

DISCOURSE PRACTICES IN NUUK, GREENLAND: LANGUAGE USAGE AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AT THE GYMNASIUM, A PILOT PROJECT

Karen Langgård

Department of Greenlandic Language and Literature

Ilisimatusarfik / University of Greenland

P.O. Box 279, DK-3900

Nuuk, Greenland

kl.unigreen@greenet.gl

Abstract / Résumé

The author reports on research on language use at the Gymnasium level (after Grade 10 and prior to university) in Greenland. Although encouraging in terms of Greenlandic language use, the report warns of possible future problems. These stem from the post-colonial situation with both Greenlandic and the colonial language (Danish) in use, and the need to educate children in Greenlandic and in a language suitable for competition in the world as a whole.

L'auteure présente un rapport de recherche sur l'usage linguistique au niveau du Gymnasium (après la 10^e année et avant les études universitaires) au Groenland. Bien qu'il présente des résultats encourageants en matière d'usage de la langue groenlandaise, le rapport signale des problèmes potentiels. Ces derniers sont issus de la situation postcoloniale d'utilisation de deux langues (le groenlandais et la langue coloniale qu'est le danois) et du besoin d'éduquer les enfants afin qu'ils s'expriment en groenlandais et dans une autre langue adaptée à la compétitivité à l'échelle mondiale.

1. Is Greenlandic an Endangered Language?

When I presented a paper with the title *Discourse Practices in Nuuk Greenland 1* at the International Symposium *Minority Identities Today* held at the University of Aberdeen, 19-21 June, 1999² I was placed in a session called "Threatened Identities". I would not have placed it there, myself, not at this moment in the development of Greenland.

By law, Greenland is a monolingual, Greenlandic-speaking community. However the population of Greenland is very small—only 56,000 people—and Greenlandic is a minority language in the sense that it is a language spoken by some 50,000 persons in a country with a numerically fairly high bilingualism of Greenlandic and Danish. Under these conditions, there is a definite danger of language shift some time in the future, and even a danger of the loss of identity.

After what was felt to be a crisis in the 1960s and 1970s, the Danish former minister of Greenlandic Affairs, himself a Greenlander, Knud Hertling, chose at a conference on Minority Languages in Edinburgh in 1990 an asserting title, not a questioning one for this paper. He titled it: "How Greenlandic Survived as a Minority Language" (Hertling, 1992). Indeed for the time being the Greenlandic language is not in any acute danger at all, but it might soon encounter a new crisis simply because it has prevailed too much! In this article I will show that young people in the Greenlandic gymnasium are aware of the language situation, and I will demonstrate their attitudes. Data will be drawn from a pilot-project done in 1998 and 1999, partly done as a parallel to a project in Nunavut. In the end of the article I will broaden the perspective and return to the issue of whether Greenlandic will become a threatened language. However, since the historical inheritance from the former centuries is a very decisive factor in the language situation of Greenland, both viewed separately and in comparison with Nunavut, I will present the reader with a short outline of the development and use of languages in Greenland through the decades.

2. A Historical Survey of the Development of Greenland

Greenland was a colony of Denmark from 1721 until 1953, and a hermetically closed country. Communication in Greenland was carried out almost exclusively in Greenlandic. Greenlanders became a reading community before 1850, even in small communities. In 1851, one authorized orthography was created and Central West Greenlandic was made a standard language. Furthermore the education of teachers was institutionalized in approximately 1850 when two Teacher Training Colleges were established in Greenland to educate young Greenlanders to become cate-

chists. The Greenlanders became a writing community during the last decades of the 19th century, foremost by writing newspaper articles in and in their own Greenlandic newspaper. The newspaper shows that they already had an awareness of ethnicity and nationality when it started in 1861 (Langgård, 1998).³

Through the following decades their ethno-national awareness increased, without however becoming politicized with a demand for independence. They created a written literary language from the beginning of the 20th century (and even in the 19th century with some hymns). Through the years a substantial literature has been written in Greenlandic (some 250 to 300 volumes of original Greenlandic lyrics and prose, in addition to oral narratives that have been written down and in addition to foreign literature translated into Greenlandic).

In the second decade of the 20th century the Greenlanders debated and negotiated their ethno-national concepts among themselves. One of the main issues, because of the beginning of a large-scale fishery in Greenland, was whether their ethno-national identity resided in the kayak or in the oral tradition (i.e. their history), in their language and in their love for their country (Langgård, 1998 and 1999). Further, at the same time, some recommended an enhanced knowledge of Danish as an instrument to obtain more knowledge, i.e. in heuristic function (see Storch, 1913, and Jonathan Petersen in a song published in 1913 in the songbook *Erinarsuutit* [Petersen, 1913]). This means that the Greenlandic language was already consciously intertwined with the ethno-national identity, but without excluding the need for Danish to be learned as a foreign language for heuristic goals.

Because the Greenlandic elite increasingly wanted more Greenlanders to obtain some knowledge of Danish, Danish finally, in 1925, became a school subject, although not a major one. However not until after 1950 was a major effort made to teach Greenlanders the Danish language. By then, the goals formulated by Greenlandic political spokesmen were to let Greenland become a more integrated and equal part of Denmark and to let the children obtain near-Native or Native competence in Danish. Simultaneously, the fight against tuberculosis succeeded. The children survived and this meant for the first time a real shortage of Greenlandic-speaking schoolteachers and a heavy import of Danish teachers without any knowledge of Greenlandic (see Berthelsen, 1990:333 ff.). What was intended to mean more modernization and equalization developed into so-called Danification. The Greenlanders felt oppressed and feared the loss of their identity by losing their language (although even during these years Greenlandic mother-tongue-speaking children were always taught Greenlandic,

even in the higher grades in the school system). The fight for decolonization of the mind started. Young Greenlanders fought for Home Rule and it was established in 1979, twenty years ago. A deliberate movement of Greenlandification then began. A further Greenlandification has taken place since 1994 when the school-system was changed from a school with both a Greenlandic stream and a Danish stream to a so-called integrated school, that is a Greenlandic-speaking school.

If one asks how the Greenlandic language survived the period from 1953 to 1979, I think that one very important part of it is the long and steady development of Greenlandic into a written language, and the teaching of spoken and written Greenlandic (including some grammar) in the schools by educated mother-tongue speakers more than a hundred years before Greenlanders felt the language to be threatened at all. This line of development is totally different from the one found in the Baffin Region in Nunavut,⁴ and it is of course very important to bear this difference in mind when comparing the present situations in Nuuk and in Iqaluit (Collis, 1990; Dorais, 1996). From a period in the 1960s with strong feelings about the Greenlandic language as the most important symbol of their Greenlandic identity, because of the years when Greenlanders feared for the death of Greenlandic, we have gradually reached a phase where almost none of the younger generation fear for the death of the language due to a certain degree of "cultural lag". Some middle-aged people, however, still retain attitudes like those they had when younger.

Apart from the inheritance of fear having an impact on the present state of affairs, another important factor is demographic development as far as ethnicity is concerned. A reasonable hypothesis is that a decrease in the number of Danes will be felt as a decrease of pressure on the Greenlandic language.⁵ Statistics gathered in Greenland do not distinguish between Greenlanders, Dane and others. The only distinction made is between persons born in Greenland and those born outside Greenland. However the figures are estimated to be more or less equivalent to a distinction by ethnicity. In this way, the statistics are interpreted to show a decrease in the number of Danes in Greenland. The number reached a peak in 1988 of 17.5% of the total population; in 1998 there are only 12.4%. A large proportion of these are concentrated in Nuuk, where in 1998 out of a population of approximately 13,500 persons, 23.7% were born outside Greenland. Both of these percentages are still slowly decreasing (the figures for 1999 are, respectively, 12.13% and 23.37%) (Grønland, 1998; Grønland, 1999).

3. A Canadian Investigation as an Instigating Factor

I was asked to conduct an investigation in Greenland, parallel to a Canadian one: "Discourse Practices in the Baffin Region". I decided to start with a pilot project in Nuuk. Since 1994, a Canadian research team under the direction of Louis-Jacque Dorais of Université Laval, Quebec and Susan Sammons of Nunavut Arctic College, Iqaluit, has been investigating discourse practices in Iqaluit, the capital since 1999 of home-ruled Nunavut, and in two smaller Inuit communities. Following Gumperz (1992), they define discourse practices as the culturally relevant ways through which various individuals and groups communicate linguistically among themselves within the confines of a multilingual community. Referring to Chase Hensel's book, *Telling Our Selves*, (Hensel, 1996), they state that these practices contribute to defining the ethnic identity of the speakers. Their data and analysis of them have not been published yet, but communicated at conferences, such as the 11th Inuit Studies Conference, held at the University of Greenland, Nuuk, in September 1998. Below, I will refer to their paper presented at that conference which will be published in a forthcoming volume of proceedings (hence referred to as Dorais and Sammons, forthcoming).

4. The Goal of the Pilot Project in "Discourse Practices in Nuuk"

If one is concerned with the preservation of Aboriginal languages, one of the more alarming results from the research in Canada in 1994 was that there seemed to be an age correlated variation in the use of Inuktitut according to the self reports of young people in Iqaluit. By now (June 2000) the Canadian researchers have analysed the data collected in Iqaluit, where they conducted 202 interviews, of which 126 were schoolchildren, including those in high school.⁶ The authors note:

As far as language behaviour is concerned among Inuit children, some variation is found between students whose two parents are Inuit (78% of our sample of 101), versus those from mixed marriages (22%). In the totally Inuit sample, about 50% of the children state that they speak Inuktitut or mostly Inuktitut with their parents. Variation by age is not evident until the children reach high school, where their responses are closer to 40%. In the lower grades, almost 40% of these children state they speak Inuktitut or mostly Inuktitut with their siblings. This percentage decreases to approximately 30% from grades 5 to 7 and to 0% by high school. Almost 30% of this group reports speaking Inuktitut/mostly Inuktitut with their friends up to grade

3, while only three children report speaking Inuktitut/mostly Inuktitut with friends by the time they reach high school... (Dorais and Sammons, forthcoming)

Since this individual shift in language usage, in my opinion, could signal a danger of future language shift in the population, it was important to investigate whether the same shift was to be found in Greenland.

In Iqaluit an important transition takes place when children start grade 4. In the first three grades, children with Inuktitut as their mother-tongue language can attend the Inuktitut stream with Inuktitut as the language of instruction. However, when they reach grade 4, they must switch over to English, getting Inuktitut only as a subject of instruction and only taught as a second language (although it is their mother-tongue language). This transition is a serious obstacle to the rate of success in school for this group of children, further worsened by the lower educational level of their teachers, most of whom are Inuit themselves but teaching in English.⁷ However, those children who make it to high school are those who show the partial language shift documented by Dorais and Sammons (forthcoming).

Since most of the children with Greenlandic as their mother tongue attend classes with Greenlandic-speaking teachers, and as Greenlandic is used as a language of instruction to a high degree in these classes, they, of course, must use Greenlandic and further develop it in school. Therefore, it is irrelevant to ask whether they can read or write Greenlandic,⁸ because it is a known fact that they acquire this competence in school. In Greenland, the interesting transition comes with their start in the gymnasium or other educational systems.

In Greenland, education at the gymnasium level (in Danish: *Den Gymnasiale Uddannelse*, or *GU*, as it will be referred to hence) is the only part of the educational system in Greenland, which is still legally part of the Danish education system. Further, apart from teachers teaching Greenlandic, gymnasiums have almost exclusively Danish staff speaking no Greenlandic. Therefore, in the pilot project, I chose to concentrate on students attending a gymnasium in Greenland. Further, out of the three gymnasiums of Greenland, I chose to begin with the gymnasium in Nuuk, because Nuuk, the capital of Greenland, is the community in Greenland with the highest percent of Danes. Further, Greenlandic mother-tongue speakers are in general mixed with Danish mother-tongue speakers in classes at the gymnasium. The only exception to this is the teaching of Greenlandic (for mother-tongue speakers, taught as a mother-tongue language).⁹ All this means that the conditions for use of Greenlandic at the gymnasium in Nuuk must be considered among the worst to be found in Greenland. If Greenlandic is endangered anywhere in the Greenlandic

educational system, the Nuuk gymnasium is certainly where this would be seen. Further, those who graduate from gymnasium are those from whom many of the future's most influential Greenlanders will be recruited. For these reasons, the gymnasium in Nuuk must be considered an interesting and important population from which to draw the sample for the pilot project.

Anticipating the analysis below, not surprisingly for anyone familiar with Greenland over these years, we could document that those young Greenlanders who have Greenlandic as their mother-tongue language or as a good second language did not stop using it during their years attending gymnasium, even when being at the gymnasium. The more interesting part was to investigate further details, that is investigating along the lines outlined by Fishman (1992): "who speaks (or writes) what language (or what language variety) to whom and when and to what end" through self reports and through evaluations of co-students, including language attitudes. The main focus is placed on the ethno-national aspect in discourse practices, as it is in the parallel Canadian project.

5. The Data Collection

The first part of my pilot project, funded by Home Rule of Greenland, was carried out in Greenland during the fall of 1998. Some students at our Department of Greenlandic Literature and Language at the University of Greenland participated in designing the questionnaire, made the interviews and transcribed the tapes, all as part of a course, and used the data for their examination papers.¹⁰

Two classes at the gymnasium in Nuuk, one of them a first grade class (below, 1GU), the other a last grade class (below, 3GU) were interviewed in order to document their use of Greenlandic versus Danish and their attitudes to the discourse practices. We interviewed 27 out of the 31 students, that is approximately 10 percent of the whole population of gymnasium students in Nuuk. However, one student, being a newly arrived American exchange student, was interviewed in English, but had not yet acquired competence enough to distinguish between Danish and Greenlandic. This leaves us with a sample of 30 students, 27 respondents and 3 non-respondents.

The next step was a parallel investigation at the gymnasium in Aasiaat.¹¹ However, I have not worked up this data yet, so they will be dealt with later in another paper.

The reason for choosing whole classes instead of picking individuals¹² was that through this it would be possible to triangulate the data by comparing self-reports of a group with the descriptions of this group made by other groups in the classes. The data would to a certain depth describe

the habits of each of the classes. If I had chosen in a pilot project to pick the sample at random we would not have had that opportunity, and still the size of the sample would have been far from any talk about statistical reliability, even without considering subgroups of the sample and multivari-ables.

Choosing whole classes, of course, implied that the classes chosen might be deviating from the average class. In fact, it turned out to be the case for one of the two classes (see below). The Canadian questionnaire was designed for the situation in the Baffin region. Obviously, it was designed for a situation that includes some fear of language shift. Some of the questions were felt to be out of context in a Greenlandic setting. However, in order to obtain compatibility with the Canadian results, the first part of our questionnaire in Nuuk, the "Canadian part", was more or less a translation of the most important questions of the survey used for adults in Nunavut,¹³ while the last part of our questionnaire, the "Nuuk part", was designed directly for the situation in Greenland and especially at the gymnasium GU in Nuuk. The fact that the questions in "the Canadian part" of the questionnaire were felt to be less fitting in Nuuk, reflects the fact that the situations in Nunavut and in Greenland are different.

In both parts of the Greenlandic questionnaire we had closed questions as well as open ones. In general, the issues of the questionnaire were brought up in a closed question, to be followed by an open one, as can be seen in the appendix of this paper, reproducing the questionnaire in an English translation. This approach was taken over from the Canadian one, even though I was well aware of all warnings against using such a procedure in quantitative research on the grounds that the answers to the open questions would be impossible to process in a database. I did it for two reasons, first to get material compatible with the Canadian survey, and second—especially valuable in a pilot project—to obtain answers that were unanticipated.

The students are divided whenever they are taught Greenlandic. The levels for Greenlandic taught as a subject are: 1) level A, Greenlandic as the mother tongue of students; 2) level B, Greenlandic as the second language of students, and 3) level C, Greenlandic as foreign language for students who do not speak it at all. In Nuuk, students at level C, including even children brought up in Greenland, are still to be characterized as monolingual Danish speakers. In the analysis in general, I will group the students on the parameter of their level of Greenlandic taught as a subject: A, B or C. This division of the students does not depend on their own evaluation. When starting at the GU, all students go through tests evaluating their competencies in Greenlandic. However, the division in Nuuk that

matters is between A on the one hand and then B and C on the other hand, with a few exceptions, notably a few level B students being naturally bilinguals. In the second part of the questionnaire, the respondents were divided through self reports into naturally bilinguals, primarily Greenlandic speaking and primarily Danish speaking. Naturally bilinguals were defined as those who had spoken both Greenlandic and Danish before starting school. Considering relevance, the questions asked to these three groups differed to some degree, as can be seen in the Appendix. This grouping is inherited in the data, because some questions were asked to "primarily Greenlandic speaking students" and to "natural bilinguals" excluding the other students as not relevant. Whenever it matters, I will draw on this distinction as an extra parameter. The use of different groupings is a complicating factor in processing and reporting the data. It does, however, offer the opportunity to refine the picture of discourse practices.

6. Analysis of the Data from GU in Nuuk

The main focus in this article will be on the data from the "Nuuk part" of the questionnaire. The data from "the Canadian part" of the questionnaire will focus when it is published with the Canadian data collected in Nunavut.

In the following sections, I will comment on whether Greenlandic is actually spoken by the students at the gymnasium, and then analyze their attitudes based upon the interviews. Finally I will look at the data in the interviews in a greater Greenlandic context.

7. Greenlandic Used During the Interviews

The pilot project in Nuuk also documented the use of Greenlandic in the discourse practices of the gymnasium students during the interviews. Our questionnaire was written both in Greenlandic and in Danish. All gymnasium students attending A-level classes in Greenlandic, that is mother tongue teaching, chose to be interviewed in Greenlandic. As there is no reason why this correlation should not be representative, we consider this to be a demonstration of the strength of Greenlandic.

Numerically, the data may not seem convincing as only 15 respondents out of 27 were students taking Greenlandic taught as a level A subject (that is mother tongue level) and only these 15 answered in Greenlandic. The remaining respondents were 4 level B students (level B is Greenlandic taught as a second language) and 8 level C students (being taught Greenlandic as a foreign language). However, if sorted by class, we have the following figures in Table 1 (where 1GU is a class of those in the first year of the triennial gymnasium and 3GU is a class at the final year) (Table 1):

Table 1

	A-level	B-level	C-level
1GU+3GU: 30	17	5	8
1GU total: 18	14	2	2
Respondents: 15	12	1	2
Non-respondents: 3	2	1	0
3GU total: 12	3	3	6
Respondents: 12	3	3	6
Non-respondents: 0	0	0	0

The total of level A students was thus 14 out of 18 in 1GU, but only 6 out of 12 in 3GU. The difference between the two classes has to do with a tendency during the three years of a higher percentage of primarily Greenlandic-speaking students dropping out than of the other groups.¹⁴ Further, an important factor is a decrease in the number of Danish-speaking young persons that start in gymnasium.¹⁵ However, even these two factors do not make our 3GU totally representative. It is extreme in its composition, and also as compared with other classes in the last year of their GU education in the same year.¹⁶ On the other hand, it is revealing that even in this setting, Greenlandic was used – cf below.

The interviews in Greenlandic contained no code-switching or use of a mixed code¹⁷: none of those interviewed switched over to Danish for whole sentences or whole turns of the interview nor did they do it for parts of sentences, although some did in order to stress the discourse situation or to convey a message, e.g. of group identity. Nor did any mixing of Danish and Greenlandic take place as part of a mixed code (that is switching as part of a generally used language habit, without a specific reason for every switch).

In the Canadian interviews and also in the home observations, it seemed to be normal to have not only sentence external code-switching, but also sentence internal code-switching (personal communication, Dorais and Sammons, October 1999, in Iqaluit, Nunavut). However, research on the extent, the patterns and the reasons behind this code-switching—or perhaps mixed code—is needed, also in order to find out whether and what kind of a development is taking place. It might be the development of a stable mixed code, it might be a step towards language shift, which might on the other hand be re-directed by the establishment of Nunavut.

Nowadays, code-switching also takes place in Greenland among bilinguals, of course, but it's not a general feature of the language situation. In our questionnaire, the answers to questions 8 a and b and question 9 a and b in the "Nuuk part" of the questionnaire, might very well imply some code-switching too, when they answered "both of the two languages" (cf below, next section). But still, when Greenlandic seemed to be endangered in the 1970s and in the beginning of the 1980s, the number of monolingual Danish-speaking Greenlanders seemed "too high" and the number of the by then so called "double semi-linguals"¹⁸ seemed "too high". When Greenlandic in those days was used in an "unsatisfying" way, it was felt to be used with a syntax which was too simple and with all too many Danish loanwords adjusted to Greenlandic through an "i"+ inflection.¹⁹ However, in general, Greenlandic was the basic language constituting the sentences.

8. The Reports on the Discourse Practices

Although all level A students (with Greenlandic taught as a mother-tongue language) did their interviews in Greenlandic, that does not indicate anything about actual discourse practice in daily communication at Den Gymnasiale Uddannelse. Self reports and the reports from others do, however.

In question 8 a and b and in question 9 a and b of the "Nuuk part" of the questionnaire (cf. the appendix), we asked the primarily Greenlandic-speaking students and the bilingual ones whether they used Greenlandic, Danish or a mixture of the two languages when talking small talk at Den Gymnasiale Uddannelse and when discussing subjects of instruction among themselves. The self-reports of the mother-tongue speakers of Greenlandic (attending A classes in Greenlandic taught as a subject) indicated that Greenlandic was used to a high degree (see Table 2).

In 1GU only 1 of the 12 A level respondents answered "Danish" and only "towards bilinguals", in all other cases the answer was either "Greenlandic" or "both of the languages". I find it especially interesting that 9 of the 12 respondents reported that they speak Greenlandic about subjects of instruction towards primarily Greenlandic speaking co-students. This self-reported practice is in full accordance with what we experience at the University of Greenland. Our students in the Department of Greenlandic Language and Literature are mother-tongue speakers of Greenlandic, although we have some guest students, some of whom are Danish-speaking. Concerning the 3GU with 12 students in total, it was worthy of note that even in this class the level A students (only 3 of them!) would still use their mother-tongue language when talking with primarily Greenlandic-speaking students and with bilinguals, thereby indicating just how strong the position

Table 2

The 12 A level respondents of 1GU: 'Nuuk8a+b' and 'Nuuk9a+b'	Speaks Greenlandic	Speaks Greenlandic and Danish	Speaks Danish
Speaking every day talk to primarily Greenlandic speaking students	8	4	0
Speaking every day talk to more or less bilingual students	0	11	1
Speaking about classes and homework to primarily Greenlandic speaking student	9	3	0
Speaking about classes and homework to more or less bilingual students	3	8	1

of the Greenlandic language is in actual discourse practice in Greenland (see Table 3).

It is the same student who answers "Greenlandic+Danish" in all three instances in the second column of Table 3.

Table 3

The 3 A level respondents of 3GU: 'Nuuk8a+b' and 'Nuuk9a+b'	Speaks Greenlandic	Speaks Greenlandic and Danish	Speaks Danish
Speaking every day talk to primarily Greenlandic speaking students	3	0	0
Speaking every day talk to more or less bilingual students	2	1	0
Speaking about classes and homework to primarily Greenlandic speaking students	2	1	0
Speaking about classes and homework to more or less bilingual students	0	1	2

In question 10 in the "Nuuk part" of the questionnaire (cf the appendix), partly to get information on discourse practice, partly to get an idea about attitudes, we asked the students attending Greenlandic mother-tongue teaching, the A level students, whether they would switch from Greenlandic to Danish if a monolingual Danish speaking student came up to them. None of them objected to the presupposition, but noted that they speak Greenlandic together at Den Gymnasiale Uddannelse. In 3GU one of the three level A students answered, that they would switch "always", one that they would switch "sometimes" and the last one that they would "never/seldom" switch. The result in 1GU was, that out of the 12 level A students, 3 answered "never/seldom" and 9 answered "sometimes". The only natural bilingual among the B level (Greenlandic as second language) students was also asked the question and answered "sometimes", too.

In question 13 a and b of the "Nuuk questions", in order to triangulate the self-reports by the Greenlandic-speaking students we asked the C-level students (with Greenlandic as a foreign language) and those three of the level B students (with Greenlandic as a second language) who were not natural bilinguals, whether the Greenlandic-speaking students when they were together with them would speak Greenlandic among themselves and if yes, whether they felt this to be annoying for them to witness.

To the first of the questions, all of them (5 C level and 3 B level in 3GU, 2 C level and 1 B level in 1GU) answered "yes". All said that they did not feel annoyed except one of them (level C in 1 GU) who answered that from time to time it would have been nice—out of curiosity—to understand their talk (but there is no aggression in the voice at the recorded tape).²⁰ The practice at the gymnasium seems to be that one will switch if the subject is considered to be of interest to the monolingual Danish-speakers, as is the case in general in the society, according to my experience since 1981.²¹

The answers to the questions seem to confirm discourse practices as indicated by Greenlandic-speaking student self-reports. Further, none of the groups hinted at any politicized attitudes in discourse practices.

9. Language Attitudes in GU

The last analysis in section 8 includes language attitudes, which will be described.

In question 14 a and b of the "Nuuk questions", we asked the whole sample whether the discourse practices at the gymnasium gave them communication problems. All answered "no", but none gave any examples.

In question 14c and d of the "Nuuk questions", we asked the whole sample whether they felt the discourse practices at the gymnasium to be annoying. The numerical figures are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

'Nuuk 14 c + d' "Does the discourse practice annoy you?"	Total of 1GU and 3GU	1GU A level students	3GU A level students	1GU B level students	3GU B level students	1GU C level students	3GU C level students
Yes	10	4	2	1	1	0	2
No	17	8	1	0	2	2	4
Comments	11	4	2	1	1	0	3
No comment	16	8	1	0	2	2	3

Only half of the respondents in 3GU had some comments. Of these six, three were level C students (i.e. with Greenlandic as foreign language) and all three of them hinted that it was a problem for the Greenlandic-speaking students—in paraphrase: 1) the monolingual Greenlandic-speaking students lower the level, 2) in the classes some are left behind, especially when they are asked to give a talk, 3) of course, it is difficult to accept that Danish is necessary in order to cope with the society when this is Greenland. The one B level student who answered “yes”, said, “probably, one would master the language better if one should only master one language” (his answers to “the Canadian part” of the questionnaire show us that he is embarrassed by not being better at Greenlandic, having a Greenlandic mother). Finally, two of the three A level students answered “yes”, one of them, because he sometimes found it difficult to explain subjects of instructions in Greenlandic to his Greenlandic mates and in this felt the Danish-speaking students to be more qualified in their mother-tongue. The other one student felt it unjust that primarily Greenlandic-speaking students have to do a bigger effort than their Danish-speaking mates because, in fact, these don’t have to learn to speak Greenlandic (however he is not objecting to the use of Danish, since in the next question, he notes that it is a good thing when considering the prospects of further education in Denmark).

In 1GU even fewer answered “yes”: five out of the 15 respondents, and among these none of the C level students. One of these five was the B-level student of the class—his comment was that it causes a little confusion, when one talks to somebody in Danish and then in the end has to explain it in Greenlandic (this student is the only natural bilingual of the B level students, but on the other hand has ended up with Greenlandic only as a good second language, which might make the student especially aware of using both languages, although it might cause him discomfort because of the expectations of his co-students to his level of bilingualism). Of the remaining students that answered “yes” (all four of them A level students), two female respondents may have some general complaints on discourse practices, but their actual answers rather seem to be comments that spring from specific problems with some co-student(s), because both mention they have been called names in Danish. Maybe, their answers have a connection with the answer given by a male C level student to question 15b of the “Nuuk questions” that it is positive that he cannot understand abusive words spoken in Greenlandic towards him. These three answers might represent a very personal internal fight, or even just mirror what happened that specific day. This leaves us with two more answers with “yes” from level A students in 1GU. One of these A level students gives as an example, that when Danes try to speak Greenlandic, they are laughed at while the Danes do

not do the same to the Greenlanders. Finally, the other one of these two is the only general answer, which is negative, stating that the student found, especially in the beginning, that the discourse practices were too much Danish, differing from the situation in the school, and that it is annoying that Danish is used at the bulletin board of the gymnasium. However when asked in the next couple of questions if anything is felt to be positive, the answer is that because many are monolingual Danes it is acceptable to have two languages.

These more "negative" questions (question 14a+b+c+d of the "Nuuk questions") were followed by a more "positive" one, question 15 a+b of the "Nuuk questions" in which we asked whether the students found something positive in the discourse practices at the gymnasium (Table 5).

Only one A level student answered "no", and he answered "no", too, to the question about whether it was annoying (question 14c). Most of the other A level students answered that it was a good thing because it had a positive effect on Greenlandic-speaking students' development of fluency in Danish, many of them underlining the importance of this for their further education. The same goes for the level C students, except for one born in a mixed marriage, who thinks that using only one language would be best, because if it was Greenlandic he would have learned more Greenlandic. The level B students are all positive, but for different reasons, one because "then those who are not good at Danish can speak Greenlandic together", another because "with two languages we can all understand it" and then finally the third one finds that "some expressions are better in Greenlandic, some jokes are better"!

In the last questions of the interviews, question 19 a+b of the "Nuuk questions", the students were asked whether they wanted something to be changed in the discourse practices at the gymnasium (Table 6).

In 3GU, of the three level A respondents (those being taught Greenlandic as their mother tongue language), one did not have any proposals, one would like to be taught English with Greenlandic as an instruction language and the last one said that "there are some hindrances, but that there would be many more hindrances if they should use Greenlandic for everything".

None of the B level respondents had proposals, but four out of the six C level respondents (i.e. the Danish speaking students!) had comments on behalf of the primarily Greenlandic speaking students or had thoughts on the ethno-national aspect—in paraphrase: "many would like more usage of Greenlandic, because they are restrained and nervous when they use Danish", "level differentiation in Danish as subject of instruction",²² "more possibilities for Greenlandic speaking students, e.g. Danish as foreign

Table 5

'Nuuk 15 a + b' "Do you feel that the use of two languagesentails something positive?"	Total of 1GU and 3GU	1GU A level students	3GU Alevel students	1GU B level students	3GU B level students	1GU C level students	3GU C level students
Yes	22	11	3	1	2	2	3
No	5	1	0	0	1	0	3
Comment	23	11	3	1	2	2	4
No comment	4	1	0	0	1	0	2

Table 6

'Nuuk 19 c + d' "Would you like something connected with the discourse practice at GU to be changed?"	Total of 1GU and 3GU	1GU A level students	3GU Alevel students	1GU Blevel students	3GU B level students	1GU Clevel students	3GU Clevel students
Yes	5	2	0	1	0	0	2
No	20	8	3	0	3	2	4
Comments	12	3	2	1	1	1	4
No comment	13	7	1	0	2	1	2

language", "everything ought to be in Greenlandic". Further one of them suggested that students ought to find the courage to co-work across the language border. This last comment will be correlated to the self-reports on interrelations between the students in section 13, below.

In 1GU an interviewer forgot to ask the question to two level A students. Of the other 13 respondents, only five commented on it at all. Out of these five, one, a level C student, said that he felt it to be OK when it is possible to use two languages, and another, a level A student reported she never thought about it. This leaves us with three comments, of which the level B respondent asked for a differentiation of levels in Danish taught as subject (for this issue, see next section) and an increase in the use of Greenlandic in the teaching in order that they could learn it better. Finally two of the A level respondents said in paraphrase: "it would of course be better if there could be more teachers speaking Greenlandic, because almost all the students are Greenlandic speaking and some of them do not have good competency in Danish" and "an increase in the usage of Greenlandic, e.g. at the bulletin table, however, the teachers are almost all of them Danish speaking".

10. Pragmatic Attitudes Versus Conditions at GU

When analyzing the answers given by the respondents, the surprising part was not that Greenlandic was spoken among the students (as was shown in sections 6 and 7). Nor was it that some students mentioned they would like Greenlandic to be used more. The surprising part has been how pragmatic their attitudes were to the usage of Danish (as has been seen in sections 8 and 9). This result should be correlated to the fact that the primarily Greenlandic-speaking students (those attending Greenlandic taught as a mother-tongue language, the A level students) have a hard job attending classes taught entirely in Danish and attending them together with mother-tongue speakers of Danish.

Further, they are even attending classes in Danish taught as a subject with the Danes, classes that are like those in Denmark for Danes. It has been a political decision to have this one and only level instead of having classes with Danish taught as a foreign language. The reason has been to ensure that the students will be able to get a Danish education after the gymnasium, not only as regards their knowledge of Danish, but also as regards cultural knowledge in a broad sense, including knowledge about how to argue. The Greenlandic mother-tongue teaching has been estimated to be too weak still to ensure this.²³

In this way, the Greenlandic speaking students are attending two mother-tongue courses (i.e. Greenlandic and Danish) and seem to have

every reason to complain, but they did so very little in their answers, although they were interviewed in Greenlandic by Greenlandic students who themselves are primarily Greenlandic-speaking and were asked questions that almost asked for complaints.

11. The Greenlandic "Linguistic Market" and the Usefulness of Danish

Bourdieu (1982; 1984) uses the term "linguistic market" to convey the perspective on language that language usage is intertwined with socio-political power relations through which certain ways of speaking (chosen register, dialect, language) are ascribed more status than others, that is more value at the market. He further mentions that choice of language in a post-colonial setting is especially intertwined with power relations. Woolard (1985) made some important comments to Bourdieu when researching the development of Catalan under pressure from Castilian in Spain. Her conclusion is that the hegemony is not fully established, and that resistance is possible, and through this, the maintenance of alternative linguistic forms. Woolard's comments are relevant in a Greenlandic setting. In the Danification period, Greenlandic did not disappear, and during these years with Greenlandification, Danish is still spoken by some Greenlanders (not only by Danes moving to Greenland from Denmark).

Because of differences between center and periphery in Greenland, one might consider whether we should talk about two "linguistic markets", i.e. one being a monolingual Greenlandic speaking market in the periphery versus the more bilingual market in the center, or one might consider the same two kinds of markets but for different strata of the population.²⁴ However, I think that in Greenland we should talk about only one basic "linguistic market", but a market which is not fully integrated and with no hegemony fully established. Further, this basic "linguistic market" might appear to be ambiguous in validations because the demands are still difficult to cope with for the Greenlandic population, although their demands spring from their own wishes for a modern welfare community with a high degree of public service, governed and performed by Greenlanders in Greenlandic. The consequences are a frustration through which ambiguity is further fuelled and which raises the need for further decolonization of the mind. This entails a need to make a sharp demarcation between Greenlandic culture and Danish culture, and thereby in some instances a need to stress the prerogatives of the Inuit roots, including language, in a way that is not always consistent with general political goals and a vision for the future.

Being asked about whether Danish is more useful than Greenlandic, in question 10 a+b of the "Canadian part" of our questionnaire (cf. the appendix), many answered "yes" because it is necessary in order to get a higher education (being in line with the answers to question 15 a+b of the "Nuuk questions" (cf. above in section 6). Some added that it depended on where you were and what you wanted to do and gave as an example that Greenlandic was necessary if you want to be shop assistant. That implies that one has to be bilingual. Another consideration was that Greenlandic was more useful when being in Greenland, but outside Nuuk. Their answers seem to be spoken out of their actual life situation. The students did not mention a growing tendency of being to get top jobs without being a Greenlander and, by preference, a Greenlandic speaking Greenlander. Very few Danish mother-tongue speakers become politicians, in fact none are in the Home Rule parliament, for the time being (although Danish-speaking citizens are eligible). Danish is only partly the majority language in Greenland, interpreting "majority language" as the language of most power. Danish is still the language giving access to education. However, by law Greenland is a monolingual Greenlandic speaking society. Not least because of its Home Rule status, Greenlandic is in effect the majority language as the language giving access to political power and many jobs as leaders. There is, however, a huge problem because too many specialists in the Home Rule administration are Danish mother tongue speakers. On the other hand, you cannot fill many of these jobs without competence in Danish (and English), partly because you have to have access directly to information in Danish, and partly because you have to interact so often with monolingual Danes. This being so, in Greenland the resource person are the bilinguals. The ideal person is a more or less bilingual Greenlandic mother tongue speaker, that is with Danish as a second language (or as a good foreign language) and with some knowledge of English. However, if the human resources at the "linguistic market" do not yield enough bilinguals, and bilingualism (or rather competence in Danish and English) is the prerequisite for many educational programs, an unpleasant choice or unsatisfying compromise must often be made. This means one must consider in any given situations whether to give greater weight to competence in Greenlandic, or to bilingualism and professional competencies. This produces ambiguity at the "linguistic market", because many do not want to renounce the demand for Greenlandic competence, although they *de facto* do it in their decision making. *De facto* the professional competencies are given precedence over language in a lot of cases, but not with pleasure. Furthermore, for years nobody has paid effective attention to a decline in competence in Danish.

12. The Greenlandic "Linguistic Market" – and Nunavut

In Greenland, the statistics office of the Home Rule Administration, Statistics Greenland, made an investigation in 1994 (Andersen, 1996) and compared the result with some data from the 80s. They found that the whole population in general seemed to have developed into being more bilingual according to the interviewed persons' self-reports. This could partly be a consequence of the establishment of television broadcasting, which includes many programs from Danish Television broadcast either in Danish or with Danish subtitles. But the report from Statistics Greenland concludes that part of the development at least should be seen as a development in attitude. There might have been a bias in the self-reports in the 1980s, because in those years it was next to bad to understand or speak Danish, while now it seems to be attractive to become a more or less bilingual Greenlandic mother tongue speaker, that is with Danish as a second language or as a good foreign language.

The Canadian investigations show a discrepancy, too, that is between the self-reports in 1994 and some home observations carried out in 1998 (personal communications, Dorais and Sammons, October 1999). The Canadian researchers have found more Inuktitut used at home now than the self-reports stated for 1994. To me this sounds as if the situation in 1994 could be compared in some aspects with the change in Greenland that took place in the period before and after Home Rule, where we saw an awakening of consciousness about the Greenlandic language. A like change of attitude might have taken place, because of the creation of Nunavut coming up, and might have started to have an impact both on discourse practices in 1994 and even more on the self-reports on discourse practices. Only the future will show what kind of development Inuktitut will go through.

13. Language and Choice of Associates

Greenland is well off concerning the use and development of its Inuit language, Greenlandic. However, there are still a lot of problems to be solved. One of them is a tendency towards segregation along the language border. According to the self-reports in the interviews, young people do not choose their friends on account of language (cf. the figures for question 6 of the "Nuuk questions" below), and few of them classify their mates at GU in language categories (cf. the figures for question 16 of the "Nuuk questions" below). However, when asked whom they are friends with outside GU (cf. the figures for question 5 of the "Nuuk questions" below) and especially whom they talk with at GU (cf. the averages of the figures of question 7a+b+c of the "Nuuk questions" below), according to their self-re-

ports it turns out, that bilinguals will be generally with other bilinguals, and more or less with the two other groups, while primarily Greenlandic speakers will mix primarily with other Greenlandic speakers and to some degree to the bilinguals. In fact, the primarily Greenlandic speaking students report that they associate less with the bilinguals, than the self-reports of the bilinguals would indicate. In general the Greenlandic speaking students seem to associate much more among themselves than the two other groups. In Tables 7 and 8, B level students are divided into natural bilinguals and those who are not natural bilinguals.

Question 7 a+b+c of the "Nuuk questions" were the following ones:

The following questions will be about discourse practices at GU:

1. to all: We divide students at GU into the following groups:
 - primarily Greenlandic speaking; bilinguals more or less; and primarily Danish speaking.
- a. If thinking of the primarily Greenlandic speaking students, would you say that you speak with them:
 - very often / from time to time / seldom
- b. If thinking of the more or less bilingual students, would you say that you speak with them:
 - very often / from time to time / seldom
- c. If thinking of the primarily Danish speaking students, would you say that you speak with them:
 - very often / from time to time / seldom

In the database assembled from the data, high frequency of interrelation ("very often") is coded with the numerical value "1", while the lowest one ("seldom") with "3" and the one in the middle ("from time to time") with "2". If one takes all the values chosen in total and divide them with the number of students when distributed into the following three groups: "natural bilinguals", "primarily Greenlandic speaking students" and "primarily Danish speaking students" we get the following quotients:

	With Greenlandic speakers	With bilingual speakers	With Danish speakers
Native Bilingual	1.43	1.00	1.43
Greenlandic	1.22	1.89	2.11
Danish	2.18	1.09	1.00

As the lowest possible value was "1", we find the maximum of interrelation frequency for the "native bilingual" and for "Danish" with their own

Table 7

'Nuuk 5': "Are your friends: Greenlandic speaking / Danish speaking / bilinguals: you may chose more than one of the possibilities"	Greenl. sp.	Danish sp.	Biling.	Grl. sp. + Da. sp.	Grl. sp + biling.	Da. sp. + biling.	Grl. sp + Da. sp. + biling.
1 GU + 3 GU total	2	0	5	1	4	10	5
1 GUs A level students	2	0	5	1	2	0	2
1 GUs B level nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1 GUs B level not nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 GUs C level students	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
3 GUs A level students	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
3GUs B level nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3GUs B level not nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
3GUs C level students	0	0	0	0	0	5	7

Table 8

'Nuuk 6': 'What counts most when choosing your friends? Choose maximum 2 of the following choices: their language / their interest / their personality'	language	interest	personality	language + interests	language + personality	interests + personality
1 GU + 3 GU total	0	0	8	1	0	18
1 GUs A level students	0	0	3	1	0	8
1 GUs B level nat biling	0	0	1	0	0	0
1 GUs B level not nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 GUs C level students	0	0	2	0	0	0
3 GUs A level students	0	0	1	0	0	2
3GUs B level nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	0
3GUs B level not nat biling	0	0	0	0	0	3
3GUs C level students	0	0	1	0	0	5

group. Further, the lowest frequency is found between "Greenlandic" and "Danish". Finally, very few used the value "3" at all, in my interpretation, in full accordance with the non-aggressive attitude so common among students; it would not be kind to associate "seldom" with those with whom one attends the same classes.

Dividing the respondents into groups of A/B/C-level, we get the following figures:

	With Greenlandic Speakers	With bilingual speakers	With Danish speakers
'A'	1.11	1.22	1.56
'B'	2.00	1.00	1.00
'C'	2.13	1.13	1.00

The students' own explanation is that personality and interests are the decisive factors when choosing friends (according to their answers to question 6 of the "Nuuk questions", in which only two of the 27 respondents included language and then only together with one of the other two parameters.

It is possible we are dealing with a difference in general attitudes which in the end might depend upon different degrees of access to different parts of the "cultural market" in Greenland. What they themselves experience as differences in interests in fact seems to correlate with their kind of access to the "cultural market", dependent as this is upon their linguistic competencies.

In the interviews, the Danish-speaking students who are of mixed descent stress their feeling of not being competent in Greenlandic. Their heuristic requirements are covered, but they seem to be very aware of facing problems at the ethno-national level and of not having access to a full integration into the community, now and in the future. The Danish-speaking students mention that they think that the primarily Greenlandic speaking students have problems in the heuristic dimension. However, this is not mentioned by the primarily Greenlandic speaking students, either because they - or at least some of them - do not feel that they have any uncovered heuristic requirements, or because they do not want to complain in any way. But this leads us to consideration of the educational system in general.

14. The "Linguistic Market" and the Educational System in General

The tendencies at GU to strive for some competence in Danish no matter how unfair the conditions are, and to be very pragmatic (or with the expression used in the Canadian research: practical) towards Danish, seem to be a very sensible attitude among the students. They know quite well that a certain degree of bilingualism gives them the greatest access to the community in modern Greenland. These tendencies are seen elsewhere in the society, too. As hinted at above, when speaking about the "linguistic market", this attitude does not mean that Greenlanders do not care any longer about development as regards to their own language. In 1999 they looked back at 20 years of Home Rule and discussed whether or when independence would be possible. They criticized the fact that monolingual Greenlanders still have to cope with a lot of problems whenever they are in contact with the public sector because they sometimes meet monolingual Danish-speaking persons with whom they must work. It is felt to be an unsolved problem that the majority of the experts working as civil servants in the Home Rule administration are still Danish speaking Danes coming from Denmark.

However, while this is taking place, we have another tendency showing the awareness of the importance of competence in Danish and English. The parents of the students are aware of problems, both of the language problems and of a problem with too low standards of school education in general. In the past, many parents chose to pay to have their children stay for one year in a continuation school in Denmark. Now such stays are subsidized, so that all children should be able to do it. Further in Nuuk, in addition to the integrated Greenlandic school we have had since 1994, we have some classes to receive newcomers from Denmark. However, the parents of some bilingual children from Nuuk have arranged to have their children attend these classes also.²⁵ Although it was more or less unspoken, it was the Danish classes in the former system (before 1994) that the bilingual children of the elite attended.

According to Gimbel and Holmen (1998:277),²⁶ analyzing the situation in the Greenlandic primary school, the most serious problem in Greenlandic language education is:

the ambiguity connected with being a bilingual society in everyday communicative patterns and the symbolic construction of the country as monolingual. As Greenlandic seems to be in a strong position, at least among the younger generations, the ambiguity mainly concerns the learning and teaching of Dan-

ish. It means that young people are expected to master Danish at a relatively high level, yet their learning process is not given very high priority. Consequently, the public debate is overwhelmingly concerned with the linguistic shortcomings of the Greenlandic youth, and much less with the quality of the Danish instruction they have been offered. In terms of secondary and further education, this seems to constitute a real barrier for a majority of the younger generation.

Unfortunately, I think that the problem is even greater, taking the attitudes of the parents through the years, and taking my experiences with new students into account. The problems of parents appear to be a concern with the general of education in the Greenlandic stream (when they have chosen to put their children in the Danish stream, and then in the later years in the "receiving classes"). In my case, as a teacher in the Department of Greenlandic Language and Literature at the University of Greenland, I am concerned for new students when estimating the level of Greenlandic mother-tongue teaching.²⁷

The problem in years to come will be not only how to ensure that the children will get enough competence in foreign languages, Danish and English, to get the education that is necessary and that they would like to get, but also whether already educated Greenlandic teachers will be able to get sufficient extra training to keep a sufficient level of students in the integrated school. As I said in the beginning, Greenlandic might have prevailed so much that it will die of its success. The school has become much more Greenlandic again, first because of fewer Danish children (compared with the number of Greenlandic children)²⁸ and in recent years because of the decrease in Danish-speaking teachers, especially in the "integrated school". This means that if a substantial effort is not undertaken, the children will neither develop enough general language competency or enough fluency in Danish and /or English to cope with an education.²⁹

15. Conclusion

The pilot project has shown that if you are a mother tongue speaker of Greenlandic when you reach teenage years, you will go on using your language except when it is either impossible or awkward, that is when talking to or with monolingual Danish speakers or primarily Danish speaking speakers. The language of the interviews showed that no code-switching took place. On the other hand, the pilot project also pointed out how the groups are divided along lines of more general attitudes, which are correlated with their linguistic behaviour. Further, the pilot project shows the tendency towards a very pragmatic attitude towards Danish as an instru-

mental language, which is absolutely necessary in educational context. The very positive element in this is that no complaints were uttered. The victimized attitude of the former generation is being replaced by a pragmatic active attitude. The precondition for this is, of course, that Greenlandic is felt not to be endangered.

Simultaneously, some remarks from primarily Danish speaking students, especially those of mixed descent, point to the difficulties they meet in Greenland of today because of a conscious effort to decolonise further through Greenlandification. The resource person now—and at least in the near future—is the bilingual speaker, if not with a balanced bilingualism, then with a full and modernized Greenlandic mother tongue and with Danish (and English) spoken with fluency.

If Greenlanders fail to get enough education, we are back to 1953 and once more to a huge import of well-educated Danes—and the Greenlandic language and identity will be threatened once more! The open question is whether Greenlandic politicians and administrators are able to find both the economic resources and the human resources to solve the problems of the school. Most of them have realized the problem.³⁰ They first and foremost have to ensure a much more competent and stimulating Greenlandic mother tongue teaching, not to nurse the language as belonging at a museum, but to ensure the general intellectual competencies of the children.³¹ The open question is whether Greenlandic politicians and administrators will be capable of inspiring the whole population to do the enormous effort needed both to retain a full-fledged developing Greenlandic language and to ensure enough education to run a country. This is the challenge that the Greenlandic population has to face, the faster the better, and the more consciously the better, in my opinion. It is a tough challenge, because they are so few, that a very great proportion of them have to become more or less bilingual—the country is not rich enough to yield them a living for free, they have got to have enough know-how in order to compete in a tough world. Further, as far as I can tell they have got to be able to compete, because they themselves do want a modern Western society, that is one that is both Greenlandic and has all the facilities and all the cultural options they have gotten accustomed to, and they do want to be in charge themselves and to reach a higher level of independence.

When compared with Nunavut, the language situation in Nuuk and in Greenland shows how different the development through the centuries has been, but also how difficult it is to master the balance between two languages in a post-colonial setting, or maybe how difficult it is to retain the Inuit language and simultaneously have enough people getting enough linguistic competencies to get access to education and to be part of global

communication and culture, in addition to competencies to bring about continuing development of the local culture.³²

Notes

1. The Greenlandic Gymnasium is the triennial education which follows Grade 10 at school and precedes university.
2. This paper is an enlarged version of that paper. A full report, including data from Aasiaat, will appear later.
3. Fortunately both missions which operated in Greenland, the Danish and Moravian missions, used the Roman alphabet. Many variations were found through the decades, but all the orthographic variants are still rather easily read. Dialect differences are small in West Greenland. The dialects of East Greenland and the Thule area are substantially different from those in West Greenland, but since those parts of Greenland were not colonized until 1900, the standards of Central West Greenland were transferred to them, causing some problems.
4. In Nunavut in general people more than 50 years old have had no school education. Until after World War Two, there were only a few missionary "schools" driven by the missionaries or their wives. The first (federal) school in Iqaluit did not start until 1948, and only with English as instruction language. There were some experiments teaching in Inuktitut in the 1970s. The education of Inuit teachers did not begin until 1975, more than one hundred years after the institutionalising of it in Greenland.
5. In the early 1990s, Langgård (1992a; 1992b; 1995) drew attention to the fact that when Greenlandic was felt to be in crisis, the number of schoolchildren born in Greenland was very low, while exactly in the same period the number of Danish schoolchildren (and their families) reached a peak. His conclusion is, that Greenlandic never was endangered, but only felt to be so.
6. Dorais and Sammons (forthcoming) report that among the 126 school children, 101 were Inuit (20 Anglophone and 5 Francophone), while their sample of adults consisted of 76 (51 Inuit, 20 Anglophones, 5 Francophones). The total population of Iqaluit is 4,500 inhabitants of which 63% are Inuit and 37% are Qallunaat (non-Inuit), these last including 250 Francophones.
7. This account comes from information gathered during a one week stay at Nunavut Arctic College in Iqaluit in October 1999.
8. Such questions were asked in Iqaluit, the situation there being different from that in Greenland.

9. This is, perhaps, better, though not optimal, than the situation in Nunavut, where Inuktitut is taught as a mother-tongue only until Grade 4.
10. I hereby thank Kistaara Vahl Motzfeldt, Eva Thomassen and Karen Ramsøe, and our guest student from the University of Copenhagen, Denmark, Liselotte Christiansen, for their enthusiastic participation in this pilot project.
11. Since the grant that I asked for and received was but 35,000 Danish Crowns (approximately 5,000 US dollars) the project was planned only to be a pilot project, and only to be carried out in Nuuk in order to avoid transportation expenses which are high in Greenland. However, thanks to the interest and participation of our students, most of the grant was saved and could be used to expand the project to include a parallel investigation at one of the other two Greenlandic gymnasiums. These are situated in environments with very few Danes. An inter Nordic research programme on bilingualism, under the direction of Langgård, has done interviews in Qaqortoq, in the Southern part of West Greenland, covering all young people born in 1981 and 1982 and those born in 1959. Although this investigation uses a different questionnaire, designed to be compatible with the other parts of their programme, I decided to let my pilot project cover the gymnasium of the Northern part of West Greenland, placed in the town of Aasiaat.
12. In the Canadian investigation, the sample was not systematically chosen at random, but rather covered those whom the interviewers could get hold of, aiming at dispersion over certain parameters such as age, gender and employment.
13. The Canadian investigation operated with a short questionnaire for children, and a longer questionnaire (which they referred to as in-depth interviews) for adults.
14. According to the staff at the GU in Nuuk, this tendency has changed over the last year, with an increasing number of Danish-speaking students dropping out, too.
15. Outside Nuuk, the numerical percentages are somewhat different, due to the general demographic picture, eg. at the gymnasium in Aasiatt. The figures of 4 1GU classes in November 1999 were; 86 at A-level, 7 at B-level and only 1 at C-level of the total of 94 students.
16. This particular class was chosen by the administration of GU, because we asked for a class with some students from East Greenland in order to cover the dialect parameter so salient a factor in Iqaluit.
17. For the terminology of Auer (1998), see the Introduction and the whole volume.

18. The term has been attacked, not least out of political correctness. I will refer to Cummins (1998) for considerations on the content of this issue.
19. Eg. Danish "telefon" (ie. phone) has become "telefoni" as in "telefoniminut" (to his own phone). Today, a lot of loanwords are still used in Greenlandic, not least about technical matters, but more or less in the same way in which Danes use English loanwords speaking Danish. However, scared by the past, some of the older generation criticize the habit, and in the opinion of many younger speakers, use too many resources on this (Møller, 1992).
20. My first thought listening to his answer was that he was a newcomer, and checking it out, the interview showed him to have lived all his life in Denmark till they moved to Nuuk 4 months before the interview. My experience from daily life in Nuuk is, that after some time monolingual Danes get accustomed to their exclusion by the language barrier from time to time.
21. The same practice is exactly the practice that causes problems for Danes when trying to learn to speak Greenlandic, and that is a stress factor for those who can understand Greenlandic, without speaking it fluently, the problem arising when they want to comment on a topic, but do not want the conversation to switch over to Danish.
22. Danish taught as a subject was only taught at mother-tongue level to all the students at GU.
23. This state of affairs in the teaching of Danish as subject is going to be changed; at last the disadvantages of the system have been estimated to be just too great.
24. Patrick (1998) talks about more markets involved in the linguistic situation in Kuujuaraapik in Nunavik, Quebec, Canada. However, I do not think it is either attractive or possible to view the Greenlandic setting as divided, as it seems to be impossible nowadays to be outside the part integrated in the modern lifestyle dependent on international know how, having access to this through Danish (and English). Apart from the different history, Greenland, being an island, is not a northern frontier, but much more centered around its Home Rule.
25. This is common knowledge, also mentioned in Gimbel and Holmen (1998:275).
26. They describe themselves on p.276 as outsiders. For a full-fledged description of the language situation in Greenland, see Langgård (1992a; 1992b and especially 1995).
27. A conference "Atuarfitsialak" was held in September of 1999 about the Greenlandic primary school. In January 2000 a preliminary status report from this conference was published, signed by the Greenlandic

- minister for School. Problems like the ones I have hinted at are mentioned (see Statusrapport for folkeskolen, 2000).
28. This development and its consequences for the fluency in Danish of the primarily Greenlandic-speaking children were researched and described by Langgård in the early 1990s. (See Langgård, 1992a; 1992b; 1997).
 29. Some would like education to become Greenlandic in the sense that not only the teaching, but also the books and all the materials should be in Greenlandic. The answer to this is quite simple, I think. This is not possible, not even at the high school level and not at all at the levels after high school. Even if all human resources were used to translate enough, the material would be outdated when finished.
 30. A school of foreign language teaching was established in Sisimiut in 1997. The need for fluency is a subject mentioned in the yearly speech of the prime minister of Greenland at the 1st of January, 2001.
 31. Here I am hinting at the necessity to find the right balance between acceptance of loanwords from English and Danish and the human resources used in order to invent new expressions for new cultural elements. A balance is used among the resources invested. Children learn some of the words describing the former traditional hunting community and the need for teaching them to argue in a modern setting about the present day and the future. Because of "cultural lag", some of the older generation will insist so much on the past, that they are an impediment to the development of Greenlandic.
 32. Since this article was written a number of things have happened in Greenland as well as in Nunavut. An important conference about language policy in Greenland was held in Kangerlussuaq in January 2001, with the participation also of the Language Commissioner from Nunavut. At this conference the Greenlandic Minister of Culture, Education, Research and Church mentioned in her opening speech among other things that one should be on one's guard against increasing monolingualism in Greenland. A figure mentioned by Thomas Anderson, Statistics Greenland (found in a publication from Statistics Greenland, 2000) at the conference in Kangerlussuaq is of special interest: in connections with interviews of pupils in grade 9-10 in the Greenlandic School about drugs, 47% said that they do not speak or understand anything but Greenlandic, while 49% were to some degree bilinguals and 4% speak only Danish. The general attitude at the conference was the Greenlandic is not a threatened language and the Greenlandic will stay the mother tongue language in Greenland, but Danish will go on having a special status (being a second or very good foreign language), while English shall be the third language (mastered

as foreign language). During these days (April 2001) an advisory body was assembled to make recommendations to the Greenlandic politicians. In Nunavut the Language Commissioner was quoted in Nunatsiaq News, November 24, 2000 stating that an effort is needed to save Inuktitut, especially among young people. That is, that in both countries, the language situation is debated, and with less tribute to political correctness, and more willingness to make an effort to cope with the problems, problems that are—to state it a provocative way—of opposite character: too much Greenlandic in Greenland versus too much English in Iqaluit.

References

- Albrectsen *et al.* (Editors)
 1998 Perspectives on Foreign and Second Language Pedagogy. Essays presented to Kirsten Haastrup on the Occasion of her Sixtieth Birthday. Odense University Press.
- Andersen, T.
 1996 Den sproglige udvikling i Grønland 1984-1994. Nuuk, Grønlands Statistik.
- Auer, Peter (Editor)
 1998 *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity.* London and New York.
- Berthelsen, Christian
 1990 Greenlandic in Schools, in Dirmid R.F. Collis (Editor): *Arctic Languages: An Awakening.* Unesco.
- Blom, Gunilla, Peter Graves, Arne Kruse and Bjame Thorup Thomsen
 1992 Minority Languages – The Scandinavian Experience. Papers read at the conference in Edinburgh 9-11. November 1990 published by the Nordic Language Secretariat. Report 17.
- Bourdieu
 1984 Vad det vill säga at tala. Det språkliga utbyttets ekonomi. Ce que parler veut dire. Paris: Fayard. 1982.
- Collis, Dirmid R. F. (Editor)
 1990 *Arctic Languages. An Awakening.* Unesco.
- Cummins, J
 1998 Semilingualism, in Jacob L. Mey (Editor): *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics.* Pergamon.
- Dorais, Louis-Jacques
 1996 *Language in Inuit Society.* Nunavut Arctic College. Iqaluit.

Dorais, Louis-Jacques and Susan Sammons

forth The Meaning of Discourse in Iqaluit. Forthcoming in Proceedings from the 11th Inuit Studies Conference, held in Nuuk September 1998.

Gimbel, Jørgen and Anne Holmen

1998 Ambiguity in Greenlandic Language Education, in Albrechtsen *et al.* (Editors): *Perspectives on Foreign and Second Language Pedagogy. Essays presented to Kirsten Haastrup on the occasion of her Sixtieth Birthday.* Odense University Press.

Gumperz, John J.

1992 *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge University Press.

Hensel, Chase

1996 *Telling Our Selves. Ethnicity and Discourse in Southwestern Alaska.* Oxford University Press.

Hertling, Knud

1992 How Greenlandic Survived as a Minority Language, in Gunilla Blom, Peter Graves, Arne Kruse and Bjarne Thorup Thomsen-Blom *et al.* (Editors): *Minority Languages – The Scandinavian Experience.* Papers read at the conference in Edinburgh 9-11. November 1990 published by the Nordic Language Secretariat. Report 17.

Langgård, Karen

1999 "Fishermen are Weaklings:" perceptions of Fishermen in Atua-galliutit before the First World War, in, Ole Marquardt, Poul Holm and David J. Starkey (Editors): *From Sealing to Fishing: Social and Economic Change in Greenland, 1850-1940. Studia Atlantica 4.*

1998 An Examination of Greenlandic Awareness of Ethnicity and National Self-consciousness Through Texts Produced by Greenlanders, 1860-1920s. In: *Études/Inuit/Studies.*

Langgård, Karen

1995 Er Grønland tosproget – og hvorfor ikke, in Daniel Thorleifsen (Editor): *Ilinniarfissuaq ukiuni 150-ini.* Festskrift anledning af Ilinniarfissuaqs 150-års jubilæum i 1995. Nuuk. Ilinniarfissuaq / Atuakkiorfik.

1992a Greenlandic is not an Ideology—it is a Language! in Nelson H.H. Grabum and Iutzi-Mitchell (Editors): *Language and Educational Policy in the North.* Berkeley: University of California.

1992b Grønlandssproget – tosproget – grønlandssproget: Nogle tendenser i det dansk-grønlandske sprog møde blandt Nuuks skolebørn, in *Grønlandsk Kultur-og samfundsborskning 92.* Ilisimatusarfik/Atuakkiorfik. Nuuk.

- Marquardt, Ole, Poul Holm and David J. Starkey
 1999 From Sealing to Fishing: Social and Economic Change in Greenland, 1850-1940. *Studia Atlantica* 4.
- Mey, Jacob L. (Editor)
 1998 *Consise Encyclopeida of Pragmatics*. Pergamon.
- Møller, Nuka
 1992 The Language Situation of the Youth in Greenland, in Nelson H.H. Graburn and Iutzi-Mitchell (Editors): *Language and Educational Policy in the North*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Patrick, Donna Rae
 1998 *Language, Power, and Ethnicity in An Arctic Quebec Community*.
- Petersen, Jonathan (Editor)
 1913 *Erinarsuutit*. (2nd edition)
- Statistics Greenland
 2000 ESPAD99, Rusmiddelundersøgelse blandt unge, årgang 1983 and 1984, i Grønland. Paarisa. Nuuk.
- Statusrapport
 2000 Statusrapport for folkeskolen. Inerisaavik. Januar 2000. Inerisaavik/Pilersuiffik. Nuuk.
- Stroch, Mathias
 1912 "Piniameq naammakkunaarpat suut allat saaffigissavavut?" *Atugagdliutit* 1911/12. Apri.
- Thorleifsen, Daniel (Editor)
 1995 *Ilinniarfissuaq ukiuni 150-ini*. Festskrift anledning af Ilinniarfissuaqs 150-års jubilæum i 1995. Nuuk. Ilinniarfissuaq / Atuakiorfik.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald
 1992 *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell.
- Woolard, Kathryn A:
 1985 Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Toward an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory. *American Ethnologist* 12:738-48.

APPENDIX

The questionnaire for:

DISCOURSE PRACTICES IN NUUK

A PILOT PROJECT AT GU DECEMBER 1998

1GU/3GU

respondent number

language of the interview

gender

year of birth

moved to Nuuk: when and from where

Greenlandic at A/B/C level

(according to the interviewer) appearance:

Greenlandic / mixed descent – blonde / mixed descent – dark /

Danish

IQUALUIT QUESTIONS:

1.a What is the first language you learned to speak?

1.b If Greenlandic, what dialect?

In the following two questions we are not asking about your grades for Greenlandic and Danish as teaching subjects, but about competencies for communication:

2. How do you rate your competence of Greenlandic. Choose one of the following values:

excellent/good/elementary/I do not speak Greenlandic

3. How do you rate your competence of Danish: Choose one of the following values:

excellent / good / elementary / I do not speak Danish

4. In the following circumstances, which language(s) do you normally speak?

Greenlandic only / Mostly Greenlandic / Greenlandic + Danish / mostly Danish / Danish only / Something else / Have not got any

4.a. with your mother

4.b. with your father

4.c. with your girl/boy friend

4.d. with your siblings

4.e. with your friends

4.f. at your work (not GU)

4. to Greenlandic: How would you describe your Danish: when communicating at Danish,
have you got many problems / some problems / almost no problems?
5. to Danish: How would you describe your Greenlandic: when communicating at Greenlandic,
have you got many problems / some problems / almost no problems?
6. to all: Are your friends: Greenlandic speaking / Danish speaking / bilinguals
you many choose more than one of the possibilities
7. to all: What counts more when choosing your friends? Choose max. 2 of the following choices:
their language / their interests / their personality

The following questions will be about the discourse practice at GU:

8. to all: We divide the students at GU into the following groups:
primarily Greenlandic speaking / bilinguals more or less / primarily Danish speaking
- d. If thinking of the primarily Greenlandic speaking students, would you say that you speak with them:
very often / from time to time / seldom
- e. If thinking of the more or less bilingual students, would you say that you speak with them:
very often / from time to time / seldom
- f. If thinking of the primarily Danish speaking students, would you say that you speak with them:
very often / from time to time / seldom
- 8.a to bilingual + Greenlandic: When you are talking everyday talk with a co-student who is primarily Greenlandic speaking,
do you then talk _____ together: Greenlandic / Danish / both of the two languages?
- 8.b to bilingual + Greenlandic: When you are talking everyday talk with a co-student who is more or less bilingual,
do you then talk _____ together: Greenlandic / Danish / both of the two languages?
- 9.a to bilingual + Greenlandic: When you are talking about classes and homework with a co-student who is primarily Greenlandic do you then talk _____ together: Greenlandic / Danish / both of the two languages?
- 9.b to bilingual + Greenlandic: When you are talking about classes and

- homework with a co-student who is more or less bilingual, do you then talk _____ together: Greenlandic / Danish / both of the two languages?
- 10 to bilingual + Greenlandic: In a setting where you are talking Greenlandic with somebody, if then a Danish speaking student shows up, will you then switch to Danish all of you: always / some times / seldom or never?
- 11 to Danish: Do the primarily Greenlandic speaking students from time to time speak Greenlandic to you, uttering more than just a few stock phrases?
- 12 to Danish: Do the bilinguals from time to time speak Greenlandic to you, uttering more than just a few stock phrases?
- 13.a to Danish: If you are together with Greenlandic speaking and bilingual students, do they then from time to time speak Greenlandic among themselves?
- 13.b to Danish: If yes, does this annoy you some times?
- 14.a to all: When talking small talk at GU both Greenlandic and Danish are spoken. Does this discourse practice often cause you communicative problems?
- 14.b to all: If yes, give some examples:
- 14.c to all: Does the discourse practice annoy you?
- 14.d to all: if yes, give some examples:
- 15.a to all: Do you fee that the use of two languages at GU entail something positive?
- 15.b to all: If yes, comment on how
- 16 to all: Above in the questionnaire we divided the student at GU into bilinguals, Danish speaking ones and Greenlandic speaking ones. However, do you yourself divide the GU students this way, when thinking of them ordinarily?
- 17 to bilingual + Greenlandic in 3GU: Do you think that a shift has taken place in the use of your two languages since you started at GU.
Yes I speak Greenlandic more / yes I speak Danish more / no it is more or less as before
18. to Danish in 3GU: Do you think that you have used Greenlandic more since you started at GU:
yes / no it has not changed / no I use it less
- 19.a to all: Would you like something connected with the discourse practice at GU to be changed? Yes/no
- 19.b to all: if yes, what