INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

LANGUAGE USE AND LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION IN BILINGUAL HOMES IN INUIT COMMUNITIES

Clair Chen

School of Communication Sciences and Disorders

McGill University, Montréal

July, 1997

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Science

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of language use and language socialization practices in Northern Québec. The focus is on families with children between 9 and 24 months of age, particularly bilingual families, living in predominantly Inuit communities. Interviews with 11 families were examined to determine the major issues concerning language use, beliefs, and relationships. Two bilingual families were then examined in-depth over one year to gain a clearer understanding of their language behaviours and how they related to the cultures present in the homes and communities. Results of the study indicate that there is variation across bilingual families in many aspects related to language. Syncretism and dissociation of language and culture and their effects on the Inuit, educators, and speech-language pathologists are discussed.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette thèse est une étude de l'utilisation du langage et de ses pratiques de socialisation au Québec nordique. Elle porte sur des familles bilingues avec des enfants âgés de 9 à 24 mois, vivant en communauté à prédominance Inuit. Des entrevues avec 11 familles ont été menées pour déterminer les faits saillants de leurs langages, croyances et de leurs relations sociales. Deux de ces familles ont par la suite été suivies de proche pendant un an afin de mieux comprendre leurs habitudes de langage et leur comportement face aux cultures présentes à domicile comme en communauté. Les résultats indiquent qu'il existe une variation de plusieurs aspects du langage à travers les familles bilingues. La discussion porte sur le syncrétisme, la dissociation du langage et de la culture, ainsi que sur leurs effets sur les Inuits, les enseignants et les orthophonistes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, many thanks to the families who participated in this study. Without them, not only would I not have had a project to conduct, but I would not have had the honour of glimpsing into their lives and going away with a better understanding of both them and myself.

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. M. Crago, whose guidance and support have kept me going. She helped me see through the fog when I was lost, and made me believe that one day, I would be able to see through it on my own. Her friendship, compassion, and positive attitude have been an inspiration.

This research was enabled through a McGill Major Fellowship and through funding to Dr. M. Crago from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The funding was very much appreciated.

Thank you to Dr. F. Genesee and Dr. R. Mayberry, who provided valuable insight and suggestions into how to make this thesis better. If they hadn't been there, I would not have found the right path. I learned a lot from their input.

Thank you to Wendy Hough-Eyamie, who took the time to help me with the data analysis and provide a little comic relief when I needed it. She listened to my woes and convinced me the sun would come out again.

Thank you to Christine Coon for her help in transcription and data analysis. I would not have met my deadline without her.

Thank you to Elizabeth Annahatak for her transcription and translation of the Inuktitut data. I would be nowhere without her. Her efficiency and patience were incredible.

Thank you to Diane Pesco for her organization and help when everything was confusing. In addition, thank you for finding me somewhere to live during the final months of this undertaking. It is very much appreciated.

Thank you to the transcribers and translators from my supervisor's research team whom I never met.

Thank you to Dang and Lamson for providing the technical know-how, the French translations, and the support I needed from someone calm. Most of all, their generosity and good humour have been greatly appreciated.

Thank you to Mom and Dad for always supporting me and teaching me that visiting new places and people would be rewarding. They have let me follow my dreams, even when my dreams have caused them to worry.

Thank you to Eugene, who encouraged me to try doing this. He believed in me more than I did. His own throroughness and dedication to research on topics important to him have gained my greatest respect. But most of all, his strength in hard times has made me a great admirer.

Thank you to Stephen for never letting me abandon my work for too long. His encouragement and fantastic humour have kept me both afloat and in stitches. He could always make me laugh.

Thank you to Lisa, Raymond, Scott, and Shari, whose support and companionship have meant a lot to me.

A portion of this work appears in Journal of Just and Caring Education (in press).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to lose one's culture? For those people whose cultures are strong, the meaning of cultural loss is elusive, perhaps even irrelevant in the opinions of some. For others struggling to preserve their ways of life in the midst of a foreign, majority culture, the concept is always in their minds, although it remains difficult to define. One of the reasons why people struggle with the concept is because there is a murky boundary between loss of culture and natural evolution of society. The distinction is a subjective one, with some people feeling that any change is a loss to be mourned, others feeling that change is progress and unaware of any loss of valuable cultural elements, and still others falling somewhere in-between.

My own personal foray into research on bilingual Inuit families has some association with an understanding of loss of culture and an interest in language and culture maintenance, although I was not conscious of it initially. In the beginning, I was simply curious about the Inuit culture of Northern Québec and wanted to learn more about it. As I became more involved, however, the emotions of the people I encountered when discussing their struggle to preserve their Inuit heritage drew out certain feelings in me that forced me to acknowledge and identify my own experiences, a process which is still difficult today and which I remain somewhat reluctant to undergo. I am the daughter of older parents born and raised in China. They immigrated to North America approximately 40 years ago and settled in Saskatchewan, where I grew up. They left their native culture and language to live with a culture and language very different from their own, and over time, blended them together. I was raised in a home where Mandarin was spoken, but predominantly only English was used between my parents and me. To this day, we only communicate in English, and what little Mandarin I possess I have absorbed from when I was very young or learned in a sterile classroom setting as an adult. Yet, it is still my "comfort" language, the language that

soothes me when I hear it spoken around me as I remember hearing it while I drifted off to sleep on so many nights as a child.

In terms of culture, I have only recently been made aware of certain behaviours I have that some might classify as "traditional Chinese," despite my previous best efforts to rid myself of them. The Chinese community in Saskatchewan was very small when I was growing up, and we did not live in an area where other Chinese families lived. For a number of years, I was the only non-Caucasian attending my school, and the rest of the time the number of minority culture students never grew to an extent where we could consider ourselves our own "group." Consequently, I adopted mainstream Canadian beliefs, values, and behaviours. In the common struggle of youth not to be "different," I strove to shed any features of Chinese culture I might have had and be as "white" as I could, much to the chagrin of my parents, who continued to practice many of their native ways.

As I became older, I realized that this was a futile struggle. No matter how hard I tried to act "Canadian," people always saw my face and classified me as Chinese. The racism I experienced sometimes made me laugh, sometimes made me angry, and all too often reduced me to tears. I felt lost, neither part of the Chinese culture nor part of the white middle-class culture. It was not that I had lost my culture, since I never really identified with either the Chinese or the white middle-class, but that I simply did not have one and could not find a place to belong. It was a difficult and private dilemma, as neither my parents nor my friends, all of whom were non-Chinese, could identify with my situation. After I left Saskatchewan, I met other North American-born Chinese and discovered that, although we all came from different backgrounds and had had different experiences, we were all existing in "the void" between our two cultures. We understand each other in a way others cannot. In a sense, we are the pioneers of a new culture, although its characteristics are not easily defined. It is one to which we all feel we belong, our bond being our

constant battle to reconcile the differences between our parents' culture and that of our environment. I have seen some members of "the void" do this successfully, others deny one culture in favour of the other, and still others become destroyed trying to bridge the seemingly impossible gap.

What does my own personal history have to do with the Inuit? Clearly, our situations are not the same. Although I have not acquired the language or culture of my parents, they are certainly not in danger of disappearing. On the contrary, Mandarin and Chinese culture could both easily be learned if I so chose. The Inuit, on the other hand, feel they are in danger of losing their language and culture as a people (Dorais, 1996; Taylor, 1990). Their population is not nearly as great as that of the Chinese and each individual is important in maintaining their heritage as the mainstream Canadian culture quickly seeps into their communities. What the younger generations of Inuit and I have in common is our existence in the "the void," where we struggle to build an existence somewhere between our native cultures and that of mainstream Canada. The consequences of this struggle on Inuit individuals appear to be similar to those of North American Chinese. However, the Inuit recognize the danger of losing their heritage and, as a people, are making great efforts to preserve it. As someone who can understand their situation, albeit to a somewhat limited extent, I am interested in examining the results of their efforts and have chosen to study one small chapter in their story. This thesis focuses on the use of language and the language socialization practices of an ever-increasing segment of the Northern population, namely, bilingual families.

This study is unique because it integrates several different areas of research and schools of thought in its search for a meaningful portrayal of a people and their culture as they undergo great change. Previous research in relevant areas is diverse in both its focus and methodology, but little work has been done that addresses both bilingualism and language socialization in individual homes within a single population. This

study centres on two bilingual families from two different communities and their communicative interactions during everyday activities at home. The families are situated against a backdrop of one community and the beliefs and language practices of its residents. The nature of this work requires natural settings and activities, participant insight, and everyday behaviours in order to gain an understanding of the situations in the lives of the people under study. Hence, the ethnographic method of research was used, as this employs natural contexts and presents findings according to the viewpoints of the participants themselves.

The thesis begins with a review of the literature. It consists of an overview of research and theory in the areas of language socialization and bilingualism, the cultural context of this study, and the rationale for the present research. The next chapter contains a presentation of interviews conducted with parents in one settlement in Northern Québec. It begins with a description of the participants, followed by a description of the methodology. The chapter ends with a presentation of the findings related to overall language use in the community. Chapter 4 discusses the in-depth portraits of two bilingual families living in Inuit communities. It begins with a description of participant selection. Next, data collection and their preparation for analysis are described. Finally, there is a presentation of the two families. Each family portrait begins with a discussion of the backgrounds of each caregiver and focal child, followed by a description of the language use and language socialization behaviours that were frequently practiced by the caregivers. The final chapter discusses the overall findings of the study, how they relate to the findings of previous studies, their implications for the Inuit and for future research on bilingualism and minority cultures, and clinical and educational ramifications.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH AND CULTURAL CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

This chapter reviews literature pertinent to unicultural and cross-cultural studies of language socialization and to studies of bilingualism. Within the topic of bilingualism I include a review of literature focusing on language socialization, input, situations of language loss and change, and syncretism. I then present the cultural context of the present research, followed by the rationale for the study.

Cross-Cultural Studies of Language Socialization

Language socialization is a relatively new area of research and the number of studies from different cultures continues to grow. Descriptions of what language socialization encompasses have been provided and refined over the last twenty years. Early work focused predominantly on single cultures, but recently, researchers have begun to apply a focus on language socialization to studies of bilingualism.

The Nature of Language Socialization

Broad overviews of the patterns of language socialization in a particular culture largely involve the ethnographic method of research. In 1990, Schieffelin wrote that "language as a source for children to acquire the ways and world views of their culture, and language as a critical resource for the researcher to analyze for what it can tell us about cultural procedures, beliefs, and expectations, has been largely untapped" (p. 14). In the last two decades studies of language socialization have begun to emerge (e.g., Clancy, 1986; Crago, 1988; Demuth, 1986; Heath, 1983; Miller, 1986; Ochs, 1988; Peters & Boggs, 1986; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin, 1994; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). The most common definition of language socialization is "socialization through language and socialization to use language" (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 2). This is a succinct way of expressing that the process of becoming a competent member of a society is realized to a large extent through language, by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). The

goal in studies of language socialization is to understand how "children and other novices in society acquire tacit knowledge of principles of social order and systems of beliefs (ethnotheories) through exposure to and participation in language-mediated interactions" (Ochs, 1986, p. 2). It is through learning language that children learn about their culture, which in turn teaches them how to use their language appropriately according to their society (Genesee, 1995). However, one must be careful not to consider a particular society as homogeneous. People often fail to realize that "language socialization is not done in the same way, nor in the same context, nor by the same people within any given culture . . . what is unique to a culture is the particular dosage and combination of 'who,' 'how,' 'when,' and 'where' that is associated with language socialization" (Crago, 1988, p. 30).

Language socialization involves interactional display, either covert or overt, to a novice of expected ways of thinking, feeling, acting (Ochs, 1986), and communicating in a given society, conducted through language and discourse. For example, it includes the teaching or demonstration of how to speak and act appropriately in various contexts (e.g., when telling a joke, when giving instructions), when speaking to or acting as people of different status and roles (e.g., formal register with the prime minister, casual speech with a best friend), and how to recognize and express feelings verbally and nonverbally. Language socialization patterns identify the speakers' ideas about who they are and how they should behave, and provide information about language acquisition patterns (Obondo, 1996). Experienced speakers convey that the use of language differs with the social situation, event, or activity (Genesee, 1995). Children and other novices actively organize the sociocultural information that is conveyed through the form and content of others' actions, and are also active socializers of others in their environment. No participant in a socializing interaction is passive (Genesee, 1995; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990).

Language acquisition, then, is both a form of socialization and a

form of cultural acquisition (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez, & Shannon, 1994). Vocal and verbal activities are socially organized and embedded in cultural systems of meaning (Genesee, 1995; Schieffelin, 1990). According to Schieffelin (1994), a basic assumption of the perspective of language socialization is that for all children, the acquisition of language entails the acquisition of critical aspects of cultural knowledge, including information about social relationships, values, and ways of acquiring knowledge. Language is used to establish, maintain, and organize social life. All cultures show sensitivity to teaching the social uses of language (Lieven, 1994), and the patterns of language use in any community are in accord with and mutually reinforce other cultural patterns (Heath, 1983). Even in the early years of life, maternal speech to infants socializes a culturally appropriate communication style (Bornstein, Tal, Rahn, Galperín, Pêcheux, Lamour, Toda, Azuma, Ogino, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1992; Clancy, 1986, Ochs, 1986), and language input is for its producers a form of socialization and a culturally prescribed activity. In short, linguistic knowledge and sociocultural knowledge acquisition are interdependent (Ochs, 1988).

Research in language socialization has identified several determinants of cultural variation. The conversations of children vary according to differences in beliefs about the status and role of the child in a particular society, the social organization of caregiving, how communities structure their families and define the roles that community members can assume, and the folk conceptions of childhood and how children learn language (Heath, 1983; Lieven, 1994; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984). In other words, the social organization of language differs across and within cultures depending on cultural beliefs, values, and goals regarding social roles and relationships (Crago 1988; Genesee, 1995). As children become communicatively competent, they are learning language structure, a set of conventions for interaction and the use of language, and the values, attitudes, and beliefs of other cultural

members surrounding the use of language (Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984).

The resounding message from the study of language socialization is that the researcher must study discourse to understand what participants are doing when they interact (Schieffelin, 1994). Children do not learn language in isolation, but rather, do so in dialogue and social interaction with more knowledgeable members of their social group. Descriptions of language acquisition cannot be complete without an understanding of the world in which children are learning to communicate and the environment that motivates them. One of the first requirements in this area of research is to identify important contexts and activities of socialization and the participants who organize them (Schieffelin, 1994). Studying language in "natural contexts" is essential to an understanding of language socialization because it is in these situations that caregivers display their socializing techniques and children are able to demonstrate their competence. The household is generally an ideal place to observe and record language socialization activities, as it is often the most important context of language acquisition and involves the most important people in a young child's life.

Cross-Cultural Diversity and Commonality

Studies of language socialization have been conducted in numerous cultures. Some studies have described general patterns of communication in particular cultural groups (Clancy, 1986; Crago, 1988; Demuth, 1986; Eisenberg, 1986; Miller, 1986; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), showing overall that there is diversity across various cultures. For example, Schieffelin (1990) documented the language socialization practices of a Kaluli community, Ochs (1988) examined language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village, and Clancy (1986) described the acquisition of communicative style in a Japanese community. Such ethnographic studies have each documented the communication behaviours of an

individual culture and, when considered together, show there is diversity across cultures in the world.

Other studies have looked at more than one culture and made comparisons across them (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Hough-Eyamie, Pan, Crago, & Snow, 1996; Rogoff, Mistry, Göncü, & Mosier, 1993). Such studies have shown commonality and variability across the cultures examined in each study. For example, in Bornstein, et al. (1992), maternal speech in four cultures (Argentine, French, Japanese, and American) was examined and both similarities and culturally related differences were found. While mothers in all cultures used similar proportions of affect- and information-salient speech with their 5- and 13-month-old infants, the actual amounts and forms of their speech within these categories varied.

Another example of research comparing language socialization patterns across cultures is that of Rogoff, et al. (1993). These researchers examined families with 12- to 24-month-old children in four different cultures (San Pedro, Guatemala; Salt Lake, United States of America; Dhol-Ki-Patti, India; and Keçiören, Turkey), focusing on cultural variation in guided participation, defined as "the process and system of involvement of individuals with others as they communicate and engage in shared endeavours" (p. 6). They explained that there is an assumption that the participation of children in activities with their caregivers reflects the children's development toward the goals of functioning within the cultural institutions and technologies of skilled social practice in adulthood. The results showed that guided participation simultaneously involved both similarities and variations. They concluded that commonalities across varying cultural communities are inherent to the nature of shared activity. The universal aspects are related to

> "the collaboration between toddlers and their caregivers in bridging between their individual understandings of the situations at hand and in their structuring of each other's participation as they directly shared in problem solving as well as in their indirect decisions about the nature of their own and each other's participation in activities" (Rogoff, et al., 1993, p. 150).

In order to communicate and proceed toward common ends, it is necessary to develop some degree of shared understanding and to adjust the involvement of oneself and one's partner.

Similarly, Hough-Eyalmie, et al., (1996) found that for both Inuit and white middle-class families there was a core set of interchanges that accounted for a high proportion of child-directed speech, suggesting that certain types of interchanges and speech acts may be fundamental aspects of caregiver-child communicative interaction, regardless of culture. The common interchanges of mothers were negotiation of the immediate activity, discussing a joint focus of attention, and directing the hearer's attention, while the speech acts were requesting/proposing, prohibiting/forbidding, and making statements. These results are related to those of Rogoff, et al. (1992) in that the interchanges involve discussing a joint focus of attention or drawing the listener's attention to the focus of the speaker's attention in order to talk about it. This lends support to Rogoff, et al.'s claim that shared understanding and the adjustment of interlocutor roles are necessary for communication, as evidenced by communication behaviours that are common across cultures.

Language Socialization in Bilingual Homes

Although there have been numerous language socialization studies of unilingual communities, showing diversity across cultures, there has been little work done that focuses on diversity within a single community or home, as in bilingual and/or bicultural environments. It is in the home where multiple languages and cultures coexist and interact in bilingual and/or bicultural families. Therefore, it is also in the home where one can best observe the language behaviours of these family members in the

context of two or more languages and cultures in contact.

Basing theories solely on unilingual, unicultural families can lead to stereotypes that may not apply to bilingual communities. Thus, the conclusions of Bornstein, et al. (1992), Rogoff, et al. (1993), and Hough-Eyalmie, et al., (1996) that there are both culturally related language socialization differences and universal behaviours related to the requirements of communication are limited, since they only examined unicultural populations. This is also true of ethnographic language socialization studies which have each focused on a single cultural group (Clancy, 1986; Crago, 1988; Demuth, 1986; Eisenberg, 1986; Miller, 1986; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), whose findings may apply to their specific unicultural groups but not to bicultural populations. It may be that bilingual/bicultural families practice different language behaviours from unilingual/unicultural families, exhibit language socialization features that are common to other bilingual families but not found in unilingual ones, or use similar behaviours to unilingual families but different in some way. The claim that certain language behaviours are universal due to the nature of communication would be stronger with the study of bilingual communities, as would other claims made based on unilingual data.

Studying language socialization in bilingual situations allows one to appreciate the diversity that can and often does exist within a single entity, be it a family or a community, and across various bilingual environments, as well as the linguistic and cultural blending that take place in the family life of children growing up in such surroundings. Only recently have language socialization studies begun to address the bilingual and multilingual context (Duranti & Ochs, 1996; Kulick, 1993; Vasquez, et al., 1994). In order to make a more complete theory of language socialization it is necessary to address the situation of cultures in contact. There are very few cultures that exist in isolation; the majority has contact with other cultures and many people live in more than one. Therefore, theories

based on unilingual and unicultural groups may need to be adjusted to account for the actual situation of many people, namely the bilingual and/or bicultural environment.

Bilingual Studies

Studies of bilingualism and languages in contact have varied widely in focus, findings, and community situations. However, there have been relatively few empirical studies of language use in bilingual homes (Genesee, Boivin, & Nicoladis, 1995; Genesee, Nicoladis, & Paradis, 1995; Goodz, 1989; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1995) and even fewer that have factored in cultural patterns of communicative interaction (Duranti & Ochs, 1996). In general, most of the research has focused on bilingual language acquisition and language loss/change, with little emphasis on input or the influence and interdependence of culture and language.

Bilingual Input

A significant element of first language acquisition studies that is missing in much of bilingual acquisition research is the direct examination of input (de Houwer, 1990; Genesee, 1989; Goodz, 1989). The focus has been on the nature of children's knowledge of linguistic codes, how these codes are acquired (Genesee, Boivin, & Nicoladis, 1995; Genesee, Nicoladis, & Paradis, 1995; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1995), and the relationship between the codes (Schieffelin, 1994). However, it is clear that the acquisition of these linguistic codes is directly affected by input. The study of language acquisition cannot be complete without an understanding of what it is children are exposed to and are trying to learn. Schieffelin describes the traditional psycholinguistic ideology that has permeated research on bilingualism. First, bilingualism is viewed as a set of abstract structures in the mind of the individual and not as a set of cultural and linguistic practices displayed between speakers. Second, "balanced bilingualism," which is the ability to speak any language to any person, is considered to be the preferred state. This view of language use runs counter to the preferences and practices in many speech

communities. Third, separation of language codes both in the mind and in speech practices is considered desirable and patterns of unilingual acquisition are the basic model. Implicitly, the belief is that unilingual acquisition is the "norm" and learning a second language is potentially problematic. However, the reality is that bilingualism does involve cultural and linguistic practices displayed between speakers, balanced bilingualism may not be desired or practiced by speakers of two languages, and separating the two languages in a speaker's mind so each will develop according to patterns of unilingual language acquisition may not be the situation for many bilingual speakers. In order to understand what is actually happening when children are acquiring two languages simultaneously, it is necessary to examine both parental language input and their children's language development.

Bilingualism: Parental Beliefs and Practices

It is not just the examination of input that is missing from most studies of bilingualism. The literature is also limited in its lack of consideration of parental concepts and views related to bilingualism and the raising of bilingual children. The typical advice and empirical conclusion of studies of bilingual homes is that the "one parent, one language" model is best for producing fluently bilingual children, although there has been little empirical research to support or refute this claim (for comparison, see Dopke, 1992; Goodz, 1989; Jarovinskij, 1995). In this model, each parent speaks a different language from the other parent and speaks only that one language when talking to the child. However, the use of languages in this way may well be an erroneous characterization of many bilingual homes. It does not permit the understanding of cultural patterns of communicative interaction, nor does it recognize the host of factors influencing language use in a home. One does not merely use a linguistic code to communicate, but one also uses it in a manner determined by a particular culture and personal beliefs and values. In order to achieve a fuller body of information on bilingualism, parental

attitudes and daily practices need to be documented and framed in their social and cultural context. For instance, without input from the people involved, the motivation for the loss of a language and its effects on the people themselves are incomplete.

Bilingualism: Situations of Language Loss and Change

The gradual loss of indigenous languages with the adoption of more widely spoken or "prestigious" languages (Kulick, 1993; Obondo, 1996) has been documented. The focus of these studies has been on the languages themselves, only discussing culture as it influences the state of a particular language. Although some studies do take culture into consideration when examining language use, they tend to portray culture as a large element of which language is but only one part (Pandharipande, 1992; Smolica, 1992). These studies generally have not studied culture and language interaction in everyday communication, as has been done in language socialization studies.

For example, Pandharipande (1992) examined language shift in India. He identified three points along a continuum of shift from minority to majority or dominant languages: (a) assimilation with the dominant language or social group, also known as transitional bi-/multilingualism, in which there is complete shift in all domains of communication; (b) co-existence of the two groups, referred to as stable bi-/multilingualism, in which there is shift in all domains except home; and (c) isolation of the minority from the dominant language or social group, resulting in the highest degree of maintenance of the minority language. The study found there was no correlation between the loss of language and the loss of cultural identity. Since "culture" is a superordinate term encompassing many areas, the loss of one identity marker (e.g., language, cuisine, beliefs) does not automatically entail the loss of cultural identity. In addition, the partial or complete loss of one or more identity markers tends to reinforce those that remain. The impetus for language shift need not be external; "a community may almost consciously decide that one of the

most effective strategies for neutralizing socio-economic pressures is giving up its language identity" (p. 262).

Smolica (1992) conducted a study of minority languages in Australia. It was found that in a minority situation that is under threat or under pressure from a more powerful and dominant culture, minority group members become more conscious of the special importance of some parts of their culture, which are referred to as "core values." These are fundamentally important aspects of a culture around which the whole social and identificational system of the group is organized. Members of the dominant group are generally less aware of their own core values. It is often the dominant language of the country which represents the core of the majority, although its attempted imposition on others "may be advocated under the guise of concern for the 'life chances' of minority children and the need to preserve the cohesion of the state, conceived in a way which reflects the majority's own cores and cultural predilections" (Smolica, 1992, p. 298). Activation of a minority tongue and its persistence is dependent not only on the linguistic tenacity of the group concerned and on whether the language is recognized as a core value, but also on the way the majority group perceives the language in question and its tolerance of linguistic pluralism in the society as a whole. Other factors influencing minority language maintenance include the degree to which the minority feels attracted towards the culture of the majority, the degree to which the minority's cultural values overlap with that of the majority, the extent to which the majority is prepared to socially and culturally "embrace" the minority, advantages which minority members might derive from a shift to the majority language, and whether the same benefits would be available if they maintained their ethnic tongue alongside the majority language (Smolica, 1992).

There are a few studies that have examined bilingualism in homes in relation to language loss. Wong Fillmore (1991, 1996) has stated that decision-making in bilingual families where a non-dominant, at-risk

language is in question could have serious implications for the survival of the language in the community as well as for the bilingualism of the children in these families. In addition, Pye (1992) has described language loss as being a sort of defective bilingualism, where a second language is gained at the price of the loss of the first language.

In some children's lives, two or more languages and cultures may coexist. This coexistence can be seen as involving loss of each language and culture as they come into contact with the other, or each language and culture may be seen as gaining new elements as they combine to form a new, single blend.

Syncretism and Blending in Bilingual Homes

Duranti & Ochs (1996) have studied a kind of cultural integration or syncretism, in which behaviours traditionally used for a specific purpose according to one culture are used in new ways in the process of adaptation to a second culture. Their work has focused on people in bilingual and/or bicultural circumstances. It has revealed blending and dissociation of language socialization patterns and language use occur when a family moves into a new culture. Their findings include the following: a) language is not a precise indicator of cultural orientation, b) members of multicultural communities blend cultures, and c) one language may be used in the traditional learning environment of another culture. Boundaries between cultures are not clear and it is possible for behaviours to derive from more than one culture simultaneously. Consequently, ways of raising children may not conform to the unspoken rules of one culture, but rather, may be a combination of elements from two or more cultures.

Other researchers, such as Vasquez, et al. (1994), describe the differences between language socialization patterns used at home and those expected at school for children growing up in bilingual/bicultural communities. Vasquez, et al. (1994) have examined bilingual homes and communities in which two or more languages are both valued and

integrated into daily life. They describe a bilingual community from the "recognition perspective," which focuses on the "dynamic interaction of exchange between two or more cultures rather than focusing on two opposing, mutually exclusive systems" (p. 12). In other words, they view minority and mainstream cultures as not being completely isolated, but rather, as intermingling and influencing each other.

However, there is a lack of research on cultures coming into contact within the home and its effect on language behaviours of family members. For example, there are no studies of syncretism and blending of different language socialization practices as they take place in families in which each parent comes from a different cultural and/or linguistic background. Furthermore, there is a lack of research into how these different culturally related language behaviours play out in the raising of children. Styles of child-rearing are, to a large extent, culturally influenced. Cultural norms, convictions, images, and rules influence the development of parental beliefs about children and these beliefs translate themselves into the verbal, enactive, and responsive practices that parents use to achieve their child-rearing goals (Bornstein, et al., 1992).

In addition, it is sometimes the case that even when members of different ethnic groups speak the "same" language, they do not necessarily share the same assumptions concerning what constitutes appropriate language use if they have learned language in different cultural contexts (Schieffelin, 1990; Genesee, 1995). To what extent is language necessarily a critical element in cultural identity (McAlpine, Eriks-Brophy, & Crago, 1996)? As described earlier, this depends on the group of people, its relationships with other groups, and its status in the linguistic and cultural environment (Pandharipande, 1992; Smolica, 1992). At the same time, it also depends on the individual and the importance of language in his/her own personal identity. It is this information about culture, social contexts, and personal beliefs that is largely missing from the literature on bilingualism. Moreover, studies of these issues

specifically in bilingual environments are not necessarily included in language socialization research.

In the Inuit communities of Northern Québec, the languages and cultures of southern Canada are becoming increasingly present. There are many bilingual and bicultural individuals and families for whom situations of blending and loss carry personal meaning. Such people are the focus of this study.

Cultural Context of the Study

This study took place among families living in Northern Québec (Nunavik). The native people of this region are known as Inuit, sometimes referred to as Eskimos. There is a growing number of non-Inuit residents in this region, many of whom are the partners of Inuit women.

Little research on the Inuit and their language, Inuktitut, has been conducted. The sources for the information that follows come primarily from Beaulieu (1983), Crago (1988), Dorais (1986, 1992, 1996), Government of Quebec (1984), Hall (1973), Kativik Regional Development Council (1986), Lachance (1979), Ornstein (1973), and Rouland (1979).

History

The Inuit people of Ungava Bay arrived in the Nunavik region of North America approximately 4500 years ago. Their way of life was based on the Thule culture of 900 A.D., in which caribou- and seal-hunting were the economic mainstays, the people led a nomadic lifestyle, and their lives were seasonally based. They lived in igloos during the winter and tents during the summer. They did not have permanent settlements in which they lived throughout the year, but rather, they travelled following their seasonal food sources.

Foreign contact was first made in 1000 A.D. with the arrival of the Vikings. Following them came European whalers and fishermen. Trading posts and Catholic missions were set up in the region where Inuit were living in the first part of this century. From the 1940s to the 1960s, Inuit settlements were established and English- and French- language federal

and provincial schools, government housing, radio-telephones, airline service, and Inuit cooperative stores were introduced. In certain communities, once schools were built, children were separated from their families and placed in a residence near the school. Gradually, families abandoned their nomadic lifestyle and settled near the schools in order to be closer to their children. They initially lived in tents and igloos and then built shacks and small houses until government housing became available. In the 1970s, nurses were stationed in each community. The James Bay Agreement was signed in 1975. It is a financial land claim settlement allowing the Inuit to have regional and municipal control over their schools, health care, and airlines in exchange for government use of some of their land for a hydroelectric project.

Geography

The region in which the people involved in this project live is known as Nunavik or Northern (Arctic) Québec. It is 563,515 square kilometres, which is approximately one-third of the province of Québec. It is located north of the 55th parallel and is accessible only by sea in the summer or by air. According to 1991 census data, 94% of the Inuit residents in Québec speak Inuktitut.

Kuujjuaq is the largest community with approximately 1200 people. Its name means "big river" and it was formed approximately 40 years ago. It is 1000 km north of Montréal and is the gateway to Nunavik. In 1991, 81% or 865 people of the total population were Inuit, 100% of whom spoke Inuktitut, 58% of whom also spoke English and/or French, and 42% of whom spoke no English or French (Dorais, 1992).

Quaqtaq is a small, isolated community 1770 km north of Montréal. It has a population of approximately 300 people and is located in a bay on a peninsula in the Straits of Hudson. Its name means "which seems frozen" and the settlement was formed in the 1960s. According to 1991 census data, 98% of the residents spoke Inuktitut (Dorais, 1992). It is the six non-Inuit residents who do not speak Inuktitut; all Inuit in Quaqtaq

speak it fluently. In addition, most Inuit residents under the age of 50 years are proficient speakers of English and some are fluent in French.

Inuktitut

Inuktitut is one of the few aboriginal languages in North America with a possibility of long term survival (Foster, 1982; Priest, 1985). In Canada, 90% of Inuktitut speakers speak Inuktitut at home, which is the highest percentage of aboriginal language speakers in the country (Priest, 1985). The language has been less influenced by English and French than other aboriginal languages due to the relatively late contact of the people with outsiders and the later creation of settlements and schools compared to other aboriginal groups (Dorais, 1986).

In Nunavik there are two dialects of Inuktitut: Hudson Bay and Ungava Bay. It is this latter dialect that is used in Kuujjuaq and Quaqtaq. It is spoken by all Inuit for all formal and informal transactions among themselves, including municipal business. Inuktitut is a polysynthetic language, meaning that words are generally made up of several morphemes that each carry meaning. There is a written form of the language that uses a syllabic alphabet created 100 years ago by Catholic missionaries. The purpose of the invention of a written form was to produce religious materials for the Cree and Inuit.

The schools under the Kativik School Board are controlled by the Inuit and, in most communities, the first three grades are offered in Inuktitut. After grade 2, classes are conducted in either French or English with the exception of specific classes, such as culture, language, religion, and sometimes gym, which continue to be taught in Inuktitut. Parents choose the language of instruction for grades beyond grade 2. In Kuujjuaq, there are three possible classrooms in which children may be placed from kindergarten to grade 2. The classrooms function in Inuktitut, English, or French. After grade 2, children who were studying in French or English may continue learning in these languages, while those who were in the Inuktitut stream must choose one of the other two languages.

The effects of the presence of two or three languages on the language beliefs and practices in certain bilingual/trilingual homes of Nunavik are the focus of this thesis. In particular, I examine the use of the various languages and cultural practices by two sets of parents with young children.

Rationale of the Study

This study is designed to begin to fill in certain gaps in the language socialization and bilingualism research. Specifically, it documents both patterns of language use and cultural patterns of communicative interaction when different languages and cultures come into contact within individual homes, focusing on the stated beliefs and the actual behavioural patterns of input from caregivers to children.

I examined a number of families living in Kuujjuaq in order to determine general patterns of language use and beliefs about the various languages present in the community. I then studied two families in depth. The spoken attitudes and daily language socialization behaviours produced by caregivers in both families are documented following ethnographic procedures.

Ethnographic research begins with a broad description searching for prominent features in the data and then narrows to a more specific focus. Data analysis is continuous and findings are discussed with participants for confirmation or clarification (Wolcott, 1995). Reliability and validity are handled differently than in conventional psychological research (Rogoff, et al., 1993) because "the fact that several observers can achieve consensus on what to call a behaviour does not make their label 'true'" (p. 31). In essence, objectivity would be no more than shared subjectivity. Excerpts from the data are frequently provided for the research participants to check the researcher's interpretations, thereby providing a different test of reliability from the experimental approach. Reliability and validity in this thesis are established by following the guidelines proposed by Goetz & LeCompte (1984) for ethnographic research.

There is an increasing number of bilingual families in Nunavik and all children, both from unilingual and bilingual homes, are receiving input in at least two different languages, one of them being Inuktitut and the other a mainstream Canadian language. Communities in Nunavik are changing today as a result of the southern Canadian mainstream culture coming into contact with their formerly unicultural, unilingual (Inuktitut) way of life. The Inuit are a minority culture speaking a minority language in Canada, similar to the cultures under study in Pandharipande (1992) and Smolica (1992). There have been changes in language use (Crago & Genesee, 1996), changes in language socialization (Crago, Annahatak, & Ningiuruvik, 1993), and an adoption of mainstream languages, values, and beliefs, often at the expense of traditional Inuit ways (Crago, et al., 1993). It is a glimpse into this evolution and a few of the people caught up in it that the present study attempts to capture and understand by documenting the stated beliefs and language and communication behaviours in bilingual families in an effort to expand the theory of bilingual acquisition and language socialization.

CHAPTER 3: INTERVIEWS

In this chapter I describe interviews that were conducted with 11 families in Kuujjuaq. The interviews were designed to be semi-structured and were conducted with the intention of using them for a language acquisition and language socialization study conducted by the supervisor of the present author. The completed interviews were selected as a source of data for the present study in order to provide insight into the beliefs, attitudes, and language practices of parents in Nunavik. A subset of the interview questions were analyzed by the present author. This chapter begins with a description of the participants, which is followed by a description of the procedures used in the interview sessions and in their analyses. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the findings.

Participants

Interviews were conducted with 11 families in Northern Québec. These families lived in Kuujjuaq, a multilingual community where Inuktitut, English, and French are all widely used. With the exception of the work of Taylor & Wright (1989) and Wright, Taylor, & Macarthur (1997), this community has not been previously studied for linguistic or cultural trends. Each of the 11 families from Kuujjuaq had at least one child between and including 9 and 24 months of age. Details about the age, heritage, and native language spoken at home during childhood are provided in Table 1 for each parent in the 11 families. One family consisted of a single parent with one child, while the remaining families each had two parents, for a total of 21 parents.

Selection Criteria

All twenty-three families in Kuujjuaq with children between and including 9 and 24 months of age were identified for a study being conducted by the supervisor of the present author. One purpose of Crago's study was to examine the bilingual acquisition of Inuktitut during the period of language acquisition when the first recognizable words and morphemes emerge in language production. Thus, the age range of 9 to

24 months was chosen because this is generally the period when comprehensible spoken language first appears (Brown, 1973). A range of families were involved since it was the aim to document language use patterns in bilingual homes of Kuujjuaq and entry level work indicated that, in certain cases, homes in which both parents were Inuit were bilingual environments, in addition to homes in which each parent came from a different culture. Researchers involved in the supervisor's study contacted each family and asked permission to interview each one. Eleven of the 23 families agreed to participate, while the remaining families declined.

Table 1. Participant characteristics

Family	Age (years)		Heritage		Language	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
1	21	26	Inuk	Inuk	Inuktitut	Inuktitut
2	32	25	Mixed	French-Canadian	Inuktitut	French
3	42	45	Inuk	Inuk	Inuktitut	Inuktitut
4	25	28	Inuk	Mixed	Inuktitut	English, Inuktitut
5	19	--	Inuk	--	Inuktitut	--
6	21	28	Inuk	French-Canadian	Inuktitut	French
7	23	25	Mixed	Inuk	Inuktitut, English	Inuktitut
8	25	30	Mixed	English-Canadian	Inuktitut, English	English
9	30	37	Inuk	French-Canadian	Inuktitut	French
10	19	33	Inuk	English-Canadian	Inuktitut	English
11	24	28	Mixed	Inuk	English, Inuktitut	Inuktitut

In total, 16 of the 21 parents from the 11 homes were interviewed, 11 of whom were mothers and five of whom were fathers. All non-Inuit (*Qallunaat*) parents were men and all women were Inuit or mixed-heritage (partially Inuk). Not all parents were interviewed due to unavailability or unwillingness to participate. The ages of all parents ranged from 19 to 45 years, with a mean of 28 years. The mothers were 19-42 years of age with a mean of 26 years, while the fathers were 25-45 years of age with a mean of 31 years. The oldest parents (a married couple) were in their 40s and had adopted their children. They were actually the biological grandparents of the children whom they were raising. Adoption of children, both within and outside a family, is common among the Inuit and serves a variety of purposes (Condon, 1987). For the exact age of each parent, see Table 1.

Tools of Inquiry

The interviews were conducted between June 21, 1995 and February 6, 1996 by a trained researcher and/or research assistants from the supervisor's research team who were familiar with Northern communities, including Kuujjuaq. Each parent was interviewed in the language of his/her choice: English, French, or Inuktitut. Interview forms were the same across all families and a copy of the questions may be found in Appendix A. The questions concerned language use in the home and personal views on language and language development. The first section was designed to gather information about the parents, such as their ages, ethnicity, occupation, marital status, communities in which they had lived and for what length of time, language use at home and at school, and language proficiency in Inuktitut, English, and French. The second section concerned language use in the home and contained questions about which languages were used among various family members, circumstances in which specific languages were used, code-mixing, specific purposes for the use of particular languages, conscious decisions about language use, beliefs about the effects of on-going language use on

future language proficiency, beliefs about language acquisition and the parents' roles, difficulties and differences having more than one language and/or culture in the home, television and FM radio use, and languages used in daycare. The third section pertained to school and community language issues. It was designed to gather information on concerns about children's language development, the effects of bilingualism on children's academic success, the responsibility of the school in language education, the importance of specific languages in the community and to parents, the importance of Inuktitut to one's cultural identity as an Inuk, beliefs about the future of Inuktitut, and languages of choice in daycare and preschool. Other beliefs about language that parents wanted to express that had not been addressed in the interview form were also included in this section.

When necessary, certain questions were adjusted for particular parents in the supervisor's study. For example, questions dealing specifically with language use in bilingual homes were omitted for unilingual families. Questions requiring parents to predict the language proficiency of the focal child's older siblings by kindergarten were changed to predictions by Grade 3 for parents whose children had already completed kindergarten. Grade 3 was chosen because it is a turning point for children who have attended school in Inuktitut, as it is from this level onwards that classes are predominantly conducted in English or French. Questions regarding children's language use in school were omitted for families without school-aged children. For the purposes of this thesis, questions concerning the perceived importance of Inuktitut, English, and French in the community, the importance of Inuktitut to the Inuit identity, languages of the media, and languages used in the home were analyzed by the present author.

All interview sessions were recorded onto 90-minute audiocassettes using a Sony TCM 5000 tape recorder. These were transcribed by research assistants in the supervisor's study. The English and French interviews were transcribed by native English speakers and

fluent French speakers, which were then reviewed by the present author for consensus of transcription and content. Inuktitut interviews were transcribed and translated into English by a native Inuktitut speaker. Reliability of transcription was obtained by consensus for all interview transcripts in the following manner: each audiocassette and accompanying transcript were reviewed a minimum of two times by at least two different individuals. All differences of opinion pertaining to transcription were resolved by discussion. One of the reviewers was a research assistant bilingual in Inuktitut and English and one was the present author, a fluent speaker of English and French.

Based on the interview data, the families were categorized according to language use (which languages were used, how many were used by each parent, and in what ways each language was used). The specific categories were as follows: 1. one language, one parent (subcategories: accommodation, third language); 2. two languages for one parent, one language for the other; 3. one language for both parents (subcategories: first language, first language plus second language); and 4. two languages for both parents (subcategories: one language, two languages for different purposes, both languages). The interview forms and transcripts were reviewed by another graduate student with experience with this population and in this field of study. She was given descriptions of the categories used by the present author to group the families. She then attempted to match the categories to the Kuujjuaq families. The single difference between her matches and those of the present author was resolved through consensus, whereby the family under question and reasons for the differences of opinion were discussed. The results presented in this thesis represent the categorized groupings agreed upon by both the present author and the other graduate student.

Results

The family interviews were analyzed for predominant issues related to language and culture in the community of Kuujjuaq. The major themes

emerging from the data are presented as a backdrop against which two particular bilingual families may be situated. This is designed to provide a clearer understanding of the overall language context and individuals' concepts in the particular community of Kuujjuaq, while the two families will provide a detailed description of some of the language socialization practices that may be occurring in this and other Northern communities. Some of the interviewed families were originally reported to be unilingual, although during the interviews they were found to be bilingual, while others were known from the beginning of the study to use two or more languages.

The Importance of Inuktitut, English, and French

In Kuujjuaq, three languages, Inuktitut, English, and French are used. English and French are used to a greater extent than in other communities in Nunavik since Kuujjuaq is the southernmost community and therefore the least isolated. According to 1991 statistics, 19% of the total population of approximately 1100 in Kuujjuaq are non-Inuit, 60% of whom speak French, 40% of whom speak English, and virtually none of whom speak Inuktitut (Dorais, 1992). The remaining 81% of the population are Inuit, all of whom can speak Inuktitut and 58% of whom can also speak English and/or French.

Among the original 23 families with children between the ages of 9 and 24 months who were contacted for interviews (11 of whom agreed to participate), 56% of the couples were Inuk with Inuk, 40% were mixed-heritage/Inuk with Caucasian, and 4% were all Caucasian. However, 44% of the couples spoke only Inuktitut, 52% spoke both Inuktitut and English/French, and 4% spoke only English. Among the Inuk-Inuk partnerships, 24% spoke a mixture of Inuktitut and English, while the remaining 76% spoke predominantly Inuktitut. Thus, it appears that cultural heritage does not necessarily predict which language(s) is used in a home since, for example, one might predict that in Inuk-Inuk couples only Inuktitut would be spoken, but in reality some English is spoken in

many of these homes. Similarly, 40% of the couples were Inuk/mixed heritage women with Qallunaat men, yet 52% of the 23 couples used both Inuktitut and English/French. If cultural heritage and language matched up, one would expect 40% of the total number of couples, the same percentage as that for different-heritage couples, to use both Inuktitut and English/French. Therefore, the relationship between language and culture in Kuujjuaq does not appear to be straightforward.

Inuktitut

Eleven of the 16 parents (from 11 families) interviewed felt that Inuktitut was an important language in Kuujjuaq and nine parents felt it was the most important language in their community. The three main reasons why people felt it was important were: (a) everyone speaks it, (b) so it will not be forgotten, and (c) it is the Inuit language and a part of Inuit people's identity. One French-Canadian father explained that it was important "for them [Inuit]" but not for him. Other parents discussed their native language in the following ways:

> "It's [Inuktitut] important for me 'cause it tells me who I am, where I come from, where my ancestors came from. As far as the community, I guess it is important also 'cause we're Inuit. We can't change it."
>
> - *mixed-heritage mother*

> "I think there was more Inuktitut before. It looks as though we were losing it for a while but it's coming back again because we have realized that it's important and because of the realization K [kindergarten] to grade 3 is now available in Inuktitut."
>
> - *mixed-heritage mother*

Four parents felt that Inuktitut was not important in the community. One of these parents believed that Inuktitut should be important because it is the Inuit language, but in reality, it was not important to most Inuit in Kuujjuaq. One parent best described her feeling:

> " . . . when I was with people my age we speak nothing but English. We'll say some words in Inuktitut to make the sentences easier or when I'm in Kangirsuk I speak nothing but Inuktitut with people of my age. So I don't think it's really important. If it were that important they'd speak in Inuktitut, nothing but Inuktitut. I don't know if I'm making any sense."
>
> - *Inuk mother*

This parent's statement suggests that English has become more important for the current generation of parents than the previous one, and more important in Kuujjuaq than in other, more remote communities.

It was also found that none of the non-Inuit men had learned or were actively learning Inuktitut. They all knew a few words and phrases, but not enough to carry on a conversation. Instead, they relied on Inuit and mixed-heritage community residents to use English or French with them, despite assertions by the majority of these fathers that Inuktitut was important in the community and that it was important for their children to speak it.

English

Fourteen of the 16 parents interviewed felt that English was important in Kuujjuaq, and two parents felt it was the most important language in the settlement. Interviewees felt it was important for: (a) work, (b) communication outside the community, and (c) communication within the community.

Two parents felt that both Inuktitut and English were the most important languages in Kuujjuaq and they were equal in importance. One parent summed it up by saying:

> "It's floating in the air. It's everywhere. Everybody is speaking English and Inuktitut."
>
> - *Inuk mother*

This parent's statement is similar to that of the Inuk mother in the previous section, in that it suggests the prevalence of English alongside Inuktitut in Kuujjuaq.

French

Seven of the 16 parents interviewed felt French was important in the community. Only one parent felt it was the most important language in Kuujjuaq and even she would choose English if she could only speak one language. People described the importance of French as being related to: (a) work, (b) communication with people outside the community, (c) living in Québec, where the official language is French, and (d) saving one's culture (according to a French-Canadian parent). During the interviews, residents discussed the status of French compared to that of Inuktitut and English:

> "They should learn English or French, one of them, but they have to learn Inuktitut. I want my kids to know Inuktitut. I want them to know at least one of their language[s]. They have to be understood by someone else. If they stay here they're gonna be okay but if they go to Montreal or anywhere else . . . . "
>
> - *French-Canadian father*

> Father (French-Canadian): "Everybody speak English and nobody speak French. Even my brother's losing his French . . . ."
> Interviewer: "Donc pour vous je pense que vous avez répondu à cette question. C'est quoi l'importance de français . . . ?" (*So, I think you have already answered this question. What is the importance of French . . . ?*)
> Father: "C'est ma culture." (*It is my culture.*)
> Interviewer: "Est-ce que c'est important dans la communauté? (*Is it important in the community?*)
> Father: "Ici, non. (*Here, no.*) They don't like French."
>
> - *French-Canadian father*

Although a number of parents expressed that they felt French was important in the community, it appeared that at least one French-Canadian father did not feel his mother tongue was valued in Kuujjuaq. Instead, he found that English was widely spoken. Support for this claim came from

other parents who expressed that French was important largely for work and dealing with people outside the community, but not for communication in Kuujjuaq.

Overall feelings about language use

Overall, two predominant trends emerged from the interviews. One was the general feeling that Inuktitut in Kuujjuaq was deteriorating. People reported that they were "losing" their language and each new generation was less proficient than the ones preceding it. Often, respondents expressed concern over the loss of Inuktitut.

The second major feeling in the community was that it was very important to learn languages other than Inuktitut for the reasons described above. The main responses were that other languages were vital for finding work and for communicating with the outside world. In some families where each parent came from a different culture, the parent who came from the mainstream Canadian culture expressed his belief that his native language was better or more important than that of his/her Inuk partner. The southern Canadian parents, all of whom were men, often conveyed an attitude of superiority over their partners. One couple revealed their positions on mainstream Canadian languages and cultures in the following dialogue:

> Father: "I think people, not to belittle you dear, but I think where I've come from the South and now I'm living here . . . I'm maybe not as limited in what I'm thinking. You know what I mean?"
> Mother: "Not exactly, no."
> Father: "You don't think about as much as I do because I was there. I lived there all my life until I moved here so I tend to think more of any possibility of going anywhere rather than limiting ourselves to staying here . . . everything changes with time, situations."
>
> - *mixed-heritage mother, English-Canadian father*

Overall, the majority of the 16 parents interviewed felt that English

was important in Kuujjuaq but Inuktitut was most important. English was reported to be commonly used in the community, while the status of Inuktitut was felt to be deteriorating. French was reported by several parents to be important, but it was generally not considered important for everyday communication in the community.

The Importance of Inuktitut to the Inuit Identity

Eleven of the 16 parents interviewed felt that Inuktitut was important to one's identity as an Inuk. Three parents were not asked about this issue due to the belief of a particular interviewer that it was not relevant for non-Inuit parents. However, only five parents felt one could not be Inuk without the native language and two of these parents believed their children would nevertheless still be "real" Inuit without Inuktitut. One parent described the importance of the language to her own identity as an Inuk:

> "If I didn't understand or speak Inuktitut how would I speak with my grandparents or to my aunts and uncles? How would I learn to make traditional clothing or learn anything about hunting or fishing? Like, there's knowledge that my grandparents have but if they can't pass it on to me what use would it have?"
>
> - *mixed-heritage mother*

Nine of the parents interviewed felt that one could still be Inuk without being proficient in Inuktitut, although three of these nine parents felt their own children would be less Inuit without their language. One of these three parents reported that she felt this way because she herself did not have a strong understanding of the Inuit culture to pass down to her child, thus without Inuktitut her son would have no sense of his Inuit identity because he would know nothing about either the language or the culture. The majority of the parents felt that one could be Inuk without Inuktitut if one had Inuit blood or if one actively practiced other elements of Inuit culture, such as eating traditional Inuit food, hunting, knowing survival skills for the North, and having traditional beliefs. Two parents expressed

their views on Inuktitut and its relation to being Inuit in the following ways:

> "It's difficult for me to see people without their own language. I know they're Inuks but don't know how to speak it. You know, it's an awful feeling. It's a very mixed, funny feeling for me. Sorry . . . I know my grandmother speaks quite a bit of Inuktitut, mostly the correct pronunciations of words. My mother said once she had almost lost her language because she was being educated down South when she was a young girl, but regained it. She might be a little less frequent [*fluent*] than my grandmother is. I know I'm a lot worse than my mother is and, eventually, I feel my son will be a little [worse] than I am. So, that['s] a pattern."
>
> - *mixed-heritage mother*

> "Yeah, we lost it [Inuktitut] and we just don't even know what people are talking about today. Like what words. Like a lot of words disappear . . . . Like if the elders are speaking about something and they say something in Inuktitut and sometimes we don't understand it."
>
> - *Inuk mother*

Overall, it appeared that the majority of the 16 parents interviewed felt that although Inuktitut was an important part of being Inuk, it was not a core element, especially if one practiced other Inuit ways.

The Role of the Media

According to the 16 parents interviewed, ten of the total of 21 parents, one of whom was not Inuk, watched Inuktitut television programs everyday or often. Seven caregivers sometimes watched Inuktitut television and two of the Inuit/mixed-heritage mothers watched it only when their non-Inuit partners were absent. Children from four families watched at least a little Inuktitut television. In the other seven families, the children did not generally watch programs in Inuktitut. The majority of the time, English television programs were watched in the homes, providing an intrusion of the white middle-class culture and its language. French television was sometimes watched by French-Canadian parents. The average length of time that the television was on across the 11 families

was 12 hours. This was determined by asking for the times of day at which the television was turned on and off.

Community announcements, messages, religious programs, and music are aired in Inuktitut on the local FM radio station. It is also used for communication between households and for community discussions. Thirteen of the 21 parents, all of whom were Inuit or mixed-heritage, were reported to listen to the FM station everyday. Two of the five Inuit/mixed-heritage parents with Qallunaat partners only listened to it in the absence of their non-Inuit partners. The two women's non-Inuit husbands did not like to hear it and would even turn off the radio while their wives were listening to it. Children in four families often listened to the FM station while children in two families heard it when their parents were listening to it but were not reported to listen actively.

Overall, the majority of parents watched Inuktitut television programs at least some of the time and listened to the FM community radio, although most of these parents were of Inuit heritage. The children in the 11 families, however, tended not to choose Inuktitut-language programs.

Language Use

Based on the interviews, the 11 families in Kuujjuaq may be placed in various groups according to their reported use of language. There were specific questions on the interview form concerning which languages were spoken by each family member to all other family members (see Appendix A). The responses of the parents were used to form a profile of language use in each home. These profiles were then categorized into specific groups that best matched them.

There are four main groups in which the families may be placed with respect to their reported use of language in their homes: (a) one language, one parent, (b) two languages for one parent, one language for the other parent, (c) one language for both parents, and (d) two languages for both parents. Throughout the following descriptions,

"mother tongue" and "first language" refer to the language used in the parent's home when s/he was growing up. "Second language" refers to a language that a parent learned outside the home and feels is weaker than his/her mother tongue. For a summary of the groups and their subgroups, see Table 2.

Table 2. Language use groups – examples[1]

Group	Parent 1		Parent 2		L between parents
	L1	L2	L1	L2	
1 L/1 parent	Inuk.	--	Eng.	--	--
Accomm.	Inuk.	Eng.	Eng.	Inuk.	Inuk. & Eng.
3rd L	Inuk.	Eng.	Fre.	Eng.	Eng.
2 Ls/1 parent, 1 L/ other parent	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Eng.	--	Eng.
1L/both parents	Inuk.	--	Inuk.	--	--
L1	Inuk.	--	Inuk.	--	Inuk.
L1 + L2	Inuk.	Eng.	Inuk.	Eng.	Inuk., (Eng.)
2 Ls/both parents	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. & Eng.	--	--
1 L	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk.
2 Ls for dif. purposes	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. for x, Eng. for y (x≠y)
both Ls	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. & Eng.	--	Inuk. & Eng.

[1] N.B.: In this table, "L" represents "language," "L1" represents "first language," "L2" represents "second language," "Inuk." represents "Inuktitut," Eng." represents English, and "Fre." represents "French."

One language, one parent

In families in this group, Parent 1 spoke language 1 as his/her mother tongue, parent 2 spoke language 2 as his/her mother tongue, and neither parent spoke the language of the other as his/her mother tongue. For example, the mother's first language may have been Inuktitut while the father's first language was English. The mother did not grow up speaking English at home and likewise for the father with Inuktitut. At least one parent spoke a second language. This group may be divided into two subgroups: accommodation and third language.

Accommodation. In families in this subgroup, the common language(s) between the two parents was the mother tongue of one parent and the second language of the other parent. One or both parents accommodated to the other, such that one parent would use the first language of the other or both parents would use the mother tongue of their partner along with their own. For example, in one couple, the mother may have had Inuktitut as her first language while the father had English as his mother tongue. The mother may have spoken English, her second language and her partner's first, with her partner. Likewise, the father may have spoken Inuktitut, his second language and his partner's first, with the mother. One family fit into this group.

Third language. In this subgroup, the common language between the two parents in one family was a third language, which was the second language of both parents. This third language dominated in the home but the first languages of both parents were still used. For example, the mother may have spoken Inuktitut as her mother tongue and the father may have spoken French as his mother tongue. Both parents may have spoken English as a second language, which they used to communicate with one another, while continuing to use their first languages when speaking to other people. Three families fit into this group, all of which had Inuktitut and French as the two mother tongues and English as the

lingua franca in the home.

Two languages for one parent, one language for the other

In these families, parent 1 spoke two languages fluently, of which at least one was his/her first language. Parent 2 spoke only one language fluently, which was one of the languages parent 1 spoke. The common language between the two parents was the mother tongue of parent 2. For example, the mother may have spoken both Inuktitut and English as her first languages, while the father may have only spoken English as his mother tongue. The mother therefore used English when speaking with her partner. Two of the families interviewed belonged to this category, in both of which one parent was Inuk or mixed-heritage and the other was English-Canadian.

One language for both parents

In families in this group, both parents shared the same first language. Thus, for example, both the mother and the father in a family may have spoken Inuktitut as their mother tongue. In all of the families interviewed, whenever the two parents shared the same mother tongue the language was Inuktitut. This group may be divided into two subgroups: first language and first language plus second language.

First language. Families in this group used only the first language of the two parents, Inuktitut, in the home. One out of the 11 families that were interviewed, two of which had Inuk with Inuk couples and three of which had mixed-heritage with Inuk couples, fit into this category.

First language plus second language. Parents in families in this group not only shared the same first language, but also shared the same second language. Their mother tongue was used more than the second language, but the second language had a strong presence in the home. For example, both parents in a family may have spoken Inuktitut as their mother tongue and English as their second language. They predominantly spoke Inuktitut with one another, although they may have sometimes spoken English and watched English television programs. According to

the interviews, three families fit into this group. All of these families had two Inuit or mixed-heritage parents whose native language was Inuktitut but also spoke English.

Two languages for both parents

In this group, both parents in each family spoke the same two languages fluently, each of which was the mother tongue of at least one parent. Neither parent considered him-/herself to be stronger in one language than the other. For example, although Inuktitut may have been the first language of the mother and English the first language of the father, both parents may have spoken both Inuktitut and English fluently. In another family, Inuktitut and English may have both been first languages for the mother while only English was the first language of the father, although both parents may have spoken both languages fluently. In a third example, both parents may have had both Inuktitut and English as their mother tongues. This group may be divided into three subgroups: one language, two languages for different purposes, and both languages.

One language. In families in this group, only one of the two languages was used in the home. For example, although both parents may have been able to speak Inuktitut and English, they may only have used Inuktitut. None of the families interviewed fit into this group.

Two languages for different purposes. Families in this group used both of their languages, but each was used for different purposes from the other. For example, Inuktitut may have been used for communication between parents, while English was used for communication between parent and child. One family could be categorized in this group.

Both languages. In this group, both languages were used indiscriminately with respect to purposes of use and were used in equal proportions. For example, when Inuktitut and English were spoken fluently by both parents, both languages were used all the time for all purposes. None of the Kuujjuaq families belonged to this group.

Overall, the 11 families interviewed in Kuujjuaq varied in their use of language. They could be categorized in four main categories, some with up to three subcategories. In all families except one, at least two languages were used in the home. In general, both Inuktitut and English were spoken in most families, including families in which both parents shared the same mother tongue of Inuktitut, with French being used only in homes in which the father was French-Canadian. In families in which one parent only spoke one language, this parent was the father, and his Inuk/mixed-heritage partner spoke his first language with him.

Conclusions

Although all Inuit in Kuujjuaq can and do speak Inuktitut in their daily lives, more parents felt English was important than the number of parents who felt Inuktitut was important for overall communication needs, especially outside the community, and for work. There was a general feeling that the Inuktitut language was quickly deteriorating with each new generation and that English, and to some extent, French, was on the increase. Interviewees expressed frustration and discouragement over this state. However, perhaps as a result of the realization of this change, the majority of parents believed one could still be Inuk without being able to speak Inuktitut . Most parents nonetheless felt that Inuktitut was an important element in one's identity as an Inuk; the discrepancy concerned exactly how essential it was.

Many Inuit and mixed-heritage interviewees regularly listened to the FM radio station and slightly fewer people regularly watched Inuktitut television, whereas non-Inuit parents tended not to do either. In some bicultural homes, this led to Inuit/mixed-heritage wives who only attended to the media in their mother tongue when their non-Inuit partners were not present. Such cases were examples of cultures in conflict to the point where one culture, that of mainstream Canada, dominated over the other. The children in the majority of families did not attend to Inuktitut-language programs. Instead, most families watched television in English.

In most of the families interviewed, the English language had a strong presence. Even in most of the families in which the two parents shared the same cultural background and associated language, namely Inuit culture and Inuktitut, more than one language was used. The two languages used in all but one family were Inuktitut and English, with French being used in families in which the father was French-Canadian. All mothers, who were all Inuit or mixed-heritage, spoke more than one language, while some of the non-Inuit fathers did not. In families in which the fathers only spoke English or both English and French, the mothers accommodated to their partners by using English with them. In no instances did these fathers learn to speak Inuktitut as their second language and use it with their partners.

Overall, it is clear that there was a large variation in patterns of language use across families in Kuujjuaq. The 11 families interviewed fit into four different main categories of language use or, when taking subcategories into account, six categories in total. There were also some empty categories that may potentially be filled by other families in Nunavik who were not interviewed. In addition, attitudes towards the various languages differed across individual parents. The findings of the interviews suggest that it may often not be enough to group families together under the heading "bilingual" simply because they all use two languages at home, since the families may differ in other, important ways. There appear to be various ways of being bilingual and different reasons behind them. In addition, bilingual families are not always so because each parent comes from a different cultural background. Families who share the same cultural heritage and mother tongue may also use two languages in the home. Each family is unique in terms of its use and beliefs about language.

CHAPTER 4: IN-DEPTH PORTRAITS

The next step in this research was to take a closer look at individual families and examine their language practices and beliefs against the backdrop of those expressed in the community interviews in Kuujjuaq. Since the focus of the present study was bilingualism in relation to language use and language socialization, two bilingual families were studied in depth. "Bilingual" families were defined as families in which two or more languages were spoken at home on a daily basis. Each language was the mother tongue of at least one parent in each family and, for each language, at least one parent reported to use it frequently and proficiently. The purpose of the study of individual families was to document, in depth, the language use and language socialization patterns of individual bilingual families in Nunavik in order to gain a better understanding of the relationships among different languages and cultures in this region. It was established in the previous chapter that there was variety across various families in Kuujjuaq with respect to language use and attitudes. The present chapter examines how these differences play out in the daily life behaviours and stated concepts of two particular families.

I begin this chapter with a description of the participants. Following this I describe the procedures used to acquire data from the participants. Finally, a presentation of the findings from both interview and videotaped data is provided.

Participants

The participants in this study were two families in which two or more languages and cultures existed. Both children and caregivers were included in the examination of language use and language socialization.

Selection Criteria

As mentioned previously, 11 families which included children 9 to 24 months of age were interviewed. The present study was conducted by the current author to provide an in-depth examination of language socialization practices in two families. Three of the 11 interviewed families

in Kuujjuaq volunteered to take part, but early on two families chose not to continue. The remaining family, Family 1, and a family in Quaqtaq, Family 2, each had one child within the selected age range at the beginning of the supervisor's study. Neither child had any known sensory, physical, or cognitive disabilities. Both families used Inuktitut and English in the home. Family 2 was selected because it was the only family in Quaqtaq with a child of the appropriate age who was willing to participate in the study. The inclusion of this family allowed the comparative study of the language behaviours of a bilingual family in a remote, largely unilingual Inuktitut-speaking community with those of a bilingual family in a larger, multilingual community. One goal of the supervisor's research was to study several bilingual families in both large and small communities and search for any relationships between language acquisition and community language patterns. Whether differences between the two families in this chapter were the result of the communities in which they lived would not be clear from this study due to the small number of families, but these differences could suggest the focus of future studies into the influence of a community on language patterns.

Family 1 was identified as being bilingual during the interviews in Kuujjuaq. Family 2 was identified in Quaqtaq by word of mouth when it became known in the community that bilingual families were being sought.

A summary of the ethnicity and languages used by each parent are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Reported language use

Parent		Family 1	Family 2
Mother			
	Ethnicity	Mixed	Inuk
	Language		
	Home	Inuktitut, English	Inuktitut
	School	French, English	English
	Fluent	Inuktitut, English, French	Inuktitut, English
	To Child	Inuktitut	Inuktitut
	To Father	English	English
Father			
	Ethnicity	Inuk	English-Canadian
	Language		
	Home	Inuktitut	English
	School	English	English
	Fluent	Inuktitut, English	English, French
	To Child	Inuktitut	English
	To Mother	English	English

Tools of Inquiry

Family 1 was interviewed as part of the Kuujjuaq cohort. Family 2 was interviewed on June 20, 1995 using the same interview form and procedures as were used with the Kuujjuaq families.

Child 1 and Child 2 were videotaped at home during everyday activities and spontaneous, naturalistic interactions over a one-year period. Both children were videotaped once every 1 – 2 months, with the exception of a five-month gap between the second last and last videotapes for Child 1, in sessions lasting 1.5 – 2 hours each. Summaries of the sessions with each family are provided in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4. Research trips to Family 1

Trip	Researchers/ Videotapers	Date	Session length	Purpose
1	Supervisor, Res. Asst.[1]	June 23, 1995	1 hr	interview
2	Res. Asst.	Aug. 13, 1995	2 hrs 2 mins	videotaping
3	Uncle	Oct. 8, 1995	1 hr	videotaping
4	Res. Asst.	Oct. 27, 1995	1hr 39 mins	videotaping
5	Res. Asst.	Jan. 18, 1996	2 hrs	videotaping
6	Res. Asst.	June 4, 1996	2 hrs	videotaping
7	Author	Feb. 9, 1997	1hr 30 mins	observation, clarification (both parents)

[1] "Res. Asst." represents "Research Assistant"

The five-month gap in the videotaping of Family 1 (January 18, 1997 to June 4, 1997) was due to the unavailability of this family during this period. Child 1 was videotaped from age 20 to 30 months, completing five two-hour videotapes, and Child 2 was videotaped from age 25 to 34 months, completing seven two-hour videotapes. Child 1 was videotaped at younger ages than Child 2 in order to achieve an approximate language match between the two children. Child 2's language development started at a later age and progressed at a slower rate than for Child 1, as determined by the supervisor's research team. Since one of the purposes of the videotaped data for the supervisor's study was to examine the form of the language produced by bilingual children and to compare them, it was desirable to obtain a large body of spoken language data from each child.

Table 5. Research trips to Family 2

Trip	Researchers/ Videotapers	Date	Session length	Purpose
1	Supervisor, Res. Asst.[1]	June 20, 1995	1 hr	interview
2	Res. Asst.	June 21, 1995	2 hrs 2 mins	videotaping
3	Res. Asst.	Aug. 8, 1995	2 hrs	videotaping
4	Res. Asst.	Oct. 22, 1995	1hr 34 mins	videotaping
5	Neighbour, Father 2	Dec. 8, 1996	2 hrs 1 mins	videotaping
6	Father 2	Jan. 1, 1996	2 hrs 3 mins	videotaping
7	Father 2	Feb. 17, 1996	2hrs 2 mins	videotaping
8	Father 2	Mar. 27 & 29, 1996	2 hrs 2 mins	videotaping
9	Author	Feb. 2, 1997	2 hrs	clarification (Father 2)
10	Author	Feb. 3, 1997	6 hrs	clarification, observation (Father 2, later with Mother 2 and siblings)
11	Author	Feb. 4, 1997	2 hrs 30 min	clarification (Mother 2)

[1] "Res. Asst." represents "Research Assistant"

Each session was recorded onto videocassette by a research assistant in the supervisor's study or by a family member of the focal child. A Panasonic PV-610-K videocamera was used to record Family 1 and a Panasonic AG-190U-K videocamera was used to record Family 2.

Research assistants transcribed all utterances to, by, and about the child recorded on the videocassettes. All other utterances were only coded for what language was being spoken (i.e., Inuktitut, English, French). Transcription was entered in CHAT format of the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES), as described by MacWhinney (1995).

English utterances were transcribed by native English speakers and Inuktitut utterances were transcribed and translated into English by native Inuktitut speakers. French utterances were transcribed and translated into English by research assistants fluent in French. Reliability of transcription and translation of Inuktitut utterances was obtained by consensus with the transcribers/translators and a research assistant who spoke Inuktitut as her native language and who was fluent in English. Reliability by consensus of English and French transcription was performed by the present author with the transcribers/translators. All transcripts were reviewed a minimum of three times by at least two different people. One of the reviewers was a native Inuktitut speaker also fluent in English, one was a native English speaker, and another was the present author.

The interview forms, audiocassettes, videocassettes, and transcripts were reviewed by the present author, who then met with both bilingual families to consult about the preliminary findings (listed as "clarification" in Tables 4 and 5). At this time, clarifications and explanations in response to the present author's questions about the data were provided by the parents and further observation of the families engaged in daily activities was conducted by the present author. A meeting with Family 1 was held for 1.5 hours on the evening of February 9, 1997. All members of the family were present together for half the time and their interactions were observed. Informal probing and questioning which concerned their language use practices were conducted with both parents together and, later, with the mother alone. A more in-depth consultation was not possible due to time constraints and previous uncertainty about their willingness to meet, which was not clarified until the actual arrival of the present author in their community. All findings and impressions were recorded in a journal immediately following the meeting.

Meetings with Family 2 occurred on three occasions for a total of 10.5 hours: 2 hours on the afternoon of February 2, 1997, 6 hours on the afternoon and evening of February 3, 1997, and 2.5 hours on the morning

of February 4, 1997 (see Table 5). Both formal and informal probing and questioning were conducted by the present author with each parent separately between February 2 and February 4, 1997. The parents were not both present at the same time due to their conflicting schedules. This total length of time spent with Family 2 for clarification and observation was longer than for Family 1 due to the necessity of meeting with each parent separately and the greater availability of Child 2 and various caregivers for direct observation. The formal part of the meetings consisted of asking a set of questions (see Appendix B) concerning contents of the videotapes and interviews. These questions revolved around several issues, including the proficiency and frequency of language use of Child 2 in Inuktitut and English and Child 2's communication patterns in comparison to other Inuit children in the community. There were also questions regarding language and cultural differences and difficulties between Mother 2 and Father 2 and comparison by each parent of both him-/herself and his/her partner to other members of their respective cultures. Finally, the parents were asked about child-rearing patterns in comparison to the previous and current generations of parents both in Quaqtaq and in mainstream Canada, reading of children's books, differences in disciplining, the perceived influence of white middle-class culture on the Inuit ways of life, the influence of having two cultures and languages in the home on the ways of life of each parent, and the typicality of the behaviours of various family members and interactions on the videotapes. Some questions were restricted to one of the two parents because they only pertained to that particular person. For example, a question about the meaning of a nickname used only by the father was only directed to the father. In addition, short clips of approximately 1 – 5 minutes from the videotapes were shown to each parent for verification of the naturalness of the interactions and explanation of the activities and motivation behind them. All segments were randomly chosen as examples of interactions that

occurred repeatedly throughout the videocassettes, with the exception of one clip that was selected because it was the only example of an interaction of its kind. Twenty-two clips in total were used: 20 were shown to the mother and 11 were shown to the father, nine of which were common to both. Some clips were only shown to one parent because they involved only that parent, the language being spoken was not one in which the other parent was fluent, or due to time constraints. Responses to all questions, both with and without the videotape clips, were recorded by hand by the present author at the time of questioning. Informal probing was conducted throughout all meetings and observations, after each of which the findings and impressions were recorded in a journal. These observations and questions provided more complete descriptions of the family in terms of its use of language, language socialization patterns, beliefs about language and its development, and cultural issues.

Analysis of the Videotapes

The videotapes of Family 1 and Family 2 were analyzed for two purposes. The first was to determine the frequency with which each caregiver and focal child in a random one-hour sample of videotape produced communicative acts of different types. The second purpose was to describe in detail the language socialization practices of each caregiver according to selected categories of analysis.

Behavioural Language Use Patterns

The middle hour of the videotapes of Child 1 and Child 2 at age 25 months was randomly selected for analysis of bilingual language use patterns. Frequency counts of utterances in Inuktitut, English, code-mixes (both Inuktitut and English in the same utterance), and other (interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, and proper nouns) were done for each child and caregiver present in the videotaped segments. This analysis was done in order to compare each family's reported language use to a sample of their actual language use.

In addition, Hough-Eyalmie, et al. (1996) found that white middle-class caregivers tended to produce many more utterances per unit time than Inuit caregivers. In keeping with this, the frequency counts for Family 1 and Family 2 were compared for total numbers of utterances produced by each family member.

Categories of Language Socialization

Specific language socialization practices and language behaviours were examined in each family and are presented in this chapter. The selection of the categories of these behaviours was made on the basis of determining which features were prominent or occurred frequently in these two bilingual families or in unilingual Inuktitut-speaking families (Crago, 1988) or unilingual white middle-class English-speaking families in North America (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Hough-Eyamie, et al., in press; Rogoff, et al., 1993; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984). If a feature commonly occurred in one family but not in the other, it was described for that family only.

Literacy activities. These generally took the form of book-reading with children and frequently occurred in Family 1. However, according to Crago (1988), in many Inuit families there are few books or writing materials, and parents generally do not read children's books to their children.

Disciplining. It has been reported that disciplining is often done nonverbally by unilingual Inuktitut-speaking adults (Crago, 1988), while the parents in the bilingual families in this study often disciplined their children verbally, sometimes with simultaneous nonverbal discipline. Since disciplining occurred repeatedly throughout the data, it was examined in depth to determine the forms it took.

Providing reason. The parents in the current study, particularly Father 2, frequently provided reasons for their disciplinary actions and commands to their children. This pattern of language socialization has not been documented as occurring frequently among the Inuit. Rather, imperatives and disciplinary actions tend to be given by adults to children

without explanation of the reasons behind them (Crago, 1988).

Test questions. These are questions to which the asker, generally an adult, knows the answers (e.g., "What's your name?"). They are often used to teach children or to check if they know particular information. These question forms were prominent in the parent-child interactions in the bilingual families and have been documented as being prevalent in white middle-class families (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Heath, 1986; Hough-Eyamie, et al., 1996; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984).

Caregivers as playmates. Caregivers frequently acted as playmates and conversational peers to their children in the bilingual families. This has been found to be characteristic of white middle-class families (Rogoff, et al., 1993).

Repetition routines. These have been reported to frequently occur in Inuit families (Crago, 1988; Hough-Eyamie, et al., in press). They are used by young caregivers to teach their charges through imitation and modelling, the preferred method of instruction among the Inuit. They were often used by caregivers in Family 2 but rarely used by the parents in Family 1; thus, repetition routines are described for Family 2 only.

Meals. Descriptions of Family 1 and Family 2 during meals are included in the in-depth portraits. This is because it has been reported that the Inuit tend to behave differently from white middle-class families during meals (Crago, 1988). For example, in the past, Inuit families generally did not sit together at a table during mealtimes and did not engage in conversation, both of which commonly occur in white middle-class homes. The two bilingual families in the present study also exhibited different behaviours from one another during meals.

General interactional patterns. Included in the discussion of general interactional patterns for each family are the overall language behaviours of each caregiver as observed on the videotapes. The most common purposes for speaking to the children, typical forms of speech directed at the children, typical types of responses by caregivers to the

children's communicative acts, and division of caregiving duties are included.

Results

The two bilingual and bicultural families were studied over a period of one year. This section begins with a presentation of their backgrounds taken from the interview data. The results of the language use frequency counts are then described, followed by a presentation of the selected language socialization categories and their occurrence throughout the one-year period of videotaping in each bilingual family.

Family 1

Background: Interview Data

The mother (Mother 1) in this family was 24 years old. She was raised in a bilingual and bicultural home as the daughter of an Inuk woman and English-Canadian man. Her mother died after Mother 1 reached adulthood and her father had remarried to a non-Inuk (*Qallunak*) woman at the time of this study. Her father and stepmother spoke English with one another and to other adult family members.

Mother 1 had lived in Kuujjuaq her entire life, with the exception of approximately four years in other Northern communities before the age of six years. This included a period in which she lived in the Northwest Territories from 4 to 5 ½ years of age, where she reported that predominantly English was spoken both in her community and at home. Later, when her family returned to Northern Québec, she spoke English and Inuktitut with her mother, English with her father, and English and Inuktitut with her maternal relatives. She had completed kindergarten through third grade in English, grade 4 to first year of college in French, and two more years of college in English. She felt she was strongest in English but also fluent in Inuktitut and French, the last two being of equal proficiency. Mother 1 reported that she spoke predominantly English to her husband (Father 1), although she tried to remember to speak Inuktitut. She reportedly always spoke Inuktitut to Child 1 and rarely used English

with her.

Father 1 was 28 years old and the son of Inuit parents. He had always lived in Kuujjuaq except for when he was attending college and a pilot training program, both of which were in Montréal. While he was growing up, Father 1 spoke Inuktitut with his family and relatives and English at school. The interview about his background and language use patterns was conducted with his wife, who reported that he was strong in both English and spoken Inuktitut and slightly weak in reading Inuktitut, with spoken French that was mediocre and written French that was poor. He spoke mostly English to Mother 1, although he tried to use Inuktitut with her. He reportedly always spoke to Child 1 in Inuktitut, with the exception of a few words in English.

Taking the categories used in the analysis of the Kuujjuaq interviews, Family 1 appeared to fit into the language use category of "two languages for both parents: two languages for different purposes," the different purposes being English for talk among adults and Inuktitut for talk to Child 1.

Child 1 was an 18-month-old female. She spoke predominantly Inuktitut with a few English words, for which she did not have the Inuktitut equivalents. She attended daycare, where mostly Inuktitut but some English were spoken. By the end of the study, she had a newborn brother.

Mother 1 reported that she sometimes code-mixed Inuktitut and English. This annoyed her and she would make a conscious effort to avoid doing so. She read many English children's books to her daughter, but she translated them into Inuktitut as she read. She planned to send Child 1 to school in Inuktitut until it ended in Grade 3, and then would enrol her child in the French stream. Mother 1 did not plan to educate her child in English because she believed Child 1 would pick it up from her family and friends. She felt that her daughter would be trilingual by the time she reached adulthood. When asked why she chose to use languages in

these ways with her child, she responded:

> "Because I wanted to preserve my native language because when I was five I lost my language and I had to relearn it. That's why I don't feel as comfortable in Inuktitut as I should." *[refers to time spent in the Northwest Territories when she was five years old]*

The father and stepmother of Mother 1 were reported to speak to Child 1 predominantly in Inuktitut with a little English. This was a conscious choice made because of their belief in the importance of preserving and maintaining Inuktitut. All other relatives also spoke to Child 1 in Inuktitut, with the exception of one cousin who sometimes attempted to speak English with her. Mother 1 asked her own brother and sister to speak to her child only in Inuktitut.

Mother 1 did not find there were any difficulties using two languages in the home. She did, however, find there were cultural differences between herself and her husband. Namely, she felt that she was stricter. She also reported that whereas she was raised in a home in which objects were used as rewards, in her partner's family money was the reward.

The television set was generally on in the evenings. Most of the time, Family 1 watched English programs, but approximately twice a week, the parents watched programs in Inuktitut. They listened to the local FM radio everyday.

Mother 1 felt that Inuktitut was the most important language in Kuujjuaq. Inuktitut was the most important part of the Inuit culture because with it, one could teach and learn other components of the culture. She felt that one could not be a true Inuk without Inuktitut. However, English and French were also important in Kuujjuaq. English had always been more important than French in the community, but it was changing at the time of the interview and French was becoming more important. According to this parent, "It [*French*] looks better on your

curriculum vitae."

Language Use: Videotaped Data

As shown in Table 6, Child 1 used predominantly Inuktitut and a little English to both of her parents during the one-hour videotaped segment selected for frequency counts. Out of a total of 191 communicative acts to Mother 1, 67.54% were Inuktitut utterances. Out of a total of 151 communicative acts to Father 1, 50.33% of Child 1's communicative acts were Inuktitut utterances. Communicative acts were considered to be any attempts to get meaning across to another person using either verbal or nonverbal means or both.

Table 6. Language use of Child 1: number of utterances and percentage for each addressee

Language	Addressee			
	Mother	Father	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	129 (67.54%)	76 (50.33%)	4 (25.00%)	1 (20.00%)
English	9 (4.71%)	11 (7.28%)	2 (12.50%)	--
Mix *	2 (1.05%)	1 (0.66%)	--	--
Other **	51 (26.70%)	63 (41.72%)	10 (62.50%)	4 (80.00%)
Total	191 (100%)	151 (100%)	16 (100%)	5 (100%)

*** code-mix of Inuktitut and English**
**** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns**

Mother 1 overwhelmingly used Inuktitut when addressing Child 1, with only a few utterances in English. Out of a total of 325 communicative acts to her daughter, 91.69% were in Inuktitut. The few communicative acts directed at Father 1 were in Inuktitut or not specific to any language. Details are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Language use of Mother 1: number of utterances and percentage for each addressee

Language	Addressee			
	Child	Father	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	298 (91.69%)	5 (38.46%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)
English	3 (0.92%)	--	--	--
Mix *	3 (0.92%)	--	--	--
Other **	21 (6.46%)	8 (61.54%)	--	--
Total	325 (100%)	13 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)

* code-mix of Inuktitut and English
** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns

Table 8. Language use of Father 1: number of utterances and percentage for each addressee

Language	Addressee			
	Child	Mother	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	225 (86.54%)	8 (72.73%)	--	--
English	13 (5.00%)	--	--	--
Mix *	4 (1.54%)	1 (9.09%)	--	--
Other **	18 (6.92%)	2 (18.18%)	--	1 (100%)
Total	260 (100%)	11 (100%)	--	1 (100%)

* code-mix of Inuktitut and English
** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns

Father 1, similar to his wife, predominantly used Inuktitut with a few utterances in English when addressing his daughter. Inuktitut utterances comprised 86.54% of the total of 260 communicative acts addressed to Child 1, as shown in Table 8. The few utterances to Mother 1 were largely

in Inuktitut.

The observed language use of Family 1 corresponded to the mother's reports (see Table 3). Both parents used Inuktitut almost exclusively with their daughter. A few English words and phrases (e.g., juice, mushy, turtle) were occasionally used by both parents when speaking to Child 1.

Across all the videotaped data for this family, predominantly English rather than Inuktitut was spoken between Mother 1 and Father 1. Their conversations tended to be in English with Inuktitut interspersed. Often, they would speak English with each other, switch to Inuktitut to say something to Child 1, then switch back to English when returning to their own conversation. This frequent use of English emerged across the entire data set more clearly than in the one-hour videotaped segment used in the frequency counts, as the parents did not talk to each other very often during that particular hour.

The maternal relatives of Child 1 tended to follow the same patterns of language use as Mother 1 and Father 1. They spoke to Child 1 predominantly in Inuktitut but used English amongst themselves. The father and stepmother of Mother 1 also communicated in this way, even though both were Qallunaat and learned Inuktitut only as adults. There were no videotaped data of any paternal relatives of Child 1; however, they were unilingual speakers of Inuktitut.

Child 1 generally spoke only Inuktitut. She sometimes used a few English words and phrases (e.g., I know, no, airplane, have a nice day, heart, done, yeah), but English utterances made up less that 10% of her total utterances, as shown in the frequency counts.

Language Socialization Practices

Book-reading. One of the most remarkable features of Family 1 was the amount of book-reading the parents engaged in with their child. In five videotapes of data there were 17 instances of one or the other parent looking through a children's book with Child 1 or Child 1 looking

through a book by herself. This was noteworthy because, as reported by Crago (1988), Inuit until recently have not generally engaged in many literacy activities except to read the Bible. This has been largely restricted to adults or read aloud by adults to children, the latter of whom were expected to listen silently. In addition, in some homes, Crago reported that it could be difficult to find a pen and paper or books other than the family's Bible. Yet in Family 1, children's books were frequently read and Child 1 herself often initiated the activity. The parents expected and elicited participation from Child 1 during the story sessions, often asking questions and placing her within the context of the story (e.g., imitated characters' actions, discussed similarities between characters and Child 1's toys). The parents also encouraged their daughter to write and draw.

In every reading session in which at least one parent was involved, many wh-questions were posed to Child 1. In particular, questions asking "who?," "whose?," "who is [verb]-ing?," "where?," "what is that?," "what is [character] doing?," and "show me/point to" permeated the interactions. Both parents repeatedly labelled objects and characters, sometimes requesting that Child 1 also label pictures. In one segment in which the maternal grandfather was present, he also participated in the book-reading session by asking questions in Inuktitut similar to those asked by the child's parents. When she was younger, the parents accepted pointing to pictures as a response when "who?" and "where?" questions were asked. As Child 1 grew older they demanded she use language, specifically Inuktitut, to answer. Child 1 also asked some questions, predominantly "what is it?," and spontaneously labelled pictures.

Both parents evaluated the responses made by Child 1 to their questions. In general, they focused on the truthfulness of her answers rather than her pronunciation or grammar. When she responded incorrectly, both parents tended to tell her she was wrong and either directed her to the correct answer with hints or provided her with it directly.

The parents also spent some time describing the situation and

characters depicted on a particular page. They often identified and described similarities and differences between characters, generally in terms of their appearances. The following was an example of this kind of interaction when Child 1 was 23 months of age:

> Mother, Father, and Child are looking through a Sesame Street book. Child turns the page and repeatedly points to Oscar the Grouch but labels it as Cookie Monster.
> Mother: *Una qai.* (This, look.)
> Mother tries to turn the page.
> Mother: *Takuginai.* (I'll show you.)
> Mother turns back the page.
> Mother: *Una Cookie Monster.* (This is Cookie Monster.)
> Mother points to Cookie Monster.
> Mother: *Qungainnatu.* (The one that is smiling.)
> Mother points to Cookie Monster's mouth.
> Mother: *Una Oscar.* (This is Oscar.)
> Mother turns the page and points to Oscar the Grouch. Child points to Oscar the Grouch.
> Mother: Oscar.
> Child: Oscar.
> Mother: *Ivitsukaujautsuni Oscar.* (Oscar is the green one.)
> Mother points to Oscar the Grouch.
> Mother: *Tungujurtautilluru Cookie Monster.* (While Cookie Monster is blue.)
> Mother turns back the page and points to Cookie Monster.
> Child flips the page back and forth.
> Mother: *Tungujurta. tungujurta. Oscar ivitsukaujautilluru.* (Blue, blue. While Oscar is green.)

Mother 1 used real-life examples to strengthen her descriptions and help her daughter understand. For example, she labelled a window in a book, then pointed to and labelled a real window in the room. She also related pictures and themes to various children's songs, which she then sang with Child 1. Often, these were songs commonly sung in English but had been translated into Inuktitut, such as "Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star."

Frequently, the parents engaged the child in counting routines, in which either the parent counted while the child pointed to each item or vice

versa, and requested that she label various body parts on characters and herself. Father 1 also often elicited repetition of names and words.

An example of a typical book-reading session that involved many of the behaviours discussed was the following, which took place when Child 1 was 23 months of age. The interactions demonstrated styles of book-reading common in white middle-class culture (Heath, 1986).

Mother, Father, and Child are looking through a Sesame Street book. Father has been trying to get Child to say "Snufalufugus," but Child is having difficulty saying it correctly.
Father: Snuffle. (*points to Snufalufugus' long trunk*)
Child: Apo. (*trying to say "snuffle"*)
Father: Snufalufugus. (*traces Snufalufugus' trunk with his finger*)
Mother laughs.
Child: Apoafasis. (*trying to say "Snufalugus," hits the book with both hands*)
Father removes his hand from the book.
Mother: *Takijualmmi qingali. Qingangali?* (He has a long nose. Where is his nose?)
Child points to Snufalufugus' trunk.
Mother: *Qingangali?* (Where is his nose?)
Child points to Snufalufugus' trunk. Mother vocalizes as though impressed.
Father: *Pamiungali? Pamiunga?* (What about his tail? His tail?)
Child points to Snufalufugus' tail.
Father: *Pamiungali?* (Where is his tail?)
Child points to Snufalufugus' tail and vocalizes. Father vocalizes and laughs, sounding impressed.
Father: *Ijingilli? Ijingilli?* (Where are his eyes? Where are his eyes?)
Child points to Snufalufugus' eyes.
Father: Uh-huh. *Snufalufugus suju?* (What is Snufalufugus doing?)
Mother: Snufalufugus.
Child: *Aamuuttu.* (He's sleeping.)
Father: *Aamuuttu ilai.* (He's sleeping, isn't he?)
Mother: *Ijiaptikkili?* (Where are your little eyes?)
Child points to her own eyes.
Mother continues to request that Child point to various body parts on her own body and Child continues to point.

In general, Child 1 appeared to love looking at books and would bring a new book to her parents after they had finished with one. She often brought books to them in order to initiate the activity or looked at books by herself. Her parents encouraged her to "read" and frequently suggested she get a book, which she always did. When asked about their frequent literacy activities, the parents responded as follows:

> Interviewer: Did your parents read to you when you were growing up?
> Mother: My [*non-Inuit*] father did.
> Father: No.
> Interviewer: So is this something you picked up from your wife?
> Father: Well, no. That's how kids learn.
> Mother: He's read a lot because he went to college.
> Mother: We started reading to [*Child*] when she was six months old. She's really aware now of the different languages and understands more English than we probably give her credit for. Most of her children's books are in English and I translate them into Inuktitut as I'm reading, but lately I've started to read them in English, pretending not to know, just to see if she'll notice. She always stops me and asks to be read to in Inuktitut.

In the data there was only one instance of a pen and paper activity involving Mother 1 and Child 1. They took turns drawing and Mother 1 often wrote words, which Child 1 read aloud. During this time, Mother 1 asked "what?" questions.

In general, Family 1 frequently engaged in literacy activities with their daughter, tending to read books in a style typical of white middle-class culture (Heath, 1986).

Discipline. Both Mother 1 and Father 1 used predominantly verbal discipline with their child, even when she was in physical danger (e.g., hanging off the edge of a high chair). *Taima* ("enough, stop") was frequently heard. The parents also used distraction (e.g., *Ukua takugi qai*

["Hey, look at these"]) and direct orders, sometimes accompanied by an explanation (providing reason), such as *Taanna ukkualiru nirilangasiratta* ("Close that now because we're about to eat") and *Ah-aalangaliravi tamaniirunnairi* ("Get out of there, you're going to get hurt"). They told her she was being filmed, which was intended to provide a reason why Child 1 should behave. Mother 1 talked about the negative results (e.g., yuck, dirty) of Child 1's actions of which she did not approve. There was also one instance of Mother 1 discussing a misbehaviour of Child 1 which had taken place earlier that day (while Family 1 was eating supper, Mother 1 said: *Allatualuuqqaujuti natirmi? Riaqanngisuti.* ["You wrote on the floor? When you weren't supposed to."]). Finally, Mother 1 used warnings and threatened to withhold treats, usually as a last resort.

At times, nonverbal and simultaneous verbal and nonverbal discipline were used by both parents. For example, at one time Father 1 told Child 1 to close the refrigerator door while closing it himself. However, verbal discipline was used most often. The following example of both parents distracting and disciplining Child 1 occurred when Child 1 was 23 months old:

> Child is peeking inside the refrigerator, holding the door open.
> Mother: *Maani allangualauri.* (Do some drawing/writing here.)
> Child continues to look inside the refrigerator.
> Mother: *Apaapalangajavu atuinnaulituarpata apaaparialangavuru.* (We'll eat when the food is ready.)
> Mother pulls Child away from the refrigerator and closes the door. Child jumps up and down and vocalizes in protest. Child grabs the door handle. Mother holds Child's hand on the handle, then walks away.
> Mother: *Qai takugi. qai takugi.* (Hey, look, hey, look.)
> Father: *Paani taima .* (Daughter, stop it.)
> Father stands and watches Child. Mother walks to the oven, where a chicken is cooking.
> Mother: *Unatara qai.* (Here it is, look.)

Father (*threateningly*): *Paani taima.* (Daughter, stop.)
Mother: *Taakkua niqitulangajavu maanittut.* (The food we're going to eat is here.)

Overall, it appeared that Family 1 caregivers did not tend to express disapproval or enforce discipline using silence or nonverbal means alone, as was reported to commonly occur among the Inuit (Crago, 1988). Instead, they preferred to use verbal discipline.

Providing reason. The parents in Family 1 sometimes explained to their daughter the purposes behind their commands or disciplinary actions towards her. For example, when Child 1 tried to put an ulu (woman's knife) in her pocket, her father reacted with, "*Ippiajummitausuungungi. Qaqqliapiti alitaulaartui,*" ("You don't put that in your pocket. Your cute pants will be ripped by it."). Other examples are described in the previous section on discipline.

This category of language socialization has not been widely studied in the literature. However, it has not been documented as a common practice in unicultural Inuit homes. It was used regularly in Family 1, although explanations did not accompany every command or disciplinary measure and it was not as prevalent for these parents as it was in the data of Father 2.

Test questions. When all data for this family were examined, it was found that the asking of test questions occurred throughout. In particular, *Qatsini ukiuqaqqi?* ("How old are you?"), "who?" questions (including those asking Child 1's own name), and questions regarding the location of various body parts occurred frequently. In addition to "who?" questions, when looking at people in photographs the parents often asked their child how different people were related. Kinship terms and knowledge of identities are important among the Ungava Coast Inuit. People are expected to greet people by name or relationship (e.g,. mother) when entering and leaving a social gathering. Children are often engaged in greeting routines with adults when they are young to teach

them how to greet properly (Crago, 1988). Although Child 1 was frequently requested to identify people, there were no instances of greeting routines in the data.

There were a few examples of the parents in Family 1 asking Child 1 about events that had recently occurred. The following excerpt was taken when Child 1 was 25 months of age and included several examples of questions to which the parents already knew the answers:

> Mother, Father, and Child are sitting on the floor, eating frozen fish and caribou.
> Father: *Maaculikia qanuitsatuq.* (I wonder how Marco is doing.)
> Mother: *Kinamut uqaalaviuqauvit?* (Who called you earlier?)
> Child: Huh?
> Mother: *Kinamut?* (Who was it?)
> Child: Maagusie [Margusie].
> Mother: *Ilai. Margusie naniituq?* (That's right, I wonder where Margusie is?)
> Child says something unintelligible.
> Mother: Hm?
> Child repeats her unintelligible utterance.
> Mother: *Montrealmii?* (In Montreal?)
> Child: *Huh. Montrealmi.* (Yes. In Montreal.)
> Mother: *Asuu. Kinamiittuu?* (I see. Who is he with?)
> Child: Um, *Jaankallamiituq.* (Um, he's with Jaan [Janice].)
> Mother: *Asuu.* (I see.)
> Child: *Maagulu.* (With Marco.)
> Mother: *Uqaaqatiqaqqaugiviit Janasimik?* (Were you also talking to Janice?)
> Child looks at Mother.
> Mother: *Ai. Jaanasa qanuiluuqauju?* (Well, what was Janice saying?)
> Child: Um.
> Mother repeats her question. Child answers and Mother confirms her answer. The conversation ends as both Mother and Child leave the room.

When Child 1 provided an incorrect answer, it was sometimes acknowledged and accepted without correction. At other times, Mother 1

provided hints about the right answer, sometimes by producing the first sounds of the target word or a sentence missing the desired word in order to provide a meaningful context. A segment involving another test question as well as an example of hinting by Mother 1 was found when Child 1 was 30 months old:

> Child and cameraperson are looking outside through the window. Mother is sitting nearby.
> Mother: *Una akittapi qanuittumi tauttuli?* (What is the colour of this little/lovely pillow?)
> Child says something unintelligible.
> Mother: *Una qanuittumi tauttuli?* (What is the colour of this?)
> Mother taps an object. Child says something unintelligible.
> Mother: *Sua?* (What?)
> Child repeats her unintelligible utterance.
> Mother: *Kutsu* . . . . (Gum . . . .) (*Mother is pronouncing the first syllables of the word she is trying to elicit from Child*)
> Child says something unintelligible. Mother tells her the response is incorrect.
> Mother: *Kutsu.* (Gum.)
> Child says something unintelligible.
> Mother: Uh-huh *kutsuujaguna.* (Yes, it's pink.)
> Child says something unintelligible.
> Mother: *Cutuu? Kuusuujami pualuqarivi?* (Really? You also have a pink mitten?)

Although the parents constantly asked Child 1 questions to which they already knew the answers, they did not tolerate similar questioning from their daughter. In one instance, Child 1 asked her mother many questions within a short period of time. Mother 1 became irritated and told her to stop asking such questions when she already knew the answers.

Overall, the constant use of test questions by the parents in Family 1 was a feature more typical of the white middle-class culture (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Hough-Eyamie, et al., 1996; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984) than of the Inuit. They were rare in the data from the unicultural Inuit homes of Crago (1988).

Caregiver acting as playmate. Various caregivers played with Child 1 throughout the videotaping sessions. However, most of these play sessions alternated between the caregiver acting as a teacher, asking many questions and demonstrating how to perform various activities, and acting as a playmate. The parents often used their playtime to have Child 1 practice counting, label pictures, and identify distinguishing features of objects. They took the opportunity to teach new vocabulary and praise their child when she correctly performed the task at hand. There were not many examples of the parents following their daughter's lead and not directing the activity. The following was an instance of Mother 1 playing with her daughter, age 25 months, which was then followed by verbal and simultaneous verbal and nonverbal disciplining:

Child gently bites Mother's hand. Mother is looking at the television set.
Mother (*in a high, playful pitch*): *Ah. apaapattaulangaltrama pantganuu*. (Ah, my daughter's going to eat me.)
Child laughs, still biting Mother.
Mother (*in a high, drawn out, playful pitch*): *Atataa.* (Ouch.)
Mother and Child both laugh.
Mother (*in a high, drawn out, playful pitch*): *Atataa.* (Ouch.)
Mother and Child laugh. Child continues to bite Mother.
Mother: *Qanuiluurqitt?* (What are you doing?)
Father: *Panii. takusatstalaunnga. Takusalaunnga.* (Daughter, take a good look at me. Look at me.)
Child looks at Father, still biting Mother.
Father: *Takusatstaluti atii.* (Look at me.)
Mother (*in a high, playful pitch*): *Atataa ataataa* . (Ouch, Dad.)
Father: *Anaanai amaamagunnailugu.* (Don't suck on your mother.)
Child bites harder.
Mother (*laughing in the beginning but sounding annoyed by the end of the utterance*): Ow *atataa* ow. (Ow, ow, ow.)
Mother pulls Child's head away from her hand. Child smiles and vocalizes.
Father (*disapprovingly*): *Raa.* (Whoa.)

Mother: *Initaartisitsamarittu.* (You even made a mark.)
Mother points to the teeth marks on her hand.
Mother (*seriously*): *Aatataa.* (Ouch.)
Father: Oh no.
Child: Oh no. (*smiles*)
Mother: *Takugi aannitavinnga.* (Look, you hurt me.)
Mother points to the teeth marks on her hand. Child touches them.
Father: *Ilaaniunngituuliru.* (Say that you're sorry to her.)
Child tries to put Mother's hand in her mouth. Mother pulls her hand away from Child.
Mother: *Taimailuurtaugumarama.* (I don't want you to do that to me anymore.)

It has been reported that Inuit in the past expected children and novices to learn new skills through observation and listening (Crago, 1988). Competent members of society tended not to describe what they were doing, but rather, modelled the task and allowed the novice to watch until s/he was ready to try it him-/herself. Demonstrations were generally performed silently, with the exception of the occasional short utterance and the word *imaak* ("like this") (Crago, 1988). When Child 1 was 22 months old, she played with her stepgrandmother, a Qallunak (non-Inuk, usually Caucasian) woman who, through her employment, was aware of the Inuit ways of teaching and promoted the education of Child 1 in Inuit culture and language:

Grandmother and Child are sitting on the floor. Grandmother is showing Child how to string beads. Child looks at the beads on the floor around her and Grandmother says something very softly to Child. Child picks up a bead. Grandmother silently holds out the string. Child takes the string, which already has a bead on it from Grandmother's earlier demonstration. Child puts the string up to her bead, looks at the bead on the string, and shakes the string. Grandmother takes the string from Child and silently guides it through the hole in the bead Child is holding. Child pulls the end of the string until her bead touches the first bead.
Grandmother: *Atiluu!* (Again?)
Child picks up another bead and tries to put the string through it.
Child: *Mauna.* (This way.)

> Grandmother is holding the string while Child tries to put the bead on it. Child is unsuccessful. Grandmother strings the bead herself. Child picks up another bead and tries to string it.
> Child: *Unalu.* (This too.)
> Grandmother pulls the third bead to the end of the string and holds up the string for Child to use. Child holds the bead in her hand still and Grandmother silently threads the string through it. Child pulls the string so the bead falls to the other end. Grandmother vocalizes in approval.

Overall, the parents in Family 1, both raised with Inuit culture, tended to interact with their child using language socialization behaviours commonly found among white middle-class parents by playing with their daughter as playmates and asking many test questions while doing so (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Rogoff, et al., 1993; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984; Hough-Eyamie, et al., in press). Neither of these activities have been found to take place in many Inuit homes (Crago, 1988). Ironically, it was Child 1's non-Inuk stepgrandmother who tended to teach Child 1 in a style more common among the Inuit than among members of the white middle-class.

Meals. In the past, to some degree Inuit ate when they were hungry and, typically, on the floor. They did not usually talk while they were eating (Crago, 1988).

Family 1 sometimes followed the conventions of the white middle-class when having meals. When they were eating non-Inuit food (e.g., roast chicken), they sat together at the kitchen table and the parents insisted Child 1 sit properly and finish her food. In one example, Mother 1 tried to coax her daughter to finish her supper before playing by offering to feed her. After several unsuccessful attempts to persuade her to finish her meal, Mother 1 threatened to withhold what Child 1 wanted (watermelon) until she finished her supper. In another example, taken when Child 1 was 30 months old, the parents persuaded Child 1 to eat only by pretending to feed the doll with which she was playing:

Child is playing with her Big Bird doll in the living room while her parents eat supper in the kitchen.
Father: *Big bird niritumarunatsatu. Big Bird niritumaju.* (I wonder if Big Bird wants to eat. Does Big Bird want to eat?)
Child says something unintelligible, still playing with Big Bird.
Father: *Big Bird nirikkalauru. Big Bird anaanamu nirikkataulaurli.* (Feed Big Bird. Let your mother feed Big Bird.)
Child carries Big Bird to Mother.
Child: *Anaana. apaapak.* (Mother, food.)
Mother vocalizes in acknowledgement.
Child: *Apaaruk.* (S/he is just dressed.)
Mother vocalizes in acknowledgement. Mother holds a forkful of food to Big Bird's beak, then puts it into Child's mouth. Child bounces up and down happily. Mother gets more food.

At other times, Family 1 ate traditional Inuit food (e.g., raw meat). During these meals, the family sat on the floor to eat. Conversations took place during most meals, which is generally not common among the Inuit (Crago, 1988). During every meal, the parents, especially Father 1, asked Child 1 if the food was good (*Mamartuu?* ["Is it good?"]).

Overall, the behaviour of Family 1 during mealtimes tended to be more similar to that of most white middle-class families, although Family 1 did sometimes practice mealtime behaviours typical of the Inuit (Crago, 1988).

General interaction. Overall, Child 1 received a lot of attention from her parents, who tended to accommodate to her needs. They invested much time and energy in teaching their daughter and constantly talking to her, narrating what was happening in the environment or what Child 1 was doing. The majority of their utterances were grammatically correct. They often spoke to her affectionately, sometimes using Inuktitut baby words and usually using terms of endearment or a playful pitch. They used the Inuktitut words for "sorry" (*iirqi*) and "thank you" (*nakurmiik*) with Child 1, which they used in the same situations in which they are used by white middle-class members but have not traditionally been used

by Inuit (Crago, 1988). They also often told her to share or offer items to guests. The parents frequently labelled items and told Child 1 to say particular words or elicit repetition. Sometimes, Father 1 corrected her incorrect utterances, said them correctly, and told her to repeat them. As Child 1 grew older, less nonverbal communication was accepted and more verbal utterances were demanded. There was also frequent singing of children's songs, both Inuktitut songs and English songs translated into Inuktitut.

Whenever Child 1 interrupted an adult conversation, her parents attended to her. This behaviour was not typical of other reports of Inuit adults (Crago, 1988), for whom children were not expected to participate in or interrupt adult conversations. Children were supposed to remain silent, and if they interrupted, they were ignored or made to feel embarrassed. However, Crago found that younger mothers tended to allow their children to interrupt and converse with adults, which older mothers did not do.

The parents in this family shared caregiving duties (e.g., potty training, feeding) and, in general, interacted with Child 1 in similar ways to one another. Both parents often did not make eye contact with their daughter when speaking to her, a behaviour that is common among Inuit. However, these parents overall tended to interact with their child more in the way white middle-class caregivers generally do than Inuit caregivers, except they used Inuktitut rather than a mainstream Canadian language.

Family 2

Background: Interview Data

Mother 2 was 36 years old and had Inuit parents. She had lived in Quaqtaq most of her life except for two years on and off in Kuujjuaq while attending a nursing assistants' course, two to three years in Québec City while working, and two years in Ottawa while going to school. She always spoke only Inuktitut with all her relatives. She completed Grade 10 and a nursing assistants' course in English. At the time of the interview,

she felt she was strong in both Inuktitut and English but mediocre in French. She always spoke English to her partner. To the focal child of this study, she reported that she always spoke Inuktitut and rarely used English. However, although she spoke predominantly Inuktitut with her two oldest children, she also used some English (more than with the focal child).

Father 2 was a 34-year-old English-Canadian who was raised by his English-speaking grandparents. He had lived in Quaqtaq for three and a half years. The remainder of his life had been spent in southern Canada, predominantly in the Atlantic provinces. He grew up speaking English with all his relatives and completed college in English. He felt he was strongest in English and strong in French, although his oral comprehension in French was slightly weak. According to him, his spoken Inuktitut was poor, oral comprehension was mediocre, and he was unable to read or write it. He always spoke to his partner in English. To the focal child, he reported that he always spoke English with a little Inuktitut and French. He reportedly spoke in the same pattern with the other four children as with the focal child, with the exception of an older child who was in the French stream at school. He used more French with her. He used Inuktitut when he knew how to say what he wanted to say and especially when giving a command. Father 2 reported that he wanted to learn Inuktitut and use complete sentences.

In terms of language use, Family 2 best fit into the category of "two languages for one parent, one language for the other." Mother 2 spoke both Inuktitut, her mother tongue, and English fluently, while Father 2 spoke only English, although he also reported to be able to speak French. Both parents reported that they sometimes code-mixed Inuktitut and English.

Child 2 was the second youngest child in the family and the first child for Father 2. He was male and was 25 months old at the time of the first videotaping session.

Child 2 had four sisters and brothers, but only he and his younger sister were children of this father. The children were reported to speak predominantly Inuktitut and a little English amongst themselves. The parents did not make any conscious decisions regarding the use of language with their children, although they reported that they used both Inuktitut and English "because we speak both languages." In discussing the effects of their language use on Child 2, Mother 2 explained, "I guess we just presumed he would talk both languages." Father 2 expressed a desire for his son to learn both Inuktitut and English and also planned to enrol Child 2 in the French stream at school in order to make him trilingual because "it's better to know more than one language anyway." However, he had never discussed this plan with Mother 2, as evidenced by her reaction to his declaration: "I've never thought of him taking French. I guess that's [*Father's*] idea." She felt that her son would be fluent in Inuktitut and proficient in English by adulthood. Father 2 felt that his son would be strong in both Inuktitut and English and good in French, as he explained, "Well, we sent him to French school. He'll be pretty good because I'll speak French to him." Again, Mother 2 responded, "I never thought of him taking French, [*Father*]."

Neither parent felt there were any difficulties having two languages in their home. However, they had noticed cultural differences between themselves. Both parents believed Father 2 was stricter than Mother 2, and she also felt they had different views on child-rearing. They described their cultural incongruities as follows:

> Interviewer: "Do you think your way of raising children is different from your partner's?"
>
> Mother: "Yes, Inuit are more relaxed. My partner likes discipline. He hasn't changed since I met him, and I haven't either. He has his own ways. He's different from us, that's for sure. Sometimes there are difficulties, sometimes we agree and sometimes we don't. Mostly it's over discipline. My partner doesn't want the kids to be too

> loud sometimes. He doesn't want them having lots of sweets. For me, kids make noise, you know? They're just kids. And I don't mind if they have sweets sometimes."
>
> Father: "[*We're different in terms of*] discipline, schedules. I haven't adopted any Inuit ways. I want more orderliness . . . maybe my partner hasn't adopted any of my ways. We have had difficulties over discipline and house rules, but we overcame them through compromise and patience. I wouldn't insist on her following my rules but would just keep them for myself. She would do her thing and I would do mine. I wouldn't make her do it my way. I'm preparing them [*the children*] for the South. I'm stronger because I'm from the South. I don't want my kids to have weak characters because they'd be preyed on down South. [*For disciplining*] I'd give a verbal lecture and sound like I mean it, but my partner wouldn't sound so harsh.

The television was usually on all day everyday, mostly in English. Mother 2 and her children sometimes watched Inuktitut programs. Both parents listened to the FM radio a few times a week, while the children listened occasionally.

Both parents felt that Inuktitut was the most important language in Quaqtaq. English was important for communication outside the community and for business. Father 2 felt that French was also important because they lived in Québec, but Mother 2 did not consider it important. If Child 2 could only speak one language, Mother 2 would choose Inuktitut while Father 2 would choose English. Mother 2 believed that it would be very important to one's identity as an Inuk to be able to speak Inuktitut, but it would be possible to be Inuk without the language. Her children would not be less Inuit without it because they practiced the Inuit culture. Father 2 agreed that their children would still be true Inuit without Inuktitut if they were Inuit in culture.

Language use: Videotaped data

Table 9. Language use of Child 2: number of utterances and percentage to each addressee

Language	Addressee				
	Mother	Father	Sister	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	48 (46.15%)	2 (11.76%)	7 (16.67%)	3 (8.33%)	–
English	5 (4.81%)	1 (5.88%)	2 (4.76%)	2 (5.56%)	–
Mix *	3 (2.88%)	–	1 (2.38%)	–	–
Other **	48 (46.15%)	14 (82.35%)	32 (76.19%)	31 (86.11%)	1 (100%)
Total	104 (100%)	17 (100%)	42 (100%)	36 (100%)	1 (100%)

*** code-mix of Inuktitut and English**
**** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns**

During the one-hour videotaped segment used for frequency counts, Child 2 produced predominantly Inuktitut utterances out of all of the communicative acts addressed to Mother 2 which could be categorized as belonging to an identifiable language. Specifically, 46.15% of a total of 104 communicative acts were Inuktitut utterances, while 46.15% of his communicative acts to his mother were neither Inuktitut nor English. Since Father 2 was not present for much of the one-hour segment, Child 2 did not address him often enough to be able to draw any conclusions from this data about the use of language to his father. Child 2 made 17 communicative attempts to Father 2, 82.35% of which could only be categorized as Other. Similarly, the majority of communicative attempts to Sister 2 belonged in the Other category, although she was

present throughout most of the videotaped segment. These results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 10. Language use of Mother 2: number of utterances and percentage to each addressee

Language	Addressee				
	Child	Father	Sister	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	77 (81.91%)	1 (20.00%)	35 (77.78%)	2 (100%)	1 (50.00%)
English	--	3 (60.00%)	--	--	--
Mix *	5 (5.32%)	--	1 (2.22%)	--	--
Other **	12 (12.77%)	1 (20.00%)	9 (20.00%)	--	1 (50.00%)
Total	94 (100%)	5 (100%)	45 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)

*** code-mix of Inuktitut and English**
**** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns**

Mother 2 addressed Child 2 largely in Inuktitut with a few code-mixes of Inuktitut and English (see Table 10). This same pattern was evidenced in her communicative acts to her daughter, an older sister of Child 2. Mother 2 addressed her son 94 times, of which 81.91% were Inuktitut utterances. She made only five communicative acts to Father 2, three of which were in English, one of which was in Inuktitut, and one of which was neither. It is difficult to determine from such few utterances whether there is truly a trend for her to address her partner in English. However, observations across the entire set of videotaped data for Family 2 show that she does.

As mentioned previously, Father 2 was only present for a short

portion of the chosen segment. During this time, he spoke to Child 2 predominantly in English with a few utterances in Inuktitut and a few Inuktitut-English code-mixes. A total of 33 communicative acts were addressed to his son, of which 69.70% were in English. He addressed Mother 2 only four times, of which three communicative acts were utterances in English. The frequency counts for Father 2 are provided in Table 11.

Table 11. Language use of Father 2: number of utterances and percentage to each addressee

Language	Addressee				
	Child	Mother	Sister	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	4 (12.12%)	--	1 (50.00%)	--	--
English	23 (69.70%)	3 (75.00%)	--	1 (50.00%)	--
Mix *	3 (9.09%)	--	1 (50.00%)	--	--
Other **	3 (9.09%)	1 (25.00%)	--	1 (50.00%)	4 (100%)
Total	33 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%

*** code-mix of Inuktitut and English**
**** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns**

Sister 2, who was four years older than Child 2, addressed her younger brother predominantly in Inuktitut with a little English. She also addressed her mother in the same manner. She produced 60 communicative acts to Child 2, 68.33% of which were in Inuktitut. She addressed Father 2 only once, which was in English (see Table 12).

Table 12. Language use of Sister 2: number of utterances and percentage to each addressee

Language	Addressee				
	Child	Mother	Father	Self	Unknown
Inuktitut	41 (68.33%)	57 (60.64%)	--	9 (21.43%)	1 (50.00%)
English	5 (8.33%)	6 (6.38%)	1 (100%)	9 (21.43%)	--
Mix *	1 (1.67%)	18 (19.15%)	--	--	--
Other **	13 (21.67%)	13 (13.83%)	--	24 (57.14%)	1 (50.00%)
Total	60 (100%)	94 (100%)	1 (100%)	42 (100%)	2 (100%)

*** code-mix of Inuktitut and English**
**** i.e., interjections, vocalizations, unintelligible utterances, nonverbal communication in isolation, proper nouns**

Overall, the number of utterances produced by each member of Family 1 was much greater than that of each of their counterparts in Family 2 (compare Tables 6 and 9, 7 and 10, 8 and 11). Child 1 produced 363 communicative acts while Child 2 produced 200. Mother 1 produced 341 communicative acts and Mother 2 less than half as many (148). Since Father 2 was not present throughout much of the one-hour videotaped segment while Father 1 was, the number of utterances each produced cannot be compared. However, when Father 1 is compared to Mother 2, both of whom are Inuit, he produced many more utterances than she did (272 communicative acts for Father 1 compared to Mother 2's 148). Thus, it appears that the members of Family 1 tended to communicate more often than Mother 2 and Child 2.

The actual language use of Family 2 corresponded with their

reported use of language (see Table 3). All members of this family, with the exception of Father 2, spoke predominantly Inuktitut. Although Father 2, an English-Canadian, was absent during much of the one-hour videotaped segment, throughout the remaining videotapes he spoke predominantly English with everyone.

Father 2 had limited proficiency in Inuktitut. He tended to use particular Inuktitut words and phrases repeatedly when speaking to children. Specifically, he used *taima* ("stop, enough"), *auka* ("no"), *nanii* ("where"), *siaruai* ("wait"), and *inirq* ("son") most often. He also used some Inuktitut baby words (e.g., *oo oo* to refer to a little animal). He often mispronounced words in Inuktitut, however (e.g., "inik" for *inirq*, "edvid" for *ivvit*). Father 2 also made grammatical errors, sometimes involving the placement of English bound morphological units on Inuktitut root words (e.g., *qimmiks* for "dogs"). When Child 2 repeated his father's utterances, he often did not repeat the errors. However, it has been reported by native Inuktitut speakers that Child 2's grammar was similar to that of his father. This parent also code-mixed Inuktitut and English by inserting Inuktitut words into English sentences (e.g., *Inirq*, is your juice *mamartuk*? ["Son, does your juice taste good?"], *Uvanga* on T.V. ["I on T.V.]).

Another type of error that Father 2 made may have been related to his misunderstanding of the use of kinship terms in Inuktitut. Inuit children are often named after someone, and it is believed that after the namesake dies his/her spirit will live on in the child. Other people address the child as if s/he was the namesake in terms of his/her relationship to them. For example, if a child was named after his maternal grandfather, the child's mother may call the child "father," as in, "Hello, father," because he represents her father (Crago, 1988). In the case of Family 2, Child 2 was named after his father, so Father 2 should address his son as "I" or "me," since his child is named after him. However, in three instances when Child 2 said their common first name, Father 2 responded, "Yes, Dad." It was unclear whether he was attempting to follow Inuit kinship recognition

but doing so erroneously, or whether he was simply playing with the fact that they shared the same name and pretending to reverse identities.

It was unclear how well Father 2 understood Child 2 and vice versa. Child 2 often did not respond to Father 2 when he spoke English, and Father 2 often interrupted Child 2's conversations with an utterance concerning a different topic, responded to Child 2 with neutral responses (e.g., uh-huh, mm) for several turns, or repeated the previous utterance of Child 2 without expanding or responding to it. Native Inuktitut speakers often interpreted Father 2's English into Inuktitut for Child 2 and then told the child what to say in response, which he usually did. Without this interpretation, Child 2 frequently did not reply.

It was not just in Inuktitut that Father 2 produced grammatical errors. In one videotape, he produced English utterances such as, "Your car don't work no more," "You throw all my laundry on floor," "Bologna don't go on T.V.," "Don't push T.V.," "Boys ain't supposed to wear dresses," and "You building new house?" It is possible that these were acceptable utterances in his dialect of English, which may have been different from standard Canadian English. These may have also been examples of Father 2 using features of child-directed speech typical of the white middle-class (i.e., reduced grammar). However, contrast these utterances with this quote from his interview, when asked about his role in his child's language development:

> "Well, if I'm going to speak to him in English I want him to learn a good strong vocabulary. Forget the bad words and stuff like that. Like, I don't talk to him in street talk. I talk to him in good grammar, English grammar."

As Father 2 reported in the interview, he sometimes used French phrases when speaking to Child 2 (e.g., *Qu'est-ce que tu cherches, monsieur?* ["What are you looking for, mister?"]). Generally, these were preceded by the translation equivalent in English. Mother 2 used a few

English words and phrases (e.g., no, catch, almost, ball), some of which had corresponding words in Inuktitut. Child 2 also used a few English words and phrases (e.g., okay, mommy, hello, mine, happy birthday, ball). However, overall, Child 2 did not use much English. Approximately less than 10% of his utterances were in English, as reflected in the one-hour videotaped segment used in the frequency counts.

Book-reading. Unlike Family 1, this family did not frequently engage in literacy activities. In seven videotapes of data, Child 2 only looked at reading material five times. In two of those sessions, he looked through a catalogue or magazine. In one session, he pulled out several children's books and threw them onto the floor one by one, never opening any of them. In a third instance, Child 2 looked through a book by himself. Finally, in the last instance, Child 2 looked through a book with Father 2. However, the book was an information book about animals written for adults and Child 2 held it upside-down. The child searched for pictures of a particular kind of animal and called out its name whenever he saw it. Father 2 repeated the name after Child 2 each time he said it. Father 2 also labelled pictures of other animals, which Child 2 sometimes repeated. Father 2 never attempted to talk about the animals beyond naming them. In no sessions did any caregivers attempt to tell a story to Child 2. The following is a description of part of the session with Father 2, which took place when Child 2 was 33 months of age:

> Child is looking at an encyclopaedia-like animal book. He points to a picture of a monkey.
> Father: Monkey.
> Child: Monkey.
> Father: Monkey.
> Child flips pages. Father and Child each take three more turns in which Child points to a picture of a monkey, one person calls "monkey," and the other person repeats.
> Father: What else?
> Child: Huh? Monkey.

Child turns pages.
Father: Uh, ox, giraffe.
Child: Monkey. (*points to a picture of a monkey*)
Father: Monkey.
Child closes the book.
Father: Where's tiger?
Child: *Aatsuuli.* (I really don't know.)
Child opens the book and flips pages.
Father: Find tiger.
Child continues to point to pictures of monkeys and calling "monkey." Father continues to repeat after Child. This turn-taking routine repeats six times.
Father: Monkey. Where's tiger?
Child: Monkey. (*points to the same picture of a monkey*)
Father: Monkey.
Child: *Monkeyalu una.* (This is a big monkey.)
Father: *Aa.* (Yes.)
Child flips pages.
Father: What's that?
Child: Monkey. (*points to a picture of a monkey*)
Father: Monkey.
Child: Monkey.

Three pen and paper activities occurred in the data, all of which took place when Mother 2 was the primary caregiver. In two instances, Child 2 was drawing, sometimes pausing to show his artwork to his mother. In the third occurrence, Mother 2 wrote his name for Child 2 to copy. She did this in an attempt to get Child 2 to stop crying. It worked.

Overall, Family 2 caregivers engaged in book-reading with Child 2 less frequently than in Family 1. Furthermore, the types of interactions that took place during book-reading sessions were different from those of Family 1, in that very few questions were asked of Child 2, there were not many descriptions or discussions about pictures, and no stories were told, all of which commonly occurred during book-reading sessions with Family 1 and in white middle-class homes (Heath, 1986). Instead, Father 2 tended to simply label pictures and repeat Child 2's labelling of pictures.

Discipline. For both Mother 2 and Father 2, verbal discipline was the most frequent purpose behind their utterances.

Mother 2. The majority of Mother 2's disciplinary acts were verbal, especially with Child 2. It has been reported by Crago (1988) that when an Inuk child is misbehaving, caregivers often ignore him/her or respond nonverbally (e.g., covering an object which they do not want the child to touch). When verbal discipline is used, it is often a means of distracting the child from his/her activity. Harsh physical punishment and verbal reprimands are generally avoided.

The verbal discipline of Mother 2 was often in the form of indirect reprimands (e.g., *Piipiu miluujangani kamajualuuviasit* ["You're playing with the baby's pacifier, as usual"]) and distraction (e.g., Child 2 was whining when Mother 2 said: *Takulaurulliuna Sandy Tooma* ["Take a look at Sandy Tooma"]). Another common means of discipline was the reminder to the child that he was being filmed (*ajjiliurtaujuti* ["You're being watched/filmed"]), used to inform the child that outsiders would witness his misbehaviour which, presumably, would be shameful. She also frequently used the phrase "don't X," as in *lagunnailutit* ("don't be doing that") and *kamanak* ("don't touch"). Mother 2 continued to discipline verbally even when Child 2 was physically fighting with a sibling and may possibly have gotten hurt.

Mother 2 used more nonverbal and simultaneous verbal and nonverbal discipline with the siblings of Child 2. The use of less nonverbal discipline with Child 2 may have been due to his tendency to obey his mother more readily than his siblings when she reprimanded verbally. The form of her nonverbal discipline was generally silence or physical punishment, although the latter was not intended to be hurtful.

When Mother 2 used nonverbal discipline with Child 2, it was generally in the form of silence (e.g., she did not respond when Child 2 hit her, she ignored him when he cried in anger). Mother 2 rarely used physical punishment with her son. At times, rather than discipline Child 2 directly, Mother 2 allocated caregiving responsibilities to an older sibling. It is common among Inuit adults to have older children, generally teenage

girls, care for younger children (Crago, 1988). Adults act as primary caregivers when older children are not present or are unable to perform necessary duties. When Child 2 was 25 months of age, his mother responded to his tantrum with very little speech and requested that his older sister look after him:

> Child is silently playing while he sucks on a pacifier. His baby sister begins to cry. Father grabs the pacifier out of Child's mouth and Child begins to cry.
> Father: Uh, I need that.
> Child (*crying*): *Amaama! Anaanaa!* (Bottle! Mother!)
> Mother: *Amaamaliurtaulaurit.* (Get a bottle made for you.)
> Mother continues to sew. Child continues to cry. Father says something to Child but cannot be heard over Child crying.
> Mother: *Qiajualu nipiliurtaalu.* (You're being filmed and you're crying.)
> Mother continues to sew. Father speaks to Child, but cannot be heard over Child crying. Father throws a different pacifier to Child. Child throws the pacifier back and continues to cry.
> Father: *Auk* (no), that's hers.
> Child screams.
> Father: *Taima!* (Enough!)
> Child continues to cry. Mother continues to sew, occasionally glancing at Child. Child lies down on the floor near Mother's feet, wailing. Fifty seconds pass.
> Mother: *Louisaaguu.* (Louisa, you're being called.)
> Mother continues sewing. Child's sister, Louisa, tries to placate Child, first by offering him a pacifier, then by offering juice. Child refuses both and continues to cry. Louisa stands in front of Child and drinks some juice. Mother tells Louisa to stop and to give Child the bottle. Louisa tries to put the bottle in Child's mouth, but Child continues to cry and covers his mouth with his hands. Mother is still sewing. Louisa drinks more juice. Mother takes the bottle out of Louisa's mouth and gives it to Child. Child stops crying and drinks silently.

Father 2. Father 2 tended to use predominantly verbal discipline with all children in most situations, including when they fought or were in danger of being injured. He often ordered Child 2 not to engage in a particular activity, and when Child 2 did not obey, he continued to

discipline him verbally, usually not resorting to physical punishment or prevention. He disciplined in English, with the exception of *auka* ("no") and *taima* ("stop, enough"). An example of Father 2 disciplining Child 2 verbally when he was 30 months of age follows:

> Child picks up an empty videocamera case, watching Father.
> Father: *Auka* (no), that's not yours.
> Child walks away from the case, then returns to examine it more closely. Child plays with the clasps.
> Father: *Innîik* (son), that's not yours.
> Child looks at Father, then walks around to the other side of the case and examines it, opening and closing it. Father makes a warning noise, like a roar. Child continues to play with the case.
> Child stops to watch television, then slides the case towards the edge of the table.
> Father: *Innîik* (son), that's not yours.
> Child lifts the case onto the floor watching Father. Child pushes the case along the floor, laughing.
> Father: That's not yours.
> Child continues to slide the case along the floor, picking up speed until it falls.
> Father: *Taimaa. taimaa. taimaa.* (Enough, enough, enough.)
> Child sits on the case.
> Father: *Taimaa.* (Enough.)
> Child sits still on the case and watches television.

Sometimes Father 2 used threats (e.g., "I'll phone your mother") or distraction. Often, he provided negative evaluations of the actions of Child 2 (e.g., you're a bad boy, that's not nice), which tended not to result in a change in activity. A common form of distraction was to call out the word "telephone" in an attempt to fool Child 2 into picking up the telephone receiver when it was not ringing and thereby removing him from his undesirable activity. It appeared that Child 2 enjoyed answering the telephone and often participated in his father's game, although he was never certain whether there was someone on the other end or not until after he picked up the receiver. An example of Father 2 using this ruse to halt his son's misbehaviour took place when Child 2 was 30 months old:

Child is throwing books onto the floor.
Father: Whoa, you're being a bad boy. You're being a bad boy.
Child picks up a book and hits it onto the floor. Child picks up another book.
Father: Ah, *taima. Taima.* (Ah, enough. Enough.)
Child holds the book up in position to hit it.
Child: *Aalai.* (Watch me do this.)
Father: After this, *taima* (stop).
Child hits the book onto the floor, then bends down to pick up another one.
Father: Telephone.
Child hits another book onto the floor.
Father: Telephone. Telephone. (*points to telephone*)
Child: *Ngimmat.* (No.)
Child walks to the telephone.
Father: *Aa* (yes). Telephone.
Child: *Ngimmat.* (No.)
Child picks up the telephone receiver.
Father: *Aa.* (Yes.)

Father 2 used some nonverbal discipline with Child 2, generally in the form of removal of objects and accompanied by speech, as in the following segment when Child 2 was 27 months old:

Mother has just returned from the store. Child is holding candy. Sister is sitting on Child's chair with Child. Child whines.
Father: Hey, we got company. Okay, you got one.
Father reaches for the candy in Child's hand. Child moves away from Father.
Child: *Auka.* (No.)
Father: Have some for later.
Father takes the candy from Child. Child lies down on the chair and whines.
Child: *Auka!* (No!)
Father: *Auk* (no), 'cause there's only . . . .
Child: *Auka!* (No!)
Father says something unintelligible to Child, clearly fed up with him. Father leaves. Child wails.

Child 2 frequently took the pacifier away from his younger sister. Father 2 did not usually directly reprimand him, but chose to comment on

the event and call his son a "squeaker robber." Although Mother 2 did not approve of this action of her son and expressed her feelings in indirect statements, it was unclear from this reaction of Father 2 whether he disapproved. In any case, his verbal responses did not result in Child 2 returning the pacifier to his sister.

Siblings. The older brother of Child 2, who was 15 years old, tended to use verbal discipline. The two older sisters of Child 2, aged six and seven years, generally used both verbal and simultaneous verbal and nonverbal discipline.

Overall, all caregivers in Family 2 tended to prefer to discipline verbally rather than nonverbally. However, in the instances of nonverbal discipline, Mother 2 tended to ignore Child 2 or have his older sister take care of him, both of which have been documented to be common means of discipline and caregiving among the Inuit (Crago, 1988). The nonverbal discipline of Father 2 generally consisted of the removal of items from Child 2 or physically stopping his son from performing an undesirable behaviour.

Providing reason. Father 2 frequently provided reasons for imperatives and disciplinary actions on the videotapes. Some examples included: "*Taima* [stop], you're going to fall down and hurt yourself," "*Auka* [no], it's going to break" when Child throws a container of milk, "That's not ours," "*Auka* [no], don't do that. That's not nice. This is McGill's."

Mother 2, in contrast, rarely explained the reasons behind her actions. Her most common way of providing reason was by means of indirect verbal discipline in which she stated, *ajjiliurtaujuti* ("You're being watched/filmed"), implying that the child should be well-behaved because his actions were being recorded.

Overall, by providing reasons, Father 2 tended not to behave similarly to Inuit caregivers. Mother 2 tended not to practice this language socialization behaviour.

Test questions. Father 2 very frequently asked Child 2 questions to which he knew the answers. However, it was unclear whether this was his natural style of interaction or whether he was trying to coax his son to talk for the videocamera. Father 2 often asked Child 2, in both Inuktitut and English, what his name was. Other types of questions that repeated throughout the data in both Inuktitut and English included: "who's that?," "what's that?," "what'cha doing?," "where?," and "how old are you?" He also asked "are you [person/character]?" and "are you [*verb*-ing]?" in English. His questions often were not related to the ongoing activity of Child 2 (e.g., "Is your name Coonaloosie?" when Child 2 was playing with cereal). Such questions tended to be ignored by Child 2.

Mother 2 rarely asked test questions. There were a few instances when she and Child 2 were labelling animals on the television screen, but most of the questions addressed to her son were information-seeking.

Overall, Father 2 behaved the way many white middle-class caregivers do (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Hough-Eyamie, et al., 1996; Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984) in his frequent asking of test questions. Mother 2, similar to other Inuit parents (Crago, 1988), rarely engaged in such questioning.

Caregiver as playmate. The siblings of Child 2 most often played the dual role of caregiver and playmate. For example, his sister played dress-up with Child 2 in one instance, and fed him in another.

Father 2 frequently played with Child 2 as a companion. He allowed children to climb on top of him, played hide-and-go-seek, and pretended to be a fighting ninja, among other games. Sometimes he participated in Child 2's games by adding speech to Child 2's actions (e.g., talked as if he was a hockey sportscaster while Child 2 "shot" pieces of cereal). At other times, father and child engaged in verbal play, as in the following example when Child 2 was 30 months old:

Child 2 is playing with cereal.
Father: *Initk* (son), where's your buddy?
Child: *Aatsuuk.* (I don't know.)
Father: *Aatsuuk.* (I don't know.) Where's Mim [Kim]?
Child: *Aatsuuk.* (I don't know.)
Father: Where's Victoria?
Child: *Aatsuuk.* (I don't know.)
Father says something unintelligible.
Father: Where's *anaana* (mother)?
Child: *Aatsuuk anitk.* (I don't know, out.)
Father: *Anitk?* (Out?)
Child: *Aa.* (Yes.)
Father: Are you hungry?
Child: *Auk.* (No.)
Child carries a plate of cereal to the kitchen table.
Father: *Auk* (no). Are you making a new cereal?
Child: *Auk.* (No.)
Father continues to ask questions. Child continues to answer *Auk* (no).

There were also times when Father 2 attempted to direct his son's play (e.g., "Okay, build a new house now" when Child 2 was turning to a different activity).

Mother 2 rarely played with her children. The few instances of her acting as her son's playmate in the videotapes occurred when she was trying to keep Child 2 occupied and out of trouble. During these times, she played catch with her son.

Overall, Father 2 acted similarly to other white middle-class parents (Rogoff, et al., 1993) by playing with his son. Mother 2 and the siblings behaved more like other Inuit (Crago, 1988), in that children generally were the playmates of other children and parents were not.

Repetition routines. Throughout the videotapes, every one of his caregivers told Child 2 what to say to various people. Most often, they told him directly, "Say 'X.'" Once Child 2 had obeyed the command, caregivers often stated the utterances they wished Child 2 to repeat without specifically telling him to repeat. Child 2 continued to imitate them. It is

common for young Inuit caregivers to engage young children in repetition routines as a means of instruction by imitation or modelling, as reported in Crago (1988).

"Say 'X'" and repetition were used for several different purposes. Child 2's siblings used it to teach him how to behave in different types of interactions, such as telephone conversations and greeting routines, and to tell him what to do in response to another person's utterance or action. These generally were repetition routines in which the sibling told the child what to say or do and Child 2 repeated it. This turn-taking continued for several rounds. All caregivers used the "Say 'X'" pattern to teach Child 2 the names of objects through labelling. Father 2 used this pattern for all of the aforementioned purposes but also used it for unknown reasons. He sometimes requested that Child 2 repeat a word that was unrelated to the ongoing conversation or activity. It is possible that he was trying to elicit speech for the videocamera.

An example of an extensive repetition routine was revealed in the following excerpt when Child 2 was 31 months of age:

> Brother gives the telephone receiver to Child. There is no one on the other end.
> Brother: *Mommyiai lasaarit.* (Hurry and say, "Hi, Mommy.")
> Child: *Ai. Mommyai.* (Hello, hi, Mommy.)
> Brother: *Qanuikkii?* (How are you?)
> Brother sits nearby while Child talks into the receiver.
> Child: *Qanuikkii?* (How are you?)
> Brother: *Sulangavii?* (What are you going to do?)
> Child: *Sularii [sulangavii]?* (What are you going to do?)
> Brother: *Aa taimalaukaa?* (Yes, bye for now?)
> Child: *Aa.* (Yes.)
> Brother and Mother laugh. Child hands the receiver to Brother.
> Brother: *Taima lalauru.* (Say bye to her.)
> Child grabs the receiver. Brother holds onto it while Child speaks.
> Child: *Taima.* (Bye.)
> Brother: *Taimaumat.* (He's finished.)
> Child: *Taimaumat.* (He's finished.)

Brother: *Taima.* (Enough.)
Brother hangs up the receiver.

Overall, members of Family 2 frequently engaged Child 2 in repetition routines, a practice common among the Inuit (Crago, 1988).

Meals. In Family 2, it appeared from the data that people ate whenever, wherever, and whatever they wished. All of the children automatically shared their food with one another when other children did not have any. Although Mother 2 and Father 2 served food at the kitchen table, family members often took it from the table and sat elsewhere to eat. Father 2 did not insist upon sitting together at the kitchen table, although he often ate his meals there. This behaviour during mealtimes was similar to that reported to occur in the unicultural Inuit homes documented by Crago (1988). Some talk did occur, but to a lesser extent than in Family 1.

General interaction. Overall, each of the parents in Family 2 interacted with Child 2 in different ways. The siblings tended to interact similarly to what has been reported for other Inuit siblings in their use of Inuktitut, repetition routines, and acting both as caregivers and playmates to Child 2.

Mother 2 sometimes interpreted Child 2's vocalizations for other people. Typically, Inuit adults do not assign meaning to the vocalizations of young children (Crago, 1988). However, the few instances in which Mother 2 spoke for her son were used to discipline other children. Mother 2 informed others that Child 2 was telling them to stop their activity, one of which Mother 2 did not approve and which appeared to irritate Child 2. She also used the Inuktitut word for "sorry" (*iirqi*) a few times in the data, although she did not use it as often as Mother 1 and she never said "thank you" (*nakurmiik*). Mother 2 frequently avoided eye contact with her interlocutor, although she was a full participant in the conversation. This parent tended to use grammatically correct utterances when speaking to

her son, which Father 2 often did not. She engaged Child 2 in a few labelling activities in which he repeated her utterances and she sometimes corrected Child 2 when he mispronounced a word. The following is an example of Mother 2 and Sister 2 attempting to teach Child 2 (age 29 months) to say his name correctly:

> Mother is looking out the window. Sister is drawing. Child is wandering around the room.
> Child: *Qai Paiku.* (Look, Paiku [Michael].)
> Paiku [Michael]. *Ai* (okay)?
> Child walks to Sister and tries to grab her pen and paper.
> Sister walks away, telling Child to stop. Child walks away.
> Mother (*to cameraperson*): That's how he says his name, "Paiku."
> Sister: Paiku. *Kinauvit piipi?* (Who are you, baby?)
> Child: Paiku. Paiku.
> Sister (*emphasizing the name*: *Ngimmat Michael.* (No, it's Michael.)
> Child: *Ngimmat Paiku.* (No, it's Paiku.)
> Sister: *Ngimmat Michael.* (No, it's Michael.)
> Mother: *Michaelai.* (Hi, Michael.)
> Child: *Aa.* (Yes.)
> Sister: *Michaelai.* (Hi, Michael.)
> Child: *Aa.* (Yes.)
> Sister: *Michaelgavit.* (You're Michael.)

Father 2 often used politeness words, such as "sorry" and "thank you," but he only did so in English. However, he did use some Inuktitut and participated in certain routines, such as greeting routines, appropriately. He spent much time during the videotaping sessions narrating his son's activities and commenting on them. One example occurred when Child 2 was 31 months of age:

> Child is making toast. He just tried to give Father an object but dropped it.
> Father: Oops. You dropped it.
> Child vocalizes and moves around, waiting for the toast to pop up from the toaster. Child hits his head against the cupboard and

whines, holding the injured spot.
Child: *Ãaa*. (Ouch.)
Child whines.
Father: Be careful. Be careful. (*strokes Child's head*)
Child says something unintelligible. The toast has popped up.
Child pushes the toaster button down.
Father: No, they're going to burn.
Child lets go of the button and pushes the toaster aside. He suddenly withdraws his hand from the toaster and looks at Father.
Father: Hot.

Father 2 often labelled things and talked about various objects and activities in the environment. He tried to converse with Child 2, usually by asking questions, to which his son sometimes responded. Father 2 frequently used such questions to interrupt the activity or Inuktitut conversation in which Child 2 was involved. Generally, when Child 2 did say something, either Father 2 would repeat exactly what had been said or, less often, expanded on the utterance. He used some features of child-directed speech common across white middle-class caregivers, such as reduced grammar and high or changing pitch (e.g., "miuk" instead of "milk," "why you throw your *nassak* ["hat"] away?"). He also played with language when speaking to his son through rhymes (e.g., "cheater, cheater, in the heater," "peek-a-boo, I got you") and repetition of phrases in which one word was changed (e.g., mister cheese/green/bean). Father 2 sometimes made jokes or comments that Child 2 did not understand (e.g., "Hey [hay] is for horses," "Are you Mr. *Auka* ["no"]?")

Both parents spoke to Child 2 affectionately, but Mother 2 tended to do so in Inuktitut while Father 2 used English. Mother 2 was predominantly verbal in her expression of affection, frequently using a higher pitch, prolonged vowels, and terms of endearment (e.g., *aannitukallaga* ["my little hurt one"], *kuniutuinnasuukallak* ["little one that just kisses"]. Father 2 was affectionate both verbally and physically, often touching his son. Father 2 also used nicknames (e.g., shneeshnee,

squeaker robber, mister "X") to call Child 2 and often teased him (e.g., "that's mine" whenever Child 2 looked at something that belonged to Child 2). Mother 2 did not use nicknames or tease.

Mother 2 and Father 2 shared caregiving duties (e.g., washing, diaper changing). However, their views on child-rearing and styles of interaction differed. For example, Father 2 verbally instructed Child 2, while Mother 2 tended to model tasks without describing her actions as she was doing them, expecting her son to learn through observation. In another example, Father 2 was disapproving when Child 2 engaged in activities which he did not consider appropriate for boys, such as wearing dresses or playing with Barbie dolls, and he told Child 2 whenever he played with them that boys did not engage in such activities. Mother 2 was not perturbed by her son playing with items stereotypically designed for girls.

When both parents were home or Father 2 was absent, the television and radio were often tuned to Inuktitut programs. When Father 2 was home without Mother 2, the television was usually tuned to English programs and the FM radio was not on.

Siblings and older children often engaged Child 2 in imitation activities, both verbal and nonverbal. Child 2 himself preferred to communicate nonverbally rather than speaking, using gestures and facial expressions. He often played silently with other children. In addition, he acted as caregiver towards his baby sister, generally by protecting her from danger (e.g., pain, cigarettes). However, he did not often attempt to engage her in conversation. When Child 2 spoke or vocalized, his parents tended to react differently when they did not understand his utterance. Whereas Father 2 pretended to understand, often through neutral responses or repetition, Mother 2 genuinely appeared to understand and responded as such. Whenever she did not comprehend, she requested clarification.

Conclusions

The language and cultural patterns of two bilingual families were examined in depth over one year. Both Family 1 and Family 2 used language in the ways they had reported during their interviews, each family exhibiting different patterns of language use from the other. Family 1 appeared to have blended their two cultures, such that, for both parents, elements from each were present at the same time without conflict. In Family 2 the two cultures tended to exist side-by-side, such that each parent practiced language socialization behaviours of his/her own culture, largely without interference from the other. There was respect for each culture and tolerance of differences.

One of the difficulties encountered when analyzing the data was determining the naturalness of the interactions involving Father 2. He talked constantly when he was operating the camera, but when someone else acted as cameraperson the number of utterances and interactions was much less. Frequently, he asked Child 2 questions that were unrelated to the ongoing activity, and it was possible that he was attempting to elicit speech for the videocamera. Support for this idea came when Father 2 was heard informing someone that the purpose of the videotaping was to analyze Child 2's speech, rather than to examine his son's natural interactions and any speech that accompanied them.

The in-depth studies of the two families revealed the importance of this form of research and ecological validity. Although statistical analyses across certain features and various people may provide numerical evidence of similarities and differences, important details may be lost. For example, frequency counts could reveal the amount of Inuktitut Father 2 spoke within a period of time, but in-depth portraits could provide information about the form of his spoken Inuktitut. In addition, not all family members may be present during isolated segments selected for frequency counts. Their language use and language socialization behaviours could only be described after examination of other data in

which they are largely present. Furthermore, the interactions observed during one period of time are not necessarily representative of those which naturally occur everyday. Finally, the in-depth portraits in the present study gave the participants an opportunity to tell their own stories and provide information that could not have been gained otherwise. They explained their past and present motivations for their use of language and language socialization behaviours, making the findings more complete and more meaningful than they would have been without the participants' input.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter has seven main sections. I begin with an overview of the thesis. Following that is a discussion of diversity in language use and language socialization practices across bilingual homes. In the third section I discuss language shift and language loss in relation to Inuktitut, followed by a discussion of syncretism and dissociation of language and culture among parents of one- and two-year-olds in a community of Northern Québec and in the two bilingual families examined in this study. Research directions in this area of study are proposed in the fifth section. I end the chapter with a discussion of the clinical and educational ramifications resulting from the findings of this thesis.

Summary of the Methodology and Findings

This thesis had two purposes. The first was to examine the use, beliefs, and issues of language and culture in a Northern community. The second purpose was to document in detail the language use and language socialization behaviours used in two bilingual homes over several videotaping sessions.

In the interviews conducted with 11 families in Kuujjuaq, parents revealed that all Inuit could and did speak Inuktitut but the majority of parents felt English was a more important language. There was an overall feeling in the community that Inuktitut was degenerating and that people were "losing" their language. This evoked feelings of frustration. However, despite the perceived negative status of their native language, there was an overwhelming belief that Inuktitut was important to one's identity as an Inuk, although it was not essential. Many Inuit and mixed-heritage parents regularly listened to the local FM radio station and watched Inuktitut television programs, which Qallunaat men did not do. There was a wide variation across homes with respect to language use, but what was common across all of them was the striking presence of English.

Two bilingual/bicultural families were then studied in depth. Their language use and language socialization practices were documented to gain a clearer understanding of the interactions among languages and cultures in individual homes. Whereas the interviews revealed broad patterns of variability across families in one community, the in-depth portraits of two bilingual families provided a microscopic view of this variability in language use and socialization. The in-depth portraits revealed that, overall, the two bilingual families were markedly different in terms of their language use and language socialization behaviours, and that both used some language socialization behaviours different from what has been documented for many unilingual Inuktitut-speaking families (Crago, 1988). In addition, it was found that the two parents in Family 1 interacted similarly to one another, while each parent in Family 2 had his/her own ways of interacting and raising children which were different from those of the other parent.

This thesis contributes to the body of knowledge in the fields of language socialization and bilingualism. There have not been any other studies of language socialization in bilingual homes in Inuit communities. Furthermore, it is the first time that in-depth portraits have been situated against a background of community-wide data.

Diversity in Bilingual Homes

Traditionally, a prevalent image and description of a "bilingual home" in the literature has been one in which each of the two parents speaks a different language to their children, commonly referred to as the "one parent, one language" model. Despite little systematic empirical research (for comparison, see Dopke, 1992; Goodz, 1989; Jarovinskij, 1995), this depiction has given the impression that many bilingual families are similar in composition and language use, which often may not be the case. This study demonstrates that bilingual and bicultural families involving the same two (or more) languages and cultures have different patterns of language use and language socialization. Indeed, they have

different beliefs and interactional styles, as revealed in the interviews conducted in Kuujjuaq and evidenced at a more detailed level in the two in-depth portraits.

Furthermore, the present study of parental input to children and parental beliefs about language use in bilingual homes has added to the bilingualism literature by showing that the traditional psycholinguistic ideology of bilingualism, as described by Schieffelin (1994), is not necessarily the norm. Bilingualism should be considered to be a set of cultural and linguistic practices.

The current study has also added to theories about bilingualism in its presentation of families in which language use does not line up with ethnicity. For instance, the fact that both members of a couple were Inuit did not necessarily indicate that only Inuktitut was spoken in their home. Differences among bilingual families may also be influenced by their communities' contexts, although further study of more families from various communities are needed to understand in what ways this influence occurs.

Differences between Family 1 and Family 2

Family 1 and Family 2 were not alike in many ways. In general, characteristics of Inuit and mainstream Canadian cultures were blended in Family 1, although the parents tended to pattern slightly more like white middle-class caregivers, while in Family 2 the two cultures seemed to coexist without much blending. Both parents in Family 1 generally used language socialization patterns more similar to "typical" white middle-class caregivers than Inuit parents, although they strongly voiced their belief in the importance of promoting and emphasizing the Inuit culture. At the same time, they consciously chose to speak Inuktitut while interacting with their child and made some attempts to bring traditional Inuit language socialization practices into their mainstream activities. Family 1 caregivers also diverged from their overall pattern of white middle-class behaviours by generally producing grammatical utterances when speaking to their

child rather than reducing their grammar, which is often produced in the child-directed speech of white middle-class caregivers. Instead, they were similar to Mother 2 with respect to this feature. It may be the case that child-directed or affect-salient speech in Inuktitut does not involve the reduction of grammar (Crago, Allen, & Pesco, 1997). In the present study, only Father 2 used a noticeable number of ungrammatical utterances.

Each parent in Family 2 tended to follow the practices of his/her native culture, such that Mother 2 behaved similarly to other Inuit parents and Father 2 practiced his other cultural patterns, and both did so largely without elements of the other parent's culture.

Support for the designation of these parents as patterning after white middle-class or Inuit cultures is found when they are compared to the findings of other cross-cultural studies. For example, Hough-Eyalmie, et al. (1996) found that white middle-class caregivers produced more than three times as many communicative acts per minute as Inuit caregivers. In the present study, Mother 1 produced more than twice the number of communicative acts per unit time as Mother 2 and Father 1 produced approximately twice the number of communicative acts per unit time as Mother 2. Although it is unclear how Father 2 compared to the other parents due to his brief presence in the one-hour videotaped segment, in other videotaped data it was apparent that he produced many more utterances than his Inuk partner.

Other findings in the Hough-Eyamie, et al. study included the production of "Request/Propose" and "Prohibit/Forbid" speech act categories most frequently by all caregivers, frequent elicitation of imitation by Inuit caregivers, and frequent use of questions by white middle-class caregivers to their children. In the current study, it was also found that a large number of all caregivers' communicative acts were disciplinary in intent. In Family 2, the use of repetition routines was the only language socialization behaviour which both parents tended to practice in similar ways. Similar to the Inuit caregivers in Hough-Eyamie, et al., the

caregivers in Family 2 frequently engaged Child 2 in these routines, which did not commonly occur in Family 1. However, caregivers in Family 1 did sometimes elicit imitation of labels and responses to test questions. Similar to the white middle-class caregivers in Hough-Eyamie, et al., the caregivers in Family 1 asked Child 1 many questions, especially test questions, which were also commonly produced by Father 2 but not by Mother 2 or the sibling caregivers in Family 2.

In the Rogoff, et al. (1993) study, white middle-class caregivers were found to act as playmates in dyadic interactions, use little nonverbal communication, and provide explanations of events and activities. Father 2 and the parents in Family 1 tended to pattern in much the same way as these parents in Rogoff, et al.

Bornstein, et al. (1992) also found that white middle-class American mother frequently asked their infants questions. In addition, white middle-class mothers tended to favour more information-salient than affect-salient speech. In the present study, both parents in Family 1 and Father 2 often provided information for their children through their labelling and narration of events in the vicinity. They also sought information from their children through their use of test questions.

Particular variables, other than individual personality differences, may have contributed to the different beliefs and interactional patterns of the two bilingual families. The communities in which each family lived were different in terms of size and exposure to the outside world. Family 1 lived in Kuujjuaq, the Nunavik community in which mainstream Canadian influence was most prevalent and the proportion of non-Inuit residents was largest. This strong presence of southern Canadian culture may have influenced the way of life of Family 1, such that they adopted certain features of it. Family 2 lived in the more remote community of Quaqtaq, where the number of Qallunaat residents was extremely low and mainstream influence was predominantly through the media. This community situation may have contributed to the strong presence of Inuit

culture and Inuktitut in Family 2 and the acceptance of them by Father 2, since they were in the majority. The level of education of Family 1 caregivers was another possible factor in their tendency to use behavioural features typical of the white middle-class. Both parents attended college in Montréal and it may have been the case that the focus in higher levels of education on white middle-class ways of interacting and child-rearing influenced their own behaviours. This may have resulted in their replacement of traditional Inuit behaviours with more mainstream Canadian ideas. It is not possible to determine from only two families which language socialization behaviours were influenced by which factors.

Similarities between Family 1 and Family 2

In some ways, however, despite the differences in backgrounds and communities, the two bilingual families were similar in their language socialization practices. English was used by both sets of parents with each other, while Inuktitut was spoken with the children by all parents of Inuit heritage. Discipline was predominantly verbal across all parents. Family 1 parents and Father 2 behaved similarly in their frequent use of test questions and provision of reasons for imperatives and disciplinary actions. All caregivers played with their children as peers, although there were some differences across parents in their frequency and style of play.

It is interesting that Mother 1 had been raised in a home not unlike that of Family 2. Her mother was Inuk and her father was English-Canadian, similar to the caregivers in Family 2, and each had a different native language (Inuktitut and English, respectively). The characteristics of her language use and cultural traits may represent the outcome for some of the children living in similar bilingual/bicultural families today, including Child 2 and Mother 1's own daughter.

Language Shift and Language Loss

Pandharipande (1992) identified three stages along a continuum of shift from minority to dominant languages: transitional bilingualism, stable bilingualism, and isolation. He also found there was no correlation

between loss of language and loss of culture. Finally, he stated that it was possible for a community to almost consciously decide to replace its minority language with the majority language in order to gain greater socio-economic benefits. In the present study, it appears that Kuujjuaq is moving out of the stage of isolation, in which the community is isolated from the majority language and the minority language has a great chance of survival. In the case of Kuujjuaq, the majority languages of English and French are increasing in use. Unlike the stage of stable bilingualism, in which there is shift to the majority language in all domains except home, English and French are being used alongside Inuktitut in many homes in Nunavik, including unicultural Inuit homes. It therefore seems that Kuujjuaq is on its way to transitional bilingualism, in which there is shift to the majority language in all domains. However, there are some parents who have consciously chosen to revive the use of Inuktitut in their homes, such as in Family 1, suggesting there may be a shift away from language loss towards stable bilingualism. The majority of the parents in the interviews did not feel one would lose one's identity as an Inuk if one could not speak Inuktitut, supporting Pandharipande's claim that the loss of language does not necessarily imply a feeling of loss of culture. In fact, most interviewees felt that in order to be Inuk, it was important to practice traditional Inuit ways, such as hunting, eating raw meat, and knowing survival skills in the North, and knowledge of Inuktitut was important but not necessary. English and French were considered important predominantly for socio-economic reasons, including employment and communication with people outside the community. This seems to support Pandharipande's statement that language shift may occur as a result of intrinsic factors, although residents of Kuujjuaq generally did not want to lose their native language, but rather, gain mainstream ones.

Smolica (1992) discussed "core values" of a culture, of which members of a minority culture become more aware when their own culture is under threat from the majority culture. Maintenance of a minority

language depends on whether it is recognized as a core value by minority members. Loss of a minority language is influenced by how it is viewed by the majority culture, the attraction of minority culture members to the majority culture, how much the two cultures overlap, and whether there are benefits to be gained from proficiency in the majority language which cannot be gained from knowledge of the minority language. In the case of the Inuit in the present study, Inuktitut was recognized as a core value by only a minority of parents in Kuujjuaq. The parents in Family 1, who felt the language was the most important element of one's cultural identity, made a conscious effort to promote the use of Inuktitut with their daughter and thus maintain it. It is difficult to discern from this study how Inuktitut was viewed by the majority culture or how attracted the Inuit were to mainstream Canadian culture. However, a few of the Qallunaat fathers stated that they did not like to listen to the FM community radio because it was in Inuktitut and none of them learned or were trying to learn Inuktitut, despite the claims by most of them that it was an important language. This study also did not go into enough detail about either Inuit culture or mainstream Canadian culture to determine to what extent the two overlap, although from the descriptions of some of the language socialization behaviours examined in the in-depth portraits, it appears that they do have some significant differences. In terms of benefits gained only through knowledge of a majority language, it is necessary for most jobs and for communication with people in southern Canada, including the provincial and federal governments, to know English and/or French. It is difficult to determine, using these criteria and the data from the present study, whether Inuktitut is in a good position to be maintained. There seem to be features both in favour of and against maintenance of Inuktitut in Kuujjuaq.

The status of Inuktitut

The main feature which Mother 1 and Mother 2 had in common was their predominant use of Inuktitut with their children. However, their reasons for speaking to their children in these ways were not the same.

Mother 1 made a conscious decision to speak to her daughter only in Inuktitut because she wanted her to know her native language and culture and be proud to be Inuk. Mother 1 wanted her child to become a more proficient and confident speaker of Inuktitut than she herself was. This parent felt that she had lost her language when she was young, had to relearn it, and consequently, felt unsure of herself in Inuktitut at the time of the study. Mother 2, on the other hand, spoke Inuktitut with her child because it was her only native language, so it came naturally. She made no conscious decisions about which language to use.

These two bilingual families are somewhat unlike those documented by Pye (1992) and Wong Fillmore (1991, 1996), where bilingualism in homes led to the loss of the minority language. In the case of the children from Family 1 and Family 2, the Inuktitut language appears to be stronger than might have been expected from Pye and Wong Fillmore's work. Nevertheless, many of the 11 parents interviewed felt Inuktitut was deteriorating in Kuujjuaq. It is this fear of language loss in Kuujjuaq that seems to be driving a small number of parents to promote the revival and maintenance of Inuktitut in their homes, leading to a reversal of its previous pattern of erosion. However, if Family 1 is representative of other homes, it does not appear that the same recognition of loss for language socialization patterns is occurring. As a result, such communicative interactional patterns may be disappearing in Kuujjuaq. It is difficult to determine, though, whether the loss of traditional Inuit language socialization patterns is simply part of the process of natural evolution or whether it is being caused by the dominance of mainstream Canadian culture. It is likely to be a little of both. It is also unclear whether Inuit residents are aware of the loss of traditional language socialization patterns but are unconcerned, not considering them to be core elements of their culture or equally as important to save as their native language.

The attempt to maintain Inuktitut and Inuit culture in bicultural homes, as revealed in the interviews and observations, is generally driven by Inuit mothers. White middle-class fathers tend to impose their own languages and cultures on their partners and families. For example, in the data of the present study it was always the case that Inuit and mixed-heritage mothers used English or French with their Qallunaat partners and no Qallunaat men had learned or were in the process of actively learning more than a modicum of Inuktitut. The men frequently do not actively attempt to preserve Inuktitut and Inuit culture, although many fathers voice their concern over the danger of losing them. Instead, they tend to either hinder the advancement of the Inuit ways or sit back and let them take their course, expecting the mothers and the schools to be responsible for language maintenance. Given that the non-Inuit men often claim to be worried about the danger of Inuktitut disappearing, they are doing very little to prevent its loss by not promoting the use of Inuktitut in their homes and by not learning it themselves. A confounding factor in this study, however, is the gender differential. All Qallunaat parents in the interviews were men. It may be that Qallunaat women with Inuit partners would behave differently towards Inuit language and culture.

Language and Culture Syncretism: Blending and Dissociation

The present study contributes to theories of language socialization with regards to syncretism and dissociation. The families examined in this study provide evidence that cultures can be blended in the same person or home. At the same time, there are examples of dissociation of language and culture. The degree to which each of these phenomena takes place may vary across homes, but a common thread throughout the blending and dissociation of languages and cultures is the presence of mainstream Canadian ways.

Blending and syncretism

Family 1

Both Mother 1 and Father 1 tended to use more white middle-class language socialization patterns than Inuit patterns, but they used Inuktitut while performing them. In terms of syncretism, this was a blending of the language from one culture with the language socialization features of the other. In comparison, the Samoan American family described by Duranti & Ochs (1996) blended its Samoan culture with the surrounding white middle-class culture, often using items traditionally used in one way in one culture in new ways to accommodate the other culture. The findings of the present study lend support to the claim of Duranti & Ochs that language is not a precise indicator of cultural orientation, as evidenced in the interviews conducted in Kuujjuaq. The in-depth portrait of Family 1 provides an example of Duranti & Ochs' claims that members of multicultural communities blend cultures and one language may be used in the traditional learning environment of another culture, at least with respect to language use and language socialization practices.

Family 2

Although Mother 2 used predominantly traditional Inuit language socialization patterns and Inuktitut, she was fluent in English and used it with her partner. She seems to represent a point between the two cultures of Inuit and white middle-class, in that she was unicultural with her children, acting similarly to traditional Inuit mothers in her methods of parenting, yet lived comfortably in a bilingual/bicultural home, switching to her partner's language when speaking with him and accepting of his southern Canadian ways. It is this tolerance and inclusion of her English-Canadian partner and his mainstream Canadian practices and language in her home that makes her home different from more traditional, unicultural Inuit homes. Although she did not tend to blend the two cultures in her own behaviours, both were present in the life of her home and her children were being raised with both, which she did not discourage. Indeed, she

accepted them as being different but of equal value. She accommodated her partner by using his language and ways when interacting with him and helping Child 2 respond appropriately to his father's white middle-class language socialization behaviours.

Dissociation between Inuktitut and Inuit Cultural Patterns of Communication

Previous studies of language socialization in unicultural environments (Bornstein, et al., 1992; Clancy, 1986; Crago, 1988; Demuth, 1986; Eisenberg, 1986; Hough-Eyamie, et al., in press; Miller, 1986; Ochs, 1988; Rogoff, et al., 1993; Schieffelin, 1990; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986) showed that language and culture were strongly associated in individual cultures. However, this study adds to this theory by supporting the recent notions of Duranti & Ochs (1996) that language and culture are dissociable as well as blendable.

Mother 1 used more Inuktitut in her daily life and with her child than her own mother did, according to family members and acquaintances. However, in the language socialization findings there appears to have been a dissociation of language and culture over one generation in this family. Mother 1 was raised with both Inuit and white middle-class cultures associated with their respective languages of Inuktitut and English in her home. In the present study, she had dissociated Inuktitut from Inuit language socialization patterns and English from white middle-class language socialization patterns (e.g., spoke Inuktitut with her daughter while involved in literacy activities). A similar dissociation did not exist to such an extent for Mother 2. A reason for this preservation of the association of the Inuktitut language with the Inuit culture may have been due to the healthy existence of the two in a more remote community like Quaqtaq.

The Future

What does the future hold for the integrity of Inuktitut and Inuit culture? The outlook is positive in some respects, although guardedly so.

The loss of aboriginal languages and cultures has frequently been documented and is often assumed to be inevitable, yet the data in the present research seems to point towards the possibility of survival of Inuktitut in the isolated community of Quaqtaq and its revival in Kuujjuaq. If Mother 1 is an example of how present-day children in bilingual/bicultural homes will feel about Inuktitut as adults, the chance of preserving this language is good. From her example, it appears that languages can be revived and/or maintained through conscious decision-making on the part of individuals to do so and through the influence of the community towards this end. Unfortunately, a similar effort is not being carried out among all parents.

The maintenance of traditional Inuit language socialization practices does not appear to be recognized as a priority for any of the interviewed parents. People tend to overlook language socialization practices because they are perhaps a less obvious part of everyday life, being simply part of the overall way a person unconsciously behaves and are thus not easily recognizable. Language, on the other hand, is a highly identifiable entity. It may be the case that, as with Inuktitut, if the threat of loss of traditional language socialization patterns is brought to the attention of the Inuit, conscious attempts to revive them may be made by certain families and promoted in the communities, especially in Kuujjuaq. This could result in the reversal of their degeneration. On the other hand, it could also be the case that Inuit residents are aware of the loss of traditional language socialization behaviours but do not consider them vital. The loss of language and culture is not inevitable after all, but their preservation requires effort by all family members (Crago, Chen, Genesee, & Allen, in press).

Research Directions

A logical extension of the present study would be the continuing examination of the two bilingual families featured in the in-depth portraits. Ongoing longitudinal studies of bilingual children are needed to document

the effects of going to school and entering the community at large. Such a study would allow researchers to track their patterns of language and culture maintenance and loss over time and circumstances. Once these children reach adulthood, it would be interesting to compare their language use, beliefs, and socialization practices to those of Mother 1, a woman who grew up in a home similar to theirs but one generation earlier. Finally, such studies would provide the opportunity to observe any changes in interactional patterns and relationships between language and culture over time.

In addition to continuing to work with Family 1 and Family 2, it would be beneficial to conduct similar studies with other families in the North, particularly with other bilingual/bicultural families, which are increasingly common. This would enhance the findings of this study by providing for more generalization or revealing additional contextual factors. Since this research highlighted the existence of variation across bilingual families, it would be useful to study several families and determine where the largest differences and similarities lie. It would be valuable to study families in various communities to determine more clearly the effects of particular communities' influence on language practices. Finally, it would be beneficial to study the language attitudes and behaviours in families in which the mother is Qallunak and the father is Inuk. This would help clarify whether the attitudes and lack of effort to preserve Inuktitut and Inuit ways on the part of the Qallunaat fathers in the present study is a feature of Qallunaat people in general or just Qallunaat men.

Further studies of bilingual/bicultural families would allow one to examine the variations and similarities across them with respect to the relationships between the languages and cultures present in each home. For example, in some families, there may predominantly be elements from only one culture, while in other families there may be features of two or more. At the same time, families in either case may use one or two languages. In those families in which there are two cultures there may be

a blending of cultures, the two cultures may coexist side-by-side without interference of one on the other, or there may be conflict between the two cultures to the extent that one may dominate over the other. However, it is likely that the relationship between the two cultures rarely stays the same and that culture is not a "static" concept, but rather, for example, moves from being blended at one time to being in conflict at another.

Clinical and Educational Ramifications

Although this thesis did not address the clinical and educational ramifications stemming from this research, it did nevertheless generate information that is relevant to educators and speech-language pathologists. The overriding message is that since bilingual and, indeed, unilingual families are not all alike, it is important for speech-language pathologists and educators to be aware of the specific home patterns of diverse associations between language and culture. Without the recognition, understanding, and adaptation of materials and intervention strategies to suit the communication styles of individual children or communities, intervention risks being ineffective and counterproductive. Incompatible styles and expectations of communication often lead to misunderstandings and negative feelings. In the field of speech-language pathology, these issues are increasingly addressed with the realization that widely available norms and speech-language pathology intervention and assessment procedures are often not applicable (Van Kleeck, 1994). There is a growing awareness of the social and cultural context of communication disorders and the need to modify services to take these into account for each client (Adler, 1990; Adler, 1991; Cheng, 1996; Kayser, 1996; Perozzi & Sanchez, 1992; Quinn, Goldstein, & Peña, 1996; Robinson-Zañarta, 1996; Roseberry-McKibbin & Eicholtz, 1994; Schiff-Myers, 1992; Stockman, 1996; Taylor, 1986; Terrell, Arensberg, & Rosa, 1992; Washington & Craig, 1992).

It is also important to realize that simply because a community is predominantly made up of members of a particular heritage, it is not

necessarily the case that the people want to use the traditional interactional patterns and languages of that culture. In some instances they may prefer to use the dominant culture's communication styles. Hence, one needs to consider community and family expectations, life goals, and wishes with respect to communication patterns before proposing educational or communication models. Again, if such models do not match the needs of the people being served, they may not be entirely successful. It is never clear which communication styles a community favours until one goes into the community and, logically, communicates.

It is therefore important for researchers, educators, and clinicians to describe each bilingual person or family when discussing their cases with other professionals in order to understand in exactly what way they are bilingual.

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

Final Connections

This study was not about me. The purpose of this thesis was not to shed light on my own bilingual/bicultural situation, nor was I looking for answers to questions about my own future. However, since I began this thesis by situating it in my personal history, it seems appropriate to end it by divulging where I am now that my part in this research is over.

During the literature review, there were no studies which struck me as describing the home and community situation in which I was raised. Perhaps it was due to the lack of research conducted in individual homes. More likely, it was due to the paucity of input from the participants in the bilingual studies. It is important to document systematically the events and interactions that take place and make comparisons to other homes and situations. However, to someone surrounded by two cultures and two languages, what really matters is how it feels to live in and between two worlds. It would mean more to me for researchers to understand the motivation behind my behaviours and how the findings about myself make

me feel. It is easy to look at language use and practices in isolation, but more meaningful to do so from the point of view of the people involved. How I feel about myself and where I come from determine my language and cultural behaviours. Without me, they do not exist.

My goal in this study was to present the families the way I would want to be presented, without trivializing them, but telling their stories in their own words. Conducting this research has made me think about my own situation and examine my own language and cultural practices more closely. I have found myself, at times, comparing my language behaviours to those of other North American-born Chinese. I feel a strong connection between myself and Mother 1. I can see her determination to maintain her Inuit heritage in my own decisions to try to ensure my future children know more about their Chinese heritage than I do. Perhaps, this is a common thread across second generation immigrants and today's aboriginal North Americans. I only know that I want my children to have a strong sense of belonging to a culture, even if it is a new "culture" comprised of a blend of several, so that they will not have to exist in "the void," for that has been a very lonely place in my life.

I now walk away from this thesis, but the people, their lives, and their influence on my own beliefs about myself walk with me.

REFERENCES

Adler, S. (1990). Multicultural clients: Implications for the SLP. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 21(3), 135-139.

Adler, S. (1991). Assessment of language proficiency of limited English proficient speakers: Implications for the speech-language specialist. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 22(2), 12-18.

Beaulieu, D. (1983). Les inuit du Nouveau Québec: Leur milieu socio-économique [Inuit of Arctic Québec: Their socio-economic milieu]. Québec: La Direction des Communications du Ministère des Institutions Financières et Coopératives.

Bornstein, M. H., Tal, J., Rahn, C., Galperín, C. Z., Pêcheux, M., Lamour, M., Toda, S., Azuma, H., Ogino, M., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1992). Functional analysis of the contents of maternal speech to infants of 5 and 13 months in four cultures: Argentina, France, Japan, and the United States. Developmental Psychology, 28(4), 593-603.

Brown, R. (1973). A first language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cheng, L. L. (1996). Enhancing communication: Toward optimal language learning for limited English proficient students. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 27(4), 347-354.

Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 213-250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Condon, R. G. (1987). Inuit youth. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Crago, M. B. (1988). Cultural context in the communicative interaction of young Inuit children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montréal, Canada.

Crago, M. B., Allen, S. E. M., & Pesco, D. (1997, April). Issues of complexity in Inuktitut and English child directed speech. Paper presented at the 29th annual Stanford Child Language Forum, Stanford, CA.

Crago, M. B., Annahatak, B., & Ningiuruvik, L. (1993). Changing patterns of language socialization in Inuit homes. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 24(3), 205-223.

Crago, M. B., Chen, C., Genesee, F., & Allen, S. E. M. (in press). Power and deference: Bilingual decision making in Inuit homes. Journal of Just and Caring Education.

Crago, M., & Genesee, F. (1996, March). Who speaks what language and why?: Language use of families in an Inuit community. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Chicago, IL.

De Houwer, A. (1990). The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study. New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Demuth, K. (1986). Prompting routines in the language socialization of Basotho children. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 51-79). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Dopke, S. (1992). One parent one language. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Dorais, L. J. (1986). Inuktitut surface phonology: A trans-dialectal survey. International Journal of American Linguistics, 52(1), 20-53.

Dorais, L. J. (1992). Les langues autochtones d'hier à aujourd'hui [Native languages from yesterday to today]. In J. Morais (Ed.), Les langues autochtones de Québec (pp. 63-113). Québec, QC: Les Publications de Québec.

Dorais, L. J. (1996). La parole Inuit [Inuit speech]. Paris, France: Peeters.

Duranti, A., & Ochs, E. (1996). Syncretic literacy: Multiculturalism in Samoan American families (Tech. Rep. No. 16). Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Eisenberg, A. R. (1986). Teasing: Verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 182-198). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Foster, M. (1982). Indigenous languages: Present and future. Language and Society, 7, 7-14.

Genesee, F. (1989). Early bilingual development: One language or two? Journal of Child Language, 16, 161-179.

Genesee, F. (1995). Language and cultural diversity in education. Unpublished manuscript.

Genesee, F., Boivin, I., & Nicoladis, E. (1995). Talking with strangers: a study of bilingual children's communicative competence. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., & Paradis, J. (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. Journal of Child Language, 22, 611-631.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Goodz, N. (1989). Parental language mixing in bilingual families. Infant Mental Health Journal, 10(1), 25-44.

Government of Québec. (1984). The Inuit. In Native peoples of Quebec (pp. 145-171). Québec: Author.

Hall, L. W., Jr. (1973). Great Whale River Eskimo youth: Socialization into northern townlife. Anthropologica, 15(1), 3-19.

Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Heath, S. B. (1986). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 97-126). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Hough-Eyamie, W. P., Pan, B. A., Crago, M. B., & Snow, C. E. (1996). A cross-cultural comparison of communicative intents expressed by Inuit and American caregivers. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Jarovinskij, A. (1995). On bilingual socialization. In K. E. Nelson & Z. Reger (Eds.), Children's language: Vol. 8 (pp. 23-39). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kativik Regional Development Council. (1986). Orientations in regional economic development for the Kativik region. Kuujjuaq, QC: Author.

Kayser, H. (1996). Cultural/linguistic variation in the United States and its implications for assessment and intervention in speech-language

pathology: An epilogue. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 27(4), 385-387.

Kulick, D. (1993). Growing up monolingual in a multilingual community: How language socialization patterns are leading to language shift in Gapun (Papua New Guinea). In K. Hyltenstam & Å. Viberg (Eds.), Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neuropsychological, and Linguistic Perspectives (pp. 94-121). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Lachance, D. (1979). Les inuit du Québec [The Inuit of Québec]. In Perspectives anthropologiques (pp. 289-303). Montréal, QC: Éditions du Renouveau pédagogique.

Lieven, E. V. M. (1994). Crosslinguistic and crosscultural aspects of language addressed to children. In C. Gallaway & B. Richards (Eds.), Input and Interaction in Language Acquisition (pp. 56-73). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

MacWhinney, B. (1995). The CHILDES project. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McAlpine, L., Eriks-Brophy, A., & Crago, M. (1996). Teaching beliefs in Mohawk classrooms: Issues of language and culture. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 27(3), 390-413.

Miller, P. (1986). Teasing as language socialization and verbal play in a white working-class community. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 199-212). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Nicoladis, E., & Genesee, F. (1995). A longitudinal study of pragmatic differentiation in young bilingual children. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Obondo, M. A. (1996). From trilinguals to bilinguals? Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm University.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 1-16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Ochs, E. (1988). Culture and language development. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. Schweder & R. LeVine

(Eds.), Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion (pp. 276-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Ornstein, T. E. (1973). The first people of Quebec. Montréal, QC: Native North American Studies Institute.

Pandharipande, R. (1992). Language shift in India: Issues and implications. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, & S. Kroon (Eds.), Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages (pp. 253-275). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Perozzi, J. A., & Sanchez, M. L. C. (1992). The effect of instruction in L1 on receptive acquisition of L2 for bilingual children with language delay. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 23(4), 348-352.

Peters, A. M., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language Socialization across Cultures (pp. 80-96). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Priest, G. E. (1985). Aboriginal languages in Canada. Language and Society, 15, 13-19.

Pye, C. (1992). Language loss among the Chilcotin. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 93, 75-86.

Quinn, R., Goldstein, B., & Peña, E. D. (1996). Cultural/linguistic variation in the United States and its implications for assessment and intervention in speech-language pathology: An introduction. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 27(4), 345-346.

Robinson-Zañarta, C. (1996). Serving Native American children and families: Considering cultural variables. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 27(4), 373-384.

Rogoff, B., Mistry, J., Göncü, A., & Mosier, C. (1993). Guided participation in cultural activity by toddlers and caregivers (Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development Serial No. 236, Vol. 58, No. 8). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.

Rogoff, B., & Toma, C. (in press). Shared thinking: Community and institutional variations. Discourse Processes.

Roseberry-McKibbin, C. A., & Eicholtz, G. E. (1994). Serving children with limited English proficiency in the schools: A national survey.

Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 25(3), 156-164.

Rouland, N. (1979). Les inuit du Nouveau Québec et la convention de la baie James [Inuit of Arctic Québec and the James Bay convention]. Québec: Association Inuksiutiit Katimajiit et Centre d'Études Nordiques.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). The give and take of everyday life. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Code switching and language socialization: Some probable relationships. In J. F. Duchan, L. E. Hewitt, & R. M. Sonnenmeier (Eds.), Pragmatics (pp. 20-42). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Eisenberg, A. R. (1984). Cultural variation in children's conversations. In R. L. Schiefelbusch & J. Pickar (Eds.), The Acquisition of Communicative Competence (pp. 377-422). Baltimore, MD: University Park.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization across cultures. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Schiff-Myers, N. B. (1992). Considering arrested language development and language loss in the assessment of second language learners. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 23(1), 28-33.

Smolica, J. J. (1992). Minority languages as core values of ethnic cultures – A study of maintenance and erosion of Polish, Welsh, and Chinese languages in Australia. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, & S. Kroon (Eds.), Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages (pp. 277-305). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Stockman, I. J. (1996). The promises and pitfalls of language sample analysis as an assessment tool for linguistic minority children. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 27(4), 355-366.

Taylor, D. M. (1990). Façonner une nouvelle identité inuit: Le rôle de la language dans l'éducation des enfants inuit du Nord québécois [Shaping a new Inuit identity: The role of language in the education of Inuit children in the Québec North]. Dorval, QC: Commission scolaire Kativik.

Taylor, D. M., & Wright, S. C. (1989). Language attitudes in a multilingual northern community. The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, IX(1), 85-119.

Taylor, O. L. (1986). Treatment of communication disorders in culturally and linguistically diverse populations. San Diego, CA: College-Hill.

Terrell, S. L., Arensberg, K., & Rosa, M. (1992). Parent-child comparative analysis: A criterion-referenced method for the nondiscriminatory assessment of a child who spoke a relatively uncommon dialect of English. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 23(1), 34-42.

van Kleeck, A. (1994, January). Potential cultural bias in training parents as conversational partners with their children who have delays in language development. American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 67-78.

Vasquez, O. A., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. M. (1994). Pushing boundaries. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Washington, J. A., & Craig, H. K. (1992). Performances of low-income, African-American preschool and kindergarten children on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – Revised. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 23(4), 329-333.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1986). Calling-out and repeating routines in Kwara'ae children's language socialization. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language socialization across cultures (pp. 17-50). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Wolcott, H. F. (1995). The art of fieldwork. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing a first. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6, 323-346.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1996). What happens when languages are lost? An essay on language assimilation and cultural identity. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, J. Guo (Eds.), Social interaction, social context, and language (pp. 435-446). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Macarthur, J. (1997). Subtractive bilingualism and the survival of the Inuit language: Heritage versus second language education. Manuscript submitted for publication.

APPENDIX A

Young Children's Language Study Family Interview

Interviewer _____

Date of Interview _____

People present at interview _____

_____

Research child's name _____ DOB _____

Grade 3 Child _____ DOB _____

Grade 5 Child _____ DOB _____

Person interviewed _____ Relationship to child _____

Section 1: Parental Information

1. Parents' Name, Age, Ethnicity, and Marital Status

Mother:	Father:
Name _____	Name _____
Age _____	Age _____
Ethnicity _____	Ethnicity _____
Marital Status _____	Marital Status _____
Job _____	Job _____

2. Parents' Living Situation

Mother: Father:

In this community:

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 yrs. _____

all life _____

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 years _____

all life _____

In another northern community:

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 yrs. _____

all life _____

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 years _____

all life _____

In southern Canada:

never lived South _____

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 yrs. _____

all life _____

never lived South _____

less than 2 yrs. _____

2 – 5 yrs. _____

5 – 10 yrs. _____

more than 10 years _____

all life _____

3. What language(s) did the parents learn when they were at home before school?

Mother: Father:

from mother?

from father?

from grandparents?

from others?

4. What language did you use in school? (by grade)

Mother:				Father:		
I	E	F	Kind	I	E	F
I	E	F	1	I	E	F
I	E	F	2	I	E	F
I	E	F	3	I	E	F
I	E	F	4	I	E	F
I	E	F	5	I	E	F
I	E	F	6	I	E	F
I	E	F	7	I	E	F
I	E	F	Sec. 1 (8)	I	E	F
I	E	F	Sec. 2 (9)	I	E	F
I	E	F	Sec. 3 (10)	I	E	F
I	E	F	Sec. 4 (11)	I	E	F
I	E	F	Sec. 5 (12)	I	E	F
	E	F	CEGEP 1		E	F
	E	F	CEGEP 2		E	F

E F Univ/other E F

5. Parents' Language Proficiency

Mother: Father:

INUKTITUT

	very good		poor	very good		poor
speaking:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
understanding:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
reading:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
writing:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

ENGLISH

speaking:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
understanding:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
reading:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
writing:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

FRENCH

speaking:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
understanding:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
reading:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
writing:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Section 2: Language use in the home

6. What language(s) do the parents use with each other?

Mother ⟶ Father =

Father ⟶ Mother =

7. How many children live in the home?

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

8. What language do the parents use with their children?

Child (name) _____

	Mother: always		rarely	Father: always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Child (name) ______________________

Mother:				Father:		
	always		rarely	always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Child (name) ______________________

Mother:				Father:		
	always		rarely	always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Child (name) ______________________

Mother:				Father:		
	always		rarely	always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

Child (name) ______________________

Mother: Father:

	always		rarely	always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(1)

9. **(BIL)** Can you give examples of circumstances in which you use each of these languages?

   Inuktitut:

   English:

   French:

10. **(BIL)** Do you ever mix languages (please give some examples of mixes)?

11. **(BIL)** Are there differences in the ways you do things in Inuktitut, French, and English with your child (such as expressing affection, discipline, teaching new skills)?

   (Interviewer to probe differences in raising children in Inuktitut and English)

12. **(BIL)** Have you made any conscious decisions about how or when to use English, French, and Inuktitut in your home with (RESEARCH CHILD'S NAME)?

   What are they?

Why did you decide to use the languages in this way?

If your child uses the language you do not expect, what do you do?

13. How much time do the following family members spend with (RESEARCH, GRADE 3, GRADE 5 CHILD'S NAME) in a week? Please specify the circumstances.

Maternal relatives

	Time	Circumstances
Mother	_____	_____
Grandmother	_____	_____
Grandfather	_____	_____
Aunts	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Uncles	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Cousins	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Paternal relatives

	Time	Circumstances
Mother	_____	_____
Grandmother	_____	_____
Grandfather	_____	_____
Aunts	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Uncles	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Cousins	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Other relatives

Brothers/sisters	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
Others	_____	_____
	_____	_____

14. What language(s) is/are spoken between (RESEARCH CHILD) and the following people?

Maternal relatives

	Other → Child			Child → Other		
	I	E	F	I	E	F
Mother	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Grandmother	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Grandfather	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Aunts	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Uncles	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Cousins	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1

Paternal relatives

	Other → Child			Child → Other		
	I	E	F	I	E	F
Father	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Grandmother	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Grandfather	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Aunts	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
Uncles	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1
	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1	3 2 1

Cousins	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1
	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1

Other relatives

	Other → Child	Child → Other
	I E F	I E F
Sibling	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1
Sibling	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1
Other	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1
Other	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1	3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1

15. What language(s) do your children generally speak to each other? Are there any particular circumstances in which a particular languages is used? Give examples.

16. **(BIL)** Have you asked other family members to use a particular language (or particular languages) with (RESEARCH CHILD'S NAME)?

    Which family members and which language(s)?

    Why did you ask them to use this language (these language)?

17. Do you think that the ways you use the following languages in your home will guarantee that (RESEARCH CHILD) will speak and

understand them fluently when he/she goes to kindergarten?

Inuktitut:

English:

French:

18. Do you think that the ways you used the following languages in your home will guarantee that (RESEARCH CHILD) will speak, understand, read, and write them fluently when he/she leaves home as an adult?

Inuktitut:

English:

French:

19. How do you think children learn Inuktitut, English, and/or French? What role do you think you play in your children's language learning?

20. **(BIL)** Are there any difficulties that you have found in using two languages in your home? If so, what are they?

21. **(BIL)** Are there cultural differences in child rearing between you and your spouse that you are aware of? What are they? Please explain.

22. When do you or someone in your house turn the TV on _____ and off _____ each day?

How many TVs does your family have?

What programs (or videos) do you watch regularly?

What programs (or videos) do your children watch regularly?

Do you watch Inuktitut TV?

Do your children watch Inuktitut TV?

23. When do you or someone in your house turn the FM community radio on _____ and off _____ each day?

Do your children regularly listen to FM radio?

24. Does your child go to daycare? How often?

If yes, what language(s) are spoken in the daycare?

	always		rarely
Inuktitut:	(3)	(2)	(1)
English:	(3)	(2)	(1)
French:	(3)	(2)	(1)

Section 3: School and community language issues

25. **(GRADE 3/5)** Do you have any concerns about how (GRADE 3 child's name) learning language and/or about (GRADE 5 child's name) language learning?

26. **(GRADE 3/5)** Are there difficulties for your children in using two

languages at school? If so, what are they?

27. How much responsibility does the school have in teaching the following languages?

    Inuktitut:

    English:

    French:

28. How important is Inuktitut in your community? In what ways is it important?

    How important is English? In what ways?

    How important is French? In what ways?

    Which is the most important – French, English, or Inuktitut? Why?

29. If you or your child could speak only one language, which would you choose? Inuktitut, English, or French? Why?

30. How important is it to speak Inuktitut in order to be Inuk?

    Can you be Inuk if you do not speak Inuktitut?

    Will your children be less Inuk if they cannot speak Inuktitut fluently?

    Or, if they do not use Inuktitut all the time?

31. Do you think there will be a time when no one will speak Inuktitut?

32. What language do you think people should use in daycare? Why?

33. What language(s) do you think should be used in preschool? Why?

34. Do you have any other thoughts about how children learn languages in your home, school, or community?

APPENDIX B

Clarification Questions for Parents in Family 2

1. With whom does [Child 2] play the most?
2. With whom does [Child 2] talk the most?
3. Does [Child 2] ever play with other children who speak English?
4. **(MOTHER 2)** Is [Father 2] like other Qallunaat men?
   a) If no, in what ways is he different?
   b) Has he changed since you met him in terms of adopting more Inuit ways?
   c) Does he ever turn off the FM radio while you're listening to it?
5. **(MOTHER 2)** Does [Child 2] act like other Inuit children his age?
   a) Does he do anything more like Qallunaat children?
6. Does [Child 2] speak like other Inuit children his age?
   a) Does his Inuktitut sound like your other children's was at his age?
   b) If no, in what ways is it different?
7. **(FATHER 2)** Is [Child 2's] English the way you expected it would be?
8. Do you think [Child 2] is stronger in Inuktitut than English or vice versa?
9. Do you think [Child 2] talks differently with you than with your partner?
   a) If yes, in what ways?
      i) Why do you think that is?
10. Do you find any difficulties having two languages in your home?
    a) Do you think your children do?

11. Do you think you are raising your children the way your parents raised you?
    a) In what ways are you different?
    b) If no, did you choose to do it differently? Why?
12. Do you think your way of raising children is different from that of your partner?
    a) If yes, in what ways?
    b) Has your partner adopted any of your ways of child-rearing?
    c) Have you adopted any of your partner's ways of child-rearing?
    d) Have you ever had difficulties due to different beliefs about child-rearing?
        i) If yes, were you able to overcome them? How?
13. Are there differences between you and your partner in disciplining your children?
    a) If yes, what are they?
    b) Are there differences between you and other parents in Quaqtaq?
    c) Are there differences between you/your generation and your parents?
        i) If yes, why do you think they've changed?
14. **(MOTHER 2)** Do you think you're raising your children the way other Inuit mother your age are?
    a) In what ways are you the same?
    b) In what ways are you different?

15. **(MOTHER 2)** Do you think your ways of raising children or talking to them has changed as a result of Qallunaat ways coming into the North?
    a) If yes, in what ways?
        i) Why do you think that is?
16. **(FATHER 2)** Do you think [Mother 2] is like other Inuit women her age?
    a) In what ways is she the same?
    b) In what ways is she different?
17. Do you read children's books with [Child 2]?
    a) Does your partner?
18. Does [Child 2] look at children's books?
18. **(FATHER 2)** What does "shneeshnee" mean?
19. **(VIDEOTAPE CLIPS)** Is this how your partner typically acts with [Child 2]?
    a) If no, how is s/he usually different?
20. **(VIDEOTAPE CLIPS)** Is this how you typically act with [Child 2]?
    a) If no, how are you usually different?
21. **(VIDEOTAPE CLIPS)** Is this how [Child 2] typically acts?
    a) If no, how is he usually different?

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

150mm

6″

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989