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1 Introduction

A recent survey of educators affiliated with Washington State public schools with a substantial population of Indigenous students inquired about Indigenous language education. The survey found that a lack of demand was a primary reason put forth as to why a school did not offer an indigenous language (Hugo, 2010). Demand can come from a larger out-group or from institutional support (e.g., grants and state wide funding), or from a more local level (§Theoretical Framework). Both language awareness and language attitudes can inform the level of demand. There has been ample research on the language attitudes toward Indigenous languages held by in-group members (e.g., Barrett, 2006; Dorian, 1987; Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hornberger, 1998; Purdie, Oliver, Collard & Rochecouste, 2002) as well as those held by out-group members in general (e.g., García, 2005; Hugo, 2010). However, similar attention has not been given to the non-indigenous communities immediately neighboring various Indigenous Nations and communities. As the many Indigenous languages that used to be spoken within the borders of Washington state are currently highly endangered and most are geographically isolated the focus on language specific demand should likely be local. To better understand the factors behind levels of demand for indigenous language education, attention needs to be placed on the neighboring non-indigenous community members who often share the public schools with the indigenous community and thus have a stake in the demand equation.

This paper describes an empirical investigation of language awareness and attitudes held by non-indigenous people who reside in a community immediately neighboring an Indigenous Nation reservation in North America. For this study, interviews were conducted in the town of Oakville, which is located in the southwest of Washington State and has a population totaling less than 700 people (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2013a), as well as the city of Marysville, which is located in the northwest of Washington state and has a population totaling approximately 60,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2013b). Oakville is much more economically and geographically isolated than Marysville. All of the local schools reside within the town boundaries of Oakville, and they are also the main schools for the local Indigenous population. More than 35% of the student population are Indigenous and 82% of the total student population comes from low income families (About Our School District, 2015). Marysville on the other hand, has some schools on Nation land, but the public schools in Marysville proper have both Indigenous and non-indigenous students, although to a lower proportion than Oakville. In Marysville, 6% of the students (totaling more than 11,000) are Indigenous (Our District, 2015). The study seeks to discover what kinds of attitudes exist regarding the teaching of indigenous languages and other non-English languages, in addition to the level of awareness and interest in the local indigenous language and culture. Using a qualitative research interview methodology informed by a postmodern perspective (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009), three one-on-one interviews and one group interview with five participants were conducted. The Qualitative Interviewing Instrument with an Adjustable Scale (QIIAS)\textsuperscript{1} was developed as a means to mediate thought and discussion on the subject during the interview. For the task they were asked to sort cards labeled with names of academic subjects organizing them according to how prioritized they believed they should be in the public education system. The final card organizations for each participant were converted into a Likert-like scale for cross comparisons.

An analysis of the data highlighted attitudes that prioritized English over all other subjects and primarily appealed to prescriptivist and assimilationist notions. Data related to other languages showed that they were valued only in situations where there was a large degree of speaker-contact and at least moderate local economic status. While there is contact between the participants and the

\textsuperscript{1} https://depts.washington.edu/qiias/
local indigenous population, no data reported any substantial linguistic exposure to the local language, and any awareness of the local language was low. Although the participants expressed nearly universal support for the teaching of U.S. history and, to a lesser degree, world history, participants often constructed complicated and contradictory discourses with respect to the teaching of the local culture and history. There was a theme in the data concerning a cultural and political divide between the Indigenous and non-indigenous in the local schools, both students and parents. This divide was seen as a detriment to the educational system and the well-being of all students. A few participants constructed a discourse whereby instruction on the local culture and history may be an opportunity to repair the gap.

2 Background

Theoretical Framework

This study utilizes the Giles et al. (1977) model of ethnolinguistic vitality, focusing especially on the status variable. The status variable encompasses factors related to prestige for an in-group speech community (e.g., in the case of this project, the Chehalis Tribe), as well as in other speech communities (out-groups). Kraemer, Olshtain, & Badier (1994) argue that (subjective) vitality perceptions may be linked to the status variable more than other variables. Links may exist between the perceived value of a language, its vitality and the vitality of its affiliated culture. Thus, this study is interested in learning about local attitudes towards and perceptions of non-English languages, in particular the indigenous language and its associated culture(s).

Giles et al. (1977) provide four factors which fall under the status variable: ascribed, sociohistorical, language, and economic status. Ascribed status comes from the linguistic in-group itself, which is only tangentially related to this study. Sociohistorical status is related to the historical salience of the language in question. If a language was the victim of official suppression, it can be used as a rallying point and promote solidarity. The status of the language itself can vary within different groups. While a language may have a high or low value in an in-group speech community, the opposite may often be the case for the out-groups. Economics are only one of the numerous challenges many minority linguistic communities face when attempting to revitalize or maintain their cultures and languages. However, the economic status of a language is an important factor (Lam, 2009; Tse, 2001), one that can have strong effects on linguistic vitality (Landry, Allard, & Deveau, 2007). The economic status of the language(s) in question is likely very low, although the associated tribes/nations are arguably some of the largest employers in their immediate area.

Research questions:

The research questions for this project build on the research and frameworks outlined above, especially the ethnolinguistic vitality framework (Giles et al., 1977) and its application to the situation of endangered languages (Sachdev, 1995). Related to the demography variable is an interest in beliefs about the number of speakers and the general linguistic vitality. For the status variable, there is the perceived economic value of the language, especially related to the local economy and academics. There is also the issue of institutional support and attitudes regarding school-based, community or wider governmental support which are held by the non-indigenous locals. Finally, Kraemer, Olshtain, & Badier (1994) suggest that there is a relationship between the perceived vitality of the culture and that of the language.

Again, this project employs a qualitative research interview methodology informed by a postmodern perspective, which guides each of the research questions. Kvale & Brinkman describe
Postmodern interviewing in the following manner: “There is openness to qualitative diversity, to the multiplicity of local meanings; knowledge is perspectival, dependent on the viewpoint and values of the investigator.” (p.52)² Diverse, locally-situated perspectives underpin each of this project’s four primary research questions:

1. What are the attitudes about indigenous languages and education held by people living near native communities who do not identify as members of a tribe?
2. Does living near an indigenous population or other language community affect language attitudes?
3. Does an expressed affinity for an associated language community relate to their language attitudes?
4. Where do indigenous language and history/culture classes exist in participants’ beliefs about educational priorities?

3 Methodology

For this project, participants were invited to explore their attitudes about education and the community during an interview. While there were a few standard questions on the interview protocol, the majority of the discussion was centered around an activity. At the beginning of each interview the participant was given a set of cards to sort, each labeled with the name of an academic subject. The process of organizing the cards and the review of the arrangement after the participant completed the task was the primary guide for the conversation. Following Kvale & Brinkman’s (2009:48) metaphor of the traveler the cards provided roads for the interviewer and participant to travel (to talk about and explore). There will be a further discussion of the card instrument later in this section.

The interview protocol closely followed the majority of the twelve aspects of qualitative research interviews provided by Kvale & Brinkman (2009:28). Of these the immediate and geographically-bound life world of the participants is strongly tied to all of the data (p.29). The study slightly extends beyond the aspect for “Qualitative”, as the methodology does have a minor quantitative focus as well. It also deviates from the aspect for “Specificity” because the subjects were asked about their beliefs regarding the prioritization of specific academic subjects in general.

This rest of this section will contain a brief discussion of some of the ethical concerns of the project followed by an explanation of the card-sorting instrument.

Ethics

This study was deemed exempt after being reviewed by the UW Human Subjects Division. While none of the participants expressed verbally any interest in remaining anonymous, some respondents were initially not very comfortable with being recorded. Some critical (& positive) statements were made about the local Indigenous community. As it is a sparsely populated area, certain personal identifiers (e.g., occupation, the exact location of the interviews) were omitted, pseudonyms were used, and only portions of the transcript are reprinted below. The interview was slightly manipulative (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009: 33) but attempts were made to make it as conversational as possible. Thus, the co-construction of the discourse is often highly apparent, especially if the posture adopted for the interviews is taken into account, which was friendly and non-combative, and has implications for the data (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009: 75).

² Also, it should be noted that the investigator is interested in local indigenous language revitalization as it has been their academic focus.
There may have been a power asymmetry for this study as the interviewer arguably had more education than the participants. An attempt was made to balance this by declaring the fact that the interviewer is only student in the conversation and on the poster. The interviewer was also both an outsider (i.e., lives elsewhere now) and an insider (i.e., grew up in the area) to the community. However, the interviewer attempted to position himself as someone who was partially ignorant of the current status of the area and especially ignorant of the local school system. Also, participants were given the option of being ‘debriefed’ about the interview after the process ended (Johnstone, 2000: 48-49).

**Instrument**

The interview began with the participants being given a short demonstration of the card sorting task. They were presented with a set of cards that were approximately 2.5” x 2.5” and stiffly laminated so they could be easily manipulated. Each card from the main deck was labeled with an academic subject (e.g., Math, Biology, Spanish, etc.). There were three blank cards that could be written on with a marker if a participant felt something should be a priority that was omitted from the main deck. There were two additional 1” x 12” cards placed on the flat surface. The first was labeled “higher priority” and the second “lower priority”. These cards were used as spatial references for the individual cards. The participants were instructed to place the cards in the order they believed the corresponding subject should be prioritized in schools. The cards with the academic subjects that should be prioritized more should be placed closer to the participant following to the corresponding guide card. Academic subjects that should be prioritized equally should be placed on a horizontal access of equal distance to the participants. A brief demonstration of the methodology was given followed by comprehension checks. None of the respondents expressed any difficulty or confusion with the instrument.

The academic subjects that were selected for the set of cards were commonly represented on a random sample of Washington State public schools and information from the state’s OSPI. A total of 16 subjects were provided on prelabeled cards with 3 optional blank cards. World History, U.S. History and (The local Indigenous Nation) History were provided to represent a spectrum of *locality* and *group affiliation*. Social Studies was included to prompt the participant to clarify the roll of history and cultural education as it was predicted that there would be some perceived overlap. Biology and Chemistry were included to represent the ‘hard’ sciences as well as to have a connection the local agricultural and logging-based economy. Both Home Economics and Physical Education were added as examples with no direct connection to employment or higher education, as opposed to Computer Science and Math. As language is the focus of the study, three non-English languages were represented. Spanish is the most widely offered language in state public schools (MELL, 2009a,b), but it has an arguably different economic status than that of the other two languages: Chinese and (The local Indigenous Language). Also, Spanish has a relatively high amount of speaker-contact for the communities in question, second only to the participants’ contact with the local indigenous population, but completely contrasted with Chinese, for which there is almost no potential for speaker contact in the areas. However, Chinese does have a high economic status being associated with one of the world’s leading economic powers. For the case of the Chehalis language, it was listed as “Chehalis Nation Language”. Even though the Tribe is not officially described as a nation, the term was used as a sign of respect for their sovereignty. The fact that the specific language names were not provided were to provide another cue for discussion and a check for participants’ awareness of the language in question. For example, with the Chehalis, it
was of interest whether a participant knew what the language spoken traditionally by the tribe, or confederation was, or if they thought it was another neighboring language like Chinook Jargon.³

**Motivation for use**

There were a few reasons why the *Qualitative Interviewing Instrument with an Adjustable Scale* (QIIAS)⁴ was developed for this project. The first reason was to provide an indirect prompt for the conversion. The cards encouraged the participant to think about each subject and their beliefs about it. It was possible to ask questions about a participant’s decisions for the ordering of the cards, instead of asking directly about their attitudes concerning indigenous language education, and thus limit any clues about the interests of the interviewer. The second reason the cards were used was as a means of gathering some more quantitative data about participants’ beliefs regarding academic priorities. In other words, if a participant said that teaching languages is important, how important is it in relation to other subjects? The project was interested in learning where the indigenous language and culture fell in each arrangement of a group of various academic subjects. This quantitative aspect will be explored later in the section titled *Quantitative comparisons* below. The final purpose was simply to test the methodology and see how participants responded to it and whether it was effective in meeting the goals of the project.

**Additional observations**

An additional utility of the instrument that became especially apparent during the interviews for this project was that the physical and manipulable aspect of the cards had a *mediational* (Swain, Kinnear, Steinman, 2011:2) function for the participants, beyond simply between themselves and the interviewer. Movement of the cards was integrated with the participants’ talk, such that the cards became a semiotic tool for participants used in constructing meaning during the interview. The participants played with the cards and spoke about them, often using private speech and other times speech directed at the interviewer. Many cards were moved to multiple locations before the participants declared they had settled on an arrangement. Some participants placed cards into sub-groups of higher and lower priorities before deciding on the relationships between individual cards. In addition to the temporary “holding areas” (sub groups) described above, some participants also deviated from the demonstrated structure and used the space in interesting ways. One participant moved a group of cards below the lower priority card, indicating that they should not be a priority of all. Another participant left a card-sized gap between some of the higher priority cards and a small group of lower priority cards, also telegraphing some strong beliefs regarding the subjects those cards represent. A different participant used different groupings on the same x-axis (i.e., no difference in priority) to express their beliefs about the connectedness of the grouped subjects.

**Quantitative comparisons**

As mentioned above, the instrument can be used to collect more quantitative data, similar to that which may be gleaned from a Likert scale. As opposed to most implementations of Likert scales, this instrument is non-static, has flexible and gradable scales and each token is arranged in space according to each other token in addition to the scale boundaries. The final organization can be given a numerical coding according to the position of each card along a vertical axis away from the participant. For example, if the furthest card from the participant is three cards away, with no

³ All three of these languages each have unique political associations that most participants commented on as well.
⁴ A video demonstration, calculator, and more information on QIIAS can be found here:
https://depts.washington.edu/qiias/
intentional card-length gaps, there would be three vertical slots. In this case the scale would range from 0-2 (or 1-3). The card(s) closest to the speaker would be equal to 2, the next closest card(s) would be 1, and the furthest card 0. The amount of vertical places used can be adjusted similar to a flexible Likert scale. The cards closest to and furthest away from the participant always function as the maximum and minimum value on the scale, respectively. The maximum value may be any number other than zero as long as the increments, the maximum value and the minimum value are kept consistent throughout the experiment. If the set maximum and minimum are 10 and 0, respectively, and one participant uses 6 vertical positions, while another uses 3, and another 5, the individual value of each position will vary but will reflect a relative space on the same scale. This provides the participant with the freedom to use a scale that can best account for their beliefs and still provides some continuity and compatibility for the data. An equation for calculating values for each position according to various card arrangements is provided below (Figure 1).

**Figure 1:** Equation for calculating the scale values of a card arrangement

\[
(x - 1) \left( \frac{y - 1}{n - 1} \right) + 1 = z
\]

- \(x\) = the vertical position
- \(y\) = the upper bound of the scale (e.g., 1-5 on a Likert scale or 1-10 for this study)
- \(n\) = the number of vertical positions
- \(z\) = the scale value of \(x\)

The interviews conducted for this project were not sufficient to provide any robust quantifiable results when analyzed as a group, but that is a goal for future research. Tables will be provided in the paper in order to highlight the participant’s individual orderings as well as illustrate some possible interpretations of the data. For this paper, the scale of prioritization is from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest priority). This leaves 0 for cards that are omitted or placed beyond the scale.

4 Data (Oakville)

Participants (Oakville)

Three participants were interviewed individually, and one simultaneous group interview was conducted with five participants. All participants were self-described as area locals and either had children currently attending local schools or their children had attended them sometime in the past. Each of the participants was given a pseudonym. Only one of the individual participants was contacted prior to the interview (Donna), the other two individual participants learned of the study by seeing the recruitment materials on location (Figure 2). After her interview and on her own behest and generosity, Donna contacted some other locals who then volunteered to be a part of the group interview at a different location.
Figure 2: Photo of recruitment materials and interview space (Oakville)

**Context**

The city of Oakville is located in Grays Harbor County, and is approximately a forty minute drive to the southwest of Olympia, the state capital (Figure 3). The estimated population of Oakville in 2012 was 676 people (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2013a).

Figure 3: The location of Oakville, WA

The neighboring Chehalis Reservation consists of 4,215 acres, which is considerably larger than Oakville’s 320 acres. The population of the reservation is comparable with that of Oakville with about 691 people residents, 56% of which were identified as being “Indian and Alaska Native Alone” (Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, 2010). The Chehalis People traditionally
spoke the Chehalis (Upper) language or Kwaiailk, which is part of the Coast Salish family. The language is classified by Ethnologue as dormant (9) (Lewis et al., 2013). For over a decade now there have been no native speakers of the language (Golla, 2007).

**Figure 4:** Map of the Chehalis Reservation (Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, 2010)

The city of Oakville was chosen for this study because it borders the reservation, and the bulk of the reservation land resides in the same county. Although the reservation is also near the city of Rochester\(^5\), which is of nearly equal distance away from the Chehalis Village as Oakville, the reservation has stronger connections historically with the town of Oakville. Because of the county boundaries, Oakville schools have been tied to the Chehalis Nation in many ways.

The individual interviews were conducted at the Oakville library on a Saturday afternoon. The main room of the library also functions as the local courthouse and city hall. The group interview was conducted at a local church that was having a fundraising rummage sale. The participants were all volunteers helping with the fundraising event.

**Group Interview**

The group interview consisted of five long-term residents of Oakville, all of who were over 50 years old: Margaret, Audrey, Sarah, Denise and Pete. Pete is associated with the local school in an advisory or administrative function, and Denise is his spouse. Margaret has lived in the area since the mid-1930s and Audrey has lived in the area since the 1970s. The others simply described themselves as long-term residents. Audrey has grandchildren which she described as Native American and some of them did attend Oakville’s schools in the past. Sarah is related to two “families” of Native Americans. Initially the interview began with Margaret sorting the cards on her own with the others watching, but after a few minutes all of them began to collaborate and discuss their ideas as a group. At that point, they were invited to complete the task together.

---

\(^5\) Rochester is immediately between Oakville and the nearest interstate highway (I-5) located to the east. As Rochester is the home of one of the participants who spends time and has connections to people in Oakville it will be briefly discussed later on.
**Figure 5:** Group Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Chehalis Nation Language(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>World History, Home Economics, Social Studies, Chehalis Nation History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Biology, Chemistry, Health, Physical Education, Computer Science, Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Science, U.S. History, English, Math, Trade School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foreign Languages**

446  SARAH: Do you think we need a foreign language? ((laughs))  
467  DIANE: ((Laughs))

\(^6\) While the usage of the word “Nation” to describe the Chehalis Tribe or the Chehalis Confederation is debatable, it was used for this project as a sign of respect of their political sovereignty and non-treaty status, and also because it is a term that is likely better understood than “confederation” (Chehalis Tribe 2009).
Foreign languages were the lowest rated of all of the subjects and this sentiment was echoed throughout the interview. Speaker contact was the primary factor used to value a language.

**Spanish**

While Spanish was the highest rated of the foreign languages it still had a very low status for the group. The main reasons for the slightly higher priority were speaker contact and a concern for Spanish speakers having a communicative advantage over them as opposed to any clearly expressed economic reasons.

34 MARGARET: U.S. History, you know? And… Spanish, I don’t care about that.

472 M: Well SPANISH. My Gosh were all be wa.. Speaking [Spanish do you know].
473 PETE: [You have to speak Spanish]. Yeah.

476 INTERVIEWER: Where would you put it. Where would you put Spanish. On this
478 M: I would, [throw it out myself. ]
479 P: [First row]
482 DIANE: But we live amongst them and sometimes they say things about you that’s not
483 so nice and you have to know what they’re saying. ((laughs))

Margaret tells a story of someone who was shopping and caught two Spanish speakers speaking ill of her. Diane states that she understands this “problem” because she has worked with Spanish speakers.

Later, the cards for Spanish, Chinese and the Chehalis Nation Language were placed haphazardly and the group was asked if they should all be equally prioritized.

560 SARAH: I think !Spanish! is more .[ than the other two.]
561 MARGARET: [Spanish. [You gotta. You]]
562 AUDREY: [[Yeah. Bec.]] Because of the. The [population that we have.]
563 M: [Of all of the Spanish that we do have:::] and we’re gonna have more:: and. Um::::

Margaret then recounts how her daughter travelled abroad to learn Spanish but still could not speak it.

**Chinese**

Chinese was the lowest rated of all of the academic subjects by the group. One of the reasons given for this was the lack of contact with Chinese speakers.

335 MARGARET: We don’t we don’t we don’t need Chinese. I don’t think we need
That:::.
495 INTERVIEWER: No pressure. That’s a that’s a big topic. What do you think.
496 Do you think Spanish. Should be taught more than Chinese. [Is this the right order.]
M: [Oh::: I don’t care about Chinese at all]

Chehalis Language

Overall, the group did not value the Chehalis language as much as the history. It is likely that this was partly due to knowledge about the language being limited. While that is understandable to some degree as the language is dormant now, it is surprising that Margaret was not aware of the language as she has lived in the area since the 1930s and said her best friend as a child was a Tribal member. In addition, even though there are no living L1 speakers of the language there might have been ceremonial or uses in other domains such as in the school which the others could have been exposed to. At one point in the conversation Audrey states that the Chehalis Nation history and the language could be helpful to promote cultural understanding.

Towards the end of the conversation, the cards for Chinese and the Chehalis Nation Language were next to each other but not placed in the main arrangement. The group was asked if both were an equal priority.

SARAH: [Oh:::] Chehalis Language is more important than [!Chinese!]

Margaret cited speaker contact as a reason why the language should be prioritized over Chinese.

S: [As far as I know they speak Chinook. (...) Or the ones that. That.

Both Sarah and Pete think that the Tribe speaks a language other than Upper Chehalis, but it’s possible that some of the members they have met do speak a form of Chinook. Chinook, and Chinook Jargon were spoken relatively near the current Chehalis Reservation (Figure 6). Pete even shares some more detailed, and generally accurate, information about Chinook Jargon (i.e., that it was a pidgin).
621  S: Can. Oh and Rob learned it from his Native buddies when he was in school? 
     You… Because he used to say something every [once in a while.]
622  P: [Well it’s called the Chinook Jargon]
623  S: Yeah. ((laughs))
624  M: ((laughs)) Well
625  P: And that’s exactly what it !is!, [it’s a compilation of. all::::: these disparate 
     languages.]

Figure 6: Map of indigenous languages that were spoken in Washington state at time of contact 
     (from (Suttles & Suttles, 1985))

Chehalis History

Towards the end of the interview, after substantial discussion about cultural problems between the 
local indigenous and non-indigenous populations, the group rated Chehalis Nation History equal 
with World History, Home Economics, and Social Studies. The main arguments for this placement 
were that the tribal students would find it interesting and it could promote some cross-cultural 
understanding between the communities.

Below is the transcript after Audrey picks up the cards for the Chehalis Nation Language 
and History.

352  AUDREY: Uh. I !really! think these:::. Would help. In. a case. In our school.
362  INTERVIEWER: How do you think they would help?
365  A: Because I don’t think they !Do! that out there with them enough.
366  M: No. what they teach em out there. Is that they hate the white people.
P: Hey [you know.]
M: Now ((someone)) went to school in Rochester and she said they came to school and
that’s what they said.
P: yeah.
M: We [hate] the white people.
P: [wow.] Yeah.
M: Now. WHY?! Like they say I went to school with the [Indians down] here
P: [Well.]
M: my best friend was an Indian.
P: umhm.
M: I loved her. She was [my friend::]

Pete extends the division between the Tribe and whites to the Tribe and Oakville and counters that the antagonism is not one-sided.

P: [but there’s] there’s uh. Uh cultural. Division. Between::
M: Yeah.
P: OAKVILLE. Now. I’m not saying !whites!. But OAKVILLE.
M: Yeah. [Well]
P: [I] I some kind caught me in::: the. (..) post office one day I was checking my bag?
And. He was on a tirade. About those. (..) doggone. Indians. And all of their money and
their throwing it in our face and. He went on for fifteen minutes. TO ME::: uh hu we’d I never have seen him before in my life.
M: Well
P: so if he’s telling these things there’s those attitudes. Are still within this community.
M: Well I think they’re getting worse. [Instead of better]

The group then discusses a recent event in the town where a group of older women who regularly swam at a pool on the reservation were told to leave because they were from Oakville.

Later in the interview Pete talks about a guest instructor from the Tribe who taught local history and culture in a social studies class. The lesson was allegedly well received by both “whites” and “natives”. Audrey then shares that she had diversity training.
The group interview also had much to say about tribal involvement and cultural conflict in the schools. The data related to these topics will be discussed further in the discussion section on blame below.

Lucy

Figure 7: Lucy's Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Chehalis Nation History, Chehalis Nation Language, Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Home Economics, Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>World History, Physical Education, Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Chemistry, Spanish, Biology, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>U.S. History, Math, Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lucy has lived in Rochester for over two years but has close friends in Oakville. She is originally from a more urban city on the East Coast. Her job is related to agriculture. One of the reasons she moved to Rochester is because she sees the community as a good place to raise a child, and her family does not have plans to move at this time. She has four kids, two are in college and two are in K-12 and attend schools in Rochester. Lucy exhibited more counter control (Kvale & Brinkman,
2009: 34) than any of the participants by occasionally using speech cues to end the interview more quickly.

After she completed the card sorting task, she was asked why English was the highest priority.

77 LUCY: Because without the spoken language of English its. The foremost in this country.
78 You cannot communicate. If you communicate well. (..) you’re destined to not. Succeed.

For her U.S. History was valued at 8.2, while World History was only 4.6. When asked why U.S. History was rated so highly, she positioned herself as a “(94) Home state kind of a girl. Home area.”

87 LUCY: If you can’t LEARN from your history. History is gonna repeat itself. I think we don’t take enough from our history these days?
88 I: mhm.
89 L: you know. We’ve taken too much of God and state out of. God and country out of this. Country.

Next, the conversation turned to the topic of Spanish.

104 I: Great. Okay. And then. Um::: you’ve got Spanish:::? Let’s. We’ll start there:::
Spanish. Being fairly high up.
105 And your reason? For. For that?
106 LUCY: Yeah. Again. With jobs:::
107 I: Okay. So jobs. Okay. Do you think particular… anything?
108 L: I’ve lived in Texas?
109 I: okay.
110 L: For. (…) a couple years. And::: if you didn’t speak Spanish you couldn’t work
111 anywhere. You know. You worked at. lived in a border town.
112 I: Totall.. do you speak some Spanish?
113 L: Not at all:(..(laughs)) It was good thing I was a stay-at-home mom at that time.
114 But I mean. You know? (…) The order menus at the. Fast food. Were Spanish English.

While her children were not currently taking Spanish at the local school she stated that they soon will. If courses are not available at the local school she might purchase Rosetta Stone or a similar software option for language learning.

When Lucy was asked about the low priority of Chinese she provided a lack of knowledge on her part, in addition to a lack of personal travel plans and speaker contact as reasons.

She suggests that it is good to know the local history, again referencing the overall positive attitude toward nationally-oriented (e.g., U.S.) history, and that it should be taught. However, when asked about whether it is taught in her kid’s schools she states that it is unlikely because “it doesn’t really have any connection.” Again, it should be noted that her kids attend school in Rochester, not Oakville. While she explicitly builds a discourse about how there is a connection to the schools because it is local she soon counters that position.

174 LUCY: I don’t speak Chinese. I don’t go to China. (..)
175 I: okay.
L: ((laughs)) The Chehalis Nation. I mean it’s good to know your local history and your local. (..)

I: mhm.

L: (..) It’s good to know it. But. Do I think it should be up here. Above social studies? No.

I: Sure. You do think. It maybe should be taught a little bit?


I: Oh Okay. Do you have any familiarity with the local culture or language? at all?

L: mm.mm. ((no))

I: You’ve been here two years. Do you know if it’s taught at all in the schools?

L: I don’t believe so.

I: Doesn’t really have any connection.

I attempted to steer the conversation towards some of the other notable aspects of the community (e.g., agriculture and migration) and she returned to the topic of the indigenous community. Again, she counters the argument that there isn’t a connection to the school and expressed some frustration with the tribe’s interference in the school’s culture.

I: You’ve got a lot of. A lot of movement.

LUCY: I do know that the middle school. in Rochester aren’t gonna be the Braves ((the current Mascot and logo of the school)) anymore?

I: Really?

L: Because::: the tribe doesn’t like them being called the Braves.

I: Okay.

L: They don’t like the Indian reference.

I: What about the Warriors? ((the HS Mascot))

L: I don’t know if they are going to change the Warriors or not. But I know the Braves are going to like the Patriots or something.

I: Oh.

L: Because of the reference. Which I think is ridiculous.

**Donna**

Donna is a lifelong resident of Oakville whose children’s entire K-12 education took place in the local schools.
**Figure 8:** Donna's Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>Chehalis Nation History, Chehalis Nation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>Spanish, Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Physical Education, Home Economics, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.625</td>
<td>Chemistry, Biology, Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>Social Studies, U.S. History, World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.875</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Donna has a strong interest in world history. While she did not travel much in the early half of her life, her family also hosted children from over 10 different countries. In the past decade, however, Donna has travelled considerably to many international destinations. In addition, both of her kids completed study abroad programs, and some of her grandchildren have recently studied abroad as well. One of her grandkids is currently studying Spanish in Spain. After I inquired about why she put Spanish where she did on the priority scale, she cited a lack of contact with Spanish speakers in the area as the reason.

When asked further about second language instruction in general in Oakville, Donna added that although Spanish is probably the most reasonable option, and second languages are largely relevant only to students planning to attend college.

On the other hand English is prioritized because she believes that proper English and literacy is highly important and both are generally lacking in the schools and society. This idea of subjects being primarily valued as a means of continuity to college or pursuing a specialization is extended by Donna to the sciences in order to explain why they are a lower priority than history.

Donna not only placed the cards for Chinese, Chehalis Nation Language and Chehalis Nation History closest to the lower priority card, an additional gap separates them from the other more-prioritized cards.
78  D: Yeah.
79  I: Maybe? Now the question I guess is.
80  D: Well I would say this one is definitely at the bottom.
81  I: At the bottom. So Chinese at the bottom and then?
82  D: Yeah.

When asked why the Chehalis language and history were placed higher than Chinese, contact or a local connection was given as a reason.

279  I: well. uh. as a final thing. You. Down here. We have. (. ) the local. So.
281  D: Well.
282  I: What could you tell me about that.
283  D: Because they’re here. I think. ((laugh))

Of the three individual participants, Donna had the most knowledge of the Chehalis’ culture and language, which is reasonable as she has spent nearly her entire life in the area. She describes her experiences with the Indigenous population as a child and notes a change of attitude that she observed about the Chehalis’ interest in learning and teaching the language and culture.

331  I: Ah. I guess one other question I had. Did. Since you’ve lived here for a long time.
332  Do you::: have any familiarity with the. With the local language or the history, [or?]  
333  D: [Not the] LANGUAGE::: really. I mean there’s a few words:. You know I’ve heard but we have.
335  He comes down and does a. program with the church once a month. And so.
336  Got into a little bit of that and he’s tried to teach some words but I don’t think their the same as the [Chehalis::] language.
337  I: umhm.
338  D: You know they all spoke different.
339  I: umhm.
340  D: different languages. And. And of course. You know I grew up? With the.
341  Indian kids they were my friends:: and everything. So. (. )
342  I picked some of the history and stuff but they didn’t know the language either so.
343  ((laughs)) It was just. And and I think it would be important.
344  And I think they’re are trying to do that more out there now is to teach. (. ) the younger ones some of the. (. ) the language and the history and so on where I don’t get. Back when I was in school it (didn’t) seem to matter to em too much.
Even though she gave Chinese the lowest priority position, contrary to some of the other participants, Donna did not construct a discourse reflecting a defensive nationalistic or economic conflict stance with respect to China. In fact, Donna has two personal connections to China. The first is a Vietnamese boat family, who were originally from China, which they sponsored back in the early 1980’s. The second is a trip to mainland China just before the Olympics in 2008. While she recounted some of the trip was a positive experience, her experiences in Beijing that she discussed were mostly negative.

301   D: And we went on over to Shanghai. And then back to Beijing again. And.
302   Beijing especially. It was just. You. you felt for the people. On they.
303   They just didn’t have anything to. hang on to I guess. You know. It was like. I don’t
304   know.
305   (.). They had. (.). tons and tons of new. New buildings. Apartments and so on. No
306   body living in em. But they had displaced lots of people that were living in these
307   poor sections to build these things.
308   I: yeah.
309   D: You know and then. We went just before the. Uh. Uh. Olympics. (.)
310   and so they were trying to make a big impression.
311   I: oh boy.
312   D: Partly you know. And so they just kicked all of these poor people out and put
313   these big fancy buildings up. (.)
314   I saw something on TV a while back where they are still empty.
315   D: [And that was] another thing. And there were people wearing.
316   Masks over there you know because the pollution was so terrible. Especially in
317   Beijing.
318   Yeah. I didn’t notice it so much in the other. (.). the other cities but Beijing’s
terrible.

Returning to the academic subject priorities, Donna cites practicality and limited resources as a reason why the lower rated subjects (including the local language) should not be prioritized.

354   D: [I I think]. (.). in Oakville. The it would not be practical. Because. (.). I mean you
355   you might have a. uh. (.).
356   history teacher that has been made a coach because he’s the only one who knows a
357   little bit of that. and you’re not going to have people that. (.)
358   that KNOW this.
359   I: mhm.
360   D: you know so. (.). Maybe for bigger schools?
361   Or even like Rochester that’s got a bigger school now. (.). they would be more
362   practical to teach.

Norma

At the time of the interview Norma had been a resident of Oakville for roughly 4 years and currently works in the town proper as well. Her grandkids had attended the Oakville schools but eventually moved to a school in a neighboring town that is approximately a 30 minute drive and is
located in the same county. The reasons for the move will be discussed in the discussion section for the Oakville data.

**Figure 9:** Norma’s Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

![](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chehalis Nation History, Chinese, Chehalis Nation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Chemistry, World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Social Studies, U.S. History, Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Biology, Health, Art, Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Band/Music, Math, Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Figure 9, Norma placed the cards for Chehalis Nation History, Chinese and Chehalis Nation Language beyond the lower priority card. Below is the conversation that took place while she was organizing those cards in particular.

25 Norma: hmm. That goes way down there. ((Chehalis Culture))
N: That goes way down there. ((Chehalis Language & Chinese))
I: (.) all of these. At. Uh. Just at the ver… same level? ((Chehalis Language & Culture and Chinese))
N: yeah.
I: Right down here [like this.]
N: down. Down.
I: But these aren’t lower than this? Or they’re just all equally low.
((These: Chehalis Language & Culture / This: Chinese – Chinese was slightly higher than the other two so this question is to confirm that they are rated equal.))
N: They’re all [equally low].

When asked about why these subjects are such a low priority, Norma cites practicality and a lack of strong social or familial ties to the Chehalis Tribe.

I: If. If I may ask::: Um. (.) for an example. You said these::: three: were way down here. Why. Why do you think. (.) the lowest priority for them.
N: um. I don’t see as it. It affects. Us. (.)
I: uhmm.
N: You know. Per se as. How they’re gonna get by in. in. (. ) in they’re life. It just doesn’t affect them.
I: mhm.
N: Really. You know. She’s not marrying into the tribe.
I: mhm.
N: She’s not having children with. uh. Tribal children. Anything like that.
I: So. ( . ) wh. What the. The Nation: you know. No offense to them?
I: probably.
N: That’s great. But. ( . ) you know. that’s up to her to learn it. You know.
I: yeah.
N: but. ( . ) you know. that’s up to her to learn it.
I: yeah.
N: But to put funding into it? Because there’s so many different dialects.
I: mhm.
N: Which one are you gonna choose?
I: mhm.
N: Mandarin? [you know]
I: [probably]
Norma also cites speaker contact as a reason not to offer Chinese and suggests an alternative, Russian. However, the alternative was not of interest enough for her to write it on a blank card and place it in the arrangement.

Spanish is ranked higher because of practicality and speaker contact and the dialect variation of Spanish is not voiced as a concern.

Shortly after that, Norma expresses some strong nationalistic and defensive economic sentiments about China.

Discussion (Oakville)

Teaching Languages

Overall, English was the highest rated of all of the academic subjects which were presented to the participants, but all other languages and Chehalis Nation History were the lowest rated subjects. Some of the group participants laughed when another asked if the local school needed a foreign language. The three individual interviews (Donna, Lucy, and Norma) were not against foreign language education in the local schools, although they did not see it as very practical for most students. While some of the individual interviewees admitted that it could be useful for people interested in attending college, all of the participants emphasized speaker contact as the primary reason a language should be taught.

Teaching English

The main reasons given as to why English should be prioritized were related to standardization. The participants seemed to express a lack of and a desire for local students to learn prescriptive, “proper” English. Noting that it was the highest rated subject, it is possible that this positioning is
related to many of the defensive comments about Spanish (e.g., Assimilationist), but no explicit statements were made about this. When asked for further explanation about why English is important, some mentioned literacy and a lack of interest in reading.

Teaching Indigenous Languages

There was a variety of knowledge about the language. Lucy and Norma, who were more recent arrivals to the area were largely unaware of the language, and Margaret, the person who has lived in the area the longest and had a best-friend who was a tribal member seemed to not know anything about the language. Pete, Sarah, Audrey and Donna were all aware of the language to some degree. Although the information provided by Donna, Pete and Sarah was not tied to the historical language of the Chehalis tribe, it is still potentially accurate depending who they talked to as the Tribe is both a confederation and has many non-local Indigenous people residing on Nation land.

While Donna saw some value in the local language being taught to Tribal members, Audrey was the only participant who verbalized a value in teaching it in the local school, noting that Audrey and Sarah both have Native American family members. The only explicit reason provided for teaching the language was for cultural understanding. Thus, it can be concluded that for these participants the status variable for the language is incredibly low, although due to the speaker-contact factor, the Chehalis language was still rated as a slightly higher priority than Chinese.

Blame: Educators, Parents, Students and the Tribe

Many of the participants talked quite a bit about divides directly related to education. There was talk of divides between students and teachers, parents and administrators, ‘Indians’ and ‘whites’. There is often an overt overlap between these terms. Sometimes the ‘parents’ in question are actually ‘Indian parents’, while other times they may not be. Along with each of the perceived divides there was often an insinuation of blame. One of the few reasons given by participants in favor of offering the local language or history as a subject in class was as a way to help repair these divides. This section looks at the comments made by participants about these topics to better understand the attitudes about the local community’s interaction with the school system.

The participants rarely directly ascribed blame for what they believed were severe problems in the schools onto the school administration or faculty. Instead, the root of the problem was often suggested to be either parental apathy regarding their children in general and their children’s education specifically, or student apathy and behavior problems. These issues were often directly and indirectly connected to the tribal population by the participants. These attitudes will be examined with the goal of separating attitudes about the indigenous population from those of the non-indigenous population.

Johnson, Clarke, & Dempster (2005) uncovered similar attitudes about parent apathy expressed by school administrators in Australia, where non-participation was assumed to be a lack of interest. Here, the parent-half of the school-family pair is considered to be deficit. Briscoe & De Oliver (2012) used the term “deficit parenting” to describe a theme which emerged in their analysis of texts and speech related to school administrators ascribing blame to families, especially to those of lower-income and minority status.

The assumption of a lack of parental involvement in education as being due to a lack of parental interest has been challenged by Smrekar & Cohen-Vogel (2001) who conducted interviews
with low-income minority parents and found that other factors (e.g., economics, access to daycare) were the issue, not a lack of interest in their children’s education.

Briscoe & De Oliver (2012), building on Foucault’s term “Subordinated discourse” (Foucault & Gordeon, 1980), use “counter discourse” to describe instances or utterances that go against the main discourse. In the case of Briscoe and De Oliver, some of their data contains arguments for explaining and even excusing the perceived lack of parental involvement. For example, the lower income minority parents cannot be involved because they do not have the means to do so. They may have systemic disadvantages that hinder their ability to function optimally in society and, in turn, the educational system.

There were a few themes that came from the interviews conducted in Oakville that “countered” the discourse around the deficit parenting of the ethnic minority in the local schools. One of the group participants argued that the current problems in the indigenous community were largely the result of systematic disadvantages they had. In other words, it was argued that the U.S. government initially destroyed their community through war, isolation and cultural genocide. The U.S. government continues to harm them through systems like welfare and now the Indigenous population has adopted a similar economic welfare system that discourages education.

In the next few subsections, excerpts from the transcripts related to these concepts will be analyzed. The review will begin with some data about how there is a lack of participation at the community level and how that is tied to the schools and the tribe. The next subsection examines the blame ascribed to the parents for the problems the local school is facing. Then data positioning kids as the cause of the problem will be discussed. Finally, the last two subsections look at the counter discourse statements and appeals to history which were made.

A Lack of Involvement

Throughout many of the interviews there was a reoccurring theme of a lack of involvement. While this was frequently attributed to parents, it was also extended to the community at large, and the Tribe as well both directly and via insinuation.

Just prior to the transcript excerpt below Pete begins to discuss how there is a lack of a sense of community and how difficult it is to get people involved. Audrey mentions that Oakville is a bedroom community, which Pete then suggests that it is more like a retirement community. Margaret interjects that it is a “welfare community” citing an anecdote she heard about Oakville being the “welfare capital of Washington” (104).

105 PETE: [Well:::] 85% of our children. In our school. Eh.
107 P: Are [on:::] 109 P: (...) reduced or free lunches. So you see. But. A good portion of those are. (..) um. From the. The. Nati. From the !Tribe:::!
112 P: You see.: and so. They THEY don’t theyre not necessarily. (..) I better sit down. I’m on a soapbox.
113 P: Her. ((laughs))
114 MARGARET: ((Laughs))
115 P: But they’re not necessary. Uh. !welfare!
116 M: uh [NO]
117 P: [More] [than]] [[they]] are from the tribe.

7 The community where the interviews for this study were conducted could be considered low income for the state. The job market is limited off reservation and the county where the community is located has a per capita income that is more than 25% below the state and national average (U.S. Department of Commerce: Bureau of Economic Analysis 2012).
M: [No] [No] [No] Yeah.
P: And [so.]
M: Yeah.
P: come from. A. a whole different !Nation!. As far as that goes. You see.
M: Yeah.
P: So there.
M: Yeah.
P: And so they come in to 'our' school district and then they qualify for all of these.
entitlements! and::: uh. Then they. The. Well.

Just then, Denise notices someone they suspect to be a Native American shopping at the indoor rummage sale near the table where the interview is taking place and mentions this to Pete.

DENISE: We have an Indian right over there.
P: Do we?
D: uh hmm.
P: But. It. But it’s !true!. That’s I’m being truthful.
D: Right
P: That’s what they need to do. (.) I mean. That’s what happens when they come in. [So it’s]
MARGARET: [Well. It’s] But. But. (.) That’s a problem with our whole. (.) System though. That (….) everything is given to you know,

During the group discussion, Audrey, Sarah, and Margaret all discuss how they know people who take their kids to schools outside of Oakville because the local school has a bad reputation. Audrey cites a lack of funding and then the discussion turns to the influence of the Chehalis Tribe.

MARGARET: Well if it wasn’t for the Indian Tribe,
A: Right.
M: We wouldn’t have a !school!. [BUT]
A: [Probably not]
M: if we didn’t have the Indian schooling here. We might have a school.
PETE: [Right.]
M: [Because that’s [part of the reason.]]
P: [It’s a catch 22.]

Deficit parents

The concept of a deficit parent here extends beyond a lack of involvement in education. Participants also cite a lack of general interest in education and even child abuse as serious problems the local schools face. Related to this topic, Norma provided an anecdote about the relationship between a local school administrator and the parents.

NORMA: Yeah. But. Um (..) You them, it was just a case of. The teachers were apathetic because they.
They didn’t get any support from. The parents. In this area.
I: mm.
N: Um. In fact. When we first started here. The person who was like the (..)
interim principal. Would literally take papers to the parent’s house because the parent’s couldn’t be bothered to fill it out. So she’d take it to them and have them fill it out in front of her so she could have! the paperwork. (…) parents weren’t coming to demonstrations? Parents weren’t coming to parent teacher conferences.

I: mm.
N: It’s a total apathy.
I: mm.
N: You know. It’s getting a little better? But I wouldn’t bring my kids back to this school district if you paid::: me:::

Margaret argues that the problem is that there is “no discipline” and Pete connects this to the Tribe.

M: Because they say. We will take of em when they get out. To the Tribal center.
S: Right.
P: Right. Yeah.
M: Well they forget about it after they get to the !Tribal! center.
M: But there’s a lot kids. That don’t have [any discipline.]
A: [It’s also::]
M: It’s just. That’s the way it is.

About half way through the interview the group discusses the idea that a lack of interest in the family towards education leads to more disinterested children in the school. Towards the end of the conversation Pete, Diane and Margaret all argue that respect needs “to be taught at home first.” Around this time in the conversation, the card for respect is placed as the highest priority.

Margaret begins to talk about a person who is in charge of truancy for the students from Chehalis Tribe and how bad their job is. Here, Margaret mentions anecdotes about child abuse on the reservation.

M: He said first off you gotta. Maybe go and. Rescue these kids from their.
P: Exactly!
M: !grandparents! who beat the heck out of them.

Kids as the deficit

One of the themes expressed by a few of the participants was that the students at the local school were responsible for the perceived poor quality education the school offered. Student apathy, anti-intellectualism and deviant behavior were all cited as problems and many of these sub-themes were directly associated with the Indigenous student population.

Norma commented how she believed that “band/music” should be a high priority in schools and when asked if they had a program at the local school she responded:

NORMA: [They !had!] one in Oakville. And it. And it’s gone.
I: wow. Is that one of the reasons? ((Reasons why she moved her kids to a different school district))

((A brief discussion on her kid’s academic history.))
N: ((The youngest kid = YK)) YK had to stay for the whole. Year. Here. Now. She’s a great student don’t get me wrong.

I: sure.

N: but she was not a straight A student.

I: mhm.

N: In ((the town they previously lived)), But I mean! Here! she’s a straight A student because comparatively to the students that were already here.

I: yeah.

N: She was head and shoulders above all of them. (...) In terms of reading. In terms of math. In terms of spelling. In terms of English. In terms of everything. ((Phone call interruption and some more discussion about her kids academic history))

N: ((Whispering)) All the teachers told me (...) They’re excellent sk. students. Get them out of here.

I: [wow.]

N: Because they will never (...) reach their full potential going to Oakville.

I: What do you think the reason is?

N: Um. (.)

I: Funding or?

N: No. (...) It’s um. The attitude of most of the tribal kids. I don’t have to learn? Because I earn a stipend?

I: mm.

N: And I will get a job through the tribe. So why do I have to excel at anything. In the school. That doesn’t interest me anyway.

Norma continued to describe how the kids with apathetic attitudes towards education created an anti-intellectual learning environment.

NORMA: I don’t need to this and I don’t need to know that. She ((Norma’s older grandchild)) knew so much history. And the kid. I. And you know. And it was just from !reading!

I: mhm.

N: And she loves historical (...) Fiction books and everything. But she had the answers and the kids would look at her and call her a nerd.

Another sub theme that was raised by participants was the deviant behavior of the students and how it would affect the learning environment.

NORMA: I. uh. The kids. At the Oakville. Um. School. If they got mad at a teacher.

You could see em walk down the hall. F-this! F-that! And then walk out. And nobody’s stoppin’ em. And they’d leave the campus.

Slightly countering the discourse of students and parents as the deficit problem, Norma adds (142) that the behavior is not impeded by the school system.

When Norma was asked about how the apathy problem might be resolved she builds a discourse whereby the teacher’s being discouraged (176) is (at least partly) a result of the deviant behavior of the students (178) and that the behavior issues stem from a lack of control over the Indigenous student population.
I: hmm. What do you think would be a good way to fix it? Was it.
Is it the apathy? Is that. Is that the biggest [issue?]
NORMA: That’s the biggest [issue.]
I: okay.
N: is the apathy.
I: So it’s not funding::: or too little teachers::: er.
N: Well the teachers are discouraged.
I: mm
N: I mean. There’s nothing they can do. Because they disci… really discipline their students because. ((soft voice)) the tribe is in charge of the. The tribal kids.
I: mm.
N: So there’s not a whole lot the school can do:: unless the tribe allows it.

Turning to the group interview, after a lack of respect for the teachers was raised by Margaret, Sarah talks about her relative who quit her job because of the lack of respect at the Oakville schools. Pete then notes that there have been three assaults on teachers, before citing problems with the Superintendent. This leads into a discussion about a student from the Tribe that assaulted another student, whose community affiliation was not provided during the interview.

P: They went to the the !Tribal! representative. The Indian uh representative came in.
talk to em. And they said that they would. Just exactly what you were saying earlier.
They would discipline them. This [person. At the tribal] center.
M: [at the tribal center.] ((They forgot))
P: And that. She should be and she graduated.

Later on in the conversation, Denise tells an anecdote about when she lived near a reservation in Oregon and how if an ‘Indian’ and a ‘white kid’ were disciplined, the ‘white’ kid would be suspended and nothing would happen to the ‘Indian’ kid. She argues that this systematic unfairness is the problem and it is being perpetuated by the government.

History and other causes of the deficits

Pete begins to talk about resources as a possible reason for the problems in the Indigenous community but Margaret does not yield her turn as she begins to talk about the responsibility of the ‘whites’.

P: Well. You see. Nowadays::: they have so::: much. More resources.
M: And who has. Who has done this to the Indians. (…..)
P: [That’s an interesting point.]
M: [The white people.] The white people.
P: Yeah. Yeah.
M: They have !NOT! made them. (…) the kind of people that they !were!.
P: uhhuh.
M: Because (their) people. There were Indians working in. In the woods?
P: uuhuh. Yeah.
M: And they worked!
P: Yeah.
M: But. (...) When the white people got. You know.
P: [Oh. Yeah I see what you mean]
M: I mean [They were just so !ABUSED!] they were so abused! You got to give make sure
that these people are taken care of because they were abused.
P: uuhh.
M: Well. There went your. (...) your tribe. (...) down the turn. The drain.

At this point in the conversation, Margaret has argued that the laziness of the local tribal members is due to abuse and the welfare system perpetuated by “the white people”. Note that all of the participants could be described as white and none claim any biological connection to the tribe. Yet, Margaret does not use an inclusive pronoun, and instead uses a phrase that could be seen as a form of stereotypical ‘Indian English’.

Next, Margaret and Pete refer back to a discussion they had another day about how the government subsidizes the Tribe. They comment how the Tribe is ‘subsidizing themselves’ now but the government will never stop subsidizing them also.

M: [It will never]  [It]  [Yeah]. But it will [never] stop because the
[[[government]]] has
taken over [[[[and]]]] they will be subsidized and taken [[[care of!]]]]
P: [[Yeah. They don’t have to]]. [[[no]]]  [[[yep]]]  [[[yeah]]]  [[[yeah]]]  [[[yeah]]]  [[[yeah]]]
M: And. Because we did. Probably do some. Things that were not !right!:::. To the
Indians.
P: One.

Immediately after this, Margaret counters the narrative of ‘Indians’ as blameless victims. Also, she earlier declared the Tribe to be ‘self-subsidizing’, she now posits that ‘the white people’ are responsible for ruining the tribes because they didn’t make them ‘self-sufficient’.

MARGARET: BUT::. Huh How many happened. That the !Indians! you know I
mean come on!
These were not good people. sometimes either.
M: [WELL:::] but it but it’s the white. The white people who. (...) these do-
gooders. ()
the white people. Who have really ruined the Indian tribes. ()
Because they have not made them. (.) Self-sufficient.

Margaret argues that there should be a further political divide between the Tribal and non-tribal governments.

MARGARET: [And I] Yeah. they’re a government within a government. And they
should be not voting in our elections.

Counter Discourse Utterances

Above, Margaret strongly argued that welfare was destroying the Indigenous population and making them lazy. She stated that the more people are given, the more they want and the less
productive they are. However, Audrey counters this discourse by saying that “jobs are hard to get now”. Both Pete and Margaret agree and they continue to talk about the lack of jobs.

While nearly all of the comments regarding the student-teacher pair placed the student as the deficit, the group interview did briefly blame the teachers for not dressing appropriately. That was given as a possible reason for why they are not respected by the students, but Pete commented that it is the society and culture of today. This is one of the few comments that have no potential connection to the Tribe.

Throughout the group interview Margaret was constructing a discourse which framed the local Indigenous population as a major cause of the school’s problems and a place of disorder and abuse. Yet, part of the way into the discussion she quickly counters her own discourse.

During her interview, Norma employed a counter discourse shifting the blame for the behavior from the students to something systemic (144-146) before returning to a more student-deficit position (148).

Norma also countered the discourse of the education administrators and faculty as not being apathetic or to blame for the perceived academic failings of the school.

Later in the interview, Norma returns to the topic of band/music being cancelled at the local school. Before, the blame was placed on student apathy. While she isn’t specifically referring to the local school in this latter utterance, the blame is now placed, not on the student’s apathy, but the decisions of school administrators.
383 They’re doing their kids a disservice. They’re doing. They’re. They’re doing this but keeping football. Really? Really.

Both the example above and the excerpt below highlight that populations and systems generalizable outside of the local area are ascribed blame directly while local ones rarely are. In the following excerpt Norma is discussing perceived teacher resistance to computer-based education (e.g., Rosetta Stone).

440 NORMA: And then. So then. That cuts that out and then.
441 All the other teachers start screaming. What about our jobs?
442 Are you going to teach that offline too? Or. Online too? And we gonna get cut out? And then that’s when the unions step in. (…) Rarrarrarrmynynanya.

The most prevalent utterances that ran counter to the parent-deficit discourse were those made by the participants about themselves and their role as parents.


Norma also comments on her handling of any potential deviant behavior issue, further connecting the deficit with (other) parents.

215 N: and. you know. And I’m one of those. I’m. I’m. rather strict. (..) If.
216 If they wanna screw around at school that’s fine: cus. I will come to the school. And I will wear a !great! big sign around my [neck].
217 I: [((laughs))]
218 N: that says I am here because she could not do her work in school.
219 (.) and I will follow her around for the day, her. Or her sister. I don’t have a problem.

Summarizing, three sub themes were discussed: 1) Deficit students lowering the academic standards because of apathy. 2) Deficit students creating an anti-intellectual environment. 3) Deficit students exercising deviant behavior disturbing the learning environment.

Most of these themes were expressed in relation to beliefs about the Indigenous population. The issue of unchecked deviant behavior was explicitly linked to the indigenous student population by a few participants. However, parent-deficit discourses were rarely connected specifically to indigenous population. Student and administrative problems were more open targets. Lucy, the only parent whose children did not attend Oakville’s schools expressed no criticism of the students or parents in Rochester where her kids attended school. She also praised the teachers at the Rochester schools.

5 Data (Marysville)

Participants (Marysville)

Three participants were interviewed individually. All participants were self-described as area locals. Two had children currently attending local schools. One attended local schools from the sixth grade through twelfth. Each of the participants was given a pseudonym. None of the participants was
contacted prior to the interview. They all learned of the study by seeing the recruitment materials on location (Figure 10) at the Marysville library on a Friday afternoon.

**Figure 10**: Photo of recruitment materials and interview space (Marysville)

![Figure 10: Photo of recruitment materials and interview space (Marysville)](image)

**Context**

The city of Marysville is located in Snohomish County, and is approximately a forty minute drive to the north of Seattle (Figure 11). The estimated population of Marysville in 2012 was 60,020 people (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, 2013b).
The neighboring Tulalip Indian Reservation consists of 22,000 acres that lie to the west of Marysville proper and divided by an interstate highway. The Tribe in 2004 had 3,611 active members (Tulalip Tribes, 2013). The Tulalip Tribes have a fairly active program promoting the teaching of Lushootseed, which is classified by Ethnologue as nearly extinct (8b) (Lewis et al., 2013). Lushootseed was spoken by many people around the Seattle area and currently has much more institutional support than Chehalis (Lushootseed Research, 2013).

The city of Marysville was chosen for this study because it borders the Tulalip reservation, shares schools and has a substantially different economic relationship to Marysville than the Chehalis Tribes do with Oakville. The Tribe employs over 3,200 people, many of whom are non-Tulalip members that reside in Marysville. In addition to a large casino and resort hotel, the tribe also manages a successful outlet mall, all neighboring the interstate highway. While these are all important parts of the local economy, Marysville is also considered a bedroom community for Seattle and Bellevue where there is access to jobs in aerospace, software and many others. In other words, Marysville is much less isolated, economically than Oakville.

Catherine

At the time of the interview Catherine had spent approximately half of her life living in Marysville. She attended middle and high school in the area and now works in a local preschool. Prior to Marysville, she resided in Alaska. Catherine described herself as being very interested in local education policy.
**Figure 12:** Catherine's Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Tulalip Nation History, Home Economics, Tulalip Nation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Biology, U.S. History, Health, Chemistry, Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7:</td>
<td>Chinese, Physical Education, World History, Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:</td>
<td>Economics (Credit), English, Math, Computer Science, Spanish, Banking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spanish and Chinese**

When asked why English and Spanish were ranked so highly, and higher than Chinese, Catherine responded:

111 Catherine: um. We have. Uh a lot of Spanish speaking families in the  
112 area. You have a higher chance of getting a higher paid job if you know a  
113 second language and since this is the number one language. Second  
114 language. used in this area I would put that. So. Um. Chinese is more you’re going  
115 to be into business. big business. And stuff then if you have this. So.

Towards the very end of the interview when talking about positive things occurring in the school district, Catherine mentioned that Spanish is being taught now and “that’s nice.” (304)
Later on, unprompted, when reviewing her second row, Catherine returned to the topic of Chinese and language learning in general. Here Chinese is made distinct from Lushootseed, with Chinese being a “world language” and having economic value:

170  C: you know these are things that they’re going to need and not necessarily just Chinese but another world language.
172  I: Good. Okay.
173  C: of any kind. Would be. Important to allow the kids to learn so.

**English**

She was asked why English was prioritized and what aspects of English were important. At no point in the interview did she mention issues related to English as a second language, but instead only focused on formal skills, such as academic writing:

118  C: um. Well English. The better you will be able to understand everything around you. Um. I mean it’s the basis for you are going into college for two you need to have solid English skills to get into college. You have so many essays you have to write to get there and. Um. So on and so forth. So. If you don’t know how to use the language well you’re not going to excel.

**Tulalip Language (Lushootseed)**

When shuffling through the deck at the beginning of the interview, Catherine noticed the Tulalip Language and History cards and made the following comment:

26  C: I would say. Those are awesome if they have those available. But it’s not supposed to be a priority with things that kids are going to need as…

Later, when reviewing her card organization she was asked about her knowledge of the local language and history and whether she was aware of anything being taught. Immediately, she steered the discourse towards the topic of social division, calling upon her past experiences with Asthabaskan Tribes/Nations:

196  I: is there. And you’re familiar. When you were in the schools was there any contact for culture or for history or. or anything?
197  C: um. Ok. I have family. OK this is. I have family in Alaska and I’ve met maybe five or six different tribes including the Tulali. Tulalip tribe.
200  I: umhmm.
201  C: and it is surprising and astounding. Uh. The difference. In. um. The word. Tribe. And how it’s used between. This.
203  I: mmm.
204  C: yeah! I’m. And and I know this sounds really strange but. Um…. The.
205  Tulalip tribe is a lot different than other native tribes that I have been around and met. Um. They. The younger kids like to push to stand alone. We’re different than you. Um. And we are more important than you versus when. Like in the Athabaskan tribes. Everyone’s welcome.
208  I: mmm.
and just because you are not Athabaskan doesn’t mean you are not welcome and it’s surprising that. That. Um. Feeling of pride that they’ve. Built up. Has kind of mutated.

I: hm.

C: in the older kids. To be a. ah. Almost like a clique.

I: hmm.

C: so the kids are totally separate. They separate themselves from you and they feel like they are Tulalip proud.

At this point she hints, by gesturing to the Tulalip cards that education could play a role in bridging this gap:

C: and. Uh. I really think that it should be addressed. um… But to have it as a priority in the school district. I don’t think that that’s. Part of. What we should be pushing for education.

C: it’s something that’s deftly unique to the social circle of this area. Um. A lot of people. Kind of see it as the other side of the tracks which is really sad. because there is a ton of amazing art and history that is getting left behind because. of how the younger. Generation is seeing themselves as. You know. Better or. Different. Instead. of welcoming.

I: mmm.

C: that. It’s really weird that that’s being built and. And sad.

I: yeah.

C: because um. Like I said. I’ve. I’m friends with some really amazing Athabaskan’s and I’ve seen wonderful things because I felt welcomed. and invited into their tribe. Whereas here. Um. Even. When you show up at. Um…. You know like some of the bigger events that they have. It’s almost like you’re just viewing it. You’re not welcome. So that’s something that’s interesting about this area.

Josie

Josie spent the majority of her life in the area, but for the bulk of that time, she lived in a city to the south of Marysville, that is still to the north of Seattle, but has a slightly larger population. She originally found work as a medical aid in Marysville assisting citizens of the Tulalip Nation. Roughly seven years prior to our discussion, she moved, and now lives within the current boundaries (recognized by the U.S. government) of the Tulalip Nation. She continues to work in a similar field but her clients are not strictly Tulalip citizens. Josie did not describe herself as a parent.
Figure 13: Josie's Final Academic Subject Priority Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>U.S. History, World History, Spanish, Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Social Studies, Home Economics, Computer Science, Art, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7:</td>
<td>Literature, Psychology, Physical Education, Biology, Health, Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:</td>
<td>Tulalip Nation History, Math, Tulalip Nation Language, English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tulalip general attitudes and perceptions

Without any prompting, the first comment Josie made as she began to sort the cards was the following:

J: so yeah. I love. I like the Tribe. The Tulalip Tribes are awesome. (…)

She continued by describing how she now lives in Tulalip and we discussed the Hibulb Cultural Center. Later in the interview she describes her affinity for the Tulalip. Here, she mentions that she had watched the local television news program and was aware of the language segment. She describes some of her patients as educating her about the culture.

J: …And Like I said. Explained about the Tulalip Nation. And I live in Tulalip. I love Tulalip Indians. I watch the Tulalip Indian news. It’s really awesome. It helps you learn the languages sometimes. Unfortunately. I lost my cable so I can’t get it right now but that’s ok I’ll get it back. Uh.
Tulalip nation history. Kind of the same thing. You know. It’s because I feel bonded to them.

I: Mhm. How did you first get involved?  
J: I got involved with the Tulalip nation and when I was very young as a Home Care nurses aide.  
I: So it was. It was your first.  
J: So yeah. My. Some of my first patients I took care of. Caregiving patients were the Tulalip Indians.  
So. I learned a lot from them. The lady I had actually. So that’s why I originally got interested and then.

After talking about why the local language and history should be taught in schools, she comment further on the Tulalip’s positive relationship with the other local communities.

J: It would be. I think you know. Good. To have that. especially like I said in this area. They do. The Tulalip Indians. They are very involved with everything around here. Like Oso for example. They donated $150,000 to Oso.  

When talking about the unique economy and mix of cultures in Marysville, Josie turns the discourse again to the economic power of the Tulalip Nation. However, here she uses the term ‘tribe’ instead of ‘nation’.

J: well there is such a wide range. You know. We got a lot of people.  
Severely in poverty. And we got the tribes that are extremely rich. but not all of the tribal people.. get. (portions) for some reason. and some of them are very poor.

**Tulalip language & history**

Asked directly why she believes that the Tulalip language and history are a high priority for education, she responded:

J: Because they are very. There some of. I mean they have their own schools. But sometimes. you know. if there are issues. People don’t like them and they integrate them into the other schools.  
I: Mhm.  
J: so I think you know. Especially if we’re talking about Marysville. It is very important for continuity for all of the students to understand because. The Tulalip Indians have a very set culture. Most. Nations do. All of them do. They have their own culture.  
I: Mhm  
J: It’s like they’re own little. Idea of living. And. It’s. for children to get a along and. you know. to understand. How their Nations integrate into each other.

Josie then transitions to talking about the economic benefits the Tulalip bring to the area, and raises the issue of preferential treatment for citizens and defends it.

---

8 Josie is referring to a landslide disaster that affected the town of Oso, WA in 2014.
J: that kind of thing. I mean they do a lot to make. Things for their. Their tribal. They do a lot to try to improve the environment. I mean. Build jobs for everybody. I mean they do. favor their nation. You know. If you wanna look for a job. They obviously are going to. But if you have more skill. You always have an opportunity. Like my best friend. is an executive’s chef at Tulalip resort. Um. The owner. Or whoever originally built Tulalip. casino.

After discussing the impractical nature of U.S. and World History, the topic turned to Social Studies and she connected it to her earlier comments about Tulalip History.

J: social studies is to me like um. I think it. There again. again that goes again back to what I was saying about the Tulalip Nation. It helps you understand different people. Be able to socialize.

**English**

English is a priority for Josie because of locality and practicality. In fact, ‘practicality’ was the most common description for why she prioritized certain subjects (e.g., Home Economics). She believes that a strong grasp of prescriptive rules is valuable and makes a comment about the changing language of youth.

because it’s something that’s needed every day and it’s applicable with global. I mean we need it for just survival. For me. I mean. English. Of course we live in an English. area and I still have problems talking. So I should go back to school for more English. You know. Proper grammar stuff. I think it gets lost in translation.

I: mmm.

J: because of the kids get slang and stuff like that.

**Spanish & Chinese**

Josie describes learning Spanish, but she did not find it useful.

Let’s see. I took Spanish when I was younger but I never ended up using it and I lost the ability to do it.

Later, I asked her why she ranked Spanish and Chinese so low and she initially gives locality as a reason (i.e., Spanish and Chinese are not as important locally as Lushootseed and English).

I: so English. And the Tulalip language are very high.

J: mhm.

I: but Spanish and Chinese are lower. Why…

J: that’s just because of the location of where I live.

I: it’s just location. OK.

J: I’ve had Spanish like. I have Spanish relatives. I took. Like I said I took two years of Spanish in high school. Got A’s in it. And I liked that. but they always had Chinese too. But Chinese.
(Interrupted by a friend of Josie’s)

However, as the discussion continues she counters her own discourse and states that Spanish is an important language locally.

I: Alright. So Spanish and Chinese so you think are equally? priority?

J: Yeah. And I mean they are so dominant within the area. Anyway. I guess if you are doing. Are going to do a job or something you think you are going to be exposed. To a lot of. We have a lot of Spanish people. I would. I need to actually go and refresh that because. In. Marysville there is a lot of Spanish people. we have plenty… Spanish speaking and stuff.

I asked her once again to confirm that she thinks Chinese should be equally prioritized. She continues supporting this opinion, but mentions she has a Chinese friend, but still doesn’t know a language. Her opinion is that it isn’t practical and she connects it to World History.

I: what about Chinese? Are there a lot of Chinese around here? You think?

J: Um. Not as many. There’s a few. Not very many in Marysville.

I: but the language is still. You think should be prioritized.

J: yeah. One of my best friends owns (an establishment related to China) here in Marysville.

I: oh ok. Fantastic.

J: (…) so that’s why I don’t know Chinese or anything like that. And like U.S. history. I mean it’s nice to know. Your presidents and stuff. And same with world history but I don’t see how it applies to daily life.

Instrument

Josie asked a few questions to clarify some confusion about how the sorting exercise worked. She seemed to respond favorably to the process and commented on it a few times during the interview.

I: no worries. it’s a new exercise.

J: it’s kind of fun (laughs)

A friend of Josie approached the table after she finished her initial sort and we discussed the first few choices. She encourage him to participate as well saying:

J: you want to do it too with him? It’s fun (laughs).

Audrey

Audrey is a parent of more than one child who both attended Marysville schools, although they have since moved to a neighboring school district. Her opinions about the subjects was oriented to elementary education although she did make some special comments about how they would change for middle and high school.
Figure 14: Audrey’s final academic subject priority ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Chinese, Spanish, Tulalip Nation History, Tulalip Nation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5:</td>
<td>Drama, Public Speaking, Geography, U.S. History, World History, Computer Science, Biology, Chemistry, Home Economics, Personal Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:</td>
<td>English, Communication, Music, Art, Social Studies, Math, Physical Science, Health, Physical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Her initial ordering had five vertical positions and the cards were arranged as described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Position</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Academic Subjects Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25:</td>
<td>Spanish, Tulalip Nation History, Tulalip Nation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5:</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:</td>
<td>English, Art, Physical Science, Biology, Health, Physical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josie frequently touched and moved the cards as she discussed them. Looking at her initial organization and the final arrangement after the discussion finished, there is a substantial difference. She also used the most blank cards of any of the participants. Another technique she used was grouping subjects into relational sub-groups to mediate the discussion.

A large part of her discourse was dedicated to the topics of personal finance, and the need for PE and the Arts. When it came to STEM subjects, she thought they were important to make
people and the U.S. in general competitive internationally. A few times she would describe other
countries educational practices and how the local schools were lacking in comparison.

170 A: In other countries. Um. Such as China. They understand. There’s not a
171 choice. It’s not just the gifted. It’s not just the people that have money
172 That have the private music lessons… But it is part of their daily part of their
education.

English

Audrey had many comments about English, particularly from a prescriptive and stylistic
perspective. She expressed a fear of the English skills of students degenerating. Towards the
beginning of the discussion, she added a card for Public Speaking.

180 A: English. I mean. When I say English. I um. It needs to be where they
181 do have more emphasis now. With. Public. You know. The Public
speaking.
182 I: mhm.
183 A: the communication. Oral. As well as written.
184 I: mm.
185 A: and it’s almost a lost art here. We expect everything to be
186 communicated in text messages. But we’re speaking very poorly…

After initially talking about the value of teaching Spanish and children learning a second
language, she returns to the topic of English and how it is a de facto lingua franca. It is at this point
that she adds a card for Communication.

242 A: uh. I mean. And. Um. I think we all benefit when we. we speak more
243 than one language. For sure. But I don’t that it. Has to be our first and
244 foremost. Because. What’s happening is. People aren’t speaking correct
245 English to begin with. And it’s still is uh. Uh. Powerful. Um. Uh. Language within
the world. Um. Still used in all of the airplanes.
246 I: (laughs)
247 A: so. Um. I think we do a disservice. um to ourselves when we’re not
248 speaking. We’re not learning how to speak. Well publicly. As well as
249 written. but. The written communication. So when I say English. I’m talking
about communication at large. So you could write communication. Put that.
250 I: ok.
251 A: as a category in itself. Because I think it’s it’s communication within.
252 Um. For comp. you know. How do you communicate. Um. With technology
appropriately?
253 I: mm.
254 A: how to use it for communication?
255 I: mhm.
256 A: but it doesn’t replace. The one on one. It doesn’t replace. Learning
257 how to write a complete sentence is and not just texting. So um. We we
258 have a really. we haven’t. fully realized the. the damage that’s going to
259 come from people being dependent on just sending text messages. Rather than.
Having communication where people can interact.
I: hmm.
A: because I think in the workplace and for the young people that are getting jobs. People that good communication skills. They are going to make it. People that. cannot. Whether it’s eye contact or other. Um. They’re going to have difficulty. Um. So. It’s it’s communication. Um. With large groups. And one on one. Um. That is almost becoming a dying art. Um. So when I say public speaking. That’s again just being able to kind of also share what you know.

Tulalip Nation Language and History

Audrey had little to say about the Tulalip subject cards, and never explicitly mentioned the language even though she talked considerably about second language learning and local non-English speaking populations. She always referred to both cards together as a set and used the words ‘culture’ and ‘history’.

A: back up here. On this (touching the cards Tulalip Nation History / Tulalip Nation Language) here. specifically in Marysville.
I: mhm.
A: um. I. my children. Are in Marysville school district. but this is definitely. And I thinks it’s appropriate again where there are. Um. I mean. The culture. Culture. Um. The culture of the Tulalip Tribe is. You know. Integral to those. Um. people. and I think we all benefit by. in. by preserving it. So. I think it. You know. Again. In their particular school it should definitely be. And I think you know. When. In the context of. Um. Um. State history. When we talk about Washington State history that needs to be taught.
I: mm.
A: In. in Washington state history.

Spanish and Chinese

Initially, Spanish (along with the Tulalip Nation History and Language) was ranked higher than Chinese. She begins describing her position on Spanish by describing her support for early second language education in the schools.

A: Um. Um Spanish. Um. Again. Speaking a second language. in a teaching. It in a younger age. They learn a lot easier than.
I: mm.
A: then when they wait until you are in junior high or high school. So I think that that’s appropriate. But I don’t think it replaces English?

Towards the very end of our discussion Audrey was asked directly about the placement of the Chinese card relative to the Spanish card. While she believes that Chinese has more economic vitality on the international stage than Spanish, it does not have the local speaking population to support it comparatively. She suggests that it might be more appropriate for Chinese to be taught in Seattle because of the greater population of speakers. However, she later argues that it could be
taught at the high school level in Marysville, but that it may not be appropriate for teaching statewide. She also makes a brief comment prioritizing Chinese over French.

I: is. Why is Chinese lower than Spanish?
A: I’m saying just because in this area. Um. Again Chinese. I know is an
up and coming. Continues to be. Viable. In fact. A. We are doing
more business with China. Were doing more business with China than Mexico
let’s put it that way.
I: mhm.
A: so it probably should be this way. So. If we were maybe in the area of.
Uh. Even Seattle maybe. There is a bigger population of Chinese and um. I think
it’s a very difficult language to learn.
I: mhm.
A: um. I think it’s very complex. And I I I that’s the only reason that
I’m putting it up HERE. Because I don’t think our population right here.
Immediately in this. Um Marysville area. Is so densely populated with Chinese
speakers. However. Is it a language for business.
I: mhm.
A: is it a language for international relations? Absolutely. So. All the
power to you if you can learn it. And the. And I think again. It should be offered in
high school.
I: mm. oh okay.
A: um and so. That’s where I would. Maybe I would put it here.
I: for highschool.
A: I would put it. You know. Again. This is. More. You know. In this
area. Not the rest of the state perhaps. But um. Yeah. I would offer it. And
it would. even though French is a pretty sounding language.
I: mhm.
A: uh. Chinese is more valuable today.
I: mm.
A: in. in the marketplace.

She considers raising the prioritization of Chinese, but changes her mind and instead reiterates her belief that English is a much more important subject.

A: I don’t think. I think they need to master their English.
I: sure. Sure.
A: in elementary school.

Finally, she argues that Spanish is more important than Chinese for the younger students because of the local population. Although she does not comment on Lushootseed (the Tulalip Language) here, it’s possible that she is referring to a speaking population again, as she is aware that the Tulalip Nation are predominately English L1s. She then expands the geography of use to the entire US and notes the growing presence of Spanish.

A: and I think this where where I say Spanish even. Um. Over Chinese for
elementary is just because for their immediate peer groups and the people
they are coming in contact with and our proximity. Um. And and.
Many. Places within the US there’s more opportunities to. Um. To interact with. With the Spanish language.

At this point, Audrey finalizes her second arrangement of the cards and moves Chinese to the same vertical position Spanish, Tulalip Nation History, and Tulalip Nation Language.

**Discussion (Marysville)**

Overall, the participants in Marysville prioritized the Tulalip Nation subjects (a mean of 4 for the language and history) more than the participants from Oakville (language = 1.41, history = 2.16). None of the participants in this group separated, in ranking, the language and history. While Spanish had the same overall ranking as Lushootseed for the Marysville group, the actual discourse reflects a stronger support for Spanish, which was seen as part of the local community and having economic value. Chinese was strongly positioned as an out-group language, primarily useful for international business.

In this data set there were also many comments regarding the need to teach children ‘correct’ English. Some of these opinions were out of an interest in developing communication skills for the workplace, but a nearly equal amount referred to a fear of language deteriorating due to things like texting.

6 **Methodological Problems**

The first batch of interviews in Oakville made it especially clear that a video recording of the cards and the participant’s hands should be captured along with the audio. During the interview, the interviewer directed comments towards the recorder about what the participant was doing with the cards and as means of clarifying referents, such as when a participant spoke about a card or identified it with a gesture. However, it quickly became apparent that this could only be done a few times in the process without having other effects on the co-construction of the interview and card organization. Therefore, a majority of the information on general movement, the flow of the organization process, and signs of mediation in general was lost. For the interviews conducted in Marysville, a camera was positioned to record the table space. In order to keep the filming as comfortable as possible for the participant, an unobtrusive video camera (Kodak Zi8) that has a shape similar to a standard smart phone was used.

A smaller concern was that the following question was not asked at the end of the interviews: “What do you believe is the relationship between language and culture?” A second small issue was that writing done with a dry erase marker on the blank cards could be easily removed if touched and manual contact is the purpose of the instrument. Instead, a wet erase marker should be used.

The card sorting methodology appears to be effective for this type of qualitative interview as it can guide the discussion, mediate thought and conversations, with minimal priming to the research questions. While the quantitative scale calculation system was able to handle this set, much more data and trials are needed to confirm its effectiveness.

7 **Conclusion**

Returning to the research questions presented at the start of this paper, it is possible to present some tentative answers, but much more data is needed.
1) What are the attitudes about indigenous languages and education held by people living near native communities who do not identify as members of a tribe?

The interviews have yielded some information about the status variable of the local language, which is very low for the participants of this study. However, all foreign languages have a very low status variable as well.

2) Does living near an indigenous population or other language community affect language attitudes?

For these participants, attitudes seem to be directly related to speaker contact and community conflict.

3) Does an expressed affinity for an associated language community relate to a participant’s language attitudes?

It appears that there is a relationship between these two as the primary motivation offered for teaching the language was to promote cultural understanding. There seems to be substantial cultural division between the non-indigenous residents of Oakville and members of the Tribe. These apparent divisions are said to be a cause and result of conflict in the schools. It may be that the only possible motivation for offering courses on the local language or history is with the goal of increasing cultural understanding and cooperation. Here, the indigenous population is seen as a, if not the sole, problem in the schools, yet there is little expressed concern for or awareness of the educational needs and situations of the youth. In reality, Indigenous youth in the U.S. face substantial challenges in the dominant academic contexts (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Deyhle & Swisher, 1997). On the other hand, the participant from Marysville with the most positive discourse towards the Tulalip community (Josie), ranked both the language and history as the highest priorities. The other two participants had mixed opinions regarding the Tulalip Nation and ranked both as the lowest priority.

As for the more commonly-taught languages, in Oakville support for Spanish education seemed to come as a defensive action against that perceived language community. The Marysville participants all expressed more neutral or positive feelings regarding the Spanish speaking community and the language itself. This could be a reflection of the more robust and diverse economic environment of Marysville, compared to the depressed farming and logging community of Oakville. Chinese was not strongly associated with any community and was positioned as a language primarily suited for international business.

4) Where do indigenous language and history/culture classes exist in participant’s beliefs about educational priorities?

While history had a higher priority rating than the language for the Oakville participants, both were rated along with Chinese as the three lowest priorities overall. In Marysville, the Tulalip Language and History were rated only slightly higher than Chinese. The overall mean prioritization value for participants in both groups for local Indigenous languages was only 2.52. Again, this is a small, semi-random self-selected sample and only gives a very rough perspective of the opinions in either community. In the end, there is evidence of a possible link between the perceptions of the local Indigenous community and the amount of support for a language class. Unfortunately, it also appears that support for diverting limited school resources to an Indigenous language program would be very limited and perhaps such a move would be very controversial. Whether there would
be concern if the respective Indigenous Nations covered the financial costs of the program, and only course time was required, is something that remains to be seen.
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Appendix

Interview guide

Part 1) Introduction

“Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. The average interview is between 5 and 15 minutes, but can go on as long as you are interested. I will not ask your name and you do not need to tell me anything that you are not comfortable discussing. You may stop the interview at any time. Do you have any questions before we begin?”

Part 2) Main interview

Question pool:
- How long have you lived in the area?
- Do you consider this area as your home?
- How do see yourself in relation to the (local Indigenous) Nation?
- What do you know about (local Indigenous) language and culture?
- Did you or a member of your family attend a local school? (Which school(s) and when?)
- I’m interested in learning about local’s opinions about educational priorities. What do you think should be emphasized or prioritized in local schools?
- What do you think about schools teaching foreign/world languages?
- What do you think about schools teaching subjects like Art, Home Economics, Shop, or engineering?
- Do you know if local schools teach (local Indigenous) culture, history or language? What do you think about this?
- Do you think they should or should not? Why?”