Tribalizing linguistic inquiry

Joseph J. DUPRIS

University of British Columbia

EDITOR:

Sarah Shulist (Queen's University)

ABSTRACT

In this paper I outline methodological considerations for tribalizing linguistic inquiry in ways that acknowledge the history of Linguistics, incorporate lessons from state based civil rights oriented approaches to research, and integrate Constitution based and inherent rights oriented research. Specifically, I consider Community Based Research, Indigenous Research Methodologies, Tribally Based Community Research, and Tribally Driven Participatory Research in the context of UNESCO's International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022-2032, the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the United States' 10-year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization. The common principles threading each approach center on reciprocity and redistribution as means to assert rights to self-determination in tribal and colonial frameworks. These principles are present in the work of tribal, Indigenous, and accomplice language workers who are paradigmatically changing Linguistics from a scientific discipline complicit with, if not embracive of, the construction of the United States as a white European Nation to one that helps to sustain the political integrity of tribal peoples from time immemorial to time infinite. Recognizing that sovereignty maintains its meaning as tribes exercise inter-sovereign relations, I share this paper from my lived experiences as a Klamath Tribes citizen of Modoc, Klamath, Big Pine Paiute, and Mnicoujou Lakota (Cheyenne River Sioux) descent engaged in the inter-sovereign relations of my own nation.

RESUMEN

En este artículo presento consideraciones metodológicas para alinear la investigación lingüística con los intereses de las tribus nativo-americanas de manera que reconozca la historia de la lingüística, incorpore enseñanzas de investigación basada en el derecho civil del estado, e integre la investigación basada en la constitución y los derechos intrínsecos. En este artículo, tomo en consideración la investigación centrada en la comunidad, la metodología indígena de la investigación, la investigación comunitaria

tribal, y la investigación participativa impulsada por la tribu. Todo esto dentro del contexto de la Década Internacional de Lenguas Indígenas 2022-2031 de la UNESCO, la Agenda de Desarrollo Sostenible 2030 de las Naciones Unidas, y el Plan Nacional Decenal de Revitalización de Lenguas Indígenas de los Estados Unidos. Los principios que comparten estas estrategias se centran en la reciprocidad y la redistribución como métodos para reafirmar los derechos a la autodeterminación en la infraestructura tribal y colonial. Estos principios están presentes en el trabajo a favor de las lenguas que realizan los miembros de las tribus, de los pueblos indígenas y otros aliados. Dicho trabajo está cambiando el paradigma de la lingüística, una disciplina científica que ha sido por lo menos cómplice, si no es que incluso ha apoyado explícitamente, la construcción de los Estados Unidos como nación blanca europea. Dicho cambio va en dirección hacia una disciplina que ayude a sostener, desde el tiempo inmemorial al tiempo infinito, la integridad política de las comunidades tribales. Reconociendo que la soberanía tiene sentido cuando las tribus mantienen relaciones entre entidades soberanas, comparto este artículo a partir de mis experiencias como ciudadano de las Tribus Klamath –Modoc, Klamath, y Big Pine Paiute– y descendiente de Mnicoujou Lakota (Cheyenne River Sioux) comprometido con las relaciones de soberanía de mi propia nación.

1. INTRODUCTION[1]

Tribes, as autonomous communities, nations, bands, pueblos, and villages, enact self-determination through mutually constitutive relations between lands and groupness work. Tribal groups are identifiable with perceptions and interpretations of lands, and governing practices represented and categorized therein. Tribalism is the reproduction of knowledge, kinship, and work through self-determining relations with lands since time immemorial. Tribes cannot be predicted to be politically structured like one another based on their present geographic location or language use except as informs the political-legal relations of tribes, the states in which tribes are located, and the empires from which states gained their independence.

Tribalized work mobilizes inter-sovereign relations across transnational boundaries to assert inherent rights to self-determination. Tribes are analogous, which accounts for mobilizations of particular historical facts and adherence to stereotypes, clichés, and identifying categories by tribal

---

peoples to enact identification as Indigenous state citizens in efforts to protect rights to self-determining relations with land in overlapping territories and jurisdictions (Friedman 1992; Jackson 1995; McIntosh 2010; Shulist 2018; Singh 2023). Tribal peoples may enact simultaneous identification as colonialist or indigenist state citizens in addition to their tribal citizenship as needed to open multiple venues for complementary activism. Processes that circumvent or refuse to acknowledge tribal politics cannot be said to be tribal.

Coloniality and Indigeneity are homologous – two sides of the same coin. Colonies enact violence, alienation, and appropriation against self-determining relations with land (tribalisms). Colonial groups are identifiable by their opposition and ambivalence toward land based relations in rights based discourse on dominion and occupancy (territoriality). Coloniality is the reclassification of knowledge, kinship, and work to normatively structure land relations on ideological terrain (as territories) that are shaped by racializing discourses about time and space. Colonial work includes disruption to self-determining relations to land through institutions like the Church, residential schools, carceral systems and so forth. Indigenous peoples enact the strategic adoption and/or refusal of practices, materials, and ideas in the dialogic space between tribes and colonies. Indigenous groups are identifiable by their opposition to colonial logics in states and frequent ambivalence toward tribes. Indigeneity reproduces knowledge, kinship, and work across colonial and tribal logics to (re)structure relations to land across time and space. The ideological terrain of indigeneity provides means for detribalized, racialized, and arrivant groups in colonial states to position themselves in coalition with tribes.

The ongoing racial reckoning in the United States' linguistic sciences provides means to frame problems and their solutions through inclusive and decolonizing research. Charity Hudley et al. (2020), for example, elucidated constrictive norms within Linguistics (prestige, economic gain, intellectual interests) and actions for developing transformative processes through academic departments and programs, conferences and professional societies, and funding agencies. These actions can be operationalized within the above distinctions between tribal work and state-based work with Indigenous peoples to develop more robust accountability systems across tribal-state jurisdictions. Such distinctions in research accountability systems would recognize problematic organizations such as the Lakota Language Consortium (LLC) and The Language Conservancy (TLC) which face multiple resolutions by Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to reject, float, and ban the organizations in response to unethical research practices, in contrast to the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation and Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe who reaffirm their exclusive ownership over traditional knowledge and resources, and Rosebud Sioux Tribe who standardized their writing system in response to the "Czech Orthography" created by the LLC and TLC (John 2023).

The UNESCO International Year of Indigenous Languages (IYIL) and International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022-2032 (Decade) take Indigenous as a self-evident category of

identification and are ultimately about mainstreaming Indigenous languages into global frameworks (i.e., non-Indigenous, colonial, state based hegemony). Indeed, *Amatlanawatilli Mahtlaktli Xihtli ma Motekipanokan Totlakatilistlahtolwan* (Los Pinos Declaration [Chapoltepek]: UNESCO 2020), an outcome document of "Making a Decade of Action for Indigenous Languages" that closed the IYIL states as its first objective to "take short, medium and long term actions to preserve, revitalize, promote and position indigenous languages, linguistic diversity and multilingualism in future post-2030 global sustainable development". There is mention of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN General Assembly 2015), but no description of what it is or how it supports the self-determination of Indigenous peoples or their communities.

The 2030 Agenda is likewise mentioned many times in the *Global Action Plan of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages* (Global Action Plan; UNESCO 2021), impressing that there are fewer than ten years to implement its relevant goals, but there is only a cursory description of what the Agenda with thumbnail images of what its goals are. A brief glance at the 2030 Agenda shows 17 sustainable development goals: no poverty; zero hunger; good health and well-being; quality education; gender equality; clean water and sanitation; affordable and clean energy; decent work and economic growth; industry, innovation and infrastructure; sustainable cities and communities; responsible consumption and production; climate action; life below water; life on land; peace, justice and strong institutions; and partnerships for the goals. Within the 2030 Agenda, however, "indigenous peoples" is used as a category of vulnerable people, adjacent to people living with HIV/AIDs, older persons, refugees, internally displaced persons, and migrants, with no recognition of indigenous people as citizens of political entities with the right to govern their own peoples. Taken together it is clear that global interests in language are collapsing distinctions between tribal and colonized peoples (i.e., Indigenous) and integrating them into state projects without addressing inequities between tribes and states or holding genocidal states accountable for expansion, settler-colonial or otherwise, into tribal lands. Accountability requires distinction between tribal, colonial, and Indigenous.

The Decade's global action plan includes the development of national plans that will outline each Member State's approach for implementing the Decade. Each national plan will provide guidance to government agencies, including linguistic specificities, priorities, relevant activities, and necessary local partnerships. In the United States the Biden Administration signed Executive Order 14049 in October 2021 (Office of the Federal Register 2021), establishing the White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Native Americans and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities in the Department of Education. The Initiative has resulted in an initial consultation and planning framework, the hosting of consultations and community discussions, and recommendations that complement the first Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative investigative report (United States 2022), including advancing Native languages. The White House

Council on Native American Affairs (2024) has published a 10-Year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization (10-Year Plan) that prioritizes expanded access to immersion language environments, and supports community-led revitalization efforts that develop, grow, and sustain Native language support networks.

The 10-Year plan states that it voluntarily aligns with the United Nations International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022-2032, and builds upon existing Native language revitalization efforts but does not mention the 2030 Agenda's Sustainable Development Goals that the Decade's Global Action Plan is linked to to. Anticipated efforts include but are not limited to: documentation and preservation, curriculum and resource development, teacher training and post-secondary initiatives, policy development and political advocacy, language classes, bilingual schools, and immersion practices. The disciplinary field of Linguistics is going to have to recognize an oncoming shift from the primacy of documentation towards broader reclamation oriented work.

In the following sections I acknowledge the history of Linguistics and outline methodological considerations of Community Based Research and Indigenous Research Methodologies as state based, civil rights oriented approaches to research, as well as Constitution based and inherent rights oriented research like Tribally Based Community Research, and Tribally Driven Participatory Research. I discuss tribal, federal, and state oversight for research with the explicit goal of sustaining tribal polity as I work toward an ideal of Tribally Driven language research with my own people. I conclude with examples of a person and an organization that are already engaged in such tribal work.

1.1. POSITIONALITY & BACKGROUND

I am an enrolled member (citizen) of the Klamath Tribes of Modoc, Klamath, Big Pine Paiute, and Mnicoujou Lakota (Cheyenne River Sioux) descent. The Klamath Tribes' citizenship is constituted by Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Paiute people whose homelands span southern Oregon and northern California. I am grounded in my community as maqlaqs[2] (Klamath-Modoc person), and I am part of the third generation of maqlaqsyals[3] (Klamath-Modoc languages) movement advocates in my home tribal community.

The Klamath Tribes (KT) has engaged in community based language work through an administrative unit of the tribal government since the 1980s. During most of that time language was housed under KT's Culture & Heritage (C&H) Department. The Klamath Tribes (1989) had developed a QWERTY friendly orthography in partnership with linguist Noel Rude. That orthography laid a

---

[2] [maqlaqʃ]/[maqlaqs]; [s] and [ʃ] are non-contrastive.

[3] [maqlaqʃjalʃ]

foundation for the next decade of language resource development from Head Start through high school with the assistance and support of Scott Delancey and Janne Underriner from the University of Oregon. Tribal elders, language instructors, and administrative assistants supported linguists to document maqlaqsyals (Klamath-Modoc languages), run a Master-Apprentice program at the University of Oregon (UO; Underriner 1997), and develop activities for adult and youth language classes. By the early 2000s tribal language was available through the Klamath Tribe's website with guidance for reading and pronunciation. Many adults maintain this knowledge from tribally-sponsored culture camps and time as counselors supporting KT C&H and staff on-site. The works of Rude, Delancey, and Underriner are examples of Tribal Community Based Research.

The Klamath Tribes offered limited adult language classes throughout the 2010s with a heavy focus on providing language in public schools. I attended adult classes in 2013 under Harold Wright, who had been an apprentice at UO. I had several opportunities to meet with Janne and Scott for guidance regarding specific words, differences between orthographies, and next steps toward understanding the materials when Scott told me "you need a PhD in Linguistics" to master how the materials relate to each other, so I researched graduate programs. In 2014 I was accepted to the Native American Languages and Linguistics Master of Arts (NAMA) program at the University of Arizona (UA). Before I left for the required summer intensive hosted by the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI), Harold shared a set of digitized language materials for me to learn from and told me to "bring back everything you can."

AILDI and NAMA at UA have been especially influential in developing my approach to language research in my hometown and tribal jurisdiction. NAMA is designed to serve the needs of language community members as they accomplish community goals en route to a degree, including but not limited to documenting and description, language education, and intergenerational transmission (Silva et al. 2022). AILDI incorporates linguistic and cultural knowledge into curriculum that democratizes schooling for indigenous students and supports the retention of their languages and cultures in a four-fold empowerment framework of enrichment, local education control, interactive/experiential learning, and advocacy oriented assessment (Galla et al. 2010). AILDI's summer intensive is required coursework for NAMA students. NAMA alumni in PhD programs serve as Research Assistants and instructors, NAMA students have direct opportunities to organize, facilitate, and teach at AILDI workshops, and AILDI hires NAMA students on occasion (Silva et al. 2022). AILDI's workshops are provided on-campus and on-site at communities' requests.

In 2015 I was accepted into the Anthropology & Linguistics (ANLI) doctoral program. I had opportunities during ANLI to support several workshops with AILDI throughout Arizona. Workshops included documenting traditional knowledges on land restoration sites, building place based maps through Google, and developing digital archives and language resources. I also had an opportunity to

intern with Where Are Your Keys? LLC while working for the Aleutian Pribilof Island Association to support communities of urban Aleut to practice their respective dialects of Unangum Tunuu in Anchorage, Alaska. These experiences encouraged me to find ways to promote collaborations with knowledge holders in my own tribal community and learn how to inform my own research practice through local values, worldviews, and knowledges in ways that other Indigenous peoples and academia can recognize. I began fieldwork for my dissertation during 2018-2019 and I completed the ANLI program in 2020.

Since graduating I have continued to conduct language work through community engagements in my hometown, contract work with a sister tribe of Modoc people in Oklahoma, and collaborative projects with my tribe. I remain in academia and have had good fortune to hold visiting positions at the University of Colorado Boulder in Linguistics and Ethnic Studies and at Brown University in Native American & Indigenous Studies. These positions provided opportunities to interact with students from tribal backgrounds, students who enact identification as Indigenous and/or racialized persons, and non-Native students on a broad array of topics about peoplehood and polity.

Students from tribal backgrounds broadly understood that their tribal citizenship and peoplehood was distinct from their racialization as state citizens, students who enacted identification as Indigenous and/or racialized but did not come from tribal backgrounds seem able to articulate the differences but did not have the lived experience to comfortably navigate tribal politics. Non-Native students seemed to understand that tribal politics and Indigenous peoples are different but are more concerned about how and when to identify peoples as tribal, as Indigenous, or, as BIPOC.[4]

These conversations caught my attention as a tribal person in academia. Tribes operate from the lands they govern and protect, from time immemorial to time infinite. My relations and peoplehood are diverse and inclusive of persons in my tribes' homelands, and racialization as off-white, non-white, Indian or non-Indian due to ethnic ambiguity does not affect tribal citizenship. Indigenous labels in Indian Country, in my experience, were terms of inclusion through which tribal members (i.e., citizens), non-citizen descendants of tribal members, and descendants of detribalized communities could mobilize for coalition. Such labels were not meant to circumvent tribal sovereignty.

I am also a founding member of the Natives4Linguistics (N4L) Special Interest Group of the Linguistic Society of America (LSA). N4L was founded by three core members and many founding members who attended the Natives4Linguistics satellite workshop at the 2018 LSA annual meeting which aimed to improve linguistic science by broadening Native American participation and integrating their needs and values into linguistic science. Many people at the N4L workshop reflected on various intersections of Indigeneity, linguistic science, and racism (Leonard 2018). A prime example includes

---

[4] Black, Indigenous, and People of Color [baj.pak] (i.e., nonwhite).

the fact that the representation of Indigenous scholars and leadership in the field of Linguistics is disproportionate to the representation of languages used by Indigenous peoples in linguistic documentation and theory (Tsikewa 2021).

The need for racialized language users themselves to lead linguistic analysis and policies within their respective groups is part of a broader racial reckoning in linguistics (Charity Hudley et al. 2020) and it is necessary to Linguistics' development to recruit racialized language users (Charity Hudley et al. 2020; Calhoun 2021). This work supports linguists who have been traditional beneficiaries of racialization processes to develop social justice within the field by reshaping their views as scientific researchers, bringing established linguists into discourse on integrating colonized and racialized perspectives into linguistic research, and changing mindsets to prioritize colonized and racialized communities' needs, values, and ways of knowing through regular engagement with community-scholar linguists (Tsikewa 2021). The approach that N4L fosters opens venues for budding linguists to decolonize and "indigenize" their research by bringing colonized and racialized language users to linguistic science, involving them with research on their languages, and designing research outputs to answer questions by and/or fill the needs of their language communities (Cornelius 2022).

The N4L approach to language research integrates recurrent themes in Indigenous Research including centering details in whole systems, relationships and reciprocity, active engagement with community needs and institutions at all stages of the research process, and respecting the responsibility that comes with knowledge and its dissemination (Leonard 2018). Charity Hudley et al. (2020) provides a complementary framework to intervene in Linguistics' colonial origins and structures, educate linguists on the history of Linguistics and antiracist-decolonial scholarship, respect the nationhood and associated sovereignty of tribal peoples, and account for the various racializations of Indigenous peoples (Leonard 2020). I am arguing here for the adoption of antiracist-decolonial approaches to collaborative language research with tribes in supranational and/or corporatized colonial entities while recognizing that tribes might alternatively and actively maintain racist structures and/or exclusionary ideologies. I am not arguing for tribes to decolonize or indigenize but to align collaborative research with tribal places, positionalities, peoplehoods, and politics.

2. STATES AND CIVIL RIGHTS IN RESEARCH

2.1. COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH

Research that is conducted by, with, and for targeted language users through community-situated, collaborative, and action oriented practice (i.e., community based), has risen as a methodological orientation in recent decades (Rice 2006; Czaykowska-Higgins 2009; Crippen & Robinson 2013; Bowern & Warner 2015). Community Based Research (CBR) aligns the guiding principles of academia with the community partners' target audience, publication mechanisms, and (in)tangible outcomes in

relation to shared, complementary, and competing values in immediate and long-term projects (Bischoff & Jany 2018). Certain questions challenge CBR oriented academics and non-academics alike, however, including who has the authority to speak for a community, who represents a community, who gets to make decisions about community language use, and who gets to define what is or isn't in a community's language (Bischoff & Jany 2018:11).

Membership in communities can be identified by who is enacting specific sets of values in constructing networks of groups and institutions with convergent interests in ostensibly single-topic issues like language. Group members regularly police, transgress, and parodize boundaries that their respective groups are called into action to disrupt and/or maintain (Brubaker 2004). Nativist-racist hierarchization provides a salient example of identifying nonmembers by the prescription of societal norms, categorical identification based on measures of variation from those norms and withholding socioeconomic privilege and opportunities in accordance with membership status (Mills 1997; Perea et al. 2015). The specific geopolitical dynamics of how nativist-racist hierarchization occurs through law and academia are already well addressed in studies of how one can come to look, hear, and/or sound like one racial group or another (Haney Lopez 2006; Alim, Rickford, & Ball 2016; Alim, Reyes, & Kroskrity 2020). Historically, academic researchers have had no problems determining who has authority to speak for a community, who represents a community, who gets to make decisions about cultural practices, and who gets to define what is or isn't legitimate language (Deloria 1969; Biolsi & Zimmerman 1997; Smith 2021). Perhaps the better questions ask who engages in language work,[5] what their political commitments are, and how language is used to achieve their goals (Costa 2017).

For example, the collective language work carried out by global invaders during the 15th-19th centuries and the institutionalization of the linguistic sciences, for example, can be analyzed as part of a political-religious movement to revitalize Europe in the Americas and the Pacific in the social construction of whiteness (cf. revitalization movements; Wallace 1956; Harkin 2004). Economic expansion following contact required the justification of land dispossession, dissolution of alternative and potential polities, and establishment of political unity by energizing particular ideas about language use and human origins, relations, and trajectories (Woolard and Scheffelin 1994; Woolard 2004). Struggles over classifications in the construction of a cohesive narrative determining group members and location in time-space required disavowals of difference vis-à-vis "culture" as a textual, semiotic, and paradigmatic measure of group (non)membership indicating belonging, rootedness, territoriality, and tradition (Bauman & Briggs 2003; Baker 2010).

---

[5] Language work includes (but is not limited to): documentation, description, analysis, teaching, learning, advocacy, criticism, and resource development (cf. Leonard 2017:16).

The recategorization of globalized whiteness (e.g., European America) as victim-of-nonwhite-contempt and citizens of alternative/potential nonwhite polities as aggressor can be traced from obsessions with an imagined external malevolent force that is demonstrable in discourses of discovery, savagery, and modernity (Said 1978; Williams 2012). Although some language researchers would grow suspicious of prioritizing theory over data, emphases on survey over sociological validity, and racist evolutionary schema toward the end of the 19th century, their contemporaries (like future Linguistic Society of America leader William Dwight Whitney) insisted that a groups' race, origins, and blood could be discovered through textual descent (Gruber 1967; Boas 1911; Errington 2007: Harvey 2015).

Missionaries' logs, colonialist journals, and federally-sponsored projects mobilized European concepts of "languages" as discrete, describable, bounded objects that can result in degenerate, hybrid, or mixed languages that ultimately stand as fetishist substitutes for the peoples and populations that they seek to describe (Berkhofer 1978; Bhabha 2004). Narrative discriminations represented in discursive practices of racial categorization, the naturalization of language research as boundary creating projects, evaluations of American languages according to European identifications of language users' homogenizing groupness criteria, and contempt for linguistic expressions dissonant with European literary aesthetics and literacy manifested as linguistic racisms (Alim et al. 2020). The task of language based movements in a European-minded colonial society, then, was to restructure the ways in which individuals interact and the types of authorities and ideologies that they sponsor and/or are beholden to through ethnographic performances of white possession (Deloria 1998; Moreton-Robinson 2015; Simpson 2018). The white European served as the interpretative subject, normalizing and reifying the hegemonies that governable subjects (arrivant-indigenous-settler) are interpellated into – identifiable by the maintenance of inequitable power relations (Leonard 2023a).

Linguistics emerged as a scientific discipline complicit with, if not embrace of, the legal construction of the United States as a white European nation through recategorizations of racial difference in terms of potential for naturalization and citizenship. The Immigration Act of 1924 established a demographic survey of the United States' inhabitants in 1920 that referenced an overarching category of the white race across fifty-three countries of origin and five categories of colored races (black, mulatto, Chinese, Japanese, [South Asian] Indian) without national origin (Ngai 1999; 2014). The Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 bestowed blanket citizenship on thousands of Americans living in autonomous communities, nations, bands, pueblos, and villages (hereafter "tribes") without their consent or naturalization but refused to extend basic constitutional rights to those same peoples (Lyons & Mohawk 1992; Rollings 2004). Virginia's Racial Integrity Act of 1924 defined "white" as one without any non-Caucasian blood (excepting mixed-race settlers having less than one sixteenth Indian blood) and "colored" as anyone documented to have any "negro blood" with the assumption

that Indians in Virginia are not legitimate and nonwhite persons are more likely to be Black than Indian (Smith 2002; Endo 2022). White supremacy worked to sever bonds between Africans, African Americans, and Americans, their relations to particular lands, and opportunities to equitably participate in societal institutions through European ideologies of purism, continuity, and blood that remain in contemporary Linguistics (hooks 2014; Alim et al. 2020).

In sum, the Europeanization of the Americas played a significant role in raising the status of settler states to intellectual parity with their relatives in Europe (Smith 2021). Settler colonial states were increasingly incorporated in a globalized European identity that emerged in opposition to everything tribal. During the 20th century American Indians integrated into the urban centers of colonial empire, emerging as a legitimate ancestor of Europeans in the Americas in opposition to both Europe and the Orient (e.g., the Indian grandmother; Deloria 1969). Sociological studies demonstrate that tribal cultures abounded with individuals establishing continuity through conscious efforts to construct more satisfying societies through the reorganization of histories, ideas, and practices in the dialogic space between groups (Linton 1943; Wallace 1956; Nagel & Snipp 1993; Grumet 2003; Harkin 2004).

Western linguistic inquiry represents the disciplinary institutionalization of a language based revitalization movement that aimed to establish a white world of Europeans forged on ideological terrain through certain discourses about language, languages, and language research through which group members (ethnologists, philologists, Linguists) carry out sanctioned language work (documentation, translation) with identified nonmember (non-white, off-white) persons in ritual performances (elicitation, analysis) that require certain artefacts (paper, writing utensils, audio/video recorders) which in turn generate new language based artefacts like texts, dictionaries and grammars, and discourses like "degeneracy", "mixing", and "endangerment" (Deumert 2020). Community Based Research approaches to language have contributed to this work productively but the racist ideological assemblages and racisms in Linguistics can become self-evident demographic categories, normalized, unless language researchers are engaging the epistemologies and lived experiences of the racialized language users they co-produce knowledge with (Nelson and Flores 2023; Leonard 2023a).

2.2. INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Western history to the present largely consists of Europeans and their descendants establishing authority to construct the past, determine who has access to cultural repertoires, who can mobilize them, who can study and preserve them, and how outsiders may intervene in terms of first contact. Textual links between whiteness and global descendants of Christian Europe and the ancient Mediterranean in opposition to and ambivalent toward nonwhite peoples established "Indian," "Black", and "Oriental" as practical categories for the differential distribution of material wealth and privilege (Mills 1997; Perea et al. 2015).

The attribution of "culture" to Indians was strategically aligned with broader political commitments to the elimination and integration of self-determined tribal people into white sensory regimes of race and class (Jacobs 2009; Baker 2010). The articulation of culture along the lines of white ideals of gender and sexuality replicated racial inequities with tribal communities as nativist-racist legislation (like the laws described above) and engendered anti-Black practices among tribal communities to assert their legal status (Klopotek 2011; Endo 2022), but it did not preclude Black integration into tribes nor solidarity with arrivant communities (Carpenter & Yoon 2014; hooks 2014; Mays 2021; Sepúlveda 2023). Solidarity among racialized and minoritized peoples and access to higher education energized nonwhite scholars to derive participatory and transformative solutions to problems created by white Europeans by focusing on local knowledge and the experiences of marginalized communities as state citizens with civil rights.

American Indian Studies and Native American Studies, for example, represent disciplines that supported the political and cultural autonomy of tribal peoples but were limited by the goals and orientations of their own white European oriented institutions in the late 20th century United States. Those disciplines evolved and experienced new growth with the break of Native American and Indigenous Studies from American Studies (Deloria et al. 1999; Lobo et al. 2016). By the turn of the 21st century research was published on decolonizing methodologies that mobilize "Indigenous" in opposition and ambivalence to its "colonial" antithesis, challenging Eurocentric knowledge and disrupting the primacy of European approaches to research among globally colonized/oppressed peoples as Indigenous Research Methodologies (Wilson 2008; Chilisa 2012, Brayboy et al. 2012; Smith 2021; Kovach 2023).

The Native American and Indigenous Studies Association brought global Indigenous perspectives to Indigenous academia in the United States following NAISA's break from the American Studies Association (Kauanui 2016). Linguistics has been challenged to recognize the colonial and racializing logics within its norms of education and training, and racialized scholars throughout the discipline are responding with suggested approaches to enhance the discipline (Charity Hudley et al. 2020). The incorporation of Indigenous Research Methodologies can change discussion towards the history of Linguistics and its roots in colonization, and the logics that persist in relations between languages users, researchers, and researcher institutions (Leonard 2020; Tsikewa 2021). Over the last few decades, Indigenous Research Methodologies have been used and applied in education, health, social work, and nursing by Indigenous persons or teams of Indigenous/non-Indigenous collaborators who work with Indigenous communities to create and sustain meaningful change (Pidgeon & Riley 2021), but Indigenous research has certain limitations and logical extremes as well.

Indigenous Research Methodologies can qualitatively help researchers locate their interests and political commitments for their audience to better understand motivations behind research, the voices

of their literary devices in co-authorship, articulate analyst embeddedness in secondary analyses, and place storywork and vignettes from throughout one's experience into the narrative context of written research (Bird 2009; Austin et al. 2015; Alderson 2020; Denzin and Salvo 2020).

Indigenous Research Methodologies can quantitatively shift standards, set recruitment targets and methods, subdivide target populations across categories, and determine recruits needed for each category in ways that resist Eurocentrism, demonstrate Eurocentric links between politics and quantitative methods, account for race and racism in quantitative methods, and encourage creative and critical use of quantitative data with researched peoples (Walter & Andersen 2016; Hayward 2021; Zwiener-Collins et al. 2021).

These are of direct concern to enhancing language documentation as a function of work with tribal communities requesting support for language reclamation, including description and field linguistics. Incorporating explicit discussion of theoretical frameworks and one's positionality and background can demonstrate how researchers relate to their work differently, such as the orientation of revitalization in documentation work as a feedback loop for enhancing Linguistic data and interests (Fitzgerald and Hinson 2013; Fitzgerald 2021), or a driving force behind interrelated Linguistic activities including documentation work (Silva and Dupris 2020).

Although participatory and transformative solutions for scholars to employ data gathering, analytic categories, and capacity-building techniques derived from and based on racialized/colonized knowledges can produce powerful pluralizing counter histories, they can also be carried to logical extremes when mobilized for groupness work. Movements to construct Indigeneity in opposition to white coloniality, like those in Indigenous Resurgence frameworks (cf. Alfred 2005, 2009; Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2011; 2017), have become popular among junior scholars and social media influencers as means to express group membership. Yet these practices can reproduce inequity in the mirror image of their oppressors because their oppressor is central to their self-identification, reifying the idea that tribal people are more or less colonial/colonized than their disenfranchised militant counterparts such as the American Indian Movement in the United States. Indigenous Resurgence, for example, claims to take a non-violent approach to the establishment of a new civil order. However, resurgent scholars mobilize polarization and potential for violence through unitary characterizations of the state as a malevolent external force, presume the futility of engagement with the state due to incommensurability with Indigenous cognition, and enact groupness through allegations that others are coopted by the state (Lightfoot 2020). Such behaviors reflect the Fanonian decolonization that Indigenous Resurgence is based on which absolutely requires the violence necessary to assert inherent rights to self-determination and spontaneous (re)construction of national identification across all previous lines (Fanon 1986, 1988, 2004).

Resurgent approaches might be physically nonviolent, but frequently involve ideological violence against tribal peoples and nontribal peoples. Such behavior is prevalent among ethnic Indigenes who mobilize their tribe(s)' histories, knowledge, and language to secure authority with groups outside of their tribal community. Ethnicization (e.g., pan-Indianism) can constrain institutional leadership along European ideals of race-sex identification and middle-class sensibilities regarding behavior in tribal governments and racialized institutions (Baker 2010; Simpson 2014). Within language revitalization there are activists that reflect uncritical displays of privilege, economic stability and flexibility, and access to cultural patrimony that highlight hierarchization of particular in-group language users – the type to say "If I can do it, so can you!" that is ignorant of their own privilege (Meek 2010; Uran 2012). The irony remains that these sensibilities are themselves the result of beliefs in Indian Country that education accomplishes a better life and the resulting generations of academics and professionals who happen to be descended from but have little experience with tribal peoples.

More concerning is that persons with no tribal relations are learning to look, walk, and talk like an Indigene - enabling them to conduct research, teach students and mentor them, serve as peer reviewers, and as peers in disciplinary organizations as an "Indigenous" person (e.g. Kang 2024). The number of Indian people skyrocketed in United States in 1960 when the federal census allowed self-identification for racial background in 1960 and Vine Deloria (1997: 1-2), noting that it was popular to be Indian at the turn of the century, stated that within a decade it might be necessary to do so because "People are not going to want to take the blame for the sorry state of the nation, and claiming allegiance with the most helpless racial minority may well be the way to escape accusations". Shulist & Pedri-Spade (2022) demonstrate ways that political discourse enables and encourages persons with questionable Indigenous heritage and/or affiliations who claim markers of Indigeneity such as language for access to resources from settler listening subjects (e.g. non-indigenous administrators). Examples include a Pretendian who mobilized language use to gain access to awards, spaces, and employment that were intended for Indigenous persons and another who came to equate their knowledge of language used by Indigenous persons with lived experience as an Indigenous person. I argue that tribal collaboration is a preventative solution to this problem.

In sum, Indigeneity is mobilized to renegotiate colonized status in the terms of the colonizer and corporatized colonial entities as state based civil rights. While this is conceptually powerful in bringing marginalized peoples from around the world into shared understandings, theoretical approaches, and political strategies applicable to their respective communities, claims to indigeneity do more to renegotiate the terms of their own colonization relative to one another. This becomes a problem when groups seek to Indigenize tribal communities – the very communities that give their performances provenance. Community Based Research and Indigenous Research Methodologies can be brought together in important ways, but researchers must maintain a self-critical edge if they are to unsettle

the boundaries crafted around racializing logics by explicit reference to the contexts from which they emerge (Uran 2012; Leonard 2023a).

3. TRIBES AND THE CONSTITUTION IN RESEARCH

Tribalizing language research mobilizes research by, with, and for transnational, transborder persons who maintain self-determining relations to land through language based reproductions of kinship, knowledge, and groupness work to assert inherent rights to self-govern from time immemorial. Tribal self-governance is inherent, not a result of delegation (like states), and is and presumed to exist from time immemorial to time infinite. I argue that state based institutions ought to re-orient their ethics to relations with tribes as polities with inherent rights who govern their constituent peoples, and Indigenous peoples as groups of individual moral agents enacting colonized and racialized identification as state citizens. The Constitution of the United States recognizes the national status (polity) of Indian tribes. The United States Supreme Court has clarified that Indian tribes are nations, having continued to practice political self-determination and governance from time immemorial. The political status of Indian tribes is that of "nation within a nation" (Marshall and SCOTUS 1832; Lyons & Mohawk 1992). Nothing prevents tribal peoples from maintaining citizenship in their tribes, the federal government, and the state in which they reside. Rather, the transnationality of tribal peoples has enormous potential for simultaneous impact on each polity that is dependent on the relational work of research.

Peoplehood is a concept in Native American and Indigenous Studies that includes interrelated criteria theorized to be universal to all indigenous peoples (Language, Sacred history, Place/Territory, Ceremonial cycle) that is meant to transcend statehood, nationalism, gender, ethnicity, and sectarian membership (Holm et al. 2003:11). This concept is similar to Johann Gottfried Herder's 18th century criteria for "apolitical" nationhood (Language, Character, Territory, Political agency, Formative influence) that later became criteria for legitimating emergent political nationalisms in Europe (Patten 2010:667-668; van den Bergh 2018). Each criterion can be symbolic to a larger sense of identity. The distinction between peoplehood and apolitical nations concepts is that peoplehood identifies interrelated groups engaged with the world as an interdependent whole while (apolitical) nations are discrete groups with rights to act in their own self-interests.

Tribalism, reproducing self-determining relations with land toward time infinite, is a process that simultaneously engages at least two political entities sharing relations to particular lands affecting transborder engagement between peoples of each nation as they interact as guest or host in overlapping jurisdictions. Engagement with home and host communities in intertribal settings, or with tribes and states in federalized contexts, can have mutually positive consequences for guests and hosts, encouraging simultaneous engagement with distinct peoples (cf. transnational simultaneity;

Tsuda 2012). Equitable relations between guests and hosts may present no immediate reason for simultaneous engagement among tribal and state citizens while inequity may present reasons for or against doing so. Mutually reinforced isolation of individuals from their tribes by decreased simultaneity is not as common and isolation does not require simultaneous withdrawal. Consider for example those tribal persons throughout the Americas who have and continue to exercise mobility across borders. Their mobility does not ipso facto strip them of tribal citizenship nor peoplehood although there is potential to reify inequitable relations for and/or against other groups. One's detribalization and racialization does not automatically make one a colonialist (Sepúlveda 2023).

The distinction between polity and peoplehood is important precisely because all tribal peoples are (non-capitalized) indigenous to their homelands but not all (capitalized) Indigenous peoples maintain political commitments toward their tribe nor enact identification as tribal peoples. Some Indigenous-led organizations organize themselves around peoplehood, broadly speaking, and commit themselves to state governance through circumvention of tribal polity. Further, the United Nations orients Indigenous labels toward self-identification with (pre-)colonial land relations rather than sustaining self-determining relations to land and associated tribal institutions that establish best practices for doing so. Researchers can start preliminary work toward tribalizing research by considering the mission and vision of relevant governing entities.

3.1. TRIBALLY BASED COMMUNITY RESEARCH

Tribally Based Community Research (TBCR) here refers to research and/or institutional engagements that take place in Indian Country and/or on land under the control or jurisdiction of a sovereign tribe, including research conducted in Indian Health Service (IHS) facilities or involving IHS staff/resources that engage citizens of tribes and may result in research outcomes with implications specific to a tribe or to individuals as members of a tribe, or involve human subjects including biological material identifiable by tribe that could result in conclusions/generalizations about a tribe or individual citizens of tribes (UA Guidelines for Engagement with Native Nations 2018).

TBCR requires further oversight and approvals from the collaborating tribe(s) to base externally driven research in their lands and/or with their peoples in addition to institutional review board/review ethics board processes of state driven research. For example, the United States' National Science Foundation (NSF; 2024) recently revised its Proposal and Aware Policies and Procedures Guide to include a section on seeking and obtaining Tribal Nation approval for proposals that may impact tribal resources or interests, including tribal languages, and will not award proposals which do not have prior written approval from the official(s) designated by the relevant Tribal Nation(s). The NSF uses the term Tribal Nation to refer to acknowledged tribes, bands, nations, pueblos, villages and communities that

the federal government recognizes as tribes. A list of these tribes is updated in the United States Federal Register each year in January (25 U.S.C. §§ 5130- 5131).

There are limits to Tribally Based Community Research. First, locating tribal communities as passive sites for research has the associated potential to perpetuate the extraction of language from the ideological commitments, embodied experiences, and communicative practices of tribal communities and their respective peoplehood (Davis 2017). Second, researchers' commitments to funding entities, academic promotion, and resource development (articles, databases, handbooks) may unduly influence project interests (questions, methods, goals) to the marginalization of community interests. Third, if researchers do not continue engagement with participating community members beyond data collection through interpretations of the data, then transcribed knowledge may not fully align. Many of these concerns can be addressed through meaningful and frequent engagement with tribal government and state oversight entities.

Field research in the linguistic sciences is often exempt from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight but may require approval by multiple authorities, including but not limited to university based IRBs, local government administrations and IRBs, and local community entities appropriate to national context (Bowern 2010). IRBs in the United States were established as protections for individual human subjects in federal and state contexts. These protections were established in response to the *Belmont Report* (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research 1979) which documented unethical research practices and recommended core principles for ethical research. Core principles for IRBs resulting from the Belmont Report include respect for persons, as autonomous agents, and protection for those with diminished autonomy, preventing and/or minimizing harm while maximizing benefits (beneficence), and equitable distributions of the burdens and benefits of the project (justice). The Code of Federal Regulations lists criteria for IRB approval of research plans that directly relate to the principles of the Belmont Report (45 C.F.R. § 46 2009).

Respect for persons requires *free prior and informed consent* with adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects, data confidentiality, and implementation of safeguards for the rights and welfare of research participants. Beneficence requires prevention of unnecessary risks to research participants, relaying the benefits in relation to the risks resulting from the research, and provisions to monitor data collected for confidentiality and privacy of participants, as appropriate. Justice requires that the selection of research participants is equitable given the purposes and settings of research conduct while also being cognizant of differently protected persons, including economically or educationally disadvantaged peoples, racialized persons, pregnant women, and children. Research projects can be exempted from review, go through limited review, or have review expedited when the research poses minimal risk or no serious threats of harm while offering research benefits to

participants (45 C.F.R. § 46 2009). At least one state, as a matter of policy, requires the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to obtain free prior and informed consent from tribes before initiating programs or projects that directly and tangibly affect tribes, tribal rights, tribal lands, and sacred sites (Washington State AGO 2019).

Some universities, such as the University of Arizona (UA), have committed to affirming the government-to-government relationships of tribes and the federal government by complying with all applicable tribal laws, codes, and regulations and acknowledging that laws to protect individual participants might not be sufficient to protect the interests of sovereign tribes who may be affected by such research (Policy 1-118; Arizona Board of Regents 2016). Areas to address in addition to general expectations of the IRB process include jurisdiction over dispute resolution and/or contractual provisions, fees and investments, control over continuation of projects or contracts, data control and ownership, publication rights, confidentiality, local presence of community partners, and presentations to Tribal Council and/or other bodies (Nelson 2021).

State based research concerning Indigenous peoples can utilize independent review boards or partner with local universities. In the case of multiple research sites, a primary oversight entity must be determined. The academic researcher's home institution may provide primary oversight but that oversight will largely apply to living people about whom information is collected and that might contribute to generalizable knowledge and to whom the research process may put in immediate danger. Archival work based on the legacy documentation of sleeping languages, analyzing materials written about language, oral histories about language experiences, and other approaches to language research are not included in narrow definitions of "research" and human "subjects".[6]

University IRB application forms also tend to exclude reference to community-based collaboration, implying that "ethical concerns are only recognized with respect to collaboration between or among academic people or institutions" (Leonard & Haynes 2010:277). This is significant because a more equitable Linguistics recognizes that the ethical standards set by Institutional Review Boards are minimal and are insufficient to ensure that language work does not have unintentional negative consequences for racialized and otherwise marginalized groups (Charity Hudley et al. 2020). Defining what constitutes language (Leonard 2017), what best practices are to support different groups (sovereign and otherwise) toward self-determination (Tsikewa 2021), and ensuring that innovative technology functions accurately, representationally, and equitably (D'arcy & Bender 2023:56) remain points of discussion in language research ethics.

---

[6] Many thanks to the journal referee that pointed out that this fact should be made explicit.

3.1.1. CASE STUDY: 2016, 2017

In 2016 I applied for a tribal grant to bring a cadre of tribal members to the American Indian Language Development Institute's (AILDI) four week Summer Session classes. Due to circumstances beyond their control, the Klamath Tribes was unable to process funding in time for that session. AILDI modified the work plan to help me facilitate a 3-day maqlaqsyals class for up to 10 tribal members that included training in sound systems, word-building, sentence-building and immersion and elicited guidance from participants about what I should consider as I trained in Linguistics.

I shared methods that I learned while I was in Arizona, including microteaching-style lessons (McCarty et al. 1997; Galla et al. 2010) and basic conversational premises for immersion that were adapted from the Where Are Your Keys? method (cf. Gardner & Ciotti 2018) that I learned from a workshop facilitated by Diné College at the University of Arizona. Bringing these skills back to my tribal community was important for demonstrating that I could share what I was learning from grammatical materials in immersion based scenarios that built capacities for individuals to teach back the words and phrases that they already knew or were learning (Galla et al. 2010). My MA advisor encouraged me to consider the interrelatedness of Linguistics, language education, cultural protocol, grassroots organization, and tribal sovereignty (cf. Oberly 2015) so I believed it was important to bring back what I could to my community before asking what was to be done. I requested and received tribal authorization to distribute surveys and record conversations about language in between lessons during the language workshop.

Language reclamation requires transdisciplinary considerations to establish participatory pathways that will accomplish community language goals. A revivalist [7] architect might ask extralinguistic questions regarding the effect of structures on language reclamation, including whether naturalistic pre-contact oriented settings, modernity with a native flair, or a western style government building are most empowering to language users (Zuckermann 2021). Fortunately, my tribe has a modern building built to have the flair of our respective cultures as Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Paiute peoples that serves as a community center and is conveniently available for tribal members to rent. The building is on tribally-owned lands and the meeting space is modeled after maqlaqs' semi-subterranean earth lodges, with skylights representing the traditional entry way through the smoke

---

[7] Revivalistics is an emergent field of study that theorizes on the universal constraints/global mechanisms and particular cultural contexts of language based social movements drawn from lessons in Aboriginal Australia and Israel (Zuckermann 2003, 2009, 2020). Zuckermann tends to imply that revivalists will not also be language custodians, but it may be the case that Aboriginal revivalists are not publishing their work in academic journals yet.

hole and floor layout modeled after an aerial perspective of giiwas[8] (also known as Crater Lake), a significant cultural site. Language work in this context is benefitted by saturation with mnemonic devices for tribal participants to share alongside extant and emergent knowledges resulting from language exposure.

This setting was relevant to the research because as an individual tribal member I cannot definitively know our tribe's collective experiences under colonialism nor epistemologies regarding language, but I can use what I know to advance community goals from a relative position of power. Australian scholar Nado Aveling (2013:211-212) makes this very point as a non-Indigenous ally to Indigenous researchers in "speaking to her own mob" against white scholars imagining that they *know* Indigenous epistemologies and experiences under colonialism (emphasis in original). However, I argue that the principle necessarily applies to community-scholar linguists working in and across tribal contexts.

Acknowledging different positionalities and differential access to language resources, critically reflecting on power relations, and continuous self-reflection helped me to yield and honor other ways of knowing while also honoring other ways of not knowing (i.e., develop cultural humility; SooHoo 2013:201; Abay & von Unger 2024:281). The reason I am conversational in maqlaqsyals with difficulties is because I have studied language materials for years and have formal linguistics training and mentors, not because I used maqlaqsyals in daily conversation beyond limited vocabulary sets and phrases. My relative position of power as language user, researcher, linguist, scholar was tempered by other relational categories of identification enacted by tribal adults, relatives, cousins, parents, and children of those who give provenance to markers of our shared peoplehood.

I can depend on many younger community members to have similar language exposure as myself through tribal programming. However, many older and elder people in my community are latent language users who are knowledgeable of words and expressions within domains related to maqlaqs culture and have a more developed implicit understanding of phonological productivity (cf. 'latent speaker;' Basham & Fathman 2008:592). As such, many are used to passively listening to maqlaqsyals rather than producing, may be more hesitant to engage in active participation as learners, and, more broadly, may look upon the next generation of language users as ambiguous figures of success and/or failure within revitalization movements (Costa 2017). Providing exercises to introduce ourselves, where our people(s) are from, and who our relatives are in maqlaqsyals through effective lessons that "sound right" to community members was important for attending to individual positionalities and backgrounds relating to language goals.

---

[8] [giːwaʃ]

The pilot workshop in 2016 engaged a small group of tribal community members who found the methods effective. Some participants learned that they were related, and lunchtime discussions were facilitated using prompts from Native American scholars engaged in similar work (e.g., Wilson and Yellowbird 2005). When administering surveys and facilitating discussions I was explicit about the fact that I would publish a summary of the workshop's results (in addition to the grant report on methods and language education) in general because it was required of me as a junior academic (doctoral student). I assured participants that I would not formalize anything that was said or recorded without their express permission and opportunity to revise their words in context for nontribal audiences as part of what is "tribally appropriate" to share as self-determined individuals and members of our highest governing body. No participants shared a particular interest in being identified for the general public so quantitative and qualitative results were published (Dupris 2019) without doing so.[9]

A second workshop was held with a larger group in 2017 that yielded similar results but the Institutional Review Board application was not approved nor exempted prior to the dates of the event so I made clear that the results of language work would not be published for a general audience. The methods enabled some tribal members to achieve existing goals, others to figure out which domains/resources they wanted to prioritize, and how to broaden participation in language based activities with regard to their families and communities. Participants broadly acknowledged that the lessons and discussions were important for our collective knowledge.

Critically, language immersion, orthography, documentation, and analysis were contextualized through continuities and disruptions to participants' peoplehood identified in histories of federal termination policy, construed (non)Indianness, and the restoration of our federal recognition. This had the two-fold benefit of affirming individuals' positionality and background within broader relations and helping each other to understand how particular family histories interrelate. The former supports the establishment of cultural validity[10] in Tribal Community Based Research by providing a lens to examine how academic theories can underpin critical discussion on the assessment of goals and expectations for language work (Trumbull & Nelson-Barber 2019; Shultz & Englert 2021, 2023). The latter considers a raciolinguistic perspective (cf. Flores & Rosa 2015; Rosa & Flores 2017) that can

---

[9] A referee notes that participants in Community Based Research and Indigenous Research Methodologies may want their voices more broadly known by name. The primacy of anonymity over identification in Institutional Review Board guidelines can be seen as restrictive and imposing but justifications can be made to negotiate administrative presuppositions.

[10] Cultural validity considers (1) to what extent practices resonate with current thinking in culture and language sciences, (2) how diverse populations are specified and properly represented, (3) how persons from different backgrounds interpret items, and (4) how multiple sources of information and forms of data analysis and interpretation combine to examine the influence of culture on community performance (Solano-Flores 2011:17).

undo the common approach in Linguistics to treat racial categories as discrete, self-evident demographic groups by paying close attention to racialization in its specific geopolitical contexts (Flores & Rosa 2023; Leonard 2023a:443). My interest in the relations of disciplinary Linguistics to the relations we had, have, and are yet to have come through language work guided by a local heuristic from my community, "naanok gew s?as?aaMaks[11] 'all my relations'."

3.2. TRIBALLY DRIVEN PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH

A more ideal means to conduct tribal research is Tribally Driven Participatory Research (TDPR). TDPR reflects core principles and methods of Community Based Research and Indigenous Research Methodologies[12] while committing to the sustenance and authority of tribal government that ensures that the tribe actively controls and drives research instead of acting as a passive base for institutionally driven research (Mariella et al. 2009). Recognizing the primacy of tribal sovereignty, however, means recognizing the potential for tribes to strategically adopt networks and methods from pluralogic space between tribal, colonial, and arrivant groups in renegotiating relations including reification of nativist-racist hierarchization and/or rejecting potentially self-defeating imitations of colonizers that are sometimes portrayed as evidence of sovereignty (cf. critical sovereigntism in Uran 2012:8; Simpson 2014; Leonard 2020). Said another way, not all tribes are amenable to participatory self-governance, and it is up to tribal citizens to assert their respective forms of self-governance or to establish alternative and potential forms as necessary to continue tribal self-determination toward time infinite.

The common principles that I will focus on here are reciprocity and redistribution (cf. Burton et al. 2024). Reciprocity and redistribution are used to address and redress extractive, exclusionary, and/or siloed modes and methodologies of research, recognize that all methods have underwritten prioritizations of outcomes and parameters, and induce methodological shifts to undo the inequalities made by research produced at universities (Burton et al. 2024). Reciprocity invokes Wilson's (2008) relational framework in mobilizing reciprocity for research that seeks to form a stronger relationship with the idea(s) that researchers and participants involved in the research will share the roles and responsibilities of the researcher in that relationship, question oneself about one's roles and obligations to other participants, to the topic, and to all of their relations, question what one is contributing or giving back, and whether the sharing, growth and learning is reciprocal.

---

[11] [na:nok gɜw ʃʔaʃʔa:maks]

[12] Salient principles of CBR/IRMs here are grounding in an Indigenous epistemology, privileging Indigenous voices, explicitly focusing on Indigenous values in research design, honoring and respecting sacred knowledges, observing cultural protocols, emphasizing collaboration and benefit to Indigenous peoples, utilizing storytelling and other methods, "giving back" to communities, and locating oneself in research reports (Aveling 2013:207).

Redistribution is "an outright challenge to the prestige economy of academic research and the presumptions about and investment in status," aligning directly with broader understandings of social and racial inequities in academia (Burton et al. 2024). The authors in Charity Hudley et al.'s (2024a) edited volume exemplify reciprocity and redistribution through community partnerships and public engagement in ways that work to create more just and inclusive classrooms, open inclusive disciplinary and institutional pathways for marginalized people, and foster intersectional inclusion when integrating disciplinary Linguistics into education systems. The second edited volume by Charity Hudley et al. (2024b) provides means by which linguists can implement a decolonizing lens in Linguistics and academia by centering community engagement and activism in ways that challenge colonial logics through teaching and research. This inclusive and antiracist scholarship resonates strongly with tribal linguists as Indigenous and racialized scholars in an academic discipline that was established to help usurp tribal lands, establish nativist-racist hierarchization, and reify inequitable relations.

The potential of this body of work can be understood to be oriented toward, and amenable to, reclamatory practices in Indian Country including partnerships between tribal models of assistance in teacher preparation, universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities, and language planning demonstrated by the authors in Crowshoe et al. (2021). It scores positively when considered through Leonard's (2021) relationality quotient for planning and assessing language work projects: "Does the project, to the extent possible for the particular location and context, demonstrate and facilitate relational accountability?". This work would also be considered positively within evaluative frameworks wherein scholars are increasingly required to address the social contexts and implications of their work as a regular portion of abstracts submitted for conferences, journals, and other venues (Leonard 2023b). Such work also facilitates redistribution of power, resources, and benefits of decision-making, financial benefit (i.e., accountability via "budget forensics"), access to educational spaces, access to social, political, and institutional power, and access to recognition of expertise beyond academic credentials or positions (Burton et al. 2024). This last point is important because academic credentials do not necessarily lend themselves to institutional positions of tribal leadership nor informal forms of community leadership among tribal peoples. Recognizing this is important to checking researchers' academic biases.

Sovereignty maintains its meaning as tribes exercise internal sovereignty and engage in inter-sovereign relations with other tribal nations, (colonial) states, the federal government, and their institutions (Cobb 2005). This process has moved forward in terms of policy, especially in the health sciences, through the creation of Model Tribal Research Codes (e.g., American Indian Law Center 1999). Some tribes, like Navajo Nation, have already established regular research oversight authorities for their tribe and/or Indian Health Service (IHS) areas while others have worked with a

common research center to develop policy (Gibson et al. 2008) and build infrastructures for research (Brugge & Missaghian 2006; Buffalo et al. 2019). An updated framework for understanding research oversight is provided by Him et al. (2019) that includes a "conscious re-ordering" of several categories of authorities that can provide research oversight for tribal nations including the Tribal Nation, Tribal Colleges & Universities (TCUs), Tribally Based/Tribally Focused Organizations or Departments, and Indian Health Service. [13] Tribes that control research within methodological considerations of reciprocity and redistribution have great potential to energize the language work of those who are living and working within their own lands and mobilizing collective language actions through their respective peoples, communities, and territories.

4. CONCLUSION

Linguistics is shifting from a century of research oriented to exploit tribal peoples toward a future in which linguists, through research partnerships and collaborative projects, are helping to rebuild that which many of our predecessors helped to destroy. This represents a marked shift in the current paradigm of linguistic science. I urge linguists to embrace this shift toward collaboration and partnerships and to make explicit the relations of language to place, positionality, peoplehood, and polity in reciprocal and redistributive frameworks.

The International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022-2032 and its relationship to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development demonstrate the intimate, if implicit, ties of language, land, and people. The United States' derivative 10-year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization must further account for the polity of autonomous communities, nations, bands, pueblos, and villages (which I have termed tribes). The federal government is constitutionally obligated to tribes as political entities and each state of the Union is obligated to the civil rights of their citizens, Indigenous or otherwise.

The extraction of language-as-structure from its relations to peoplehood and political relations has led to a bad habit on the part of contemporary language researchers to conflate marginalized citizens of the state with self-determined citizens of tribes when operating in civil rights oriented approaches like Community Based Research and Indigenous Research Methodologies. Community-scholar linguists have already shared that Linguistics must minimally reformulate what we understand to constitute language and what are best practices for working with colonized, racialized peoples. Explicit distinction between tribal and Indigenous peoples must be made within theoretical frameworks to realize the transformative potential of language based activities to equitably sustain tribal polity. To tribalize language research, linguists can start by contacting the relevant governing entity/entities to

---

[13] A list of independent Tribal Institutional Review Boards is available at
https://www.ihs.gov/dper/research/hsrp/instreviewboards/

see where they can begin and/or where they can reevaluate and adjust the frameworks in which they operate.

Language research that facilitates reciprocity and redistribution considers power, resources, and benefits of decision-making, financial benefit, access to educational spaces, and access to social, political, and institutional power. There are many tribal, Indigenous, and racialized scholars who are doing good work in this vein, but it is important to also recognize some of the non-Native and white language workers who do well in this work. I specifically want to recognize Tim Thornes at Boise State University as a non-Native scholar who has dedicated his career to meaningful engagement with the Northern Paiute people with whom he conducts research (cf. Thornes 1996, 2003, 2020; Sapién & Thornes 2017), including Paiute citizens of my own tribe. I also want to recognize Evan Gardner and Susanna Ciotti of Where Are Your Keys? LLC for their non-Native owned business strictly dedicated to building tribal capacities for language work, including active recruitment, language consulting, and research collaborations with or from within tribal government.

Tribalizing research is difficult, but it is achievable, and will likely be necessary by the end of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022-2032 and the United States 10-year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization.

REFERENCES

25 U.S.C. § 5130 (2022). Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994.
https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:25%20section:5131%20edition:prelim). [Accessed January 4, 2025]

45 C.F.R. § 46 (2009). *Protection of Human Subjects*.
https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/sites/default/files/ohrp/policy/ohrpregulations.pdf [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Abay, R.A., & von Unger., H., (Eds). (2024). Cultural humility in participatory research: Debunking the myth of 'hard to reach' groups. In Abay, R.A., & Soldatić. K. *Intersectional colonialities: Embodied colonial violence and practices of resistance at the axis of disability, race, indigeneity, class, and gender.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003280422-17

Alderson, A., (2020). Reframing research in Indigenous countries: A methodological framework for research with/within Indigenous nations. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 15(1), 36-57. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-07-2018-1666

Alfred, T., (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom.* University of Toronto Press.

Alfred, G.T., (2009). Colonialism and state dependency. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 5(2). 42-60. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijih/article/view/28982

Alim, H.S., A. Reyes, & Kroskrity, P.V., (Eds.). 2020. *The Oxford handbook of language and race*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190845995.001.0001

Alim, H.S., J.R. Rickford, & Ball A.F., (Eds.). 2016. *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. Oxford University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190625696.001.0001

American Indian Law Center. (1999). *Model tribal research code: With materials for tribal regulation for research and checklist for Indian health boards*. American Indian Law Center, Inc.

Arizona Board of Regents. (2016). *Tribal Consultation (Policy Number: 1-118)*. 1-5. Arizona Board of Regents. https://naair.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2024-05/ABOR%20Tribal%20Consultation%20Policy.pdf [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Aveling, N., (2013). 'Don't talk about what you don't know': on (not) conducting research with/in Indigenous contexts. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2). 203-214.
https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2012.724021

Austin, J., Parkes, G., & Antonio, A., (2015). We know our place: Indigenous community research and the ever-evaporating critical qualitative research tradition. *Qualitative Research Journal,* 15(3). 282-293. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-01-2015-0001

Baker, L.D., (2010). *Anthropology and the racial politics of culture*. Duke University Press. https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/48496

Basham, C. & Fathman, A.K., (2008). The latent speaker: Attaining adult fluency in an endangered language. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(5). 577-597. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ824596

Bauman, R. & Briggs C.L., (2003). *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486647

Berkhofer, R.F., (1978). *The white man's Indian: The history of an idea from Columbus to the present*. Knopf.

Bhabha, H.K., (2004). *The location of culture*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203820551

Bird, S., Wiles, J. L., Okalik, L., Kilabuk, J., & Egeland, G. M., (2009). Methodological consideration of story telling in qualitative research involving indigenous peoples. *Global health promotion*, 16(4), 16–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975909348111.

Bischoff, S. & Jany, C., (2018). *Insights from Practices in Community-Based Research: From Theory To Practice Around The Globe*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018.

Biolsi T., & Zimmerman L.J., (Eds.). (1997). *Indians and anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr., and the critique of Anthropology*. University of Arizona Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1jf2d9c

Boas, F., (1911). Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages, Vol.1. *Bulletin 40*. 1-83. Bureau of American Ethnology.

Bowern, C., (2010). Fieldwork and the IRB: A snapshot. *Language.* 86(4). 897-905. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40961721

Bowern C. & Warner, N., (2015). "Lone wolves" and collaboration: A reply to Crippen & Robinson (2013). *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 9. 59-85. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24634

Brayboy, B. M. J., Gough, H. R., Leonard, B., Roehl, R. F. II, & Solyom, J. A., (2012). Reclaiming scholarship: Critical indigenous research methodologies. In S. D. Lapan, M. T. Quartaroli, & F. J. Riemer (Eds.), *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs*. 423–450. Jossey-Bass.

Brubaker, R., (2004). *Ethnicity without groups*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1nnwhvg

Brugge, D., & Missaghian, M., (2006). Protecting the Navajo People through tribal regulation of research. *Science and engineering ethics*, 12(3), 491–507. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-006-0047-2

Buffalo, M., Heinzmann, J., Kenyon, D. B., Blindman, K., Bordeaux, S., Frederick, A., Garrison, E., Greensky, C., Larsen, H., Kjerland, T., & Grey Owl, V., (2019). Not a One-Size-Fits-All Approach: Building Tribal Infrastructure for Research Through CRCAIH. *American Indian and Alaska native mental health research (Online)*, *26*(2), 42–70. https://doi.org/10.5820/aian.2602.2019.42

Burton, A., Davis, J.L., & Brennan, M.L., (2024) Reciprocity and redistribution: Methodologies for rethinking public and community-based humanities research. In Fisher-Livne, D., & May-Curry, M. *The Routledge Companion to Public Humanities Scholarship*. 13 pgs. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003248125-5

Carpenter C.M. & Yoon, K.H. (2014). Native/Asian encounters. *College Literature*. 41(1). https://muse.jhu.edu/issue/29368 lanbg

Charity Hudley, A.H., Mallinson, C., & Bucholtz, M., (2020). Toward racial justice in linguistics: Interdisciplinary insights into theorizing race in the discipline and diversifying the profession. *Language 96*(4), e200-e235. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2020.0074.

Charity Hudley, A.H., Mallinson, C., & Bucholtz, M., (Eds.). (2024a). *Inclusion in Linguistics.* Oxford Academic. doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197755303.001.0001

Charity Hudley, A.H., Mallinson, C., & Bucholtz, M., (Eds.). (2024b). *Decolonizing Linguistics*. Oxford Academic. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197755259.001.0001

Chilisa, B., (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Cobb, A.J., (2005). Understanding tribal sovereignty: Definitions, concepptualizations, and interpretations. *American Studies*, *46*(3/4). 115-132. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40643893

Costa, J., (2017). *Revitalising language in Provence: A critical approach*. Wiley Blackwell. https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02105500

Coulthard, G. S., (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. University of Minnesota Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt9qh3cv

Crippen, J.A. & Robinson, L.C., (2013). In defense of the lone wolf: Collaboration in language documentation. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, *7*. 123-135. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4577

Crowshoe, L., Genee, I., Peddle, M., Smith, J., and Snoek, C. (Eds.). (2021). *Sustaining Indigenous languages: Connecting communities, teachers, and scholars.* Northern Arizona University College of Education. https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/SILL/

Czaykowska-Higgins, E., (2009). Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, *3*. 182-215. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4423

D'arcy, A., & Bender, E.M., (2023) Ethics in linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, *9*. 49-69. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031120-015324

Davis, J.L., (2017) Resisting rhetorics of language endangerment: Reclamation through Indigenous language survivance. *Language Documentation and Description*, *14*. 37-58. https://doi.org/10.25894/ldd147

Deloria, V., (1969). Custer died for your sins: an Indian manifesto. Macmillan Company.

Deloria, P., (1998). *Playing Indian.* Yale Historical Publications Series. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300153606

Deloria, B., Foehner, F., & Scinta, S., (Eds.) (1999). Spirit & reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr., reader. Fulcrum Publishing.

Denzin, K.D., & Salvo, J., (Eds.). (2020) *New directions in theorizing qualitative research: Indigenous research*. Myers Education Press.

Deumert, A., Storch, A., Shepherd, N., (2021) *Colonial and decolonial linguistics: Knoweldeges and epistemes.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198793205.001.0001

Dupris, J., (2019). maqlaqsyalank hemyeega: Goals and expectations of Klamath-Modoc revitalization. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, *13*. 155-196. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24851

Endo, M., (2022). *Redefining race: Virginia's Racial Integrity Act and American Indian Identification*. George Mason University Dissertation.

Errington, J., (2007). Linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power. Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470690765

Fanon, F., (1986). *Black Skin, White Masks*. Grove Press.

Fanon, F., (1988). *Toward the African revolution: Political essays*. Grove Press.

Fanon, F., (2004). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.

Fitzgerald, C.M., (2021). A framework for language revitalization and documentation. *Language*. *97*(1). e1-e11. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0006

Fitzgerald, C.M., and Hinson, J., (2013).'Ilittibatoksali 'We are working together': Perspectives on our Chickasaw tribal-academic collaboration. *FEL XVII: Endangered languages beyond boundaries: Community connections, collaborative approaches, and cross-disciplinary research*. Norris, Mary Jane, Erik Anonby, Marie-Odile Junker, Nicholas Ostler, and Donna Patrick. (eds.). 53–60. The Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J., (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Flores J. & Rosa F., (2023). Undoing raciolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. *27*(5). 421-427. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12643

Friedman, J., (1992). The past in the future: History and the politics of identity. *American Anthropologist*. *94*(4). 837-859. http://www.jstor.org/stable/680224

Galla, C. K., Oberly, S., Romero, L., Sam, M., & Zepeda, O., (2010). American Indian language development institute: 30 year tradition of speaking from the heart. *Tucson, AZ: American Indian Language Development Institute*. https://aildi.arizona.edu/content/book-30-year-tradition-speaking-our-heart

Gardner, E.& Ciotti, S., (2018). An overview of Where Are Your Keys?: A glimpse inside the technique toolbox. In Hinton, L., Huss, L., & Roche, G. *The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization,* 137-145. Routledge.

Gibson, G., Martin, J., Zoe, J.B., Edwards, K., Gibson, Nancy., (2008). Setting our minds to it: Community-centred research for health policy development in northern Canada. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, *5*(2). 33-54. https://journalindigenouswellbeing.co.nz/media/2018/10/3_Gibson.pdf

Gruber, J.W., (1967). Horatio Hale and the development of American Anthropology. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, *111*(1). 5-37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/985751

Haney-López, I., (2006). *White by law: the legal construction of race. Revised and updated, tenth anniversary edition*. New York University Press.

Harkin M.E., (Ed.) (2004). *Reassessing revitalization movements: Perspectives from North America and the Pacific islands*. University of Nebraska Press.

Harvey, S.P., (2015). Native tongues. *Colonialism and race from encounter to the reservation.* Harvard University Press.

Hayward, A., Wodtke, L., Craft, A., Robin, T., Smylie, J., McConkey, S., Nychuk, A., Healy, C., Star, L., & Cidro, J., (2021). Addressing the need for indigenous and decolonized quantitative research methods in Canada. *SSM - population health*, *15*,(100899). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100899

Him, D.A., Aguilar, T.A., Frederick, A., Larsen, H., Seiber, M., Angal, J., (2019). Tribal IRBs: A framework for understanding research oversight in American Indian and Alaska Native communities. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research, 26*(2). 71-95. https://doi.org/10.5820/aian.2602.2019.71

Holm, T., Pearson, J. D., & Chavis, B., (2003). Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *18*(1), 7–24. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1409431

hooks, b., (2014). Black looks: Race and representation. Routledge. https://doi.org./10.4324/9781315743226

Jacobs, M.D., (2009). *White mother to a dark race: settler colonialism, maternalism, and the removal of indigenous children in the American West and Australia, 1880-1940*. University of Nebraska Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/11886/

Jackson, J.E., (1995) Culture, genuine and spurious: The politics of Indianness in the Vaupés, Colombia. *American Ethnologist, 22*(1). 3-27. https://www.jstor.org/stable/646044

John, S., (2023): Das Geschäft mit der Lakota-Sprache im Lichte ethischer und rechtlicher Erwägungen [The Lakota language business in light of ethical and legal considerations]. *AmerIndian Research* 18/2(68). 50-56. http://www.sonjajohn.net/DasGeschaeftMitDerLakota-Sprache_SonjaJohn.pdf

Kang, J. C., (2024, February 26). *A professor claimed to be Native American. did she know she wasn't?* The New Yorker. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2024/03/04/a-professor-claimed-to-be-native-american-did-she-know-she-wasnt

Kauanui, J.K., (2016). "A structure, not an event": Settler colonialism and enduring Indigeneity. *Lateral, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.7

Klamath Tribes (1989). ?ewksiknii?am hemkanks: Klamath words and phrases. Klamath Tribes Culture & Heritage Program.

Klopotek, B., (2011). Recognition odysseys: Indigeneity, race, and federal tribal recognition policy in three Louisiana Indian communities. Dike University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822394082

Kovach, M., (2023). Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts. (2nd edn.). University of Toronto Press. https://utorontopress.com/9781487525644/indigenous-methodologies/

Leonard, W.Y., (2017). Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language'. In Leonard, W.Y. & De Korne, H. (eds.). *Language Documentation and Description, 14.* 15-36. http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/150

Leonard, W.Y., (2020). Insights from Native American Studies for theorizing race and racism in linguistics (response to Charity Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz). *Language, 96*(4). e281-e291. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/45r672xq

Leonard, W.Y., (2021). Closing remarks [Video]. *International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC), 7*. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/74505

Leonard, W. Y., (2023a). Who is (not) engaged with undoing Raciolinguistics?. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *27*. 441–444. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12638.

Leonard, W. Y., (2023b). Thoughts on the ethics of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages. *Colorado Environmental Law Journal*. 34. 115-120. https://scholar.law.colorado.edu/celj/vol34/iss3/10

Leonard, W.Y. & Haynes, E., (2010) Making "collaboration" collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research. *Language Documentation & Conservation, 4*. 268-293.

Lightfoot, S.R., 2020. The pessimism traps of Indigenous resurgence. In Stevens, T., Michelsen (Eds.). *Pessimism in International Relations*. 155-172. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21780-8_10

Linton, R., (1943). Nativistic Movements. *American Anthropologist*, *45*(2), 230–240. http://www.jstor.org/stable/663272

Lobo. S., Talbot, S., & Morris, T.L., (Eds.). (2016). *Native American voices: A reader.* Routledge.

Lyons, O. and Mohawk, J., (Eds.). (1992). *Exiled in the land of the free: Democracy, Indian Nations, and the U.S. Constitution.* Clear Light Publishers.

Mariella, P., Brown, E. & Carter, M., (2009). Tribally-Driven Participatory Research: State of the practice and potential strategies for the future. Jouirnal of Health Disparities Research and Practice, 3(2). 41-58. https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/jhdrp/vol3/iss2/4.

Marshall, J., & Supreme Court Of The United States. (1832) *U.S. Reports: Worcester v. the State of Georgia, 31 U.S. 6 Pet. 515.* [Periodical] Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep031515/.

Mays, K.T., (2021). An Afro-Indigenous history of the United States. Beacon Press. https://www.beacon.org/An-Afro-Indigenous-History-of-the-United-States-P1731.aspx

Mills, C.W., (1997). The racial contract. Cornell University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt5hh1wj

McCarty, T. L. , Watahomigie, L. J., Yamamoto, A. Y., Zepeda, O., (1997). School-community-university collaborations: the American Indian Language Development Institute. In J. Reyhner (Ed.). *Teaching Indigenous Languages*. 85-104.Northern Arizona University. https://aildi.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/aildi-30-year-book-01-school-community-university-collaborations.pdf

McIntosh, I., (2010, April 2). Are there Indigenous peoples in Asia?. *Cultural Survival.* 24(3). https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/are-there-indigenous-peoples-asia

Meek, B., (2010). We are our l,anguage: An ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community. University of Arizona Press. https://uapress.arizona.edu/book/we-are-our-language

Moreton-Robinson, A., (2015). *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty.* University of Minnesota Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt155jmpf

Nagel, J., & Snipp, C. M., (1993). Ethnic reorganization: American Indian social, economic, political, and cultural strategies for survival. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *16*(2), 203–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1993.9993780

National Archives and Records Administration. *DCPD-202100841 - Executive Order 14049-White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Native Americans and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities*. Government: Office of the Federal Register. https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/DCPD-202100841. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html [Accessed January 4, 2025]

National Science Foundation. (2024). Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide. Office of Management and Budget 3145-0058. https://nsf-gov-resources.nsf.gov/files/nsf24_1.pdf?VersionId=m8jaLa_6ShoF6gQzkyYeMXFMImHgl5jl. [Accessed January 4, 2025].

Nelson, C.E., (2021). *Collaborative research + Engagement with Native Nations and Indigenous peoples.* University of Arizona Native Peoples Technical Assistance Office. https://naair.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2021%20NPTAO%20UA%20Research%20in%20Indian%20Country_for%20web.pdf. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Flores, N., & Rosa, J., (2023). Undoing raciolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 27. 421–427. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12643.

Ngai, M. M., (1999). The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924. *The Journal of American History*, *86*(1), 67–92. https://doi.org/10.2307/2567407

Ngai, M.M., (2014). *Impossible Subjects*: *Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America - Updated Edition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/64461/

Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. (2021, October 10). DCPD-202100841 - Executive Order 14049-White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Native Americans and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities. [Government]. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration. https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/DCPD-202100841. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Oberly, S., White, D., Millich, A., Cloud, M.I., Seibel, L., Ivey, C., & Cloud, L. (2015). Southern Ute grassroots language revitalization. Language Documentation & Conservation, 9. 324-343. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24646

Patten, A., (2010). "The most natural state": Herder and nationalism. *History of Political Thought*, *31*(4). 657–689. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26224133

Perea, J.F., R. Delgado, A.P. Harris, J Stefancic, & Wildman S.M., (Eds.). (2015). *Races and races: Cases and resources for a divese America*. West Academic.

Pewewardy, C.D., (2004). So you think you hired an "Indian" faculty member?: The ethnic fraud paradox in higher education. In Mihesuah, D.A. & Wilson, A.C. Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities. Bison Books.

Pidgeon, M., & Riely, T. (2021). Understanding the Application and Use of Indigenous Research Methodologies in the Social Sciences by Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Scholars. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 17(8). https://doi.org/10.22230/ijepl.2021v17n8a1065.

Rice, K., (2006). Ethical Issues In Linguistic Fieldwork: An Overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics,* 4. 123–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-006-9016-2

Rollings, W.H., (2004) Citizenship and suffrage: The Native American struggle for civil rights in the American west, 1830-1965. *Nevada Law Journal*, 5(1). https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/nlj/vol5/iss1/8

Rosa, J., & Flores, N., (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, *46*(5). 621–647. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562

Said, E., (1978). *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books.

Sapién, R-M., & Thornes, T.J. (2017). Losing a vital voice: Grief and language work. *Language Documentation & Conservation*. 11. 256-274. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24735.

Sepúlveda, E., (2023). Chicanx studies, indigeneity and the politics of settler colonialism. *Latino Studies, 21*. 262–269. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41276-023-00411-9

Shulist, S., (2018). *Transforming Indigeneity: Urbanization and language revitalization in the Brazilian Amazon*. University of Toronto Press. https://utorontopress.com/9781487522193/transforming-indigeneity/

Shulist, S., & Pedri-Spade, C. (2022). *Lingua Nullius*: Indigenous Language Learning and Revitalization as Sites for Settler-Colonial Violence. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La revue canadienne des langues vivantes 78*(4), 271-288. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/872527.

Shultz, P.K., & Englert, K., (2021). Cultural validity as foundational to assessment development: An Indigenous example. *Frontiers in Education, 6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.701973

Shultz, P.K., & Englert, K., (2023). The Promise of Assessments That Advance Social Justice: An Indigenous Example. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *36*(3). 255–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2023.2222031

Silva, W.d.L., & Dupris, J., 2020. On a method for language documentation based on language (re)vitalization activities: A case study. *Cadernos De Linguística,* 1(3). 1-14. https://doi.org/10.25189/2675-4916.2020.v1.n3.id243.

Simpson, A., (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1198w8z

Simpson, A., (2018). Why white people love Franz Boas; or, the grammar of Indigenous dispossession. In Blackhawk, N., & Wilner, I.L. (Eds.). Indigenous visions: Rediscovering the world of Franz Boas. 166-182. Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300235678-009

Simpson, L., (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Simpson, L. B., (2017). *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c

Singh, M., (2023, Feb 27). It's time to rethink the idea of the "Indigenous". *The New Yorker*. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2023/02/27/its-time-to-rethink-the-idea-of-the-indigenous

Smith, J.D., (2002). The campaign for racil purity and the erosion of paternalism in Virginia, 1922-1930: "Nominally White, biologically mixed, and legally Negro". *The Journal of Southern History, 68*(1). 65-106. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3069691

Smith, L.T., (2021). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Bloomsbury. https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/decolonizing-methodologies-9781786998125/

Solano-Flores, G., (2011). Assessing the cultural validity of assessment practices: An introduction. In Basterra, M d.R., Trumbull, E., and Solano-Flores, G. (Eds.). *Cultural Validity in Assessment: Addressing Linguistic and Cultural Diversity*. 3–21. Routledge.

SooHoo, S., (2013). Humility within culturally responsive methodologies. In Berryman, M., Soohoo, S., & Nevin, A. (Eds.). *Culturally responsive methodologies*. 199-219. Emerald.

Thornes, T.J. (1996). Yahooskin-Northern Paiute verb morphology. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. MA thesis.

Thornes, T.J. (2003). Northern Paiute grammar with texts. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. Doctoral dissertation

Thornes, T.J., & Toosarvandani, M. (2020). Texts in the Indigenous languages of the Americas: Northern Paiute texts across varieties. International Journal of American Linguistics, 86(1). S1-S160.

Trumbull, E., & Nelson-Barber, S. (2019). The ongoing quest for culturally-responsive assessment for Indigenous students in the U.S. *Frontiers in Education*, *4.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00040

Tsikewa, A., (2021). Reimagining the current praxis of field linguistics training: Decolonial considerations. *Language*, *97*(4). e293-e319. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0072.

Tsuda, T., (2012). Whatever happened to simultaneity? Transnational migration theory and dual engagement in sending and receiving countries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *38*(4) 631–649. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.659126

UN General Assembly. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

UN General Assembly. (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

UNESCO. (2020). *Amatlanawatilli Mahtlaktli Xihtli ma Motekipanokan Totlakatilistlahtolwan* (Los Pinos Declaration [Chapoltepek]). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374030. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

UNESCO. (2021). Global action plan of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages (IDIL 2022-2032). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379851/PDF/379851eng.pdf.multi. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Underriner, J., (1997). *Klamath-Modoc master-apprentice materials* [Unpublished manuscript]. Northwest Indian Language Development Institute.

United States. (2022). *Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative Investigative Report*. Library of Congress. https://www.bia.gov/sites/default/files/dup/inline-files/bsi_investigative_report_may_2022_508.pdf. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Uran, C.S., (2012). *The aesthetics and politics of Ojibwe language revitalization*. University of Iowa Dissertation

van den Bergh, G.v.B., (2018). Herder and the idea of a nation. *Human Figurations, 7*(1). http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.11217607.0007.103

Wallace, A.F.C., (1956). Revitalization movements. *American Anthropologist, 58*(2). 264-281. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1956.58.2.02a00040

Wallace, A.F.C., (2003). *Revitalization and mazeways: Essays on culture change, Volume 1* [Edited by Grumet, R.S.]. University of Nebraska Press.

Walter, M., & Andersen, C., (2016). *Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology*. Routledge.

Washington State Office of the Attorney General. (2019). Tribal consent & consultation policy. Centennial Accord Plan. https://www.atg.wa.gov/tribal-consent-consultation-policy. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

White House Council on Native American Affairs. (2024). *10-Year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization*. US Department of Interior. 10-Year National Plan on Native Language Revitalization. https://www.bia.gov/sites/default/files/media_document/final_12032024_10-year_national_plan_on_native_language_revitalization.508_1.pdf. [Accessed January 4, 2025]

Williams, R. A., (2012). *Savage anxieties: The invention of Western civilization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, S., (2008). *Research is ceremony*: Indigenous research methods. Fernwood.

Wilson, W.A. & Yellowbird., M., (Eds.). (2005). *For indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook*. School of American Research. https://sarweb.org/for-indigenous-eyes-only/

Woolard, K. A., (2004). Codeswitching. In Duranti, A. *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Blackwell.

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B., (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *23*, 55–82. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2156006

Zuckermann, G., (2003). *Language contact and lexical enrichment in Israeli Hebrew*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Zuckermann, G., (2009). Hybridity versus Revivability: Multiple Causation, Forms and Patterns. *Journal of Language Contact*, *2*(2), 40-67. https://doi.org/10.1163/000000009792497788.

Zuckermann, G., (2020). *Revivalistics: From the genesis of Israeli to language reclamation in Australia and beyond*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199812776.001.0001

Zuckermann, G., (2021). Revivalistics is Not Documentary Linguistics. *Sustainable Multilingualism*. 18(1). 1-13. https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2021-0001.

Zwiener-Collins, N., Jafri, J., Saini, R., & Poulter, T., (2021). Decolonising quantitative research methods pedagogy: Teaching contemporary politics to challenge hierarchies from data. *Politics, 43*(1). 122-138. https://doi.org/10.1177/02633957211041449