words in the Wichita collection than in larger

collections like the Wampanoag. Estimates for how many words a speaker should know to be considered fluent varies but it is usually several thousand. However, these estimates are not necessarily relevant for polysynthetic languages. In a polysynthetic language it may be more important to know how to build words or how many morphemes a speaker knows than the number of whole words or roots of a word. Within the Wichita archives I would tentatively suggest that many of the most common morphemes in the language are present. Students of Wichita could learn the basic mechanics of the language and a significant number of combinations with morphemes. Even if there are only a few thousand words or morphemes, if they are very common, speakers might be able to become conversational or more.

Words that are missing from the archive could be filled in from other sources. They may possibly be added by comparing Wichita to its near relatives or by creating neologisms. There are people in the community who still have some language knowledge and there is still time for them to add words. There may also still be documents in the community that have not been discovered or added to the archive yet.

I do not believe that there is enough information in the archives to speak the language exactly the way that it was spoken 100 years ago. However, it seems there is enough to begin to establish a solid foundation of knowledge that could be built upon.

4.3 Creating the archive

Umayam told me that she started her work with the Wichita Language Project by traveling to the Wichita administration buildings in Anadarko from Norman, Oklahoma to assess the materials that would go into the archive. She would begin by taking an inventory. What she found might reflect the state of language materials in many communities. There were many boxes of cassette tapes in various states of condition. Much of it had not been touched for many years and without labels the content of individual tapes was unknown. Most of the materials were in McAdam's possession because he created them. They included recordings of elicitation sessions with a speaker of Wichita, handwritten notes in notebooks and recordings of songs.

Like many other communities and researchers, the tribe had materials that were difficult to access because they were kept in private collections or in outdated formats like cassette tapes or notebooks. In addition to being inconvenient, outdated formats are also more susceptible to corrosion. There may still be more important language material in the community that is lost, forgotten, or even damaged.

One of the primary purposes of an archive is to make materials accessible to people – something that is also important in revitalization.

Umayam turned to this goal once she had an inventory and started planning how to capture the information on the tapes or in notebooks, and how to digitize and audio edit them. The materials would be made into a digital collection that could then be accessed on a computer.

During this early phase of building the archive, Umayam also drafted two seminal archiving documents: the collection scope and the mission statement. These documents state the policies of the archive including its purpose and what will be accepted in the collection.

Umayam worked with President Parton and Mr. McAdams to make sure the mission statement and the collection scope embodied what they wanted for the community. She shared parts of these documents at a conference in Arizona. According to the mission statement,

> The Wichita Language Project Archive (WLPA)[12] consists of a growing number of digital materials related to the language and culture of the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes of Oklahoma. It contains two collections: the contents generated by the tribe and the research materials of linguist David S. Rood. As a community language archive, the WLPA uses these two collections to both preserve and advocate for the use of the Wichita language.
>
> The mission of the archives is to identify and collect Wichita language materials, to preserve them, and to make them available for researchers, tribal members, and tribal programs in perpetuity. Its

[12] It appears that the official name of the collection at the NAL is The Wichita Language Project, but on other official documentation, it is called the Wichita Language Documentation Project and encompasses other activities besides the archive, including recording new material. It is the same archive even it is occasionally referred to by slightly different names.

goals are:

> 1. To maintain a tribal-run digital archive of Wichita language materials
> 2. To support further documentation of the Wichita language.
> 3. To support the study and teaching of the Wichita language and culture.

(Umayam, 2016)

Knowing the content of the archive and their purposes in the community allowed them to envision a collection scope that would further outline what is in the archive and what they will accept in their collection in the future. It reads

> The WLPA collects recordings, historical information, linguistic research materials, language teaching materials, biographical information, music, and artwork pertaining to the Wichita language. Acceptable formats for deposit include:
>
> - Audio/visual recordings
> - Research materials
> - Manuscripts
> - Teaching materials (curriculum, lesson plans, etc.)
> - Ephemera

(Umayam, 2016)

The Wichita archive can be classified as a language archive. Language archives are unique in that they do not necessarily have the same purposes as other archives. The Wichita language archive is meant to be used for teaching, preservation and as a safe place for future collection. It was meant to store

physical materials and make them accessible and available for teachers, members, scholars and tribal programs.

While the scope of the collection includes a wide variety of materials from art and ephemera to research and teaching materials, all of these items are meant to aid the community's goals of documenting and teaching the language and culture. They had these goals were in mind when they made audio files, for example. Audio files are easier to copy and distribute than say, a notebook, but they are useful for pedagogical purposes as well.

Anyone in the tribe should be able to add to the archive under the guidelines in the collection scope and mission statement. Ideally, it will create a cycle of both adding and benefitting from those additions. For example, teachers of the language might make materials such as reading resources, grammar worksheets, lesson plans or games. The teacher could use these in class or at home, and also donate them to the archive. Then anyone else who teaches can find these items in the archive and also benefit from them. Perhaps the next person will try a lesson a different way or add to it and then donate these new items to the archive and the cycle starts over.

After the initial stages of gathering and collecting materials, Umayam managed several other steps in the archival processes such as organizing and describing. She explained to me that this process can transform something from a box of random materials into an archive because the collectors knows

exactly what they have and a way to access and retrieve materials has been established.

Because I spent time volunteering with the NAL, I learned more about what these steps entail. Every item will receive a unique identifying number and metadata will be recorded about every item. Metadata is information about information, or in this case information about the materials. Metadata includes dates, participants who were involved, where materials were created or in what language the materials might be. All of this information is recorded on spreadsheets created by people at the NAL. When all the information has been gathered and edited to fit the NAL's standards, it is transferred to an online catalogue for anyone to search. People who search for documents in the archive can search for specific tribes, languages, genres, collectors and materials. Describing the items, including providing as much metadata as possible is paramount in any archive. Without metadata, materials have no context and they are difficult or impossible to find.

Members of the tribe are often in the best position to be able to describe most of their items in the archive. An archivist or assistant can do some of the work when they receive items if they are already well labeled, but tribal members who were present when materials were made can do better. They have expertise in the language and culture that others lack. One of the great advantages of community-based archives is that they can do this part of the process themselves.

Community-based archives can also be flexible about when materials are described. In a large, traditional archive it might not be ideal to wait to describe materials until after they are absorbed in the archive. However, a community-based archive perhaps run on volunteer work could create a plan to update the archive every few months or at other regular intervals. This is a viable option for the creation and maintenance of an archive when community members are dedicated to its success. Because the Wichita archive was built so quickly under the four-month grant, this is exactly what they did.

Before or after materials are described, they may need to be digitized to preserve content of outdated items and optimize their usability. The NAL has a lab with equipment to transfer content from one type of format to another. They can convert tapes to CDs and WAV files or scan notebooks to be uploaded into the digital collection. The NAL can digitize the materials for anyone who contributes to their collection. In this case, they are a backup repository and Rice was trained to use NAL equipment for the Wichita archive. Community archives should also keep in mind that technology will continue to change so a long-term plan should be made for the archive to be periodically updated.

Before Umayam finished her work with the Wichita, she configured the archive at the tribal level, assisted with the transfer of the archive to the NAL, and ensured that the archive conformed to the museum's standards and policies. She provided a presentation to train interested tribal members on how to use the archive in Anadarko. Finally, to help the tribe use the archive,

she recorded procedures and explained her efforts in documents stored in a binder that is kept with the archive. All of her choices were explained so that anyone working on the archive in the future will understand why she did everything the way she did it.

4.4 The Archive Dictionary

A dictionary is not a common component of archives, but they may be an integral part of any long-term language documentation project. The Wichita dictionary, or "lexicon" as Umayam referred to it, will hopefully be useful for many years to come in studying the Wichita language.

The lexicon was started using a linguistic software called FLEX. Umayam recommends that other communities interested in building archives should use it, but perhaps not start with it because the learning curve is high. It requires specialized skills in using the software as well as some linguistic knowledge. Typically, linguists use the software to organize their data with exhaustive detail, down to the morpheme level. For the general reader who is not familiar with linguistics, we will take a very brief detour to introduce morphemes. Morphemes are the smallest unit of meaning in languages. For example, in English, the word "cats" has two morphemes; "cat" and "s." The first morpheme has the meaning of a small, feline animal and the "s" denotes

plurality. The Wichita word *tachira.s* is made of four morphemes (Rood, 1996, p. 597). The morphemes are on the left side of the chart below and their meanings are on the right.

Wichita Morpheme	Meaning
ta	indicative (a way to communicate the sentence is a statement rather than a question or some other kind of sentence.)
t	first person subject (the word "I" in English)
kira.h	sing
s	imperfective (the "ing" in an English sentence)

Figure 4 'tachira.s' broken down by morphemes from Rood, 1996, p. 597

Other words can be much longer. The traditional opening to stories in Wichita is *kà.ʔà.ʔà.kó.khá.rʔa*, meaning something like "long ago it came to pass that" (p. 596). It is made of six morphemes.

FLEX has the capacity to record all of these morphemes and their meanings. Setting up FLEX with a language can be time consuming but once morphemes are labeled they can be searched for and linked to texts. For example, a linguist or a language teacher who wanted to study Wichita indicative sentences could search the database for the morpheme *ta.* Thankfully, though it might take time and effort to set up, using the dictionary is not difficult. An archive might be mysterious or intimidating to some people who are unfamiliar with academia, the technology involved or archival best

practices. However, a dictionary is a familiar tool for many people that can immediately be used and appreciated with a small learning curve for using the program online. As with any other dictionary, it is a powerful tool for organizing a large amount of information so that it is compact and easily accessible. Words can be organized alphabetically, searched for by the Wichita word, the English translation or even semantic category.

According to Umayam, FLEX was used in the Wichita archive for two reasons. First, audio files can be uploaded into the dictionary with the lexeme entries. Previously, there had not been a way to listen to words but now visitors who use the archive will be able to see written words and hear them spoken by one of their own elders who was a fluent speaker. (Most of the recordings in the archive were made with tribal members who are no longer alive.) The audio files in the Wichita dictionary came from thousands of short audio files of single words or phrases recorded in elicitation sessions. They had been transcribed by hand by McAdams so their translation could be added as well. Rice listened to many hours of recordings, cut the best recording of words and uploaded them into the program using equipment from the NAL.

The second reason for using FLEX was that Rood had worked with a FLEX database in his research of the Wichita language. His database has been parsed grammatically and requires some linguistic knowledge to use well. Rood's lexicon and the Wichita lexicon were created for separate

purposes and for now they may be best kept separate. Both databases need more work.

Umayam stressed that they made a lexicon and not a dictionary because dictionaries have more information. If you peruse through a Merriam Webster dictionary, entries might be listed along with part of speech, various forms of the word (the plural form, the superlative form etc.), a number of definitions or uses, and example sentences. The lexicon can be organized to include usage and grammar rules and cultural information that could otherwise be buried in a wordlist or a long recording without context. The Wichita lexicon is not yet this rich. Creating a dictionary is a colossal task and the Wichita archive team had very little time in which to fulfill all the objectives written into their grant. They had to prioritize to preserve the language data that exists first by converting material into a digital format as quickly as possible. This why they chose FLEX and started by entering full words or even full phrases into the program. They did not break everything down by word and morphemes.

Breaking down the words is important in studying both grammar and culture. For instance, the Wichita word *kahasárkih* is translated into English as "North Star" (Rood, 1996, p. 608). The phrase "North Star" reflects a Western cultural understanding and function. The star was used for thousands of years in navigation. In Wichita, the word literally means "It always stands still." This meaning reflects the Wichita understanding and is evidence of the knowledge

they must have gained from their own observations. The word teaches us not only about the language but also about the people who used it. When the words and phrases in the lexicon are broken down further, people will be able to access both this kind of cultural knowledge and the grammatical knowledge that is needed to speak the language productively.

Someone still needs to comb through the lexicon to break down the phrases and separate all the words and morphemes in each entry to regain cultural and linguistic knowledge. Umayam thinks a highly motivated student of Wichita should do it. Perhaps this could be encouraging to tribal members to know that it does not need to be done by a linguist. They do not need to wait for outside help (though it would certainly be useful) if they are willing to contribute the time and effort to learn the software and language. The process of parsing morphemes would help with the latter.

Even though the lexicon is not a full dictionary, it is important because it creates a digital record of language material. Umayam (2017) explained that "Previously it was just written in spiral notebooks and if something happened everything is lost. Digital records are all accessible, preservable and searchable. It maximizes the amount of output you can have. "

4.5 Comparing the Wichita Archive and Traditional Archives

> The Wichita archive shares many foundational practices with traditional archives. These include the mission statement and collection scope, caring for physical items and establishing protocols for access. I asked Umayam to expound on what made this archive different from other archives. From her response I gather that it is different both because it is a community-based archive and because it is a language archive.
>
> Typically, archives are generalist. They don't serve one type of researcher, but language archives are thinking about people who want materials for language work. That affects a lot of archival processes in turn.
>
> (Umayam, 2017)

One of the processes that was changed was in the organization or arrangement of the archive. In a manual on best practices approved by the Archival Society of America, it states that

> The records created, assembled, accumulated, and/or maintained and used by an organization or individual must be kept together (i.e., identified as belonging to the same aggregation) in their original order, if such order exists or has been maintained. They ought not to be mixed or combined with the records of another individual or corporate body. This dictum is the natural and logical consequence of the organic nature of archival materials. Inherent in the overarching principle of respect des fonds are two sub- principles—provenance and original order. The principle of provenance means that the records that were created, assembled, accumulated, and/or maintained by an organization or individual must be represented together, distinguishable from the records of any other organization or individual. The principle of original order means that the order of the records that was established by the creator should be maintained by physical and/or intellectual means whenever possible to preserve existing relationships between the documents and the evidential value inherent in their order. Together, these principles form the basis of archival arrangement and description. (p. xvi)

Keeping records together in their original order is a very basic archival principle. Original order is supposed to give insight to the history of the

collection and perhaps the psyche of the collector. In this way, not only the materials but also the way they are organized gives information about the collection and its contributors.

However, Umayam and Mr. McAdams rejected this principle of best practice because it was not conducive to their dual mission of language documentation and preservation.

If they had kept the original order, "it would be jumbled and difficult to find language information." Instead, they created their own sections or categories referred to as series. There was a series for a song project, there is a language section and there is the lexicon. This will make it easier for people to find what they are looking for when they use the archive.

More than anything, they wanted materials to be accessible "Because revitalization has to come from community. The language is not revitalized just because it is digitized...having the archive isn't going to inherently bring the language back, it has to have support. "

Another process that sets this archive apart from bigger archives was the care brought to minute details. Many large institutions such as the Smithsonian with its millions of artifacts would not have the luxury, resources or possibly the interest to scour an archive and separate every document or label every tiny file. Generally, archives try to remain impartial about their

collections, or at least present it that way. Umayam commented that many institutions do not process at the careful level that they did. "In a bigger institution, they might put everything together and label it "Wichita," but the Wichita team "cared about every recording. Every word was important for users who want to search the archive." With the future archive users in mind, they "tailored the archive function to meet the needs of the community." For example, they captured metadata about speakers and other information that might be important in revitalization. They arranged material that would make them discoverable to their specific audience.

If the reader is not familiar with traditional archives, it may not be known that archives are usually not used so extensively by people. They might just be a way to keep company records long-term for legal purposes. Many archives might restrict access to only a few people in a company. It would not be expected that other individuals in the company add to the archive or need to find anything in it.

3.6 The Wichita Archive as a Community-Based Initiative

I reminded Umayam that only one or two tribal members were directly involved in creating the project. Did she still consider it to be a community-based archive with such a small number of participants from the community? Absolutely. Part of the reason for this is the way she conducted herself:

> I really tried to make sure the design and information metadata represented information that they wanted. They sometimes wanted to defer to me to make decisions and I tried to bring it back to them and explain why things were important and give options so they could take ownership and be part of establishing the founding principles. Otherwise it would be me as non-community member telling them what to do and they would have to stick with it (Instead I) engaged them in conversation, in designing it and making sure it was useful for people besides me (in community.)

It would have been easy for Umayam to make all of the decisions about the archive herself. She could have worked quickly, efficiently and catered to her personal preferences. Instead she took time to teach others the knowledge she used to make decisions, offer suggestions, wait for tribal members to make their own choices and then follow through with their decisions regardless of her personal preferences.

Another reason the archive is community-based was that Umayam trained others to use the archive. In some organizations, archives are the exclusive realm of archivists who act as record keepers and gatekeepers. They decide what comes in and out, possibly including visitors along with materials. Often archives are meant for long term storage but not immediate use. In contrast, the Wichita archive was meant to be used immediately. This is a significant difference in use between traditional archives and community archives. The arrangement in the Wichita tribe is ideal for language revitalization because it is available to tribal members to study materials, listen to recordings or make teaching tools.

Umayam claims the Wichita archive is community-based for yet another reason. "What makes it community based is that the individuals represented in the materials are involved in arrangement and description and use of the materials." McAdams is a perfect example; materials that he created are in the archive bearing his name, he was involved in building the archive and will be able to use it himself. This is also an unusual arrangement. Umayam made an analogy using the company Coca Cola. Let's say that Coca Cola has a corporate archive. (They most likely do.) To make their archive community-based, the people who drink their products would have to be engaged in creating and contributing materials, looking through their records and making executive decisions about the archive.

Umayam and I also both recognize that the definition of "community" can be slippery or context driven. What if there is only one member of a community? How does the community in question define membership? In the cases of Native Americans, it could be based on claims to ancestry like blood quantum, legal status such as enrollment, language use, relationships with other tribal members and so on. For some groups, there may be no consensus on what it takes to create a community effort and for others there may be strict rules. Though the word 'community' implies more than one person, in some cases there could just be one or two people who comprise or represent a community. Many indigenous tribes face a reality where only a couple native speakers belong to the speech community of their heritage language. Or one or two people may be all that is left of an entire tribe. In the case of the Wichita

tribe, there was just one or two people who worked on the archive who represented the tribe. It is their responsibility to bring the archive back to the rest of the tribe.

Based on the slippery definition of 'community' and the myriad of situations where it could apply, I believe there are varying levels of community participation. Linn (2014), Cameron et. al (1992), Grinevald (2003), Rice (2009) and Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) describe how much participation a community has with a researcher, but there are levels of participation within a community that also deserve attention. I would like to suggest a few basic models or levels for what participation within a community might look like:

- One in which many people or most of the community is aware of a project, are continually informed about its progress and are involved somehow.
- One in which some people are involved and aware of what is happening. That group may work for everyone else. They may be accountable to others or they may be the only ones who are committed or interested.
- One in which a few people, representatives, employees, leaders or others are aware and involved. They may work for the whole group or keep others informed. Or they may be a body of decision makers who decide what to do for the community and carry out those plans regardless of what everyone else wants or believes.
- One in which only one or two people work on a project because no one else is available.

There could be any number of variations or combinations of these levels. None of them necessarily include outside experts; they could be efforts from inside a community or combined efforts between a community and a researcher or an institution. This separates them from other models

previously mentioned in this paper. I consider the first option to be the most effective level of participation because the number of speakers is a crucial factor in the robustness of a language. The more people who are participating and learning and taking ownership of the language and revitalization responsibilities the better.

According to models by linguists such as Linn and Czaykowska-Higgins, the Wichita archive would fit neatly into their highest categories because the project was initiated by the tribe and outside experts were hired as consultants. Umayam oriented her work around concepts of community empowerment and involvement as I have laid out above. According to other researcher's models, this could be a best-case scenario. According to my model, there is room for improvement by involving more people within the community. The genesis of the Wichita archive fits a lower level of community participation that I have suggested. There was a small number of people within the tribe who knew about the archive and a smaller number who were directly involved. I want to be clear I do not consider the tribe to be in error and no one should be blamed for this situation. The grant period was very short, so the team had to identify and adhere to their top priorities which included setting up the archive and arranging materials so that they would be preserved and easy to access. They started at a lower level of inner community participation out of necessity and any organization might do the same at different points in a project. It is not strictly my ideal to involve a whole group at every step in the process. It is more important that the work be done at all

even if it is only done by one or two people. Now that the grant is over, it is more feasible that community involvement could increase.

Near the end of the grant period, Umayam gave a presentation of the archive to interested members of the tribe. Since that time, it appears that the archive has been utilized or worked on very little. However, it is not too late for the tribe to reach a higher level of in-group participation. I know they are interested in involving more people and there are many ways to do so. They might have more workshops to train community members in how to use the archive. The archive could be made available online so that people can access it without traveling. The tribe could create a language committee and assign them to do some work on the archive as part of their responsibilities. Any of these options would be helpful. Revitalization work would be much more effective, fast, and more meaningful for more people if more were involved.

3.7 Challenges for the Community-Based Archivist

A community-based archive can help solve many of the problems identified in chapter one by allowing indigenous communities to take control over their own materials, narratives, and the way they are represented. However, they are not a perfect system and they could come with some of

their own challenges. Some of the most significant challenges Umayam and the tribe faced in building their archive were time and resources. They were working under a four-month grant with a year's worth of objectives. (Originally the grant was written for a year.) Given more time, Umayam felt that more could have been done.

Another challenge she faced that will apply in many other communities was the gap in the kinds of skills and knowledge that are needed to create an archive. Sometimes people lack basic computer skills, including elders with valuable language knowledge. Anyone working with a community-based archive, museum or revitalization program should be aware that this could be a problem. It could be solved with time, training and dedication on the part of the learners and teachers, but this in itself could be a challenge. Some community members may be unwilling to take the time to learn when the language situation is so urgent. Or they might be intimidated or uninterested. Linguists and archivists may be tempted to give up and do the work themselves. Both sides may need to compromise.

Another problem that arises when elders with language knowledge do not know how to use archives or technology is that they may be forced to rely on others or wait on others. For some elders this could be very frustrating. It might be seen as a loss of independence and possibly dignity. If they could learn to use the archive on their own, they could do a great deal of work independently. When I distributed my surveys, I found that there were several

elders who were willing to participate in archival or revitalization activities during the day. They might have more time than their grown children with full time jobs and with a knowledge of archival processes they could work on their own schedule. On the other hand, some elders might prefer for others to take over the work rather than learn how to use the archive themselves. They may see it as a way to work faster or include others.

Umayam would have liked to do more outreach in the community and bring in younger tribal members. She suggested that they could "sit down and go over the archive and start taking ownership of the materials and where to go from there. I wish someone could have come to shadow us as we put it all together."

Given more time, Umayam would have like to develop digital skills training for community members to use the FLEX dictionary and other features of the archive so they can more easily do their own research. She also would have liked to help identify materials in the archive that could be used in teaching or interacting with other people or research. Those things can still be done but she said the interest would have to come from within the community. "They have to take ownership and keep the momentum going."

As the Wichita continue to learn and practice using the archive, I expect that future projects will be more confidently driven by more experienced tribal members.

Other challenges there were not necessarily an issue here could arise. Perhaps community members will be reluctant to make executive decisions based on the fear that a precious language will be mangled if wrong choices are made. Perhaps tribal members are unorganized or unmotivated in the beginning. Maybe interest levels in revitalization will be low in the community or perhaps some tribal members will look to experts as having more authority and expect them to control a project.

When an outside expert such as a linguist, archivist or curator is faced with these kinds of challenges, it is important to remember the big picture. Language revitalization will be more successful with more people involved, archives will be more useful if they are built with a community's needs in mind and exhibits will be more respectful and authoritative if a community is involved in the creation.

If outside experts are sought, they should help the community learn and gain confidence their ability to direct a project. They may need to be willing to consider new ways to do things even departing at times from best practices in order to accommodate a unique culture.

Archives are Western institutions with Western processes. An important question that some tribes may be asking themselves is whether or not a Western institution has any business in their community. Some Native

Americans may feel strongly that using an archive would be a form of colonization or that an archive does not align with their own cultural values.

I asked Umayam if she thought Native Americans should eschew Western methods of building and maintaining archives. She responded that "We need more Native Americans trained as archivists and linguists so they can do the work and make their own decisions." She reminded me that there are best practices designed for physical care that cannot be argued, but many other processes could be changed.

According to Umayam, tribal leadership could make decisions about choosing between institutional archives or other kinds of archives. "It's the person who matters." In archives,

> all processes are shaped by Western ideas of information. When an indigenous person builds from the ground up, they can recreate or reshape that model of what archives can be altogether. Community archives are an act of decolonization. They could be that way even if they are using Western best practices because it's under their control.

She mentioned the Chickasaw community center in Oklahoma as an example. The tribe has employees with the same master's degree in Library and Information Sciences that Umayam has. They might have learned about Western institutions in a Western University, but they are using that education to make decisions for their own tribe. Perhaps that could include rejecting some of the principles they learned.

3.8 Conclusions

I am not aware of any injustices suffered by the Wichita from having their materials in another archive or museum. Nevertheless, their community-based archive solves or prevents issues expounded on in chapter one. At a larger institution it would be more difficult to find, access and retrieve their material. This would be especially true if materials were all lumped together or organized according to best practices and kept in the jumbled manner in which they were found. Instead the Wichita archive is close to home and meticulous attention can be given to details. Many responsible institutions like The Smithsonian have policies to respects indigenous codes of access as they find out about them. But in the Wichita community if there are any codes of access they can be decided before any material is ever inappropriately made public. They are able to describe the material themselves instead of reading a description from an outsider. They are not marginalized because they are in control. The Wichita archive prevents these kinds of problems even as it offers opportunities to reach tribal goals of language preservation.

The success of community owned and operated archives rest with the community and no one else. Owning an archive that is well used will take time, practice, and patience. The tribe has already established a solid foundation for

the archive with the material they gathered, a place to keep it and they have had an introductory presentation by Umayam. Umayam helped establish policies and best practices and now it will be in the tribe's hand if they are followed or not. People are also aware of some of the benefits of using the archive even if they have not experienced them in their own lives yet.

McAdams will continue to be involved with the archive. It was part of his responsibility to add descriptions to items in the archive that have not yet been fully described. He will also be part of educating other tribal members about how to use it. The Wichita Tribal History Center is the home of the hard drive that stores the archive and the laptop that accompanies it. A member of the tribe has been trained in how to use it and will be able to assist visitors who want to use it. The tribe may eventually decide that the archive should be available online. As more and more of the information in the world becomes available online, this could be a wise choice to make it more available to more people. On the other hand, tribes that want to restrict access should approach this option carefully.

The archive is an important part of the tribe's plan for language revitalization. It is a way to manage and preserve data and allow people to access it. People will be able to use it to create other materials or find gaps in the language that might still be filled. When Rood's collection has been fully incorporated, the tribe will have many more hours of reading and recordings to search that adds to their history, language and culture.

The archive is only part of the tribe's revitalization plan. They have had language classes in the past and tend to use them to prepare for the youth language fair. Language is a part of the Little Sister's organization and people still sing in Wichita. All of these activities can be enriched with material from the archive as the archive can be enriched with materials from these activities. All of these activities will be more successful if more people are involved and they become community driven projects.

Chapter 5
The Wichita Tribal History Center

The Wichita Tribal History Center is the museum created by the Wichita tribe. Like the archive in the Wichita community, the Wichita Tribal History Center is community-based and also fits into the highest level of community involvement mentioned earlier. As with other community-based models, Wichita tribal members have been in control of the project and all outside help has been for their benefit. They wanted to create the museum, so they initiated the work. They contacted professionals outside of the community when they wanted assistance, but they retained control. Instead of a museum *for* the tribe or created *with* the tribe, the History Center was and is conceived, built, owned and run *by* the community. Also, like the archive, the museum is a tool of revitalizing history, culture, and maybe even language.

5. 1 Background on the Wichita Tribal History Center

All of the information here about the Wichita Tribal History Center (WTHC) was gained in an interview with McAdams who is one of the many people involved with the museum.

The museum opened in April 2018, but McAdams explained that the tribe had been interested in building it for a long time. Several tribal members who have since passed away began to take a more serious interest in learning about Wichita culture, history and archeology. Unfortunately, there is a lack of information about the tribe. Only a handful of researchers have written about the tribe's history, language and culture, or researched artifacts pertaining to them. Many of the sources that I have been able to read contain much of the same information. For example, the tattoos that the people wore are often mentioned and iconic pictures of the grass houses turn up in many sources. However, cultural and historical information about everyday life and relationships is sometimes missing and there is little information on the history of the language. Even though the tribe has an important place in the history of the plains tribes, other tribes with more resources or that are more well-known may receive more attention. For example, there may be more interest in the Cherokee and the Navajo because these tribes are larger and more well known. Many Americans believe they have some Cherokee ancestry (whether or not it is true) and many are familiar with the vital role of the Navajo code talkers during World War 2. A quick internet search for books on these tribes will result in dozens of titles whereas a search for Wichita books will mostly result in books about the city in Kansas named after the tribe. The same may be true for many Native American tribes that are smaller, have fewer resources, or are less well known in general.

McAdams pointed out another important problem with the information that is available about the tribe; it has all been researched and written by people who are not themselves part of the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes. The information is valuable, but it has all been interpreted by outsiders. As mentioned in chapter 1, this could lead to decontextualization and it does not give communities an opportunity to speak for themselves. The WTHC provides a way for the tribe to accumulate information, share information with tribal members who may be unaware of their own history and culture, and be able to interpret and tell their story in their own words. The tribe itself is the primary target audience, but it is an effort to relate their history and culture to the general public as well.

Construction of the WTHC was mostly funded with a block grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. [13] The remaining funds were contributed by tribal members.

Deciding what to include in the museum and researching tribal history and culture has been a community endeavor spanning decades. They started with basic knowledge of their ancestors but preparations for a museum full of knowledge has been going on for 20 or 30 years. During this time the tribe has

[13] I have added a very brief explanation of these in Appendix B.

been more engaged with language and cultural programs and consultations in tribal issues. In the last decade some of the tribal members have prepared for the museum by researching and becoming more familiar with cultural resources. They were able to gain a significant amount of knowledge about the tribe that has not been published anywhere. With this accumulated knowledge, they thought about the most significant events in their history and decided to create the exhibits from them. Ultimately, the tribe's governing body, the executive committee, decides what goes into the WTHC.

The museum does not have a large number of artifacts like some do but they were carefully selected to represent what the tribe thought was most important to share. Most of the artifacts they have are 500 to 1,000 years old and many were chosen so that visitors could learn about how Wichitas used to live. For example, there are tools made from various types of stone and bone. These were used in hunting bison and in farming plants like corn, squash, beans and others. These are important because they demonstrate what people could accomplish during a very successful time period for the Wichita before their involvement with the United States. They are also important because of the lack of information about this time period. Generally, only a handful of people, archeologists and tribal members, are aware of the history during that time. Information about daily life or population may have been buried in archeological records and not necessarily accessible to the tribe. Perhaps they were not always aware that such information even existed. Most tribal

members have only a general sense of their own history. For example, they are aware that the tribe was in Oklahoma, Kansas and Texas, but they may not be very knowledgeable about their ancestors' beliefs, family relationships or subsistence practices. Artifacts in the WTHC help expound on the general knowledge that tribal members may have about their ancestors' lifestyles and culture.

These types of archeological artifacts were collected by archeologists and are on loan to the tribe from the Sam Noble Museum. Aside from these artifacts, the WTHC also includes some more recent material objects that were made by tribal members in the last century. Many of them are recent enough that even though the people who made them are gone, they are still remembered by the living. These objects are from an exhibit called "Wichita Memories" created in the early 80s. It was on display in tribe's administration building and included records of Wichita objects in other museums. Objects were taken from the Wichita Memories exhibit and will be presented in new cases in the WTHC.

The objects will be presented so that visitors know what they are, how old they are and where they are from. When artifacts aren't enough, the tribe is also making use of graphic panels to tell their story. Panels will be able to communicate their history, religion and other worldviews and traditional practices to visitors.

When visitors first enter there is an area where they can sit or stand and listen to a video presentation. The video includes a Wichita story in Wichita and English. Next visitors will walk down a short hallway full of graphic panels before coming into an open room. This room has more graphic panels, some artifact displays and the bare structure of a grass house. At the back of the museum, there is also a conference room. It is not large, but the space, the exhibits and the panels are attractive and informative. It is also meant to be the home of the Wichita archive so that people will have a public place to access it. With a more formal archive set up in the museum, it is hoped that people will also have a better way to contribute to the archive. Tribal members could bring in photos, family records, language materials or other pertinent information. It is a safe and central place to keep and communicate everything Wichita.

5.2 The Wichita Tribal History Center as a Community-Based Memory Institution

Besides McAdams, many other people have been involved with the museum so far. These people include tribal members who participated in research or made objects that are now on display. Some tribal members

participated in language projects, including recorded sessions that are now part of the archive that will be housed there. Community effort also includes those who are members of the Wichita government, those who contributed financially and those who will work there, maintain it and even the visitors who will come to learn.

The tribe chose to hire people outside of the community to do certain tasks in creating the museum. A contractor was hired to do the construction and an exhibit designer with experience contracting with various museums worked inside. People in the tribe were involved with creating exhibits in the museums, and they were able to learn more about exhibits and their own priorities from the exhibit designer. Even though they were unaware of museum theories when they started, control of the project was maintained by the tribe and not the designer. First, they choose facts and items that they thought should be included in the museum. Then the designer helped them turn their ideas into a reality and consulted with tribal members about how to use the graphic panels to tell their story.

The Sam Noble Museum loaned objects and resources or acted as consultants for the WTHC. For example, they have a special disinfectant chamber to get rid of pests. Pests like insects are a major concern in any museum because they can destroy materials. It is common knowledge that termites eat wood and moths eat fibers like wool, silk, fur, hair and feathers.

Museums carefully watch for several other insects including the book louse and the firebrat which both eat paper, paste, and cellulose materials. When new artifacts are transported to the Sam Noble Museum, they are first disinfected before they are stored or displayed. All of the artifacts that were kept in the Wichita Memories exhibit in the administration building were taken to Sam Noble to be disinfected before they were moved to the Wichita History Center. In this way, the tribe was able to follow best practices of preservation and ensure that the objects will be safer and last longer.

The tribe was able to learn more about the history and clarify what they wanted to share about themselves from people outside of the community as well. They learned more about their native Oklahoma from The Oklahoma Archeological Survey and they learned more about their ancestors in Kansas and Texas from Professors Donald Blakeslee and Earl H. Elam. Blakeslee, a professor at Wichita State University, has published widely on plains tribes and once curated a museum exhibit about the Wichita at the Mid-America All Indian Center in Wichita, Kansas. He is currently working on an archeological site that shows evidence of a large Wichita town of about 20,000 people. The site in Arkansas City, Kansas is providing new information about the tribe and their history. They are learning so much that Blakeslee is rewriting what was previously standard knowledge about the history and archeology in that area (Wichita State News).

Elam has also been a valuable source of knowledge. He wrote his dissertation on the Wichita and in 2008 was able to publish it as a book called *Kitikiti'sh: The Wichita Indians and Associated Tribes in Texas, 1757-1859.* (Elam, 2008). Like Blakeslee, Elam has also participated with an exhibit about the Wichita, this one based on his book. Both of them have contacted the Wichita at different times and shared their findings. An important difference between Elam and Blakeslee's work is that Elam is based in Texas and his book centers around the history and people of Texas. Blakeslee is based in Kansas and the long-term project in Arkansas City will shed more light on that area and on the time the Wichita lived there. They each have something unique to offer. McAdams was able to talk with both of them and learn more from each of them than what they published in their research. Part of the WTHC's exhibits is from their knowledge.

I asked McAdams if he thought the tribe could have done everything without any outside assistance. He did not believe so.

Perhaps the WTHC would not have been possible without grant money, without the historical and archeological expertise of Blakeslee and Elam or without contractors to build the WTHC. They could have moved artifacts to the museums without the disinfectant chambers, but it cannot be understated how beneficial that process is for objects that are meant to be preserved. The outside assistance does not bother McAdams. He even mentioned at one point

that he did not think it was particularly important for him personally to understand museum theories. Their designer had that knowledge and those principles were still applied even if people in the tribe are not familiar with them.

Utilizing outside help may not bother many other Native Americans. When small cultures are so quickly disappearing, ends may sometimes be more important than the means. In other words, language classes, museums, archives, having children learn their ancestor's language and culture, and being able to participate in cultural activities will sometimes be more important than making sure that no outsiders are involved or that a language is absolutely, exactly spoken the way ancestors spoke it. For the Wichita tribe, outside help was important and very advantageous.

At the same time, McAdams and others in the tribe hope that the WTHC will be instrumental in their growth and ability to do more on their own. It could be used as a research facility where tribal members are inspired to learn more, use the archive or dictionary, take classes or contribute to the archive or exhibits. The Wichita museum has unique knowledge that is not available anywhere else, but maybe in the future the work of this tribe will be able to make it more widely available. That would be valuable for the public at large but it would be especially precious for tribal members who are local to Oklahoma and may not be able to visit the museum frequently or at all.

Maybe the museum could even inspire a new generation of archaeologists, historians, genealogists or linguists in the tribe. Right now, almost everything about the Wichita including history, culture, and archeology has been done and interpreted by non-Wichita people. The WTHC is not meant to be a pool of static knowledge so much as a tool that will allow them to begin to be more in control of the resources and knowledge about their tribe. As much as they hope that their own members will be able to take control of these kinds of projects in the future, it was wise of them to not wait for tribal members to earn costly degrees in museum theories, linguistics or archeology. It could take many years to build a foundation of research or trained personnel in a community and by then linguistic or cultural knowledge may have disappeared. Every day is important when populations are small, and knowledge is scarce.

The model used by the Wichita tribe will not necessarily be the first choice or best fit for every community. It is not necessarily the most ideal museum for them, either. There were limitations in space and budget so some items that were originally planned to be in the museum did not end up there. Without limitations, McAdams might change a few things about the way the museum looks, add more interactive activities, and having learned more about museums since they started, there are other things they might have changed.

In an ideal world, the tribe would not have to borrow some of their artifacts from other places like the Sam Noble Museum. Eventually borrowed items are usually returned and there is less control and ownership. For this reason, the tribe avoided borrowing very many objects from other institutions.

The tribe will still be able to make improvements in the coming years to their design and display. When new choices or problems arise, they will work as a community as they have in the past.

5.3 Museums as a tool for language and culture revitalization

The Wichita were able to learn more about their culture and history just by planning and researching for the museum. When it opens they will be able to use it to spread that knowledge to a wider audience. They have also gathered resources and artifacts and added the archive.

Museums are not generally thought of as a tool for language revitalization and this is not really the goal for the WTHC. However, museums may be underutilized as a tool in revitalization, especially if they are only conceived of as a storage place or a way to exhibit a frozen past.

First, it has already been pointed out that many museums are a place of storage. Sometimes local museums have language archives or other artifacts. Tribes could learn how to take advantage of their local archives to find linguistic information.

Museums can also be a physical place for events or a space where language can be used. For example, in the tribal owned WTHC there are no plans yet for specific activities in the museum's conference room, but it would be an ideal space for lectures, language classes or research. The Sam Noble Museum hosts a Youth Language Fair every year that is an opportunity for Native American youth from all over the country to come and use their language. The event motivates youth in the Wichita and other tribes to practice language skills. Community owned museums like the WTHC could host their own events and cater them to their own goals and community.

Another important role that museums can play in language revitalization is in spreading historical and cultural knowledge that gives languages more context. Every language is situated in a time, place and culture. One reason to mourn language loss is that all of this information disappears with languages. People in the tribe who visit may be able to find a place to practice language or learn more about what it means. Maybe learning more about their identity could inspire them to study the language more.

Chapter 6
Final Thoughts

Languages without living fluent speakers are generally considered to be extinct, but conventional wisdom on the matter is changing. The Wichita language is a perfect example of why the situation is more complicated. There are semi-speakers and people with language knowledge in the community who should be taken into account and there is some documentation on the language. There are several important reasons why the Wichita may be able to do some revitalization work. These include their ability to create and control community-based projects, their positive language ideologies, and the amount of documentation that is in the archive.

The Wichita do not have nearly as much documentation as the Wampanoag who have used their documentation to build a successful revitalization program. The Wichita may not be able to revitalize or recover their language to same extent as the Wampanoag, but they still have a significant amount of data that can be utilized. There are recordings of Wichita in various genres including songs, prayers, stories and conversations. Many common morphemes are documented along with words. Along with recordings and transcripts, the extensive work of Rood with the language has produced over a dozen articles on the language and a grammar. Rood explains

many language processes in his grammar. It is not necessarily easy for the non-linguist to read, but it represents a wealth of knowledge that can be used in revitalization. The language sketch for the lay-person that I have provided in Appendix A is completely based on Rood's work. It reads somewhat like a textbook or occasionally like a workbook. It is one small example of the kinds of language and teaching materials that could be adapted from Rood's grammar, his articles or the documentation in the archives.

There are also ways the Wichita can add to the documentation that they have. There are semi-speakers in the community who could fill in some of the gaps and new words could be created or reconstructed from linguistic relatives like the Pawnee or Caddo languages. If the tribe uses all the resources available to them they may be able to create conversational speakers, if not more. If parents can learn language skills and pass them to their children, children could continue to build on the language with hard work and natural language processes.

The Wichita archive will be a safe place to preserve their language and provide access to it for tribal members for generations. The archive should be an important part of their language revitalization processes, both in documenting material and in creating new ones.

No matter what kind of documentation a tribe has, it will not be of use without revitalization-positive ideologies and community efforts to utilize it.

The Wichita tribe has several language ideologies that are conducive to successful revitalization. Chief among these is the belief that it is possible despite the difficult circumstances. They also have a range of meaningful motivations that connect the language to family, history, identity, culture and sometimes religion. Language ideologies are important because they can affect actions and behaviors that pertain to language. Many people in the tribe are willing to work on revitalizations programs, possibly because of their ideologies that revitalization is important and possible. They responded to my survey questions and talked to me about revitalization with enthusiasm and sincerity.

The Wichita have already created other community-based projects that can revitalize or maintain language and culture. They use the language in singing at events like the Annual Dance and the Pawnee visitation, they have had small language classes, and programs like the Little Sisters use a little language. Thus far these efforts and social functions have been part of the reason the language is still alive, but they are not promoting advanced conversational skills. The WTHC and the archive are important steps in expounding and furthering the use and revitalization of Wichita already present in these other projects.

The WTHC will allow the Wichita to be the authority in telling their own stories in their own space. With their own museum they can avoid or

solve some of the problems associated with memory institutions and language revitalization when the community is not involved or perhaps not involved enough. These problems include decontextualization, misrepresentation, appropriation, marginalization, inappropriate access, damaged relationships and conflicting worldviews. It also provides a safe place to store the archive and gives cultural and historical context to the language. Hopefully the tribe will continue to expand on their archive and museum, take advantage of the ways they can be used in revitalization, and involve more people.

The people who took the revitalization survey did not seem to believe that the tribe has a strong revitalization program. They talked about not waiting and checked boxes with activities they would like to see in their community. A few others in the tribe who have spearheaded or participated in revitalization activities in the past also took the survey and were dubious about the effectiveness of the programs like language classes that have not always been well attended or supported. It is my hope that with more work to promote the archive and with occasional reminders of its important, that support will improve in the future. The surveys showed evidence that people could change their minds and recommit themselves to this cause. With more opportunities to involve more people in the tribe, more people may feel responsible and take ownership of revitalization. It is likely ineffective to place the entire burden of revitalization on just a few individuals. Community-based revitalization with many people involved could be more effective because it

can create more speakers, more people can contribute time and skills, and it becomes meaningful to more people who are invested in it.

From here the tribe will need to find approaches that work for them. Perhaps they could build programs with more volunteers or a few more paid employees. They might create a language committee, hold archive workshops, ask for help from the NAL or send tribal members to learn from other indigenous programs or educational institutions. They could also invite experts or indigenous individuals from other communities with successful revitalization programs to share what they have learned. The tribe might call people from the surveys who gave permission to be contacted to be more involved. They could start new classes or make more materials available online. They might create a community effort or encourage more individuals to learn independently. They might act alone or choose to incorporate others into their community efforts. Or they might do nothing. There is a myriad of options and it is in their hands to decide, and to pursue their own priorities.

Though I have advocated for community-based archives, museums and language revitalization, I acknowledge that they are not always perfect. For example, there could be communities who are unwilling or unable to participate in any kind of documentation or revitalization efforts. And with more people involved, there will likely be more disagreements. Conversely, a community might struggle to gain wide participation. And as Umayam pointed out with her archival work, time and resources are often an issue.

However, it is my belief that even if there is no perfect approach, community-based programs create the most well-rounded, user friendly institutions, offer the best environment for language revitalization and are a highly respectful way to approach a community. Dr. Michelle Jacob shared her personal experiences on this topic as a guest professor in a class I attended at OU. She is a social scientist who works on language revitalization within her own tribe, the Yakama Nation in the Pacific Northwest. Among other things, we discussed some of the problems the Yakama face with so many differing needs and opinions in the community. For example, which elder to listen to when debating how a word should be pronounced or whose grammar should be followed. When asked about these challenges, Dr. Jacob offered this profound and cheerful philosophy: "Isn't it great that (we have progressed to the point where) we can have these types of problems?" (Jacob 2017.) There will always be problems, but some problems are the result of the commitment of many people who deeply care about revitalizing their language and culture. Some problems are a testament to a great deal of time, effort and progress. Others represent knowledge that has been saved and is being further developed. These struggles are worth having.

I have tried to emphasize that every community is different, and this is a case study of only one tribe. Their situation is the complex result of the interplay between their unique culture, history, ideologies, resources and other factors. More research or efforts would need to be spent to understand

how much of the language can be revitalized in this or other communities. Perhaps it cannot be revitalized to the same extent as languages like Wampanoag or Myaamia but there is much that can still be done and anything that can be done can be built upon.

Other communities will share some of the factors that affect the Wichita. They are worth investigating in their own context and community before it is decided that a language is extinct or impossible to revitalize. Even if efforts to bring a language back have not been successful in the past, communities might determine to try a new approach and revitalize hope in this important work.

References

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (2015, September) *Section 106 Applicant Toolkit* Retrieved from http://www.achp.gov/apptoolkit.html

Baird, Jessie Little Doe (2013) Wampanoag: How Did This Happen to My Language? In Leanne Hinton (ed.) *Bringing Our Languages Homes, Language Revitalization For Families* (pp. 19-30). Heyday, Berkeley, California

Baird, Jessie Little Doe, (2016) Wopanaak language reclamation program: bringing the language home, (Presentation) *Journal of Global Indigeneity* Vol 2 Iss. (2). State University of New York, NY Available at :http://ro.uow.edu.au/jgi/vol2/iss2/7

Baldwin, Daryl, Karen, Jessie, and Jarrid (2013) myaamiaataweenki oowaaha: Miami Spoken Here In Leanne Hinton (ed.) *Bringing Our Languages Homes, Language Revitalization For Families* (pp. 3-18.) Heyday, Berkeley, California

Bonney, R.,. Cooper C. B ., Dickinson J., Kelling S., Phillips T., Rosenberg K. V., Shirk J., (2009) Citizen Science: A Developing Tool for Expanding Science Knowledge and Scientific Literacy *BioScience*, *59(11), 977–984*, Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2009.59.11.9

Brown, D. H. (2004) *Principles and Classroom Practices Pearson Education* Inc. New York, NY

Buccitelli, B. (2004) In their Own Voices: A Comparison of three Native-Run Museums (Senior Thesis) *Anthropology Senior Theses*. Paper 57. Available from http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1120&context=anthro_se niortheses

Bunte, P.A. (2009). "You keep not listening with your ears!" Language ideologies, language socialization, and Paiute identity. In P.V. Kroskrity & M. Field (eds.), *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian country*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Cameron, D., Frazer E., Harvey P., Rampton, M.B.H., & Richardson, K., (1992) *Researching language: issues of power and method*. London: Routledge.

Curtis, E. S. (1908) *The Wichita, The North American Indians* (2004 ed.) Northwestern University Digital Library Collections Retrieved from http://curtis.library.northwestern.edu/curtis/viewPage.cgi?showp=1&size=2&id=nai.19.book.00000046&volume=19#nav

Czaykowska-Higgins, E. (2009) Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working with Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation and Conservation 3*(1), 15-50

Christen, K., (2011) Opening Archives: Respectful Repatriation *The American Archivist* 74 (1) 185-210.

Dorsey, George, A. (1905) *The Mythology of the Wichita* (1995 version) University of Oklahoma Press

Elam, E. H., (2008) *Kititiki'sh: The Wichita Indians and Associated Tribes in Texas 1757-1859* Hillsboro Texas: Hill College Press

Field M & Kroskrity P.V. (Eds.) (2009) eds. In *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian country.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona

Fishman, J.A. (1991)*Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Language* . Clevedon-England: Multilingual matters LTD.

Gaither, E. B. (1992) "Hey, That's mine!": Thoughts on Pluralism and American Museums. In Karp Ivan, Kreamer Christine Mullen & Lavine, Steven D. (Ed.) *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture* (pp. 56-64). Smithsonian Books.

Gerdts, D. B. (1998) Beyond Expertise: The Role of the Linguistic in Language Revitalization Programs. In Nicolas Ostler, (Ed.) *Endangered Languages: What Role for the Specialist?, Proceedings of Second FEL Conference. Foundation for Endangered Languages*, Bath, England, 13–22. Retrieved from http://www.sfu.ca/~gerdts/papers/GerdtsBeyondExpertise.pdf

Gorenburg, D. (2005) Tatar Language Policies in Comparative Perspective: Why Some Revivals Fail and Some Succeed. Ab Imperio 2005 (1) 257-284 Retrieved at https://kb.osu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/1811/30222/GorenbugPa?sequence=16

Goswamy, B. N. (1991) Another Past, Another Context: Exhibiting Indian Art Abroad. In Karp Ivan & Lavine Steven D. (Eds.) *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. (pp 68- 78). Smithsonian Books

Grenoble, L. A. & Whaley, Lindsay J. (2006) *Saving Languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grinevald, C. (2003) Speakers and documentation of endangered languages In Peter K. Austin (Ed.) *Language and Documentation and Description*, 1 (pp52-72). London, SOAS

Hill J., (2002) "Expert Rhetorics" in advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who is Listening, and What Do They Hear?, Journal of Anthropology, 12(2) (pp 119-133). Retrieved at http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43104007.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A76f1dc5baac748986ba47d1d5a1523f2

Hinton, L., (2009) Language Revitalization at home. *International Conference on Language Documentation, 2009 researchgate.net* (Audio recording of conference presentation) 1st International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC), University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Hinton, Leanne "Plenary Language Revitalization at home " *1st International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation,* University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 12-14 March 2009, Retrieved at http://hdl.handle.net/10125/5165

Hinton, L. (2001) The Use of Linguistic Archives in Language Revitalization: The Native California Language Restoration Workshop. In Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale (Eds.) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp 419-428). San Diego, California: Academia Press.

Holland, S. A., (2015) *The Wichita Indians People of The Grass House.* Stockton Kansas: Rowe Publishing

Huvila, I. (2008) Participatory Archive: Towards decentralised curation, radical user orientation, and broader contextualization of records management. *Archival Science*, 8(1) (pp15-36).

Irvine, J.T., & Gal, S. (2000) Language Ideology and linguistic differentiation. In

P.V. Kroskrity (Ed.) *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, (pp 35-84). https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/IrvineGal2000.pdf

Jacob, M. (2017) Guest Lecturer at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK

Karp, I. (1992) Introduction. In Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer, & Steven D. Levin (Eds.) *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture.* 1-2. Smithsonian Books

Karp, I. (1992) On civil society and social identity. In Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer, & Steven D. Levin (Eds.) *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture*. 1-2. Smithsonian Books

King, Jeannette (2009) Language is Life, The Worldview of Second Language Speakers of Māori. In Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (Eds.) *Indigenous language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance and Lessons Learners*. (pp 97-108) Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Department of Education
Retrieved at
http://epub.sub.unihamburg.de/epub/volltexte/2013/23244/pdf/ILR.pdf#page=79

Kroskrity, P.V. (2007) Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.) *Companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517) Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell

Kroskrity, P.V. (2009) Language Renewal as Sites of Language Ideological Struggle: The need for "ideological struggle." In Jon Reyhner & Louise Lockard (Ed.) *Indigenous Language Revitalization: encouragement, guidance and lessons learned* Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, (pp 71-83). Arizona. http://epub.sub.uni-hamburg.de/epub/volltexte/2013/23244/pdf/ILR.pdf#page=79

Leonard, W. Y. (2008) When is an "extinct language" not extinct?: Miami, a formerly sleeping language In Kendall A. King, Natalie Schilling-Estes, Lyn Fogle, Jia Jackie Lou & Barbara Soukup (Eds.) *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties*, (pp 23-33). Washington: Georgetown University Press

Lewis, P.M. & Simons, G.F. (2009) Assessing Endangerment: Expanding Fishman's Gids. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique.* (pp1-30). Dallas: SIL International.

Linn, M. S., (2014) Living archives: A community-based language archive model. In David Nathan & Peter K. Austin (Eds.) *Language*

Documentation and Description, 12: Special Issue on Language Documentation and Archiving. (pp 53-67). London: SOAS.

Marzio, P. C. (1991) Minorities and fine arts in the United States In Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (Eds.) *Exhibiting cultures: The poetics and politics of museum display*. (pp 121-127) Smithsonian Books

Mitra, A. (2001) Marginal Voices in Cyberspace *New Media & Society*, 3 (1) (pp 31)

Newcomb, Jr. W. W. (1976) *The people called Wichita. Indian Tribal Series* Phoenix Arizona.

Neely, A.A., & G. Palmer, Jr. (2009). Which way is the Kiowa way? Orthogaphy choices, ideologies, and language renewal. In P.V. Kroskrity & M. Field (Eds.), *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian country.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Plateau People's Web Portal contributors: Northwest Museum of Arts and Culture Record. Yakama Contributors Vivian Adams, Jolena Tillequots & Tisa Metheson. Spokane Contributors Viola Frizzell, Pauline Flett, Marsha Wynecoop & Tisa Matheson.

Storage Basket http://plateauportal.wsulibs.wsu.edu/digital-heritage/storage-basket-13

Cornhusk bag http://plateauportal.wsulibs.wsu.edu/digital-heritage/womans-beaded-bag-8

Pool, C. G. (1988) Reservation Policy and the Economic Position of Wichita Women *Great Plains Quarterly* 439. Retrieved at https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1438&context=greatplainsquarterly

Reynold, R. & McLemore, D. (2010, May 14) American language [YouTube] *Al Jezeera English* Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9vg6Qs1zeq8

Rice, K. (2009) Must there be two solitudes? Language activists and linguists working together. In Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (Eds.) *Indigenous language Revitalization: encouragement, guidance and lessons learners.* (pp 37-59). Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Department of Education

Rood, D. S., (1976) *Wichita Grammar* New York: Garland

Rood, D. S., (1996) Sketch of Wichita, A Caddoan Language, *Handbook of North American Indians,* 13, Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Rood, D. (1993) A Formula for Delaying Language Death: Wichita Language Lessons, *Proceedings of the 1992 Mid America Linguistics Conference and Conference on Siouan-Caddoan Languages*, Columbia MO: University of Missouri- Columbia. Edited by Evan Smith and Flore Zéphir

Society of American Archivists, (2013) *SAA Manual Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (2nd ed.), Chicago, 2013 Retrieved at http://files.archivists.org/pubs/DACS2E-2013_v0315.pdf

Shaul, D. L., (2014) *Linguistic Ideologies of Native American Language Revitalization, Doing the Lost Ghost Dance, Springer* International Publishing, Cham, eBook

Shilton K. & Srinivasan R. (2007) Participatory appraisal and arrangement for multicultural collections *Archivaria*, 63, (pp 87-101) Retrieved from <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13129>. Date accessed: 05 May. 2018.

Silverstein, M. (1979) Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology in P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (Eds.) *The Elements* (pp 193-248) Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, M. (1985) Language and the Culture of Gender. In E. Mertz and R. Parmentier (Eds.), *Semiotic Mediation* (pp. 219-259). New York: Academic Press. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/36490740/Silverstein-Language-and-the-Culture-of-Gender-At-the-Intersection-of-Structure-Usage-And-Ideology

Simon, N. (2010) *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz: Museum 2.0, Retrieved from http://www.participatorymuseum.org/read/

Smith, F. T. (1996) *The Caddos, The Wichitas, and the United States 1846-1901Texas* A&M University Press

Speas, M. (2009) Someone Else's Language On the Role of Linguistics In Jon Reyhner & Louise Lockard (Eds.) *Language Revitalization Indigenous Language Revitalization Encouragement, Guidance and Lessons Learned* ed. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ http://epub.sub.unihamburg.de/epub/volltexte/2013/23244/pdf/ILR.pdf#page=79

Stenzel, K. (2014) The Pleasures and Pitfalls of a 'Participatory' Documentation Project: An Experience in Northwestern Amazonia" *Language Documentation and Conservation,* 8 (pp. 287-306). https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/handle/10125/24608/stenzel.pdf

The Pinky Show (2008) We love Museums... Do museums love us back? [Vimeo] Retrieved from https://vimeo.com/39864880

The Unites States Government Manual, Title 2 CFR part 180 Subpart I Definitions page 65 180.00 Federal agency https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2017-title2-vol1/pdf/CFR-2017-title2-vol1-sec180-950.pdf

Theimer, K. (2011) Exploring the participatory archives: What, who, where, and why. *Paper given at the Annual Meetings of the Society of American Archivist.* Retrieved from www.slideshare.net/ktheimer/theimer-participatory-archives-saa-2011

Umayam, Nicole, (2016) Starting a Community Language Archive in Four Months: The Wichita Language Documentation Project *Paper presented at International Conference of Indigenous Archives, Libraries and Museums,* Phoenix Arizona

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development *Indian Community Development Block Grant Program* Retrieved from https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/ih/grants/icdbg

WSU professor, students continue research on archeological discovery (2017 April 3) *Wichita State News* http://www.wichita.edu/thisis/stories/story.asp?si=3617

Wichita Tribal News (Jan-Feb, 2017) *Program Reports* Anadarko, OK, *Program Reports* 2(6) (p 3) Retrieved from http://www.wichitatribe.com/media/45467/jan-feb17.pdf

Wichita Tribal News (March, 2018) *Tribal Statistics as of March 6 ,2018* (p10) Anadarko, Oklahoma Retrieved from http://www.wichitatribe.com/media/56984/wtn_march_2018__issue.pdf

The Wichita Tribe Official Website Retrieved from http://www.wichitatribe.com/default.aspx

Yamada, R. M., (2007) Collaborative Linguistic Fieldwork: practical application of the empowerment model." *Language Documentation & Conservation* 2, (pp257-282).

Yang C., O' Grady W., Yang S. (2017) Toward a linguistically realistic assessment of language vitality: The case of Jejueo, *Language and Documentation and Conservation*, 11 (pp 103-113). Retrieved at https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/handle/10125/24727/yang_ogrady.pdf

Appendix A

Wichita Grammar for Beginners

A language sketch is a very brief overview of a language that might include information about its sound systems, grammar, the way that words or sentences are put together and other topics. A language sketch is more of a reference guide than a teaching tool. However, I hope that members of the Wichita tribe who are making teaching materials or studying the language will find this little reference helpful.

Not every topic about a language will be in a sketch. Within the field of linguistics, these language sketches are often very academic and difficult to read without training in linguistics. This is an attempt to create a language sketch of the Wichita language that members of the tribe will be able to use without any linguistic training. Many linguistic and grammatical concepts are broken down and there are examples of many of the concepts in Wichita or English. There is a glossary of terms at the back in Appendix AB. All of the information about Wichita is from Rood's extensive work, specifically his 1996 language sketch and 1976 grammar.

The Sounds of Wichita

Linguists talk about sounds in a language instead of "letters" in an alphabet. One reason for this is because letters in an alphabet tend to have more than one sound and they often change depending on where they appear in a word or what other sounds are next to them. (For example, the English letter c might sound like a k or an s.)

A single unit of sound is called a phoneme in linguistics. Because it is more accurate and reliable, this paper will discuss "phonemes" instead of "letters." Wichita has a fairly short inventory of phonemes. They are listed below:

phoneme	sound
i	ee as in "b**ee**t" or ih as in "**i**f"
e	eh as in "b**e**t" or ah as in "b**a**t"
a	ah as in "b**ou**ght" as Americans in the South and West usually say it.
k	k as in "**c**at"
k^w	qu as in "**qu**ick" if k and w are said at the same time.
t	t as in "**t**ime"
ʔ	The pause in the middle of "uh-oh" This sound is called a glottal stop.
c	ts as in "ca**ts**" unlike English, this sound might appear at the beginning of a word in Wichita. Be careful not to confuse it with the "k" sound – notice that Wichita already has a letter or phoneme or "k."
s	s as in "**s**ee"
h	h as in "**h**at"
w	w "**w**hy"
r~n	r as in "ki**tt**y" when your tongue flicks against the roof of the mouth. It sounds more like a d than a t or an r. Sometimes this sound is "whispered." n as in "**n**ight"
y	y as in "**y**es"

Figure 5 Wichita Phonemes

It is important to keep in mind that the example sounds in English are not completely correct. Even if the sounds look similar on paper, every

language has their own way of making these sounds. One of the ways that Wichita sounds might be different from similar sounds in English is that the tongue is a bit farther back in the mouth for the t, c, s, and the r and n sounds. Try saying the following words in English and pay attention to where your tongue touches the top of your mouth when you say the sounds in bold: **t**ime, ca**ts**, **s**ee, **n**ight, and ki**tt**y. You may feel your tongue in different positions on the roof of your mouth. It might touch just behind your teeth or a little further back on the bump behind the teeth. This bump is called the alveolar ridge and sounds that are made when the tongue is close to or touching the alveolar ridge are said to be alveolar. Wherever your tongue touches when you say these words in English, in Wichita they are all alveolar. If you say any of these sounds in English with the tongue close to the back of the teeth, you will need to move the tongue closer to the alveolar ridge to have clear pronunciation in Wichita.

Some of the sounds have more than one example in the chart because they make more than one sound in Wichita. They are still made with the same "letter" in the alphabet. This is normal for all languages. Sounds tend to change depending on their position or what other sounds are nearby. For example, the "r~n" will sound like an /n/ when it is the first sound in a word before vowels or before other alveolar sounds. At the end of a word it is voiceless. To make a "voiceless" sound, your mouth makes the right shape for the sound and you breathe out a little but don't actually make the sound, a bit like whispering. In all other positions, the r/n sound is like a "tap." To make a tap, flick your

tongue against the top of your mouth. Sometimes this sound is made instead of a "t" in English words. Try saying the words "itty bitty," "witty" and "kitty." If you say them quickly and naturally, it will be a tap and it will not sound like the "t" in "time" which has more air and less voice. If you listen carefully, it probably sounds more like the English 'd.' For simplicity, the Wichita symbols n and ɾ will be used to help the reader see which should be used in pronunciation. Beside the n sound, there are no other nasal sounds in Wichita except in the words kamma and camma´ci, the verb roots for 'grind corn' and 'hoe, cultivate.'

Note that the ɾ is not the only sound that becomes voiceless at the end of a word. i, a, w and k^w are also voiceless in word final position.

Another Wichita sound worth mentioning is the glottal stop represented as "ʔ." To make this sound the back of throat closes completely. English speakers occasionally make this sound without thinking about it. It is the pause in the middle of the word "uh-oh." Try saying "uh-oh" with and without the pause in the middle to hear and feel the difference. In some languages including Arabic and Hawaiian, this little pause is a letter in the alphabet. It is the pause in the word "Hawai'i" represented by the apostrophe. The glottal stop is also a letter in Wichita.

Vowels

There are only three vowels in Wichita and they might sound different in different environments. For example, the o sound is sometimes heard, but it is actually one of the other vowels next to another sound that affects the way the mouth moves. For example, this might happen next to a w, possibly because the lips move forward and inward. This lip movement is called roundness and o's are rounded too. Wichita vowels are not rounded but next to the round w they can become round and they will sound like the rounded o.

Changes like these, including the variations in the chart are not intentional and fluent speakers don't always notice these kinds of differences. These kinds of changes are normal in English and other languages too. However, there are important differences in Wichita in length and pitch that speakers are more aware of because they might change the meaning or the clarity of a word. Each vowel can be short, long or overlong. Short vowels have a regular duration, long vowels are held out about twice as long and overlong vowels are one and a half to three times longer than regular vowels. Each vowel can have a low pitch or a high pitch where the voice raises. When the high-pitched vowels are at the end of a word the pitch starts high and then falls.

With all of the length and pitch combinations there are 18 possibilities for Wichita vowel sounds. (Not including those that are unintentional like o

sounds.) These are written in the chart below. When vowels have a high pitch, an accent mark above the vowel is used. For long vowels, a small raised dot is used after the vowel and for overlong vowels, two dots are used.

Type	**Sound**
Short	i
Long	i˙
Overlong	i::
Short with a high pitch	í
Long with high pitch	í˙
Overlong with high pitch	í:
Short	e
Long	e˙
Overlong	e:
Short with a high pitch	é
Long with a high pitch	é˙
Overlong with a high pitch	é:
Short	a
Long	a
Overlong	a
Short with a high pitch	Á
Long with a high pitch	á˙
Overlong with a high pitch	á:

Figure 6 Wichita Vowels

Do not be overwhelmed by the long list. Some of these vowels rarely occur and after some practice they will begin to feel more natural.

With everything you have learned about the sounds in Wichita, look at the following words from Rood (1996) and try to pronounce them. It is likely that these words will be recorded in the archive or the dictionary included in the archive so you can listen to them. It could also be helpful to spend some time listening to other the recordings in the archive. Even if you don't understand anything yet, try to get a feel for the sounds. See if you can pick out all the sounds in the Wichita language. There are also some transcripts in the archive that might help you check what you hear.

Wichita word	English translation	Pronunciation Notes
hiˑc	snake	notice the vowel is held out and remember the c makes a 'ts' sound!)
wé:h	yes	here is a high pitch on the overlong vowel
wáˑh	moon	this high pitched long vowel should be shorter than the vowel in the previous word.)
haɾah	there	make sure the r is a "tap"
niyeˑs	child	
kaˑcʔa	fish	your throat will close for the glottal stop like a little pause and make a 'ts' sound for c.
waɾiˑc	warm	long vowel and the "tap" ɾ

há·kassk^{w}i	chair literally: “wood feet stand upright”	the ss is held a little longer and note the difference between the k and k^{w}.)
ka·hi·kʔa	woman	two long vowels, a glottal stop and the vowel at the end is voiceless so it doesn't make a sound!
nikwa·cʔa	arrow or bullet	
ksi·cʔa	bow or gun	
ka·hi·c	salt	
k^{w}a·c	red	
khá·ki·sʔa	book or paper Originally it meant a transparent membrane	
iciɾi	bird	
kʔíta·ks	coyote	
hawa·c	acorn	
ak^{w}a·ha·ɾʔa	clothing	
ʔaskʔicʔa	toe	

Figure 7 Practice Wichita sounds

One last note on reading Wichita - beware of combinations used to make sounds in English such as ‘ch,’ ‘sh’ or ‘th.’ Assume that every ‘letter’ must be pronounced by itself and don’t say the English combinations.

Verb Classes

Verbs are arguably the most important part of a sentence. Wichita is built around verbs and speakers' can pack a lot of information in verbs. Sometimes it takes a whole sentence in English to communicate what can be said with just one or two verbs in Wichita. This is because Wichita can build words by stacking many layers of affixes onto verbs.

An affix is not a word by itself. It is a unit of meaning that can be added to a word or the root of a word to give it more information. The root of the word is the main part of the word. If an affix is attached to the beginning of a word or anywhere before the root, it is called a prefix. Anything after the word or root is a suffix. For example, in the word “trainer,” the root of the word is “train” and the affix (a suffix in this case) is “er.” “er” is not a word by itself but it does have meaning. It means something like “someone who does X” where X is the root word. So a trainer is someone who trains. ”er” is a handy affix in English that is added to many words such as painter, builder, biker, teacher, player and singer.

If you read about grammar or look at linguistic descriptions, you may sometimes see an affix with a little dash either before or after it. The little dash represents where the affix can be attached. If the dash is at the front of an affix, it attaches after the root as in -er (it’s a suffix.) If the dash is the last symbol in

an affix, it attaches at the front of a word as in anti- or dis- (they are prefixes.) Wichita is a polysynthetic language, meaning it can stack many of these small units of meaning together both before and after the root.

In Rood's (1996) sketch, he recognizes four categories of verbs in Wichita. They are as follows:

Active and Stative
Stative and process
Transitive
Impersonal Process and Impersonal Stative.

Figure 8 Rood's 4 Verb Classes

Let's look at these one by one and give a few examples of each. First, active verbs are used when someone is *doing* something. For example:

George **went** to school.
George **sang** loudly.

The second category is stative verbs and process verbs. Stative verbs express states instead of actions. Below are some examples:

I **feel** happy.
I **think** Wichita is an interesting language.
Sarah **knows** the answer.
Flowers **smell** nice.
Frank **enjoys** movies.

He **is** sick.
The scarf **costs** ten dollars.

Grammarians argue that the subjects in the sentences above are not doing physical actions like running, jumping, playing, reading or cooking. The flowers aren't smelling something themselves, rather the verb tells us about a quality that the flowers have. (They have a nice scent.) The scarf has not priced itself, it just *is* ten dollars. A Wichita example that does not appear in English is the verb *tacʔi* 'be big.'

Process verbs does not express a voluntary action either. They express a process that happens to someone. For example, if you fall down the stairs, something is happening, but you did not mean to do it.

The third category is transitive verbs. Transitive verbs have a subject and an object. The terms 'subject' and 'object' explain the relationships between entities and verbs. The subject is usually someone who does something in the sentence or it is the person, place, thing or idea that the sentence is mainly about. In the example sentences below, the subject is in bold and the verb is underlined:

Marsha <u>is</u> smart.
The dog <u>ran</u> after the fox.
Gardening <u>is</u> my favorite activity.

If the subject does something to someone else, that person or thing is the object of the sentence. In these example sentences, the object is in bold:

Marsha baked a **cake.**
Bill ate the **cake.**
Marsha scolded **Bill.**

The examples above are all transitive because there is both a subject and an object. Intransitive verbs only have a subject as in "Marsha slept" or "Bill laughed." Transitive verbs are usually active, but this is not important right now.

The final category of verbs are "impersonal" stative and process verbs. They are like the process and stative verbs above with one difference; they do not take any kind of subjects or objects. Something is still happening in the sentence, but not to anyone or by anyone. An example of an impersonal process would be when it's raining (but no one is raining, it's a process that isn't happening to anyone or because of anyone.) An impersonal state would be *heˑha*, the Wichita verb for "be a creek" (an interesting verb that English doesn't have!)

For review, the verb types with examples are in the chart below.

Verb Category	**Examples**
Active and Stative	Hisha *go* Kirah *sing* Ta͡tsʔi *be big*
Stative and Process	Ac *be cold* Hiya *be hungry*
Transitive	ʔiːs *see* Kaʔac *eat* Ɪrasi *find*
Impersonal Stative and Process	Reʔerha *be a village or camp* He.ha *be a creek* Wa.wkʷic *heat lightning*

Figure 9 Review of Rood's Verb Categories with examples

The observant reader will notice that some of the categories seem to appear more than once in the chart. The reason for this is that categories here are not based on the type of verb but rather on the relationship with nouns or people that go with each kind of verb. In Wichita, this includes first person (I, me,) second person (you,) third person (he, she, it, them, they,) and number (singular or plural person.)

The first verb category in the chart takes a subject as in **He** sings or **He** is big.

The second category of verb needs an object, or someone who experiences something. Many stative and process verbs are in this category which means with these verbs, someone experiences a process or a stative quality, but no one is doing anything to them. In the examples above, someone can be hungry or cold, but no one Don't be confused by English translations! In English the system is different, and these verbs take subjects. In Wichita, the verbs for 'be cold' and 'be hungry' use objects and not subjects. In translation the meaning is similar or the same. The difference is only in grammatical categories.

Transitive verbs, the third category, need someone that does the action and someone that the action is done to, in other words a subject and an object.

Finally, impersonal verbs don't take a real subject or an object, but there is a third person prefix attached to them. This is not very different from the way English requires a subject and uses the word "it" if there is no person involved. For example, in the sentence "It's raining," 'it' is the subject even though it doesn't mean anything or stand for anyone. In these Wichita sentences, there is an unspecified third person singular subject that does a similar job. Below are is the chart again with the new information about the kinds of entities that each verb category requires.

Verb Type	**Noun or Person**	**Examples**
Active and Stative	Subject	Hisha *go* Kirah *sing* Taʧʔi *be big*
Stative and Process	Object	Aʧ *be cold* Hiya *be hungry*
Transitive	Subject and object	ʔiːs *see* Kaʔaʧ *eat* Iɾasi *find*
Impersonal Stative and Process	None	Reʔerha *be a village or camp* He.ha *be a creek* Wa.wkʷiʧ *heat lightning*

Figure 10 Rood's Verb Categories with examples, and noun or person

Some of the verb types such as stative verbs appear in more than one category because within that category different verbs require different relationships with subject and objects. The best example is stative verbs; in Wichita some only have a subject, some have an object, and some don't take either.

Also note that in some languages subjects, objects, and verbs must be arranged in a certain order. In Wichita, the object comes before the verb, which is the opposite of most English sentences (English is a subject, verb, object language.) The subject in Wichita might come either before or after the verb and the object. Furthermore, the ideas of subject and object might be part of the verb itself.

Verb Construction

In Wichita, verbs can take on many important meanings with affixes. In English, many of these meanings are often communicated with whole words or phrases instead of affixes. Affixes on verbs in Wichita can communicate mood, evidential information, tense and aspect. Each of these will be discussed briefly.

"Mood" in languages give information about the speaker's attitudes.[14] It manifests as different types of sentences. For example, if speakers believe something is true, they might make a factual statement. If they are unsure about something they might ask a question. Other moods in grammar might be commands or "if-then" sentences. (All of these moods have names, but they are not important right now.) A good example of mood in Wichita is indicative mood. This is used for factual statements and it is a very common mood. To make something indicative, Wichita speakers add the affix *ta.*

[14] Occasionally beginners are confused by grammatical terms that have other meanings in English. For example, "mood" does not necessarily have anything to do with emotions and the "object" of a sentence is not necessarily a physical object like a chair or a pencil. If the terms confuse you, don't worry – you don't need them to learn a language. They just make it easier to talk about grammar. Refer to the glossary at the back of the grammar to review the meanings of grammatical terms.

Evidentiality is not a feature of English but many other languages possess it. Languages with evidential systems have affixes or other grammatical features that communicate how the speaker knows what he or she is saying. For example, speakers may choose affixes that mean they saw or heard something themselves, that someone else told them something or that something can be inferred. In the Wichita evidential system speakers can make a statement based on either personal knowledge or knowledge from some other source. Knowledge from another source, called an impersonal report or 'quotative,' is usually translated into English as "I heard that..." There are several affixes associated with this quotation meaning. If the speaker does not use any quotative affixes, it is assumed that it is a personal report; the speaker or saw or knows the information himself or herself. The quotative can occur with any pronoun. (I heard that, he heard that, they heard that etc.)

A word of caution about using this feature. When speakers use the quotative when they are talking about themselves, it can imply that they did something without realizing what they were doing or that they were temporarily insane at the time. Quotative affixes all have more than one meaning in Wichita because each one is associated with other information about tense and aspect.

Tense and aspect are sometimes confused with each other. Tense refers to time such as the past, present or future. Wichita has markers for past (or "aorist,") future, and no reference to time at all. Aspect relates to time but is

not the same thing. In English, '-ing' verbs are used to communicate a continuous or progressive aspect. It means that the subject was in the middle of doing something or doing it for some amount of time. Often it is used to show a relationship of some kind with another event. For example, in the sentence 'He **was watching** TV when I came home' the relationship is that one thing (watching TV) was continuously happening without a specified beginning or end when another thing (I came home) occurred. Another common aspect in English is the 'perfect' or 'perfective.' It is also often used to show some kind of relationship between two events, but it generally means that something has been finished. It is made with a form of the word 'have' and a past tense form of the main verb. In the sentence 'I **had run** down the stairs by the time by friend knocked on the door.' the act of running was complete by the time the second act of knocking on the door occurred.

Wichita also uses perfective with the marker '*s*'. Wichita imperfective (for actions that have not been completed) has no marking or affix. Wichita uses other aspects as well. Intentive *-staris* expresses the idea that something is planned and habitual *-ss* means that something is habitual for the speaker or subject. Durative aspect is used for actions or events that happen at the same time as something else and may be translated as "meanwhile" or "at the same time." There are several affixes that communicative the meaning 'durative' in Wichita because it is also marked for person. For instance, *i* is the form for third person durative.

It is not unusual for words or affixes to have more than one idea or piece of information the way durative markers code meaning for person and durative. Consider pronouns in English. The word 'she' has the combined meaning of female, singular, subject pronoun and 'her' is female, singular and object pronoun. (Or female, singular, possessive pronoun.) Even if native English speakers don't know what these grammatical words mean, they understand instinctively how to use them. Without thinking about it, the words are always used in the right positions in a sentence and for singular entities and so forth. You won't find sentences like "Her loved she" where even one of these intrinsic meanings is confused. It is the same in Wichita. Fluent speakers don't think about the grammatical process, they just use time, aspect and mood instinctively.

In Wichita, many verbal affixes also have combined meanings. Tense and aspect affixes are combined with each other and at the same time they express attitudes such as wishes, commands, obligation and others. For example, *ehe-* has the combined meanings of future impersonal report and quotative (impersonal quotative is translated as "I heard that") with nothing special about aspect. *keʔe-* has all the same meanings except it is not quotative. *kiʔi-* is an imperfective future command.

Wichita speakers can mix these combined-meaning affixes at the beginning and ends of verb roots for even more meanings. To demonstrate

this concept, we will look at a few examples with the affixes above starting with *keʔe-* (future, no special aspect, impersonal.) The verb root will be *ʔrasi* 'cook.' *keʔe-* will always come before the root because it is a prefix and the other affixes will be after because they are suffixes.

1. *keʔe + ʔrasi* + perfective (no marker) = *keˈʔárasiki* she will cook it
Future, finishing an action, cook

2. *keʔe + ʔrasi* + imperfective *s* = *keˈʔárasis* she will be cooking it
Future, continuous action, cook

3. *keʔe + ʔrasi* + habitual *ss* = *keˈʔárasikiˈss* it will be her job to cook it every time.
Future, habitual action, cook

Ehe- is also used for future tense but it is quotative as well.

ehe + ʔrasi + perfective = *ehèˈʔárasiki* I heard she will cook it.
ehe + ʔrasi + imperfective *s* = *ehèˈʔárasis* I heard she'll be cooking it.
ehe + ʔrasi + habitual *ss* *ehèˈʔárasikiˈss* I heard it will be her job to cook it every time.

kiʔi- is a future command affix. It does not occur with imperfective, but here it is with perfective and habitual.

kiʔi + ʔrasi + perfective = *kiˈʔarási* You must let her cook it
kiʔi + ʔrasi + habitual = *kiˈʔárasikiˈss* let her always be the one to cook it.

Noun Categories (Count and noncount)

Wichita nouns can be divided into two major categories depending on if they can be counted or not. Nouns that can be plural are count nouns and as

the name implies, they are things that you can count. Noncount nouns cannot be plural. Many languages have categories like this. For example, in English you can count tomatoes or apples but not rice or milk. These particular nouns often take an 's' at the end to signify that they are plural and you can put numbers in front of them as in **5** tomatoe**s** and **3** apple**s**. But rice and milk would sound strange pluralized because English speakers do not consider them to be countable: 7 rices and 10 milks. Different languages will put different nouns into these categories, so it cannot be assumed that if something is count or noncount in English it will be the same in Wichita.

Wichita further divides the categories of count and noncount into more subcategories. Count nouns can be divided into collective and non-collective nouns. Collective nouns are some kind of group. In English these include words like orchestra, family, committee, and team. These words might be plural or singular in English but in Wichita collective nouns are plural. Non-collective nouns in Wichita are divided into three more categories: animate, activity and other. Animate refers to things that are alive. Like other semantic categories things that are alive might not be classed the same in all languages. Noncount nouns are divided into the categories of liquid and dry mass.

In Wichita, nouns can be singular, plural or dual. Like English, singular refers to when there is only one of something but plural in Wichita means there are three or more. If there is two of something it is 'dual.'

Wichita nouns may be marked for one of three cases. Languages with case systems indicate the grammatical function of a word, perhaps with some kind of affix. Wichita nouns can be marked to be agent, patient or dative. An agent in a sentence is the entity that acts or initiates the action. The patient has something done to it and may undergo some kind of change. In the sentences below, the agent is in bold and the patient is underlined.

Ben climbed up a hill.
Berry broke <u>the window.</u>
<u>Benji</u> was stung by a **bee**.

Notice that patients might be animate or inanimate, but agents are usually animate and voluntarily doing the action. It is also important to note that agents and patients are not the same as subjects and objects. For example, in the last sentence above, Benji is the subject because of the structure of the sentence, but Benji is the patient because of the semantic meaning where something is being done to him.

In English, speakers understand the grammatical function of different words from structure; words are placed in certain positions in a sentence. In Wichita, grammatical functions are marked with affixes.

The dative case is used to identify the entity that has received something. In English this is the indirect object. The indirect object is bolded in the sentences below.

Max gave **Marty** a cake.
Mary gave a cake to **Marty.**
Marty gave **his sister** a hug.

Wichita nouns can also be in or out of focus and they are marked for definiteness. In English, the word *the* is used when something is definite and *a/an* is used when something is indefinite.

Finally, Wichita nouns are marked for person. They can be first, second, third or inclusive. First person is the speaker (I, me) second person is the person addressed by the speaker (you) and third person is someone being talked about (she, he, it, they.) Inclusive is the speaker and one or more other people (we, us.)

Modifiers

Modifiers are words that describe or modify other words. There are several types of modifiers in Wichita, some of which modify verbs, some

modify nouns, and some modify other modifiers. Modifiers of nouns will be discussed first.

Quantifiers are a type of modifier that tells you something about how much or how many of something there is. In Wichita quantifiers include numbers and the words 'all' *assé·hah* and 'few' *ta·wʔic*.

Demonstratives are modifiers that give information about the distance between the speaker and some entity and sometimes they clarify what the speaker is referring to. In English, demonstratives include this, that, these, those, here and there. In Wichita the demonstratives are *tiʔih* 'this' and *ha·rí·h* 'that.'

The last category of modifiers for nouns are adjectives. In English adjectives include words like big, light, heavy, pink, beautiful, strange, lucky, round, bumpy and notorious. Often these words come before the noun they modify as in

The **big** house
The **bumpy** road
The **notorious** thief.

In Wichita, adjectives can come before or after the noun they modify and there is more than one kind of structure for them. Rood gives an example

with two different types of adjectives for 'big.' The word *niwaˑc* is a word all by itself and is a "true adjective."

Akhaˑɾʔa **niwaˑc** big house
(if said faster natural speed, it will sound more like *akháriwaˑc*)

Other true adjectives include *ɾiyaˑs* 'old,' *khac* 'white,' and *kʷhacˑ*'red.' True adjectives follow the word they modify.

Other structures are called 'adjectives' because they modify nouns but they behave like verbs. The construction *tac tiˑʔi* means "is big." This is a stative verb construction and it turns up in various positions in a sentence.

Akhaˑɾʔa **tac tiˑʔi** or **tac tiˑʔi** akhaˑɾʔa

'House is big.'

There are also modifiers for verbs that give information about things like time, manner and place. They answer questions like 'how?' 'when?' and 'where?' In English the words and phrases that answer these questions are called adverbs. In the examples below, the adverb is underlined and follows the verb.

The man walked <u>quickly</u>.
I worked <u>yesterday.</u>
The kids played <u>outside</u>.

These adverbs answer the questions 'how did the man walk?' (quickly,) 'when did I work?' (yesterday,) and 'where did the kids play?' (outside.)

In Wichita adverbial information like this is not always a simple adverb that is a single word like in English. Most adverbial information about time and manner are actually subordinate sentences. Subordinate sentences or "fragments" cannot stand alone. They do not make sense by themselves so they are part of a bigger, independent sentence. For example, these fragments don't make sense alone:

After Bob went to the store
Whenever you're not home
Until I find my lost shoe

They need the rest of the sentence:

After Bob went to the store, he went to the park and the ice cream melted in the car.
Whenever you're not home I miss you.
I can't go anywhere until I find my lost shoe!

Remember that some Wichita verbs can have all the information of an English sentence, either a whole sentence or in this case, a fragment. The Wichita words for 'tomorrow' and 'yesterday' give adverbial information about time. They are examples of verbs that are also fragments.

hiˑhánthiɾih
‘tomorrow’ literally: “when it is day’

tiʔikhánthirisʔih
‘yesterday’ literally: ‘this which was day.’

These words include the verb root *hanthiɾi* ‘be daylight’ and *h,* which is a marker meaning it’s subordinate.

Two other types of modifiers that will be briefly discussed are instrumentals and locatives. Instrumentals are some kind of grammatical structure that tells you by what means or instrument some action was accomplished. This is one of the functions of the word ‘with’ in English.

Write **with** a pen.
Move the pancakes **with** a spatula.

In Wichita, instrumentals are either nouns by themselves or body parts. Both of them have their own way to be identified as an instrumental. A noun is identified as an instrumental with the suffix *ɾáˑɾʔ.* Note that the form of this suffix will be changed when it is combined with other sounds in a structure. For instance,

kiɾikiɾʔiˑs + ɾáˑɾʔ = kiɾikiɾʔiˑsáhiɾʔ
Wichita + ‘instrumental suffix’ = “in Wichita.”
(It is awkward to say “with Wichita” in English so this is translated “in.”)

The sentence *harhiwiˑcáˑhirʔ assiʔariˑs* is from a recipe and it means 'Put it aside in a bowl.' The first word more literally means ' using a bowl'

harhiwic 'bowl' + *Ráˑhirʔ* 'instrumental marker' =
harhiwiˑcáˑhirʔ

The verb *tacʔickhitéˑshas* is translated as the sentence "I peeked over the edge" but the literal translation it is "using the face, I went over the edge." It is an example of a body part acting as an instrumental. The part that means face is *ʔicka* and it is identified as instrumental because it is placed in a certain spot in the verb structure.

There are several other kinds of modifiers in Wichita, but the last type discussed here are locatives. Locatives tell you something about location or direction. In Wichita different constructions have locative information. The demonstratives *tiʔr* 'here,' *harah* 'there' and *híˑrakaˑh* 'way off' are locatives. Nouns have a special suffix, *kiyah,* that is a locative telling you where something is. For example

ʔikaˑ 'rock' + *kiyah* 'locative' = *ʔikaˑkíyah* 'where the rock is.'

The suffix *hrih* is a locative for certain types of verbs as in *niyaˑhkʷírih* ' where the tree is.' There are also 20-30 locative affixes that cannot be used alone. They are placed right before the verb root and some of them can be

combined. For example

kataska 'in an open area' + *ʔr* 'in a direction' =
kataskeʔer 'through the yard'

kataskeʔer 'through the yard' + *iwaˑc* 'outside' =
kataskeʔeroˑc 'out the other way from the yard.'

Derivation

Derivation is a useful process in languages that creates new words or new types of words from other words. There is plenty of derivation in English. For example, adding -er to the end of some verbs turns them into nouns with the meaning of 'person who does X.' In this case, we say that the resulting noun is derived from the verb.

Bake + er = baker, someone who bakes. Bake is a verb, baker is a noun. The noun is derived from the verb.

Write + er = writer, someone who writes. Write is a verb, writer is a noun.

There are many other ways to derive new words classes in English. Adding 'ful' to 'joy' gives you 'joyful' which is an adverb derived from a noun. 'Strategy' plus 'ize' results in the word 'strategize:' a verb that was derived from a noun.

Wichita words can also change word classes with derivation or even become something new within a word class. For example, process verbs can be made from stative verbs by using the roots *ʔahɾih* 'become' or *hi* 'do.' Transitive verbs can also be made from stative verbs with *ɾaʔi* 'make.'

Let's look closer at another example in Wichita. *kakic ʔi* is 'be dry.' (*kakic* is dry and *ʔi* is the verb 'be.') Notice that it is a stative verb because nothing is happening; it is just the state of something. If we add *ʔahɾih* 'become' or *hi* 'do' then some action will be taking place.

ti**kakicʔáɾis** 'It is drying' (the 'h' in *ʔahɾih* disappears when added in this construction.)
ti**kakic**a**hi**s 'They are getting dry.'

In the context of language revitalization it is important to note that Wichita speakers have added words for new cultural items. One of the techniques used to do this was derivation. It is more common to derive nouns from verbs and this is the case with some of these new cultural words. Below are three nouns that were derived from verbs with *na*, a general participle for nouns. It is in bold in the examples.

***ná**:sa·khíʔnnih*
Sunday literally: “When it is his day.”

kíɾiwa**ɾé**·sa·khíʔnnih
Monday literally: “when it is no longer his day.”

kín**ni**·ciɾiʔí:hiɾih
Automobile literally: “what goes without a harness.”

Notice that sometimes the form for *na* changes. Sometimes it has an r and sometimes it has an n. Remember that the ‘n’ sound in Wichita actually comes from an ‘r’ that changes in some environments. It is always the same even though sometimes it sounds different.

Derivation could be one of many language processes that could be useful in further language revitalization. If the Wichita would like to add more words that may be missing from the language, this is one way that might be done.

Appendix AB
Glossary of Terms

Active Verbs
Active verbs are usually an action that someone does. Examples include jump, eat, write, play and sing.

Affix
An affix is a small meaningful part of speech that is attached to other words and changes the meaning of the words to which they attach. An affix is not a word by itself. If an affix is attached at the beginning of a word or before the root of the word, it is called a prefix. If an affix is attached at the end of the word or after the root, it is a suffix. English prefixes include pre-, re-, un-, and anti-. English suffixes include -tion, -ed, -ship, and -ous.

Alveolar Ridge
The alveolar ridge is the firm bump on the roof of the mouth just behind the teeth.

Alveolar sounds
Alveolar sounds are made at or near the alveolar ridge. These sounds include t and d because the tongue touches the alveolar ridge.

Animate
If something is animate it is considered (or at least treated grammatically) to be alive. Humans and animals are animate, but it should be noted that what is considered to be animate will not be the same in every language.

Aspect
Aspect expresses how an action happens over time. For example, the "-ing" forms of verbs are often used in English to indicate that something was continuous, unfinished or that it doesn't matter when something ended.

Evidentiality
Evidentiality is the grammatical term for the way speakers express the evidence for what they are saying. In some languages evidentiality is required and might include ideas like "I saw that" "I heard that" "I can infer that" etc. Wichita has a quotative morpheme which expresses evidentiality with the meaning "I heard that…"

First person

In grammatical terms, the first-person perspective is used when speakers talk about themselves. The words "I," "me," "us," and "we" are first person terms in English.

Glottal Stop
The glottal stop is a phoneme in some languages that is made by completely closing the throat. This is a regular sound in the Wichita language so there is a letter in the Wichita alphabet to represent it.

Inanimate
In grammar something that is inanimate is not alive (or at least not treated that way grammatically.) Not every language will agree on what is animate and inanimate. For example, one language might consider rocks to be inanimate and another might treat the word for rock as grammatically animate.

Indicative mood
The indicative mood is used for factual statements, beliefs and questions. For example, "It's sunny today" and "Present Smith is good at her job" are both said to be in the indicative mood.

Intransitive Verb
An intransitive verb does not have an object. For example, in the sentence "I smiled" there is only the subject of the verb *I.* To most English speakers it would sound incorrect and seem illogical to insert an object as in "I smiled her."

Language Revitalization
Language revitalization is the act of stopping language shift, loss or disappearance and creating new speakers. Language revitalization could produce a community of new fluent speakers. Language revitalization activities are meant to revitalize a language even if years of work are still required to realize that goal.

Mood
The grammatical mood of a sentence indicates something about how the speaker feels about what they are saying. For example, when a speaker believes something to be true, they make a factual statement or state an opinion as if it is a fact. These types of sentences are said to be in the "indicative mood." If a speaker commands someone else to do something, it is in the "imperative mood."

Morpheme
A morpheme is the smallest unit of meaning in a language. It might be a word or an affix. For example, the word "cat" is a morpheme by itself because it

cannot be broken down any further, but "cats" has two morphemes: The word *cat* and the suffix *s* which indicates plurality in English.

Nasal sound
Nasals sounds are made when the flow of air through the mouth has been completely closed and some air escapes through the nose. For example, m and n are nasals.

Object
The grammatical object is something or someone that is acted upon in a sentence. For example, in the sentences, "I love French fries" and "I pushed George" the objects are *French fries* and *George* because they are receiving the action of the verbs.

Phoneme
The smallest unit of sound in a language that speakers of the language perceive to be distinct from other sounds. For example, in English *r* and *l* are distinct phonemes even though the difference may be difficult to hear in other languages.

Pitch
The tone of voice when speaking. In some languages like Wichita, some sounds have a higher or lower pitch. In many languages the pitch raises at the end of a question.

Root
The root of a word is the basic element or idea and it can grow, or the meaning can change when affixes are added. For example, the root of "unfair" is *fair* and the meaning has changed to its opposite by adding the suffix *un-.* The root might be a word by itself or it might be a morpheme that cannot be used by itself.

Stative Verbs
Stative verbs describe a situation or state instead of an action. Examples include feel, know and like.

Second person
In grammatical terms, the second person is the person that the speaker is addressing. In English, "you" refers to the second person.

Semi-speaker
There may not be a definitive definition for a semi-speaker, but it is someone who partially speaks a language. A semi-speaker with a little knowledge might be able to use basic vocabulary and grammar or a semi-speaker might be advanced enough to be conversational but still not be able to use the language in every situation.

Subject
The grammatical subject in a sentence that does the action of the verb. For example, in the sentences "I slept all day" and "Marsha sat down" the subjects are *I* and *Marsha.*

Third person
In grammatical terms, the third person is the person or people the speaker is talking about. In English "they" and "them" refer to the third person.

Tense
Tense communicates time. Tense includes past, present and future but there could be other tenses in some languages.

Transitive Verbs
A transitive verb requires a grammatical object, or something that is acted upon. For example, in the sentence "Fred kissed Jen," the word "kiss" is the transitive verb that needs an object. *Jen* is the object that is acted upon. *Fred* is the subject and the verb.

Word final position
When a phoneme, pitch or other feature is at the very end of a word it is in word final position.

Velum
The velum is the soft palate on roof of the mouth near the back of the mouth. Sounds that are made at or near the velum are said to be velar. Velar sounds include k and g because the back of the tongue raises and touches the velum.

Voiceless sounds
Voiceless sounds are made when without the vibration of the vocal folds. Sounds that are voiceless include k, s, t, p and h.

Voiced sounds
Voiced sounds are made when the vocal folds vibrate. Voiced sounds include g, z, d, b and m.

Vowel length
The amount of time a vowel sound is held out. In some languages, the same vowel is held out at different lengths on purpose. Speakers perceive them as different phonemes. Wichita has three important vowel lengths: short, long and overlong.

Appendix B
A brief background on Section 106 and the Housing and Urban Development

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is a program that reviews projects before they are undertaken by federal agencies to preserve historical sites in the country. Federal agencies are defined by the US Government as "any United States executive department, military department, defense agency or any other agency of the executive branch..." (The United States Government Manual p 65).

The review or investigation process is supposed to involve all other interested parties. These parties and historical sites include Native Americans and land or sites that are relevant or important to them. The federal agency conducts the review and non-federal applicant, such as a landowner or developer, will work with the agency. For some Housing and Urban Development projects, the responsibility for review falls to tribal governments. Tribal Historic Preservation Officers also consult with federal agencies during a Section 106 Process (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 2015).

Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of projects on historic properties but does not guarantee that all historic sites will be preserved. The website states that the organization tries to find a balance between the interests of projects undertaken by federal agencies and of preserving historic sites, but that some projects may not be possible without damaging these sites. After an investigation, the site may be avoided or destroyed with the agency taking responsibility.

When federal financial assistance is given, it is also considered an undertaking that falls under Section 106. There are various types of grants that may be awarded to different entities including funds for Native Americans to preserve historical sites or for indigenous and other peoples for development in rural or urban projects. The block grant that the Wichita received for their museum is a type of indirect assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. (HUD) The HUD gives grants for several kinds of projects and entities. It includes a grant called the Indian Community Development Block Grant Program, under which projects like a museum or other community development might be undertaken. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development).

Appendix C
Survey Data

Survey Data

The following is data from the surveys for those who are interested in the details of each question. Information that has already been laid out in chapter 3 is repeated for convenience of having everything in one place. The number of people who voted for an option appears after the question or description. Open ended questions and comments are not included.

Demographic Information

Ages
5 people between the ages of 12 and 19
5 between 20-30
11 between 30-40
9 between 40-50
9 between 50-60
9 between 60-70
5 between of 60-70
2 between 70-80
2 did not comment

Gender
13 males
34 females
2 people did not answer

Self-Assessed Speaker Fluency

49 participants rated themselves on a scale of 1 – 10 with 10 being fluency.
10 did not answer
31 said 0-2
6 rated themselves at a 3
3 rated themselves at a 4
1 rated himself as a 6

Language Revitalization Survey

Is it possible to revitalize the Wichita Language?

Out of 48 participants:

Yes (37)
Maybe (8)
No (3)

Would you be willing to serve on a language committee?

Out of 51:
Yes (23)
Maybe (23)
No (5)

Would you be able to participate without compensation?

Out of 51 participants:
Yes (36)
Maybe (13)
No (2)

Why is language revitalization important to you?

50 people answered this question

Family Reasons

I want my children to know the culture (39)
I want my children to speak the language (33)
I know someone special (parents, grandparents, teacher, etc.) who wants me to learn (14)
It's a good social activity or opportunity to connect with the community (24)

Cultural Reasons

It's part of my Wichita identity or it helps me feel more connected to it (38)
I want to learn more about the language or culture (37)
The language has important historical or cultural information in it (33)

Historical Reasons

It's healing (27)
It helps me feel closer to my ancestors. (33)
It's a way to decolonize my life or culture (20)
It helps me remember the past (30)

Others

It's fun. (20)
It's interesting (34)
I'm afraid we will lose the language or culture (37)
Others 3

What types of things do you think are necessary for successful revitalization?
Out of 42

What kind of people do you need for revitalization?

Certified teachers (13)
Certified teachers are not necessary – traditional teaching approaches will work (24)
Help from people who might not be members of the tribe (22)
Tribal members and the skills we already have are enough (17)
Tribal members should learn special skills (27)
A mixture of people in the tribe and outside help (27)

What kinds of programs or opportunities do you think are necessary for successful language revitalization?

Workshops or classes in the community (31)
Kids need to learn the language (35)
Wichita in the media (TV, radio, YouTube, texting, books, etc.) (15)
Wichita taught in schools (17)
Wichita spoken in the home as much as possible (27)
Lots and lots of people need to be involved (28)
It can't be done (3)

Which of the following would you like to see in your community?

Programs

Language camp (36)
Master Apprentice type programs (25)
Language classes (40)
Wichita preschool or daycare (32)
Workshops for making learning materials (29)
Workshops for leaning to speak at home (35)

Learning Materials

A website with resources for learning Wichita such as grammar lessons, games, recordings etc. (44)
Wichita language textbooks (37)
Other books for learning Wichita (35)

Other Materials in Wichita

Dudded movie or cartoons (27)
Children's books (44)
Native stories in books (35)
Others (4)

What skills and efforts would you be willing to contribute to a language revitalization program?

Home, technical or artistic

Preparing food for events (34)
Artistic work (26)
Web design or maintenance (13)
Other IT skills (11)
Clerical work (25)

Community leadership

Being a discussion leader or teacher for classrooms or other events (17)
Organizing events (21)
Helping kids with activities (36)

Community participation

Being a master in a master apprentice program (6)
Being an apprentice in a master apprentice program (22)
Attending language classes or discussions (42)
Participating in language camp (32)

Language study activities

Use Wichita at home with family, friends or even by yourself (23)
Study Wichita by yourself (35)
Send kids to participate in classes or other events (29)

Language development activities

Uploading language projects to a website (plays, poems, books, blogs about your efforts, etc.) (19)
Creating language projects like games, simple books, or lesson plans (20)
Writing stories, poems or acting out plays (16)
Dubbing cartoons, movies or skits (10)
Working with or adding to the Wichita archive or dictionary (17)
Create art for books, pamphlets or a website (20)
Playing language games (26)

What skills would you be willing to learn to participate in language revitalization activities?

Linguistic work

How to use the Wichita dictionary (37)
How to do basic linguistic work (26)
How to write a grant to fund language projects (21)
How to write in Wichita (32)
How to bring language into your home or strategies for using it more at home (31)

Community leadership or participation

How to lead a class or discussion group (17)
How to work with kids for day care or class (22)

Other community or technical work

Computer skills (21)
How to use the archive (30)
How to prepare food (traditional or otherwise) (32)
How to do any other traditional activities (29)
Clerical work (15)

What are some reasons or obstacles that would prevent you from participating in language revitalization?

I'm afraid I won't be good at it (12)
It's not important to me (0)
I don't have time to participate or learn (14)
It's not a priority/I have other obligations right now that I need to focus on (5)
I don't think we should do these things (1)
I don't think we can do these things (0)
I don't have transportation (5)
I need a babysitter (1)
I live in another city or state (7)

None (4)

When are you available to participate in language revitalization activities?

51 people answered this question.

Evenings (24)
Weekends (29)
Summer (10)
I will find time because I am interested (14)
During the day (7)
A couple people said they could participate at any time and this was counted as a vote for every category.

Archive Survey

What would you be interested in using the archive for?

<u>Language and cultural reasons to use the archive</u>

To study the Wichita language (41)
To learn more about the Wichita culture (39)
To create learning materials for the Wichita language (21)
To find or add words to the Wichita dictionary (21)
To read what scholars have said about Wichita language or culture (34)
To watch videos of Wichita language classes or discussions (33)

<u>Other reasons to use the archive</u>

To listen to or learn songs in Wichita (41)
To listen to recordings or elders speaking (36)
To listen to recordings of friends or relatives (31)
To look at pictures or people or places (35)
To find genealogy information (34)

What obstacles might prevent you from using the archive?

I don't know how to use it (23)
Computers or technology are difficult to use or understand (5)
I don't know what to do with it (6)
I don't have time (11)
I don't think it's important (2)

I have no interest (2)
I don't have a way to get to the archive (12)
Other (11)

What do you need to be able to visit the archive?

Transportation (13)
Childcare/babysitter (6)
Someone to help me use it (17)
Others (6)
No answer (10)

Would you be willing to attend a workshop to test the archive or archive manual?

Yes (40)
No (0)
Maybe (8)

Would you be willing to attend a free workshop to learn how to use the archive?

Yes (42)
No (2)
Maybe (4)