LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES:

A NATIONAL STRATEGY

A Final Report
on
A Comprehensive Strategy for Aboriginal Literacy

presented to

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

by

THE GABRIEL DUMONT INSTITUTE OF NATIVE STUDIES
AND APPLIED RESEARCH INC.,

and

THE METIS NATIONAL COUNCIL

October, 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To all those who gave of their time, knowledge and concern to make this study possible, our sincere thanks. We particularly acknowledge the caring and dedicated labours of the people at the program level. It is your energy and enthusiasm that is making even the small victories possible for our people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv

1.0 BACKGROUND 1

2.0 INTRODUCTION 2

2.1 The Metis and Non-Status Indian People of Canada 2
2.2 The Non-Status Indian Peoples of Canada 2
2.3 The Study Contributors 2

3.0 RESEARCH 4

3.1 Survey of Literacy Advocates 4
3.2 Survey of Aboriginal Organizational Personnel 4
3.3 Survey of Successful Program Personnel 5

4.0 RESPONSES 6

4.1 Literacy Advocates 6
4.2 Aboriginal Organization Personnel Responses 8
4.3 Successful Program Personnel Responses 9
4.3.1 Success Factors 14
4.3.2 Problems Encountered by Successful Programs 16

5.0 THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN AND THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES 17

5.1 Structures and Processes In Literacy For Metis And Non-Status Indian Peoples: The Issues 17

6.0 DEFINING LITERACY 21

6.1 Current Differing Definitions 22

7.0 DEFINING LITERACY FOR ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES 25

7.1 Aboriginal Communities 25
7.2 The Aboriginal Languages and Worldview 27

7.3 Aboriginal Community Attitudes Towards Languages and Literacies 28
7.4 Orality and Literacy 29
7.5 Aboriginal Languages As Non-Dominant Discourses 30
7.6 Literacy and Power 32

8.0 DEFINING LITERACY FOR A LITERACY STRATEGY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES 34

9.0 DEVELOPING A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLE 35

APPENDICES

Appendix "A" 42
Appendix "B" 44
Appendix "C" 48
Appendix "D" 51

BIBLIOGRAPHY 54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The following strategy for Aboriginal literacy was developed by the Gabriel Dumont Institute in collaboration with the Metis National Council. The purpose of the research was to provide recommendations for action in the areas of policy, program and strategies to meet the literacy needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

Research

The research was designed to identify successful approaches and programs presently in existence and at the same time to discover gaps and needs. Telephone interviews were conducted with three separate groups: personnel in Literacy programming for provincial and territorial governments; representatives of Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations; and personnel in Literacy programs deemed successful for Aboriginal peoples. Literature pertinent to Literacy and Aboriginal peoples was used to provide a framework for the findings from the surveys.

Survey Findings

The Literacy Campaign and the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples are not being well served by the Literacy Campaign in Canada as it is currently structured.

The following was found:

Lack of Knowledge of the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

Different jurisdictions are tackling the issues of Aboriginal literacy in totally different ways. However, it became clear in speaking with the provincial officials involved with literacy programming that the distinctions between the needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples were often confused with needs of Status Indian peoples. Governments are much more aware of the Indian communities and cultures in their jurisdictions than they are of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

Lack of Formal Structures for Involving the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

It was found that provincial departments can through various legislation contract services with and to reserve communities and the federal government easier than with Metis and Non-Status Indian

communities and organizations. In most jurisdictions there is no formal mechanism in place for contracting directly with Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations for the delivery of programs.

Lack of Communication Links Between the Literacy Units and the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

Furthermore, there is little direct communication between the Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations in many areas and the provincial education authorities. Where there is a long history of communication between the organizations and the provincial governments such as in the prairie provinces, there is a high level of frustration on the part of the Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations. Literacy is seen as one more issue where programs designed to meet the perceived needs of members of the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities were designed, developed and implemented without the involvement of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

Lack of Policy Development

None of the jurisdictions have a policy regarding literacy programs and Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples even though many have policies with regard to the education of Aboriginal peoples in elementary and high school or post-secondary education. In most literacy units there appeared to be no knowledge of the existing policies and therefore, these policies had not been adapted to the needs of the literacy programs. In the Northwest Territories, British Columbia and the Yukon specific reference was made to pertinent reports, legislation and policies that impinged on the work of the literacy unit.

Lack of a Fiscal Policy For Literacy Programming for Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

There are no long-term funding structures in place to address the needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples. Presently funding is on a project or program by program basis. Many of the spokespeople from organizations of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples stated that federal funding had been essential in their province to give impetus to literacy programming.

Lack of Structures and Procedures for the Involvement of Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples in the Evaluation of Programs Aimed at Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

For the most part the procedure used in the delivery of literacy programs is community-based. Community organizations apply for

funding. The funding request is approved or rejected on the criteria set at the provincial level. There is no mechanism in place to involve members of the Aboriginal community in the decisions about funding. There is no process for the involvement of the larger Aboriginal community to evaluate the proposals, monitor the programs, make suggestions as to appropriate materials or give feedback on the outcomes of the projects. There are very few Aboriginal people on staff in the projects identified with some very impressive exceptions. No where does there appear to be a formalized acceptance of the right of Aboriginal peoples to control their own programs nor a commitment to Affirmative Action in the hiring policy for programs.

Jurisdictional Complications in the Delivery of Literacy Programs

There are other problems of jurisdiction in the delivery of programs which complicate the issues of literacy programming. In many provinces, the Community Colleges or an equivalent agency deliver literacy programs. These institutions are autonomous entities and their relationships with the Aboriginal communities dictate how programs are delivered to the local communities. Provincial governments generally have an arms-length relationship with these institutions.

Lack of Philosophical and Pedagogical Foundation for Programming

As far as programs go, there is a lack of a philosophy base to Aboriginal programming. There is little research or evaluation data which guides programming for Aboriginal literacy. There is no policy about Mother Tongue Literacy or English as a Second Language. There is no Aboriginal control policy in literacy programming. There is a recognized lack of appropriate materials and curricula. There is no attempt to apply research already existing in learning styles, teaching styles, orality, writing processes and Aboriginal peoples.

DEFINING LITERACY FOR A LITERACY STRATEGY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES AND COMMUNITIES

Any literacy campaign involving Aboriginal peoples must:

(1) Recognize the existence of a variety of literacies in Aboriginal communities;

(2) Recognize literacy programming for Aboriginal peoples as cross-cultural experiences;

(3) Recognize the tensions between orality and literacy;

(4) Recognize that non-literate people have different language usage methods, concepts, and techniques than English or French writers do;

(5) Recognize that the teaching of essayist English is a narrow restricted training in English literacy;

(6) Recognize that literacy is not new to communities and that the resistance in the present context is related to the system which has forced English or French language literacy at the expense of the Aboriginal languages;

(7) Recognize that there is resistance to literacy within Aboriginal communities based on the threat to cultural identity posed by the assumption of the values of an outside culture bound within the English or French language literacy;

(8) Recognize that there are serious differences of opinion within Aboriginal communities on the costs and benefits of English or French language literacy;

(9) Recognize the rich heritage language experience both oral and literate that Aboriginal people possess;

(10) Recognize that issues of English or French language literacy cannot be considered in isolation from issues of Aboriginal language retention, retrieval and renewal.

It is essential that in a national strategy for Aboriginal literacy, old assumptions that have been the reason that programs in schools and adult education have been the failures that they have been, are challenged and re-examined. From the above cursory discussion of some of the factors impinging on the literacy issues for our people, it becomes even more important that the process of defining what is needed in literacy programs is determined by the Metis and Non-Status Indian community itself. The answers will be different in different places for different communities.

DEVELOPING A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

Presently lip service is paid to the needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples in the area of literacy programming in most jurisdictions although there are notable exceptions. It became increasingly apparent to us in the course of this study that if present structures, processes and strategies continue, the needs of our people will never be addressed. This is unacceptable for we have a young, quickly growing, increasingly disenchanted population.

The right of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples to demand programs that both meet our particular community needs and the requirements of the larger Canadian society must be recognized. We ask the federal government to join with us in a passionate fervent crusade towards maximizing the human resource base in the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities of Canada.

RECOMMENDATION ONE:

THAT A NATIONAL FORUM BE HELD IN THE NEAR FUTURE FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES TO DISCUSS AND DEBATE THE ISSUES OF LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

RECOMMENDATION TWO:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IN COLLABORATION WITH MEMBERS OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES DEVELOP A LITERACY CAMPAIGN SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE METIS AND NON-INDIAN COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS.

RECOMMENDATION THREE:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PASS THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES EDUCATION ACT TO DEFINE THE PARAMETERS FOR FEDERAL FUNDING OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA ADOPT THE CONCEPT OF ABORIGINAL CONTROL OF ABORIGINAL EDUCATION AS A FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES OF CANADA

RECOMMENDATION FIVE:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA ESTABLISH SUPPORT STRUCTURES FOR THE EDUCATION OF METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

RECOMMENDATION SIX:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE UNDERTAKEN

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY COALITION FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE FORMED MADE UP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN Peoples OF CANADA WITH THE MANDATE TO MANAGE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT:

THAT RESEARCH BE UNDERTAKEN TO ESTABLISH PHILOSOPHICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL CRITERIA FOR THE FOUNDATION OF CURRICULUM AND PROGRAMS FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

RECOMMENDATION NINE:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY COUNCIL FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE FORMED TO BRING TOGETHER PRACTITIONERS WORKING IN THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN Peoples

1.0 BACKGROUND

In April, 1990, Gabriel Dumont Institute was awarded a contract with the federal Department of the Secretary of State to develop a comprehensive literacy strategy for the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples of Canada.

Under the direction of a Steering Committee made up of representatives of the Metis National Council and the Gabriel Dumont Institute, the principal investigator conducted surveys of literacy advocates in the provincial and territorial governments and Aboriginal organizations to identify successful approaches and programs for Aboriginal people, review documents and research pertaining to literacy and Aboriginal peoples and visit sites of programs deemed successful.

This final report presents a synthesis of the data with recommendations for action -- policy, program and strategy implications.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This national study looked at literacy programming for the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples of Canada. It is important at the outset to understand who the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples are.

2.1 The Metis People of Canada

The Metis National Council defines **Metis as:**

- **an Aboriginal People distinct from Indian and Inuit;**
- **descendants of the historic Metis who evolved in what is now western Canada as a people with a common political will;**
- **descendants those Aboriginal Peoples who have been absorbed by the historic Metis**

(The Metis Community comprises members of the above who share a common culture identity and political will.) Our homeland encompasses the three prairie provinces, northeastern British Columbia, parts of the Northwest Territories and parts of the Northern United States (Montana, North Dakota and Minnesota).

2.2 The Non-Status Indian Peoples of Canada

The people are those people of Aboriginal ancestry who are not defined as Indian within the criteria of the Indian Act and are not part of the Metis community.

2.3 The Study Contributors

The contributors to this study represent Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples from across Canada. The relationships between the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples and the Canadian people was imposed on our peoples over one hundred years ago and continues to define our existence today. The federal institutions that were created and the legislation that was formulated for Indian people strictly excluded us. Provincial governments made little or no accommodation for us.

In practical terms, what does this mean? We suffer from the same barriers to our personal lives as Indian and Inuit people do. Many of our people suffer personally from racism because of their skin colour, language or cultural dress. Many of us worry about the maintenance and survival of our languages. Many of us lack appropriate educational services, employment

opportunities, suitable housing and lives of dignity. At the same time most of our people are without a land base, without a community infrastructure, and without adequate access to federal programs for Aboriginal peoples such as economic development strategies or federal policies such as Indian Control of Indian Education.

What is taken for granted in terms of the right of Indian band governments to deliver programs that meet the needs of their people, is still a dream for us. What is of crucial importance to us is the establishment of a framework that allows us to control programs are offered to our people.

3.0 RESEARCH

Surveys were conducted with three separate populations for this study: provincial and territorial personnel in literacy programming; representatives of Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations; and personnel in literacy programs or delivering agencies deemed successful for Aboriginal peoples. The results are presented below in Section 4.0.

3.1 Survey of Literacy Advocates

A list of the people directing the Literacy programs in the provincial and territorial governments was provided by the Department of the Secretary of State personnel and was the basis for the population of this survey. Names, addresses and positions of the individuals interviewed are attached in Appendix B. In some cases the initial contact person identified a subsequent interviewee.

All of the interviews were conducted over the telephone except the one with the Saskatchewan government representative who was interviewed in his office and with the Quebec representative where a follow-up letter was sent in French for his written reply. It was made clear to the persons interviewed that our survey was concerned with the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

All informants were asked the same questions:

> Is there a provincial/territorial policy related to Aboriginal literacy?
>
> Is there a legislative mandate for Aboriginal literacy programming in your jurisdiction? What is the involvement of Aboriginal people in the process of Aboriginal literacy programming?
>
> What are the characteristics of successful literacy programs for Aboriginal people?
>
> What Aboriginal literacy programs in your jurisdiction would you recommend for us to visit to get some ideas for our work?

3.2 Survey of Aboriginal Organization Personnel

The Steering Committee identified Aboriginal organizations across the country representing the Aboriginal peoples of Canada not under treaty or registered status. Appendix C contains a list of the Aboriginal organizations or affiliates

whose representatives took part in the study.

The following questions were asked of each representative:

> What involvement do the Aboriginal peoples of your area have in Aboriginal literacy programming?
>
> What gaps have you identified in the area of Aboriginal literacy programming?
>
> What services, processes, programs, legislation, etc. do you feel are needed to meet the needs of Aboriginal people with regard to literacy?
>
> What characteristics do you think make programs in Aboriginal literacy successful for Aboriginal peoples?
>
> What literacy programs for Aboriginal people would you recommend to us which would help us learn how literacy programs can be successful?

3.3 Survey of Successful Program Personnel

Those interviewed from provincial and territorial governments or from Aboriginal organizations identified Aboriginal literacy programs in their jurisdiction which they felt were successful in meeting the needs of Aboriginal peoples. The exemplary programs for Aboriginal people identified by the government were checked with the Aboriginal representatives to see if the Aboriginal people had the same judgment of the success of a program as the government officials do.

Programs singled out for commendation by both government and Aboriginal representatives were contacted. The program staffs were asked to describe what they felt were the characteristics which make their programs particularly successful with Aboriginal people. The possibility of on-site study were broached with the program personnel. Two on-site visits were made of programs specific to Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples in Ontario. A list of the identified programs is in Appendix D.

4.0 RESPONSES

4.1 Literacy Advocates

Eighteen literacy advocates and identified personnel from government departments in territorial or provincial governments were interviewed. The following represents their responses to the questions asked:

Is there a provincial/territorial policy related to Aboriginal literacy?

There is no jurisdiction in Canada that currently has a policy on Aboriginal Literacy. Aboriginal Literacy was identified as one of the two areas of greatest concern in a Task Force Report in Manitoba and work is underway on policy development in that province. In Nova Scotia, it is hoped that a policy will evolve from work which is identifying what the issues are and what practices work.

Jurisdictional boundaries complicate the development of literacy policy in Newfoundland. Since program delivery is through the Community Colleges which are autonomous self-governing institutions, Department of Education policy would not apply to the programs.

Although there is no policy with regard to Aboriginal Literacy in place in British Columbia, a recommendation for such a policy was made to the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology by the Provincial Literacy Advisory Committee in December, 1989 and accepted and resubmitted by the Provincial Advisory Committee on Post-Secondary Education for Native Learners in February, 1990.

Policies regarding Native Languages are seen to be part of the issue of policy related to Aboriginal Literacy. In the Northwest Territories, there are 8 official languages and funding for literacy in all of these languages is the direction of the government at the present time. In the Yukon, there is a policy to implement Native languages and culturally relevant materials.

In Newfoundland, recommendations have been made to the Minister of Education to make "Mother Tongue Literacy" and English as a Second Language courses part of the overall literacy strategy. At the present time, department officials are considering how to proceed on these recommendations.

Is there a legislative mandate for Aboriginal literacy programming in your jurisdiction?

Currently, in Canada, no government has a legislative mandate

for Aboriginal literacy programming.

What is the involvement of Aboriginal people in the process of Aboriginal literacy programming?

Aboriginal Community Involvement

At the present time there is no direct Aboriginal community involvement in Aboriginal programming. The involvement that is occurring is through individuals who are employed by governments or apply for community-based projects. There are no structures in place for the involvement of Aboriginal groups in evaluating proposals, managing budgets, advising on proposed projects, etc. There are no mechanisms whereby the Aboriginal community has an oversight function regarding literacy programs.

In British Columbia, the Provincial Literacy Advisory Committee Report to the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology contained the following recommendation:

* Immediate action be taken to establish policy and procedures for the delivery of Native literacy programs which recognize that effective programs depend on the maximum involvement of Native educators and leaders in the design and implementation of a province-wide strategy.

A similar recommendation was made in an evaluation of the Saskatchewan literacy initiatives. Hindle (1990) pointed out that in Saskatchewan 11% of the estimated population of need for literacy learning is Aboriginal in origin. Furthermore, at least 45% of the Aboriginal population of Saskatchewan over the 15 years of age are potential literacy learners (Hindle, iii). This prompted the following recommendation:

* The Government of Saskatchewan allocate substantial resources to literacy-learning opportunities for aboriginal people, and that a province-wide developmental planning process for literacy/ABE education be undertaken in conjunction with the Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research, Northlands College and aboriginal community organizations such as Native Friendship Centres. It is recommended that two independent literacy programs, READ Saskatoon and the Regina Public Library, along with SIAST Native Services Division, be consulted in the planning for urban aboriginal literacy programs, so that communication and cooperation in the provision of literacy services to aboriginal people is assured (Hindle, ix).

Aboriginal Personnel Involvement

In Prince Edward Island, there is one Aboriginal individual who works on Aboriginal issues within the government.

In New Brunswick, the Provincial Cabinet has had one Native Consultant for the past ten years. As well, through federal money, one Micmac Literacy Worker and one Malecite Literacy worker have been hired. These individuals are hired through federal money, are employed by the provincial Department of Education, are housed in the Community Colleges, are supervised by College staff and are to work with the Aboriginal communities.

In Nova Scotia, a Micmac Facilitator is employed by the Department of Education and is developing a Micmac curriculum which will provide literacy in a Micmac context.

In Ontario, a Native Consultant works with the 28 Aboriginal community literacy programs and with the Ontario Native Literacy Coalition which has been formed by program personnel in the Native community programs. The Native Consultant helps communities apply, and develop programs and is a resource person to existing programs.

In Manitoba, two Aboriginal employees work with the Department of Education. The Literacy Program Co-ordinator oversees sub-offices in Brandon and the Pas. The Literacy Community Worker is fluent in Cree and works in the northern communities.

What are the characteristics of successful literacy programs for Aboriginal people?

Although literacy advocates found this a particularly difficult question, certain trends appear to be present in literacy programming as evidenced by the kinds of projects supported across the country.

There is an implicit recognition of the need for Aboriginal peoples to be part of the delivery of programs: in Newfoundland the recommended program was an Inuit literacy program which was developed and delivered by the Inuit community; in New Brunswick, there have been two Aboriginal literacy workers employed; in Nova Scotia, Micmac curriculum is being developed by Micmac researchers; in Ontario, a Native Consultant is part of the Literacy Unit; Two Native literacy workers are in Manitoba; there is support of Aboriginal staff for Aboriginal peoples in programming in Saskatchewan; attempts to provide Aboriginal tutors for Aboriginal clients in Alberta; recommendations for involvement of Aboriginal people at all stages of programs in British Columbia;

Aboriginal community-based programming in Northwest Territories; efforts to develop programs for Aboriginal communities in the Yukon which meet the needs of the local Aboriginal people through meetings with the local people.

Successful programs are thought to be learner-centred rather than curriculum centred and community-based. In Ontario and the Northwest Territories in particular, traditional adult education resources are being replaced by locally developed materials. In Native communities this involves the communities in Oral History projects, Story Telling activities, etc. The Northwest Territories is utilizing approaches which involve whole communities. Intergenerational processes are encouraged.

In Ontario, the major emphasis of programs is making people feel good about themselves. Learning to believe in themselves is a primary objective. Concurrently, community development and empowerment are goals of the projects.

In Manitoba, the approach to Aboriginal literacy is community-based. There is no pre-packaged curriculum set by the Department. Local Literacy Working Groups at the community level receive grants from the Department of Education to fund the program but have responsibility for hiring teachers, picking curriculum, etc. Curricular approaches range from Language Experience or Whole Language Approaches to more structured university-bound materials.

Friendship Centres house many of the community-based literacy programs funded by the Manitoba Department of Education. Manitoba sees community-based program as community-controlled. The role of the Department is as facilitator. Accountability is maintained through internal evaluation for planning and development. According to the Department official, it is a developmental process and the longer communities are involved, the better their programs become.

4.2 Aboriginal Organization Personnel Responses

Responses were obtained from 12 Aboriginal organizations or affiliates.

What involvement do the Aboriginal peoples of your area have in Aboriginal literacy programming?

There is no direct involvement by any Metis or Non-Status Indian organization in literacy programming for Aboriginal people.

In Newfoundland and Labrador, the Inuit organization has found

that the regional composition of the Literacy Coalition of Labrador and Newfoundland has afforded Aboriginal people in that province a valuable forum. The Micmac, Innu and Inuit have each been regional representatives on the Coalition. No special provision is made in the structure for Aboriginal representation but because of the way the regions are distributed, it worked for the Aboriginal people. The Metis and Non-Status Indian people had no special representation.

In Prince Edward Island, no input from the Native Council of P.E.I had previously been sought but discussions are currently underway. In Ontario, the Ontario Metis and Aboriginal Association is not involved in any way except in monitoring programs.

The Pacific Metis Federation in British Columbia has no input into literacy programming but report having approached the Provincial Government, School Boards, and Colleges in an effort to deal with the literacy problem so prevalent among their people.

What gaps have you identified in the area of Aboriginal literacy programming?

A wide variety of gaps were identified in literacy programming by the representatives of Aboriginal organizations. These are as follows:

1. Control By Aboriginal Communities

Almost every person interviewed pointed to the lack of the acceptance of Aboriginal people's right to control programming that is geared towards their people. This lack of control is manifested in a variety of problems. In Labrador, the difficulty of accessing funding for Aboriginally designed and desired programs was described. No structure is in place for Aboriginal organizations to receive money directly to run programs. Funds are directed through the Community College. A "Gentleman's Agreement" between the Aboriginal organization and the College in the case of Mother Tongue Literacy programming is not a solution to the structural problem.

This view is reiterated in Ontario where organization personnel say that the fundamental issue is control. Programs and policies at all levels are developed by autonomous units somewhere in isolation of the Aboriginal community. "If you want to develop programs for us, involve us from the outset so that the delivery ensures that it meets our needs." There is a need for involvement by concerned people when decisions are made as to where scant resources are put. Funding should be put directly

into the hands of Aboriginal organizations or local organizations by the federal government. The money is currently funnelled through the provincial government and another set of criteria for the Aboriginal programs to be judged by according to the Ontario organization personnel.

The Manitoba Metis Federation sees the problem as control as well. The Federation feels that problems are caused by the institutional control presently in place. The Federation has found it easier to negotiate with governments than with the institutions. The final resolution is Aboriginal control. "Let the federal government formulate a fiscal policy and a general policy and we will do the rest."

Saskatchewan has the only Metis controlled educational institution in Canada and it has been virtually shut out of the Saskatchewan Literacy Campaign to date. The need for structures to support the delivery of literacy programming within such institutions is overdue.

There is no funding for literacy for Metis and Non-status Indian peoples in Alberta according to the Metis Association of Alberta spokesperson. Individuals may attend programs but no recognition is given to their Metis community or heritage. The Association feels that only through direct funding to the Metis community itself will the needs be properly assessed, identified and appropriate programs be devised.

The Metis National Council in a brief to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs of the House of Commons pointed out that in literacy initiatives as other federal and provincial endeavours aimed at solving problems of the Metis and Non-Status Indian people, the Metis people were not asked to be involved in the process at the federal level or provincial level. The Council recommended the commencement of a coherent, integrated plan for Metis self-determination beginning with an act of Parliament establishing principles of Aboriginal self-government in educational programs supported by federal funding.

2. Small Populations

Problems exist in Prince Edward Island in that the population is very small even though it is acknowledged that a high proportion of the people are uneducated.

3. Relevant Curriculum for Metis and Non-Status Indian People

The president of the Pacific Metis Federation sees the major gap in literacy programming as the lack of teaching of Metis people within the context of their culture. This position is supported by all Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations interviewed. Culturally relevant materials related to Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples are missing across the country in educational programming.

4. Information About Programming Suitable For Aboriginal People

There was a general feeling among most organizations that there is not enough opportunity for an exchange of information across provincial and territorial boundaries by people of Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations. There is a great deal of "Reinventing the Wheel" in programming and a need for moral support as well in striving to meet the needs of a similar clientele.

What services, processes, legislation, etc. do you feel are needed to meet the needs of the Aboriginal people with regard to literacy?

A Legislative Mandate

The Metis National Council feels that the only protection for the rights of people to an education is an act of Parliament setting out the right of all to an education; the right for Aboriginal people to control their own education; accountability to Aboriginal peoples for the education delivered to them by programs funded federally; support for Aboriginal educational institutions, etc.

Processes

Most Aboriginal organizational personnel mentioned the need for processes which involve the Aboriginal communities in the inception, design, development, implementation and evaluation of programs with the intent of meeting the needs of the Aboriginal community. Processes for the evaluation of proposals for programs through federal and provincial auspices were also a concern.

The Metis Association of Alberta is concerned about appropriate learning approaches and processes in literacy programs. As well they believe that research is needed into different and appropriate support systems to learning for Metis people. Are tutors an appropriate

technique? Do Literacy Councils work in Aboriginal communities? How can Metis specific processes be developed? How can suitable teachers be recruited to teach Aboriginal students?

Structures

Aboriginal educational institutions were seen as the structures most needed by the Manitoba Metis Federation. As well, structures to support and legitimize these Aboriginal institutions: fiscal policies; contracting arrangements; policies which promote the work of these institutions such as federal contracts; policies which support cultural knowledge and approaches, etc.

A National Literacy Campaign for Metis and Non-Status People formulated with Metis and Non-Status Indian People which has targets, goals, long-term funding and meets the definition of literacy based in the Aboriginal communities is needed to make literacy programming have the serious commitment that it needs to be successful.

Programs

There are groups of people within the Aboriginal community who are not having their needs met. The Manitoba Metis Federation is concerned about the young drop-outs who are on the streets. No one seems to be taking responsibility for them.

The Native Council of P.E.I. recognizes a need among those who are 40+ who are illiterate. The research in Northern Alberta has shown that the Aboriginal people who are the majority of the illiterate population are male and older. Those who are in programs are mostly female and younger. The Metis Association of Alberta wants to do a needs assessment to find out the real needs among their people.

Definition of Literacy

A number of the organization representatives said that the kind of literacy programming in their area was not the kind of literacy wanted by their people. The needs included First Language Literacy, development of Michif language programming, community-based multilingual, multi-level literacy, etc. It was recommended that the various concerns of Aboriginal peoples in reading and writing be examined by Aboriginal people.

What Characteristics do you think make programs in Aboriginal literacy successful for Aboriginal peoples?

The representatives of the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples' organizations had few examples of programs that worked for Aboriginal people. They knew that programs with content and learning environments that made people feel at home and comfortable worked. They supported the concept of community-based programming as long as the people of the community who controlled the program were in tune with the people who are in the courses.

The Pacific Metis Federation feels that in order to have some semblance of success, any literacy program must give the recipient some self identification as to the program being offered. Culturally relevant materials, methods and information are seen as essential.

Most individuals interviewed stated that what has been going on isn't meeting the needs of the Aboriginal people but that until Aboriginal people were involved in devising experimental projects and testing a variety of techniques what was said about successful programs was primarily theory.

4.3 Successful Program Personnel Responses

There were only two programs identified as serving Metis and Non-Status Indian People and these were both in Ontario. They were surveyed and on-site visits were paid to them. They were seen to be very successful by the Department personnel and by the program people as well as were mentioned by the provincial Aboriginal organization personnel.

4.3.1 Success Factors

In both cases, the projects were supported by the local Aboriginal community. This was seen to be key to the success in the opinion of the program staff. The community identifies those needing the program in an informal way and the decision of the individual to seek help is supported by the community. Recruiting is done by someone saying " My Aunt would like to see you." and that being followed up by the program personnel. People remain as part of the program even if they drop-out. They then become oral-story tellers or work on the newsletter or just drop back in.

One of the instructors pointed out that in communities that have not had success at the formal schooling process, people have a "Wait and see" attitude and with the help of the community, trust is built.

The programs are learner centred. The tutor manuals are

community based. A newsletter serves to make the program a part of the wider community. It also draws on other people as volunteers. The Life Skills Component is based on confidence building.

Flexibility is a key to success. In one of the programs the instructor is itinerant and travels to homes in a radius of about 50 miles to serve the community. Oral history projects supplement the curriculum.

Other programs in other parts of the country evolve their own curriculum as well. The Inuit Literacy program worked with a consultant in Whole Language to develop an approach for the teaching of literacy. The Micmac curriculum is being developed from Archival resources as well as contemporary materials about the Micmac. In Manitoba, the literacy program called Journey's Adult Education Association has used drama so successfully that a play written by the students has been produced.

Support systems geared to the students' needs have proven successful in many of the programs. In Calgary, the Life Skills Component has changed so much that it will no longer be called Life Skills but will be called Bridging the Gap. The content is dependent on the aspects of "White Society" that the students are presently struggling with in their life.

In Winnipeg, the Journey's Program has found that it is important to identify Metis students in their application form because when they learn that there are other Metis people at the centre that they can turn to they feel at home. There are Metis people on the Board of Directors, a Metis teacher and a Native childcare worker.

STRIDE in Calgary is a computer-assisted program which uses the computer to alleviate some of the fears people have about their abilities. It works well with Aboriginal people according to the Project Manager. It is non-threatening. It tracks the students' progress and lets them set their own goals. They challenge themselves and learn quickly. Even with the computer, differences have been observed in the behaviour of the Aboriginal students. They approach learning differently than non-Aboriginal students, the staff has observed.

A warm, informal learning environment has been noted in a number of the programs. Close monitoring by a caring staff is important. Dealing with the real issues in the lives of students is also a reoccurring theme in successful programs.

4.3.2 Problems Encountered by Successful Programs

There are a number of serious problems that were identified consistently by program personnel.

1. Funding

Funding is a problem in that it is short-term. About every nine months new proposals must be written to justify the existence of the program under the same or new criteria for the same or increased needs. Word of mouth means that there is a greater demand the longer a program exists but the funding agencies are not equipped to fund on-going, stable, successful programs. Preference is given to experimental unproven projects. Projects have to vie for funds against other as greatly needed programs.

Funding has a detrimental effect on the quality of the program. Staff is underpaid, and part-time, often transitory as other better opportunities come up in more stable institutions. Space has to be shared to save money. There is insufficient money for developing appropriate resources or buying appropriate resources. Literacy programs are chronically short of books.

2. Legitimacy

Because of their short-term, project by project life, literacy programs lack status and legitimacy among educational establishments.They are often peripheral to mainstream education.

3. Student Support

Program staff expressed concern at the lack of adequate funding for many current and prospective clients for Aboriginal literacy programming.

5.0 THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN AND THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLE

Metis and Non-Status Indian people are not being well served by the Literacy Campaign in Canada as it now is structured.

Metis and Non-Status Indian people may be involved as students in a few programs but their particular needs have not been recognized nor addressed. The input of the Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations has not been sought nor have programs designed and proposed by them been supported. Metis and Non-Status Indian community representatives who have tried to become involved have become very frustrated.

Questions arise such as "What kind of access do Metis and Non-Status Indian people actually have to programs for literacy?" "Who guarantees that they have access?" "What mechanisms ensure that they get access?"

5.1 Structures and Processes in Literacy for Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples: The Issues

1. Lack of Knowledge of the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

Different jurisdictions are tackling the issues of Aboriginal literacy in totally different ways. However, it became clear in speaking with the provincial officials involved with literacy programming that the distinctions between the needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples were often confused with needs of Status Indian peoples. Governments are much more aware of the Indian communities and cultures in their jurisdictions than the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

2. No Formal Structures for Involving the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

It was found that provincial departments can through various legislation contract services with and to reserve communities and the federal government easier than with Metis and Non-Status Indian communities and organizations. In most jurisdictions there is no formal mechanism in place for contracting directly with Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations for the delivery of programs.

3. Lack of Communication Links Between the Literacy Units and the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

Furthermore, there is little direct communication between the Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations in many areas and the provincial education authorities. Where there is a long history of communication between the organizations and the provincial governments such as in the prairie provinces, there is a high level of frustration on the part of the Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations. Literacy is seen as one more issue where programs designed to meet the perceived needs of members of the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities were designed, developed and implemented without the involvement of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

4. Lack of Policy Development

None of the jurisdictions have a policy regarding literacy programs and Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples even though many have policies with regard to the education of Aboriginal peoples in elementary and high school or post-secondary education. In most literacy units there appeared to be no knowledge of the existing policies and therefore, these policies had not been adapted to the needs of the literacy programs. In the Northwest Territories, British Columbia and the Yukon specific reference was made to pertinent reports, legislation and policies that impinged on the work of the literacy unit.

5. Lack of a Fiscal Policy For Literacy Programming for Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

There are no long-term funding structures in place to address the needs of Metis and Non-Status peoples. Presently funding is on a project or program by program basis. Many of the spokespeople from organizations of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples stated that federal funding had been essential in their province to give impetus to literacy programming.

6. Lack of Structures and Procedures for the Involvement of Metis and Non-Status Indian People in the Evaluation of Programs Aimed at Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

For the most part the procedure used in the delivery of literacy programs is community-based. Community organizations apply for funding. The funding request is approved or rejected on the criteria set at the provincial level. There is no mechanism in place to involve members of the Aboriginal community in the

decisions about funding. There is no process for the involvement of the larger Aboriginal community to evaluate the proposals, monitor the programs, make suggestions as to appropriate materials or give feedback on the outcomes of the projects. There are very few Aboriginal people on staff in the projects identified with some very impressive exceptions. No where does there appear to be a formalized acceptance of the right of Aboriginal peoples to control their own programs nor a commitment to Affirmative Action in the hiring policy for programs.

7. Jurisdictional Complications in the Delivery of Literacy Programs

There are other problems of jurisdiction in the delivery of programs which complicate the issues of literacy programming. In many provinces, the Community Colleges or an equivalent agency deliver literacy programs. These institutions are autonomous entities and their relationships with the Aboriginal communities dictate how programs are delivered to the local communities. Provincial governments generally have an arms-length relationship with these institutions.

8. Literacy Councils and the Metis and Non-Status Indian People's Needs

Literacy Councils are structures which are part of the literacy network. In some jurisdictions, these organizations have supported the ideas of the Aboriginal people of the area. However, in other jurisdictions, the Aboriginal people have had little involvement or influence within the Councils. There was some concern expressed by the Metis and Non-Status community that the development of Literacy Councils might not be the best way to address the problems of literacy for the Metis and Non-Status Indian people because the population is diverse and scattered.

9. Lack of Philosophical and Pedagogical Foundation for Programming

As far as programs go. There is a lack of a philosophy base to Aboriginal programming. There is little research or evaluation data which guides programming for Aboriginal literacy. There is no policy about Mother Tongue Literacy or English as a Second Language. There is no Aboriginal control policy in literacy programming. There is a recognized lack of appropriate materials and curricula. There is no attempt to apply research already existing in learning styles, teaching styles, orality,

writing processes and Aboriginal peoples.

10. Literacy--What Do People Mean?

It was evident in speaking with people from the different provincial and territorial governments, Metis and Non-Status Indian organizations and literacy programs, that there are a variety of definitions of "literacy" co-existing. Since the definition sets the parameters of programs, determines the characteristics of the clientele, influences staffing decisions, dictates content and presupposes outcomes, agreement amongst the partners is essential to meeting the needs of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

6.0 DEFINING LITERACY

The key to an understanding of literacy programming is determining what is meant by literacy. In this study it is even more critical to come to an understanding of the concept because not only is this a study of different programs and jurisdictions, but it encompasses differences in cultures, languages and histories of peoples. Let's start with a dictionary definition:

Literate: 1. a. educated or cultured
b. able to read and write
2. being versed in literature
3. having knowledge and competence

It can be seen that such a dictionary definition stresses the "cultural" aspects of literacy over the ability to read and write. It is also evident that there is a societal value placed on being "literate". Further, the implication is that literacy bestows upon the individual recognition for being knowing and skilled. Being literate, therefore, is understood to mean that a person possesses certain abilities, knowledge and awareness accepted as legitimate by society. Therefore, the main benefit of being literate is the entry into the cultural world of mainstream Canada.

As a corollary of this definition, it is understood that "not to be literate" means that you are uneducated, uncultured, are not versed in literature, and do not have knowledge or competence.

This definition comes out of the Western Intellectual Tradition fostered by such writers as Voltaire and Carlyle. Voltaire is purported to have said," Books rule the world." Carlyle claimed that all that mankind had done, thought, gained or been, is lying as a magic preservation in the pages of books. (Brown, 1975, 7). Reading is seen as the key unlocking this knowledge. It will then help you understand yourself, others and the past and present.

When knowledge and competence are added to the list of concomitant acquisitions of literacy the logical conclusion to be drawn is that those who are not literate are those with no know-how and lack knowledge. Brown states that reading is equivalent to earning power because "an individual with know-how is obviously worth more than one without know-how" (Brown, 1975, 8). Hence, a person who is not literate has no earning power.

But how does this definition relate to Aboriginal peoples? Ferdman (1990) states that cultural identity both derives from and modulates the symbolic and practical significance of literacy for individuals as well as groups (182). How does is the cultural identity of Aboriginal peoples influencing their literacy? Aboriginal cultures are non-literate cultures. Aboriginal languages have been for the most part preserved as oral languages. What was important to be remembered, was said. The Elders were and

still are among other things, the keepers of the spiritual knowledge, the historians, legal advisors, counsellors, tellers of tales, moral teachers, medical researchers, and guardians of the corporate memory.

Those things that have to be known and skills that have to be learned within the community are transmitted through the teachings of the culture and the language. However, in the words of Wilde,

> But non-literate people in the midst of a literate culture are seen as illiterates, a pejorative term referring to someone who hasn't met the society's norm, someone who is socially handicapped. (Wilde, 143)

6.1 Current Differing Definitions

Arnove and Graff (1987) state that literacy takes on meaning according to the historical and societal setting" (Arnove and Graff, 1987, 204). They point out that "notions of what skills constitute literacy change over time and differ by setting" (Arnove and Graff, 205). The following represents some current definitions of literacy.

Literacy as Improvement

Literacy is the ability to read and write to improve one's living and working conditions. (Government of Saskatchewan, 1986)

Literacy as Grade Level

Literacy = ability to read simplest texts and street signs -- "below" the level of functional literacy -- about the Grade 4 level on standardized tests

Literacy = ability to read simple texts as local newspapers or articles in digest magazines -- about the Grade 8 level on standardized tests

Literacy = ability to read technical manuals in industry and the military and such national magazines as Time and Newsweek -- about high school level on standardized tests (Chall, Heron and Hilferty, 1987, 190)

Literacy as Language

Literacy is not simply the result of teaching someone to read by some method and evaluating by some standardized test. The issues of literacy are blurred and confused by language

differences, social attitudes towards language, language teaching and learning, politics, economics, psychology and law. (Goodman, Goodman and Flores, n.d., 41)

Literacy as Social Construct

Literacy is a social construct more reflective of the culture and context than of formal instruction and can be used for cultural transmission within a society or for cultural imperialism when imposed from outside. (Battiste, 1984, Abstract)

Literacy as Interethnic Communication

English essayist literacy shares many features with discourse patterns of English speakers. Where these patterns are different from those of another ethnic group, literacy will be experienced as interethnic communication. (Scollon, and Scollon, 1979, Abstract)

Literacy as Mastery over a Second Discourse

I believe that any socially useful definition of "literacy" must be couched in terms of the notion of Discourse. Thus, I define "literacy" as the mastery of or fluent control over a secondary Discourse. Therefore, literacy is always plural: literacies (there are many of them, since there are many secondary Discourses, and we all have some and fail to have others). If we wanted to be rather pedantic and literalistic, rather we could define "literacy" as "mastery of or fluent control over secondary Discourses involving print. (Gee, "Literacy, Discourse and Linguistics: Introduction", 1989, 9)

Literacy as Writing an Aboriginal Language

It seems likely that seventy or eighty years ago, the Cree-speaking people of Northern Canada had one of the highest literacy rates in the world. They were able to read and write their own language in the syllabic script .... (Berry and Bennett, 1989, 431)

Literacy as Subtle Cultural Genocide

As far as I can see, most literacy programs for Aboriginal people in Canada today are a form of cultural genocide. They delegitimize the traditional ways of speaking, thinking and passing down information from generation to generation.

Attempts to express the oral culture in a literate way fossilize it and support the museum view of culture. (Delores Koenig, in conversation, March 9, 1990)

Literacy as a Process of Consciousness Raising Aimed at Human Liberation

In the twentieth century, literacy has become equated with a process of consciousness raising aimed at human liberation -- not an end in itself but a means to "national development and social order defined by national and international elites". (paraphrased from Arnove and Graff, 1987, 203)

Literacy as Empowerment

> "[people learn to] deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world." (Freire, 1972, 15)

7.0 DEFINING LITERACY FOR ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

7.1 Aboriginal Communities

The following describes a typical Aboriginal community in Canada:

> At the one extreme is a family I know in which one adult in the household does not read or write at all -- indeed knows little English. The children in the family, although prolific in their oral language read and write with difficulty and have little interest in reading. At the other extreme is a teacher, her husband is a bus driver, and their family. They often spend their evenings reading and their children read well and enjoy it. The parents are bilingual and the children speak only English. An average or typical family is one in which the grandparents cannot read [English] at all, the parents can read haltingly and the children are beginning to enjoy reading. The children of the community all speak English when they come to school and while for most of them it is their first language, it is of course influenced by Ojibwa. For most of the children, written language is something they'll primarily do at school. They see it to some extent on T.V., on signs and packages when they go to town and in connection with money but generally, not as something that the adults in their community produce, enjoy or even use very much. Of course, older brothers and sisters are an influence, but their reading and writing is also done only in school. Exposure to the written language comes, therefore, primarily from non-Indian sources. (Wilde, 1979, 141-5)

The conditions surrounding issues of languages and literacy are very complex in this typical Aboriginal community. There is no doubt that in this community, very few adults would have a level of schooling higher than Grade nine. This conclusion is based on the history of Aboriginal education in Canada. Aboriginal peoples have had limited access to a high school education until recent times. Most of the adults in the community would be classified as functionally illiterate. What does this classification add to our understanding of the literacy needs in this community? Can we say that these people are uneducated, unskilled, lack competence and knowledge? Can we say that these people cannot function in society? If so, what society?

A closer look at the community shows that the functional language of the community is the Aboriginal language. Can we then say that those who cannot communicate in the Aboriginal language in this society are functionally illiterate? In studying northern Canadian Cree communities in the late

1980's, Berry and Bennett stated that "virtually no one is illiterate in these communities" (Berry and Bennett, 1989, 445). Approximately one third of the residents read Cree syllabics, one third are schooled [and presumably can read English] and one third are biliterate. Berry and Bennett conclude that it may be fair to say that Cree literacy levels match or surpass national norms. It would seem more correct to say that those who are biliterate are really the only ones who are functionally literate in these communities.

Were we to assume the literacy levels of our hypothetical community by looking at the Ojibwa language literacy levels as well as the grade level, no doubt, we would find results similar to those found among the Cree. Literacy in Aboriginal languages was the norm in the nineteenth century across Canada. The Ojibwa and other groups schooled by the Jesuits and Sulpicians during the French Regime have a literate tradition which dates from at least the seventeenth century (Cecil King, in conversation, May 24, 1990).

There is a growing body of research acknowledging widespread Aboriginal language literacy exists in Canada. Slobodin (1981, 529) identified the many uses of literacy among the Kutchin. Numerous studies have examined literacy among the Inuit people from Labrador across the north. Reading and writing were regarded as universal skills among these people who not only kept daily records and diaries and communicated by letter but wrote poetry and autobiographies. (McGrath, 1984; Harper, 1983; Shearwood, 1987).

Shearwood (1987) and Berry and Bennett (1989) demonstrate that a variety of literacies co-exist in Aboriginal communities today in Canada. Shearwood has created a typology of literacies currently in Aboriginal communities in the Northwest Territories: Biblical vernacular literacy; Pragmatic vernacular literacy; High vernacular literacy; schooled vernacular literacy; pragmatic English language literacy; essayist English literacy (Shearwood, 1987, 634). Each of these literacies fulfils certain functions, possesses a certain code, script and typical message while maintaining a particular relationship between the writer and the reader (Shearwood, 1987, 634).

Studies examining Aboriginal language literacy have decried the fact that school-based essayist English literacy has been taught at the expense of the other literacies. In Labrador, literacy among the Inuit was prevalent until the 1950s when union with Canada resulted in the imposition of English as the sole literacy given legitimacy. Berry and Bennett (1989, 443) refer to the "missing generation" among the Cree who did not acquire syllabics either traditionally or in school.

7.2 The Aboriginal Languages and Worldview

The introduction of English language literacy into Aboriginal communities through the school or especially through adult education classes is not only the introduction of reading and writing but the introduction of a new language, new ways of expressing thoughts, and new communication styles.

Language structures the world for us. Aboriginal languages define the existence of the speakers of those languages. This definition of reality is not only through the words that are available to describe the world, but is also built into the structure of the language itself. Take for example, the Algonkian languages. Algonkian languages (which include a large proportion of Canada's Aboriginal peoples) divide the world into what linguists have termed "Animate" and "Inanimate" classifications. All nouns are either animate or inanimate, as in French, all nouns are masculine or feminine. This grammatical structure reflects the relationships of the Algonkian peoples to the Great Spirit, the Physical World, the Plant World, the Animal World and to other human beings.(Cecil King, in conversation, June, 1990). The language and the cultural values are intimately connected. Literacy in the Algonkian languages is a continuation of this cultural system of organizing the world.

Aboriginal peoples believe that their languages are a Gift of the Creator. In the words of Gayle High Pine:

> Languages were given to us as a way of knowing the Creation. Words describe the way in which our relatives of the Creation relate to our lives. Words tie the world together in an intricate network of relationships. (High Pine, 1976, 30)

The English language or French language represent different systems for defining and describing the world. They incorporate a different value system and different structuring principles. In High Pine's terms:

> Each language has its own life, its own spirit and its instructions are to shape and carry our thoughts in the sacred paths given to its nation.(High Pine, 1976, 30)

High Pine expresses eloquently the spiritual connectedness that most Aboriginal people feel toward their languages. This in itself places a burden on Aboriginal people who acquire other languages and literacies which begin to take over from their Aboriginal one. For, many Aboriginal people see the loss of Aboriginal language use as symbolic of the loss of the values, practices and worldview that it embodies and a breach of faith with the Great Spirit.

7.3 Aboriginal Community Attitudes Towards Languages and Literacies

Arnove and Graff (1987) maintain that "regardless of the intensity or the scale of literacy campaigns over the last 400 years, each was successful with approximately 85% of the adult population. "A seemingly irreducible 10%-20% of the adult population in each nation remained illiterate (Arnove and Graff, 205)". Arnove and Graff wonder what factors exist which are associated with the failure of literacy campaigns.

Statistics would indicate that Aboriginal peoples in Canada have a high resistence level to literacy programs. Resistence to English or French literacy among Aboriginal peoples may be assumed not only from the numbers that have remained "illiterate" but also, from the high drop-out rates in adult education programs. A study in northern Ontario in 1989, showed that the drop-out rates of Aboriginal students in adult basic education courses at Confederation College, Thunder Bay was 45% and in Sioux Lookout was 25%-30% (Keewatin-Aski Ltd., 1989, Response, p.4). Drop-out rates in northern Alberta range from an average of 25% in ABE programs in the northern region to a high of 80%. No studies have satisfactorily explained the high drop-out rates of Aboriginal peoples.

Factors which enter into the resistence of Aboriginal peoples to English and French language literacy are often deeply felt things such as loss of language, threat to cultural values, loss of identity, etc. which are not easily articulated nor likely to be reported to school officials.

Scollon and Scollon (1979) described the discourse patterns among Athabaskan speakers. They found that Athabaskan speakers and English speakers had different discourse patterns and that these discourse patterns resulted in ethnic stereotyping and these stereotypes affected the attitudes that Athabaskans had towards reading and writing English. To an Athabaskan, acquiring essayist English meant taking on the discourse style of an English speaker, becoming "smug, boastful, arrogant and talkative." As a result, Athabaskans resisted becoming "literate" because of negative feelings towards the behaviour of English speakers. Athabaskans fully understand that becoming English language literate is to become bicultural.

There is at the same time among many Aboriginal people, resistence to Aboriginal language literacy. Many believe that languages should only be taught in the home and community in the traditional oral way. There are those who feel that the oral traditions are destroyed when they are written down. The essence of orality is orality.

7.4 Orality and Literacy

In many Aboriginal homes and communities, the literate tradition exists beside a vibrant orality. All Aboriginal peoples of Canada have descended from oral cultures. In the words of Eric Havelock,

> Primary orality is a condition that is very difficult for the literate mind to describe and conceptualize because all our terminologies and the metaphors involved are drawn from experience which is literate and which we take for granted. Literate habits and assumptions and language are the warp and woof of modern existence. (Havelock, 1986, 64)

Primary orality is for many Aboriginal people their primary socialization. The communication is face to face. The Elders are the repositories of the traditions about every aspect of life. The traditions are very much woven into the language that is spoken in the community. There is a fear by many that the loss of language will result in the death of the culture. At the same time, the sanctity of the traditions are considered to be incompatible with the written word. In many communities, Elders do not allow the traditions to be put into literate form especially in European languages. Hirsch discusses the "trouble with writing" as it is seen by Aboriginal peoples:

> ...first, it is static; it freezes words in space and time. It does not allow the living story to change and grow, as does the oral tradition. Second, though it potentially widens the story's audience, writing removes the story from the place and people who nourished it in the telling, and thus, robs it of much of its meaning. (Hirsch, 1988, 1)

Havelock maintains that orality is the essence of communication, a process of spontaneous exchange, varied, flexible, expressive and momentary (Havelock, 1986, 64). He also concludes that orality as a functioning condition of society does not fossilize until it is written down when it ceases to be what it originally was (Havelock, 1986, 66).

It is important to understand the discomfort many Aboriginal peoples have with the written word. The written word is immutable. Many Aboriginal people feel that the invention of the written word has caused a "blind worship of the written word, that has denuded the spoken word of its power and sacredness." (Luther Standing Bear quoted in Lake, 1983, 134).

The oral tradition has different checks and balances than the literate tradition. The tenets of academic writing, such

things as logical conclusion, linearity, internal consistency, and quoting authority, come from the Western Intellectual Tradition. Such tenets are not part of the Oral Tradition. The process of writing oral traditions is fraught with the attempts of non-Aboriginal scholars to structure them into the "accepted" literary format, i.e. a story must have certain characteristics to be a "story".

On the other hand, within Aboriginal communities there are those who believe that unless Aboriginal languages are written, the traditions written down and taught formally that the languages will eventually become extinct (Zaharlick, 1982, 44). The Aboriginal proponents of written language forms want to acknowledge that Aboriginal children are not learning the language and traditions at home, that they are learning English only and they want to stop that trend by instituting formal Aboriginal language literacy programs. These people passionately believe that Aboriginal literacy programs are the only way to preserve Aboriginal languages, cultures and traditions. The opponents to Aboriginal literacy programs feel just as strongly that Aboriginal language literacy programs will destroy Aboriginal languages, cultures and traditions.

McLaughlin (1985, 5) states that among the Navajo, the oral tradition is protected because the idea of the written vernacular was brought to the community by outsiders for non-Navajo functions.

7.5 Aboriginal Languages as Non-Dominant Discourses

Wilde explains the external impetus for literacy among contemporary Ojibwa:

> To put it another way, the Ojibwa people did not enter into the process of becoming literate because they needed literacy in order to communicate better among themselves; rather literacy was needed in order to deal with the larger literate North American culture....(Wilde, 142)

Gee (1989) defines literacy in terms of the mastery of secondary discourses. Discourses, as Gee describes them, are "ways of being in the world; they are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions and clothes (Gee, "Literacy, Discourse and Linguistics: Introduction", 6-7). He states that what is important is not grammar but saying (writing) -- doing--being--valuing--believing combinations (Gee, 5).

Developing his theory of literacy as discourse mastery, Gee distinguishes between dominant and nondominant discourses. The

mastery of the dominant discourse brings with it the acquisition of social "goods" (money, prestige, status, etc.). This is what Arnove and Graff are referring to when they say that literacy is symbolic initiation into a select group (Arnove and Graff, 204).

Gee describes nondominant discourse as bringing solidarity with a particular social network but not wider status and social "goods" in society at large (Gee, 8). Dominant discourses have constant tests of fluency. Such tests are in part to provide gates to exclude non-Native speakers.

According to Gee in our primary socialization, we all acquire one initial discourse. It is the one we first use to make sense of the world and interact with others. It determines our original home-based identity and forms the carrier or foundation for later discourses (Gee, 8). All reading and writing, according to Gee is imbedded in some discourse and that discourse is more than reading and writing, i.e. ways of talking, acting, valuing, etc. Gee becomes even more explicit. He clearly enunciates the ideological aspect of literacy. He says that " a discourse is an integration of saying, doing and valuing and all valuing is political (Gee, 13).

Gee's analysis of literacy teaching fits very closely the analysis that has been a part of the Aboriginal peoples' critique of schooling in English and French ever since it was first imposed on them. Gee states

> ...true acquisition of many mainstream discourses involves, at least while being in them, active complicity with values that conflict with one's home and community-based Discourses, especially for many women and minorities (Gee, 13).

Many Aboriginal peoples see the acceptance of the dominant discourse and the destruction of their own languages and cultures as two sides of the same coin. The literate theorists are only now able to conceptualize the "felt knowledge" of Aboriginal communities. Unwritten languages and oral cultures are particularly "vulnerable to destruction when the educational system, economic life and mass culture are all conducted in another language." (Spolsky, 1970, 2). "Acculturation and language loss have gone hand in hand" (Spolsky, 1970, 3). According to Wilde, Native people feel caught in the middle: it is impossible to return to the pre-literate days, and they have been prevented from entering fully into the social and economic life of the surrounding society, partly because they lack its most fundamental communication skills. (Wilde, 142-3)

Many Aboriginal leaders have accepted the necessity of

training their people in English language skills at the expense of language and cultural programming in an attempt to solve the pressing economic needs of their communities. Many Aboriginal communities have been split because of this. Many question the priority put on economic development if it results in the acquisition of a different set of values which conflict with the traditional values of the community and the loss of the Aboriginal language. Supporters of the economic imperative state that Aboriginal languages don't help Aboriginal people to get jobs, support themselves or to become part of the mainstream society. Their loss is regrettable but perhaps necessary for Aboriginal people to survive.

7.6 Literacy and Power

Much discussion and attention has been paid to the concept of literacy as empowerment. To acquire the ability to read and write is to acquire the power over your own life. This power is often assumed to bring greater social equality. Gee (1989) challenges this assumption. He asserts that greater literacy does not de facto lead to greater social equality and democracy. In fact, often literacy is used as a "socializing tool for the poor". It serves to inculcate the values of the establishment in the minds of all members of society while at the same time serves as a means for maintaining the continued selection of members of one class for the best positions (Gee, 1989, 52).

Gee maintains,

> Literacy - of whatever type - only has consequences as it acts with a large number of other social factors, including a culture's or a social group's political and economic conditions, social structure, and local ideologies. Any technology, including writing, is a crucial form, a social product whose shape and influence depend upon prior political and ideological factors. (Gee, 1989, 52).

Graff (1979) revealed through historical analysis that literacy has been used to reinforce the status quo and to keep people in their places and support the hierarchy even when it was not in their best interests. Whereas education has been purported to be about vocational training and personal growth and development, Gee pointed out that for the most part, it has been primarily based in behaviours and attitudes appropriate to good citizenship and moral behaviour.

Literacy is hardly liberating if it is training for Aboriginal people to stay in the positions already assigned to them in Canadian society. Literacy classes associated with employment

programs in Aboriginal communities have often had the effect of training Aboriginal people to "Think rightly" for the job they are entering. In this way this literacy is assimilative rather than liberating in that it teaches the motivations, values and knowledges which are socialization for economic advancement and subvert the community-based values.

Arnove and Graff (1989) state that literacy campaigns can be designed either to equip people to play more active roles in shaping the direction of their society or instead be aimed at inducting people into predetermined roles (Arnove and Graff, 205). However, there is an element of surprise because it is very difficult " to predict or prescribe the manifest outcomes of a literacy campaign and the uses to which literacy will ultimately be put (Arnove and Graff, 206).

8.0 DEFINING LITERACY FOR A LITERACY STRATEGY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES

Any literacy campaign involving Aboriginal peoples must:

(1) Recognize the existence of a variety of literacies in Aboriginal communities;

(2) Recognize English-language literacy programming for Aboriginal peoples as cross-cultural experiences;

(3) Recognize the tensions between orality and literacy;

(4) Recognize that non-literate people have different language usage methods, concepts, and techniques than English or French writers do;

(5) Recognize that the teaching of essayist English is a narrow restricted training in English literacy;

(6) Recognize that literacy is not new to communities and that the resistence in the present context is related to the system which has forced English or French language literacy at the expense of the Aboriginal languages;

(7) Recognize that there is resistence to literacy within Aboriginal communities based on the threat to cultural identity posed by the assumption of the values of an outside culture bound within the English or French language literacy;

(8) Recognize that there are serious differences of opinion within Aboriginal communities on the costs and benefits of English or French language literacy;

(9) Recognize the rich heritage of language experience both oral and literate that Aboriginal peoples possess;

10) Recognize that issues of English or French language literacy cannot be considered in isolation from issues of Aboriginal language retention, retrieval and renewal.

It is essential that in a national strategy for Aboriginal literacy, old assumptions that have been the reason that programs in schools and adult education have been the failures that they have been, are challenged and re-examined. From the above cursory discussion of some of the factors impinging on the literacy issues for our people, it becomes even more important that the process of defining what is needed in literacy programs is determined by the Metis and Non-Status Indian community itself. The answers will be different in different places for different communities.

9.0 DEVELOPING A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

Presently lip service is paid to the needs of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples in the area of literacy programming in most jurisdictions although there are notable exceptions. It became increasingly apparent to us in the course of this study that if present structures, processes and strategies continue, the needs of our people will never be addressed. This is unacceptable for we have a young, quickly growing, increasingly disenchanted population.

The right of Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples to demand programs that both meet our particular community needs and the requirements of the larger Canadian society must be recognized. We ask the federal government to join with us in a passionate fervent crusade towards maximizing the human resource base in the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities of Canada.

RECOMMENDATION ONE:

THAT A NATIONAL FORUM BE HELD IN THE NEAR FUTURE FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES TO DISCUSS AND DEBATE THE ISSUES OF LITERACY FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

Participants in this study representing Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples stated that they would appreciate the opportunity to discuss, debate and share information with other Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples and organizations about the issues around literacy. A national forum based on the results of this report was suggested as a good next move.

RECOMMENDATION TWO:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA IN COLLABORATION WITH MEMBERS OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES DEVELOP A LITERACY CAMPAIGN SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE METIS AND NON-INDIAN COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS.

Such a campaign must be based on agreed upon governing principles and operating formulae. It must include a ten to twenty year mandate with a fiscal arrangement which supports the activities required. It must specify goals and dates for meeting those goals. It must outline the relationships among the governments and the Aboriginal organizations, educational institutions, communities and individuals.

Recognition of the complexities of the issues of literacy for Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples must be made explicit within the campaign plan and the responsibility of programmers to provide

appropriate programming must be made perfectly clear.

RECOMMENDATION THREE:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PASS THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES' EDUCATION ACT TO DEFINE THE PARAMETERS FOR THE FEDERAL FUNDING OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES.

Federal legislation governing education is not unknown in Canada. The Canadian government has taken legislative action in the past to provide impetus for action in the area of education. The legislation supporting vocational education is a case in point.

The fact that the federal government funds so many educational programs for Aboriginal peoples puts some responsibility on the federal government to provide the laws to govern the expenditure of those funds. Presently, programs are functioning with little evaluation, few guidelines and very little accountability to either the government or the Aboriginal people.

One of the fundamental principles that must be built into the delivery systems of educational programming to Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples, is the obligation of the program deliverer to meet the requirements of the Metis and Non-Status Indian community. Canada needs a legislative mandate which legitimizes this position similar to Sections 315a in the U.S. Adult Education Act which regulate the conditions under which programs are provided for adult Indian peoples. We propose the following model:

The Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples' Education Act

The Act would state the following principles:

(1) that the Government of Canada accepts the UNESCO position that literacy is a basic human right, accessible to everyone;

(2) that the Government of Canada accepts that the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples of this country have not been served well by the educational institutions of this country;

(3) that the Government of Canada accepts the right of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples to be involved in decisions relating to educational programming for them;

(5) that the Government of Canada promotes the development of educational institutions for Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples;

(6) that the Government of Canada accepts the view that changes in the educational services offered to the Aboriginal peoples are urgently needed to meet the challenges of the 21st Century;

The proposed Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples' Education Act would regulate the expenditure of all federal monies designated for any and all educational initiatives directed towards Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples. The Act would govern monies paid out through federal departments, Crown Corporations, cost-sharing agreements with other governments, agreements with corporations and any other contractors. The Act would stipulate that monies shall not be expended unless the Aboriginal people for whom the educational initiative is intended have adequate involvement in the planning and development of the project and that continuing involvement is an essential part of the operation and evaluation of the project. Applications from Aboriginal educational institutions, community groups or organizations will get priority in the funding of educational programs.

The Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples' Education Act would specify the funding available for each year to meet the goals of the Literacy Campaign and other national education strategies. Fiscal policy would be established and the priorities for spending would be set in consultation with Aboriginal groups. Management Committees composed of representatives from Aboriginal groups would monitor the progress in meeting the predetermined goals.

Institutions currently receiving federal funds for programs offering education to Aboriginal peoples will have a specific period of time to bring their programs in line with the national agenda or risk the loss of funding. Aboriginal organizations would be given the responsibility of managing programs which fail to re-structure to meet the requirements of the Act.

The Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples' Education Act is envisaged to provide a vehicle whereby the cultural and linguistic differences within the Aboriginal community of Canada will be promoted and preserved. Further, it is meant to give Aboriginal peoples and institutions the maximum amount of flexibility in assessing local needs and developing programs and materials to meet those needs.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA ADOPT THE CONCEPT OF ABORIGINAL CONTROL OF ABORIGINAL EDUCATION AS A FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES OF CANADA

Research supports the view of when Aboriginal peoples control their

own programs more effective programs result. Community controlled, designed, initiated, developed and delivered programs are the most effective. A broad definition of community is needed to meet the needs of all the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples. At one level, community-based means discrete identifiable geographic centres. Community-based, at another level of meaning applies to the larger community of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples and the regional, provincial or national institutions which are in place to serve the needs of the community as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE:

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA ESTABLISH SUPPORT STRUCTURES FOR THE EDUCATION OF METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

Fiscal Support for Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples

A comprehensive long-range fiscal plan is needed for the educational future of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples. Structures must be created whereby the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples have access to federal funding to promote programs to meet their needs. What is the federal framework for financing strategies related to Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples? What is the Federal funding formula used by the federal government in supporting the needs of Indian and Inuit peoples? What is the formula used to provide for the Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples?

When the jurisdictional responsibilities are sorted out, then the structures must be built to allow Metis and Non-Status Indian communities to contract needed services.

Funding for Literacy

Literacy campaigns need to have a ten to twenty year life span to be successful. This means that a serious literacy campaign for Aboriginal peoples in Canada needs a budget that is ongoing and long-term. This funding must be based on realistic statistics that identify the clientele in various types of learning situations. Successful programs must be funded on a continuous basis. Innovations and experimental approaches planned in conjunction with Aboriginal communities should be encouraged but not at the expense of existing programs that have proven themselves to the Aboriginal people.

Funding for the production and dissemination of local materials should be an expected expense as part of Aboriginal literacy programs.

Cultural Support Systems

There is a need for a comprehensive fiscal plan for the creation, development, renewal and maintenance of a support network for Literacy among the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples. Literacy Campaigns must be passionate and all encompassing to be successful. Support for literacy takes many forms. In the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities support is needed for Aboriginal media: radio, television, newspapers, computer software, and books in Aboriginal languages and in English and French. All types of creative expression should be fostered in Aboriginal communities from the recording of the Elders on tape to theatrical productions and poetry readings.

An Elder who has a story to tell should know that within the community the story can be recorded, translated (if necessary), transcribed, reproduced and placed in reading and study programs of Aboriginal adults and children.

Successful literacy programs use approaches that meet the students "where they are" using culturally relevant materials-often transitional materials from Aboriginal cultural and linguistic experiences. It is hard to find materials that portray the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples' perspective, history and realities. We need support to develop Michif Cree, Michif Saulteaux and Michif Sioux as well as materials to tell our story.

Student Funding

Student funding must be part of the fiscal support system. Metis and Non-Status Indian students trying to become literate are funded inadequately. Not only is the system of programs complex but the funding available is a disincentive to "becoming literate". "Literacy at what cost?" is a question asked by Aboriginal students.

RECOMMENDATION SIX:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE UNDERTAKEN

It is critical that meaningful statistics on the needs of the Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples of Canada be collected. Census data are not only inaccurate but the categories used to denote Aboriginal ancestry are not helpful. A national picture of these Aboriginal people is needed. We need to know things such as: educational levels as related to Mother Tongue; Home language as related to educational levels; numbers of people in training programs; people's aspirations; comparisons of characteristics of people receiving programming and those not, etc. Basic questions

such as, " How many people are there in need of programs?"and " What types of programs do people need?" must be answered to be able to assess what infrastructure must be established to support a successful Literacy Campaign for Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples.

We know that the need for literacy is great among our people. We need to know how great it is to prepare for the future. How could the institutions of adult education currently in place possibly cope with the demand if all of our people needing and wanting literacy appeared at their doors?

Assumptions are made about the characteristics of Metis and Non-Status Indian communities. A lot of assumptions come from people having some knowledge of the Indian people of the area and their history, culture and experience. In some cases these assumptions are partially correct. In other cases, they do not fit our situation at all. We need specific factual information to describe our position to those who make decisions based on their knowledge of us.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY COALITION FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE FORMED MADE UP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES OF CANADA WITH THE MANDATE TO MANAGE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN

It is critical that the Literacy Campaign for Metis and Non-Status Indian Peoples be managed by Aboriginal people. A national coalition is necessary to provide a management committee to supervise activities undertaken on behalf of the Metis and Non-Status Indian communities. Liaison and communication with similar organizations working on the literacy campaign for the Indian and Inuit peoples must be maintained.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT:

THAT RESEARCH BE UNDERTAKEN TO ESTABLISH PHILOSOPHICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL CRITERIA FOR THE FOUNDATION OF CURRICULUM AND PROGRAMS FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

It is obvious that programs for Metis and Non-Status Indian peoples are set up without benefit of research or proven experience which provides criteria for judging their value. We are tried of being experimented upon. We propose that a research project be set up which incorporates culturally relevant materials and culturally relevant approaches to provide the foundation for future programming.

RECOMMENDATION NINE:

THAT A NATIONAL LITERACY COUNCIL FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES BE FORMED TO BRING TOGETHER PRACTITIONERS WORKING IN THE LITERACY CAMPAIGN FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIAN PEOPLES

Networking, information sharing and support must be provided to programs. Literacy Councils have been very effective in some areas in bringing concerned people together. Presently, there is a need for Metis and Non-Status Indian peopleS themselves to share their experiences and develop strategies and action plans to meet their particular needs.

APPENDIX A

Steering Committee for
A Comprehensive Literacy Strategy for Aboriginal Peoples

Metis National Council Representation
Ron Rivard, Executive Director
Larry Desmeules, President, Metis Association of Alberta

Gabriel Dumont Institute Representation
Christopher LaFontaine, Executive Director
Donovan Young, Director, Research and Development

APPENDIX B

List of Government Officials and/or Literacy Advocates Interviewed

Newfoundland
Wayne Taylor,
Policy Advisor on Literacy,
Advanced Studies Branch,
Department of Education,
P.O. Box 4750,
St. John's, Nd.,
A1C 5T7 (709) 576-5906

Prince Edward Island
Ian Scott, Management,
Adult and Continuing Education,
Department of Industry,
P.O.Box 2000,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
C1A 7N8 (902) 368-4471

John Joe Sark,
Department of Secretary of State
Suite 316, Dominion Building
97 Queens Street
Charlottetown, P.E.I. (902) 566-7181
C1A 4A9

Nova Scotia
Kathie Swenson,
Executive Director,
Department of Advanced Education and
Job Training,
1701 Hollis Street,
P.O. Box 2086, Station "M"
Halifax, N.S.,
B3J 3B7 (902) 424-7573

New Brunswick
Richard Tendernda,
Literacy Programming,
Education Services,
Department of Advanced Education and Training,
Fredericton, N.B.,
E3B 5H1 (506) 453-8245

Quebec
Lino Mastriani
Coordonnateur de l'alphabetisation
Direction generale de l'education des adultes
Ministere de l'Education du Quebec
1035, rue De la Chevrotiere
Quebec (Quebec)
G1R 5A5 (416) 643-5267

Ontario
Betty Butterworth,
Literacy Unit,
Ministry of Education,
625 Church Street, 6th Floor,
Toronto, Ontario
M4Y 2E8 (416) 326-5488

Priscilla Hewitt,
Native Literacy Consultant,
Literacy Unit,
Ministry of Education,
625 Church Street,
Toronto, Ontario,
M4Y 2E8 (416) 326-5488

Manitoba
Devron Gaber,
Literacy Director,
Manitoba Literacy Office,
Department of Education and Training,
100-1200 Portage Ave.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
R3G 0T5 (204) 945-8247

Saskatchewan
Duane Rose,
Managing Director,
Saskatchewan Literacy Campaign,
Department of Education,
2220 College Ave.,
Regina, Sask.,
S4P 3V7 (306) 787-5595

Robin Stonehouse,
Saskatchewan Literacy Council,
Saskatchewan Institute of Applied
Science and Technology
229-4th Avenue South,
Second Floor,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
S7K 1N1 (306) 933-8362

Alberta
Keith Anderson,
Consultant, Adult Learning,
Advanced Education and Manpower,
11160 Jasper Avenue,
Edmonton, Alta.,
T5K 0L3 (403) 427-5628

British Columbia
Gwen Armstrong,
Co-ordinator, Adult Basic Education,
Ministry of Advanced Education and
Job Training,
Parliament Buildings,
818 Broughton Street,
Victoria, B.C.,
V8V 1X4 (604) 387-6176

Charles Horn, Project Officer
Ministry of Native Affairs,
Fifth Floor, 712 Yates Street
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X5 (604) 387-1287

Northwest Territories
Lynn Fogwill,
Literacy Coordinator,
Education,
Government of the NWT,
Yellowknife, NWT.,
X1A 2L9 (403) 920-3482

Yukon
Carolyn Hole
Advanced Education Branch
Yukon Department of Education
P.O. Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6 (403) 667-5142

Elsie Netro,
Advanced Education Branch,
Department of Education,
P.O. Box 2703,
Whitehorse, Yukon,
Y1A 2C6 (403) 667-5932

Mary Louise Fournier,
Co-Ordinator,
Yukon Literacy Council,
Yukon College,
Whitehorse, Yn. (403) 668-8000

APPENDIX C

List of Aboriginal Organizations and Affiliates Surveyed

Metis National Council
Ron Rivard
Executive Director,
558 Whitewood Cres.,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
S7J 4L8 (306) 373-8855

Metis Association of Alberta,
Larry Desmeules, President,
#120-12520 St. Albert Trail,
Edmonton, Alta.,
T5L 4H4 (403) 455-2200

Metis Society of Saskatchewan,
Jim Durocher, President,
1249 8th Street East,
Saskatoon, Sask.,
S7H 0S5 (306) 343-8285

Labrador Metis Association,
Box 599, Station B.,
Happy Valley, Nf.,
A0P 1E0 (709) 896-5112

Native Council of P.E.I.,
Graham Tuplin,
33 Allen St.,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C1A 3B7 (902) 892-5314

New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples' Council,
Raymond Gould
320 St. Marie's St.,
Fredericton, N.B.,
E3A 2S5 (506) 458-8422

Ontario Metis and Aboriginal Association,
Brad Thompson,
369 Queen St. E., Suite 202,
Sault Ste Marie, Ont.,
P6A 1Z4 (705) 949-5161

Manitoba Metis Federation,
Audreen Hourie,
Provincial Education Coordinator,
408 McGregor St.,
Winnipeg, Man.,
R2W 1X4 (204) 586-8474

Manitoba Metis Federation,
Yuon Dumont, President,
408 McGregor Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R2W 1X4 (204) 586-8474

Metis Association of Alberta,
Doreen Richardson,
Action Centre,
#109 - 12520 St. Albert Trail,
Edmonton, Alberta,
T5L 4H4 (403) 451-2870

Metis Association of NWT
Bren Kolson,
Box 1375,
5125 50th St.,
Yellowknife, NWT.,
X1A 2P1 (403) 873-3505

Dene/Metis Co-ordinating Group,
Dene/Metis Negotiating Secretariat,
Ray Griffith,
Box 1417,
Yellowknife, N.W.T.,
X1A 2P1 (403) 920-2725

The Pacific Metis Federation,
Norman B. Evans,
President,
503 Comox Road,
Nanaimo, B.C.
V9R 3J2 (604) 753-1269

APPENDIX D

Programs and/or Program Deliverers Surveyed

Journey's Adult Education Association
3rd Floor, 414 Graham
Winnipeg, Man. R3C 0L8
Contact: Kathleen Walsh (204) 943-1170

Brandon Friendship Centre Literacy Program
303 - 9th Street
Brandon, Man. R7A 4A8
Contact: Louise Phaneuf-Miron (204) 727-1407

Micmac Facilitator,
Department of Education,
542 Prince St.,
Truro, N.S.
B2N 1G1
Contact: Theresa Isaac Julien (902) 893-5989

Malecite Literacy Worker,
New Brunswick Community College,
P.O. Box 1175,
Woodstock, N.B.,
E0J 2B0
Contact: Bill Paul (506) 328-9386

Literacy Project
Bev Cardinal,
Director,
On-Campus Program
SIAST/Native Services Division,
2nd Floor
221 Winnipeg Street North,
Regina, Sask.,
S4P 3E1 (306) 787-0181

Friendship Inn Literacy Project,
Doris Anderson,
Co-Ordinator/Facilitator
619 20th St. W.,
Saskatoon, Sask., (306) 242-5122

Inuit Literacy Program
Torngasok Cultural Centre,
P.O. Box 40,
Nain, Labrador,
A0P 1L0
Contact: Gary Baikie (709) 922-2941
and Jan Woodford (709) 922-2158

Project Word Power
Yukon College
Box 2799
Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 5K4
Contact: Mary Louise Fournier (403) 668-8000

Native Language Institute,
Yukon College,
Box 2799
Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 5K4
Contact: Ann Cullen (403) 668-8800

STRIDE
Literacy Attainment for Natives
Columbia Training Centre,
802-Manning Rd. N.E.,
Calgary, Alta.,
T2E 7N8
Contact: Wendy Russell (403) 240-1919

Northwest Territories
Arctic College,
Yellowknife, NWT.,
Contact: Mark Cleveland, Pres. (403) 920-6306
Bill Stapleton

Lovesick Lake Native Literacy Alert,
Burleigh Falls, Ontario
KOL 1KO (705) 654-4222
Contact: Pearl Parkin
Site Visit

OMA Local #5 Literacy Project,
Sharbot Lake, Ontario
KOH 2PO (613) 279-3251
Contact: Carol Pepper
On-Site Interview

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adult Education Act Amendments of 1984. Report to Accompany S. 2496, Senate, 98th Congress, 2d. session Congress of U.S. Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labour and Human Resources, 6, June 1984.

Anderson, Kim, "Native Women and Literacy", Canadian Woman Studies, 10, 2&3, summer/fall, 1989, 79-80.

Arnett, Robert James, "A Study of the needs of Older Adults in Selected communities in the Northwest Territories" Unpub MSW, University of Calgary, Social Work, 1973.

Arnove Robert F. and Harvey J. Graff, "National Literacy Campaigns: Historical and Comparative Lessons" Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 3, November 1987, 202-207.

Balfanz, D.J. "Indian Cultural and Educational Strategies upon which to base a reading program." Unpub M.Ed. University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Balmuth, Miriam, Essential Characteristics of Adult Literacy Programs: A Review and Analysis of the Research, 2nd Ed. Albany, N.Y.: Bureau of Adult and Continuing Education Program Development, 1987.

Battiste, Marie Ann. An Historical Investigation of the Social and Cultural Consequences of Micmac Literacy. Pub Ed.D Stanford University, Curriculum and Instruction, 1984.

Battiste, Marie. Micmac Literacy and Cognitive Assimilation. Paper presented at the International Conference of Mokakit Indian Education Research Association, London, Ontario, 26 July 1984.

Berry, J.W. and J.A Bennett, "Syllabic Literacy and Cognitive Performance Among the Cree", International Journal of Psychology. 1989, 24 (4), 429-450.

Bhola, H.S., Campaigning for Literacy: A Critical Analysis of Some Selected Literacy Campaigns of the 20th Century with a memorandum to Decision Makers, Paris: UNESCO International Council for Adult Education, 1982.

Blunt, Adrian, "The Characteristics of participants in Indian Adult Education Program" Unpub M.A. University of Calgary, Education, 1972.

Bobbish, James, "Mother Tongue Literacy: Indian Languages" a presentation to Cicumpolar Conference on Literacy by Cree School Board, Yellowknife, NWT, April, 1990.

Boloz Sigmund A. and Diana Jenness, " The Sun is Shining in My Eyes: The Navajo Child Enters Kindergarten Expecting to Write and He Can", Journal of American Indian Education, 23, 3, May 1984, 25-30.

Brewington, Lisa A. Program Evaluation and Implementation Report - Adult Basic Education Program. North Carolina Commission of Indian Affairs, March 29, 1985.

Brid, Lois B. The Reflection of Personal Experiences in the Writing of Papago Indian Children, University of Arizona: Ph.D, 1984.

Brod, Rodney L. and John M. McQuiston, "American Indian Adult Education and Literacy: The First National Study", Journal of American Indian Education, 22, 2, January, 1983, 1-16.

Brown, James I., Reading Power, Lexington: D.C Heath and Co., 1975.

Browne, Duana Bell "Learning Styles and Native Americans" Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17, 1, 1990, 23-35.

Browne, Duana Bell, Whole Language: An Approach to Reading that Fits Native American Reading Styles, Viewpoints, 1986. ERIC ED 296861

Buckley, Peggy and Penny Carriere, "Literacy for Change", Canadian Woman Studies, 9, 3&4, 73-76.

Burghardt, F.F. Can the Problem of Illiteracy be Solved? A View Based on the AVC Edmonton's Adult Basic Education Program, A paper presented at the Conference on Change: Implications for Adult Learning, Regina, Sask., May 1987.

Cairns, V.B. "A Study of Adult Education in Saskatoon with Reference to the Canadian Scene" Unpub M.Ed., University of Saskatchewan, Education, 1950.

Carbo, Marie "Deprogramming Reading Failure: Giving Unequal Learners an Equal Chance", Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 3, November 1987, 197-202.

Carpenter, Tracy, The Right to Read, Toronto: Frontier College, 1986.

Chall, Jeanne S., Elizabeth Heron and Ann Hilferty, "Adult Literacy: New and Enduring Problems" Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 3, November 1987, 190-197

Clyne, Roger Dean, Learning Style Preference and Reading Achievement of Urban Alaskan Native Students. Oregon State University, Ph.D dissertation, 1984.

Chaisson, Joseph Thomas, "Residential Adult Education and the Condition of Participation in Learning - an Exploration" Unpub M.Cont. Ed., University of Saskatchewan, Continuing Education, 1970.

Courtney, Richard, "Islands of Remorse: Amerindian Education in the Contemporary World", Curriculum Inquiry 16, 1, (1986), 43-64.

Creative Research Group Ltd., Literacy in Canada: A Research Report. Toronto: Southam News, August 1987.

Dooley, Mary S., Dialogue Journals: Facilitating the Reading- Writing Connection with Native American Students, Northern Michigan University, requirement for a Master's degree, January 1987.

Dyson, Anne Haas, " Oral Language: The Rooting System for Learning to Write", Language Arts, 58, 7, October 1981, 776-784.

Enochs, John Romely III, "The relationship between Choctaw teachers and non-Choctaw teachers' perceptions of Choctaw First Graders and Student Achievement in Reading". Unpub. Ph.D. Elementary Education, University of Mississippi, 1977.

Fargo, G.A. The Power of Literacy: Applied to Traditional Birth Attendants, Saulteaux-Cree Indians and Hawaiian Children, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Claremont Reading Conference, Claremont, California, January, 1981.

Ferdman, Bernardo M. "Literacy and Cultural Identity" Harvard Educational Review, 60, 2, May 1990, 181-204.

Fletcher, J.D., "What Problems Do American Indians Have With English", Journal of American Indian Education, 23, 1, October 1983, 1-14.

Freire, Paulo, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

Gabriel Dumont Institute in co-operation with Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, Literacy Manual, Regina, 1989.

Gee, James Paul, "Literacy, Discourse and Linguistics: Introduction", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 5-18.

Gee, James Paul, "What is Literacy?" Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 18-26.

Gee, James Paul, "Literacies and "Traditions"", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 26-39.

Gee, James Paul, " Orality and Literacy: From The Savage Mind to Ways With Words", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 39-61.

Gee, James Paul, "Literariness, Formalism, and Sense Making: The Line and Stanza Structure of Human Thought", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 61- 75.

Gee, James Paul, " The Narrativization of Experience in the Oral Style", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 75-97.

Gee, James Paul, " Two Styles of Narrative Construction and their Linguistic and Educational Implications", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 97-116.

Gee, James Paul, " Dracula, the Vampire Lestat, and TESOL", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 116-135.

Gee, James Paul, " What Do English Teachers Teach? (or Why Isn't the Pope a Bachelor?)", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 135-147.

Gee, James Paul, " The Legacies of Literacy: From Plato to Friere through Harvey Graff", Journal of Education, 171, 1, 1989, 147-166.

Goodman, Kenneth, Yetta Goodman and Barbara Flores, Reading in the Bilingual Classroom: Literacy and Biliteracy, National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education, n.d.

Goodman, Yetta. M. and Sandra Wilde, Writing Development in 3rd and 4th Grade Native American Students. Occasional Papers Program in Language and Literacy No. 14, November, 1985.

Goody, John Rankine, and Ian Watt, "The Consequences of Literacy" in Literacy in Traditional Societies, ed. J.R. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1968, 27-68.

Graff, Harvey, The Legacies of Literacy: Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Graff, H. J., The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the 19th Century City, New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Gregory, George Ann, "Composing Processes of Native Americans: Six Case Studies of Navajo Speakers", Journal of American Indian Education, January 1989, 1-6.

Hargrave, Susanne ed. Literacy in An Aboriginal Context. Work Papers of SIL-AAB Series B. Vol. 6, Darwin Australia, Summer Institute of Linguistics, April 1981

Harper, Kenn, "Writing in Inuktitut: An Historical Perspective", Inuktitut, 53: 3-35.

Harrison, George William, "A Survey of Indian Education in Five Selected Alberta Community Colleges" unpub Ph.D University of Washington, Geography, 1977.

Havelock, Eric A., The Muse Learns to Write, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Henson, Jane E., "Pedagogy and Politics in Native Literacy Projects: The Case of the Native Adult Learning Group", The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 11, 1, 1982, 71-89.

Hewitt, Priscilla, "Educating Priscilla", Canadian Woman Studies, 9, 3&4, 12-14.

Hindle, Judith K., Literacy Learning in Saskatchewan: A Review of Adult Literacy Programs (1989), Regina: University of Regina, June 1990.

Hirsch, Bernard A, "The Telling Which Continues: Oral Tradition and the Written Word in Leslie Marmon Silko's Storyteller", American Indian Quarterly, 12, 1, Winter, 1988, 1-27.

Hobbs, Sandra D.,"A Beginning Reading Program for a Select Group of Native Students" Unpub M.Ed., Memorial University, Curriculum and Instruction, 1985

Hymer, Robert "Computers and Writing", Journal of American Indian Education, May 1988, 35-41.

Jaimes, M. Annette, "The Myth of Indian Education in the American Education System', Action in Teacher Education, 5, 3, 15-19.

Kasten, Wendy Christina, The Behaviors Accompanying the Writing Process in Selected third and Fourth Grade Native American Children, University of Arizona, Ph.D dissertation, 1984.

Keewatin-Aski Ltd., A Training Needs And Demonstration Project Evaluation Study, October 1989.

Lake, Randall. "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in American Protest Rhetoric", Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69 (1983), 127-142.

Leader-Post, Literacy: Special Report, Regina, Sk.,: Leader-Post, October, 1987.

Littlejohn, Catherine, Background Paper on Native Education, paper written for the Curriculum and Instruction Review Advisory Committee to the Minister of Education for Saskatchewan Regina, October, 1983

Mace-Matluck, Betty J. et al., Language and Literacy Learning in Bilingual Instruction. Preliminary Report. Descriptive Studies-Asian, Spanish, Navajo. Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Texas, September, 1982.

McConnell, Taylor, "Oral Cultures and Literate Research", Religious Education, 81, 3, Summer, 1986, 341-355.

McGrath, Robin, Canadian Inuit Literature: The Development of Tradition, Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1984.

McGrath, Robin, "The History of Inuit Literacy in Labrador" paper delivered in Yellowknife, April, 1990.

McGreevy, Carol-Jean ."I Don't Understand My Textbooks" Students Comment on their Indian Bilingual Schooling in Mexico. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1984, July Vol. 9 (3), 260-268.

McLaughlin, Daniel. Literacy in Navajoland, Functions and Effects of Power. Paper presented to the Annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Philadelphia, March, 1985.

McQuiston, John M., Brod, Rodney, The Status of Educational Attainment and Performance of Adult American Indians and Alaskan Natives. National Indian Management Service of America Inc., Philadelphia, Miss., 1981.

Mogan, Susan Barbara, An Analysis of the Development of a Literacy and Life Skills Curriculum for Native Adults, Unpub M.A. University of British Columbia, 1986.

National Indian Brotherhood, Assembly of First Nations, The Aboriginal Language Policy Study, Ottawa: National Indian Brotherhood, 1988.

National Indian Brotherhood, Assembly of First Nations, Tradition and Education: Towards a Vision of Our Future, A Declaration of First Nations Jurisdiction Over Education, Ottawa: National Indian Brotherhood, 1988.

National Indian Brotherhood, Assembly of First Nations, Tradition and Education: Towards a Vision of Our Future, Volumes 1,2,and 3. Ottawa: National Indian Brotherhood, 1988.

Ong, Walter, J., Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word, London: Methuen, 1982.

Ovanda, Carlos J. and Virginia P. Collier, Bilingual and ESL Classrooms: Teaching in Multicultural Contexts, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1985.

Oversight Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act Hearings before the Subcommittee on Post-secondary Education, Washington, D.C.

Paul , William, "A Position Paper on Native Literacy in New Brunswick", unpublished paper available from the author.

Reyhner, Jon Allan, "Indian Teachers as Cultural Translators" Journal of American Indian Education, 21, November 1981, 19-23.

Ridley, Karen, "A Learning Materials Package in Canadian Government for Adult Basic Education Students in Northern Saskatchewan."Unpub M.Ed University of Saskatchewan, Curriculum Studies, 1986.

Rozier, Paul Webb "A Comparative study of Two Approaches of Introducing Reading to Navajo Children: the direct approach and the Native Language Approach" Unpub. Ed.D University of Arizona. Educational Administration, 1977

Scollon, Ron and Suzanne B.K. Scollon, Athabaskan-English Interethnic Communication, Alaska Native Language Center, January 1979.

Scollon, Ron and Scollon, Suzanne B. K., Literacy as Interethnic Communication: An Athabaskan Case. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 59. Southwest Educational Development Lab. Austin Texas, April 1979.

Scollon, Ron and Suzanne B. K. Scollon, Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1981.

Shearwood, Perry, "Literacy Among the Aboriginal Peoples of the Northwest Territories", The Canadian Modern Language Review, 43, 4, May, 1987, 630-642.

Snively, Gloria, "Traditional Native Indian Beliefs, Cultural Values and Science Instruction", Canadian Journal of Native Education, 17, 1, 1990, 44-57.

Slobodin, Richard, "Kutchin". In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 6, Subarctic, ed. June Helm, Washingtin, D.C.: Smithsonian, 514-532.

Spolsky, Bernard. Literacy in the Vernacular: The Navajo Reading Study. Paper read at the Council on Anthropology and Education Symposium on Cognition and Linguistic Studies, 69th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Diego, California, November 19, 1970.

Spolsky, Bernard, The Situation of Navajo Literacy Projects. Navajo Reading Study Progress Reports No. 17. Albuquerque, New Mexico, New Mexico University, April 1972.

Taylor, Denny and Catherine Dorsey-Gaines, Growing Up Literate, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1988.

Toohey, Kelleen Ann. "Northern Native Canadian Second Language Education: A Case Study of Fort Albany."unpub Ph.D., University of Toronto, Education, 1982.

Whimby, Arthur, "A 15th Grade Reading Level for High School Seniors," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1987, 207.

Wiggins, Betty Cynthia. "Adult Basic Education for B.C. Indians: An Evaluation of Existing Programs" Unpub M.Ed. University of British Columbia, Education, 1971.

Wilde, Sandra J., "The Experience and Consequences of Literacy: A Case Study" Language Arts, 56, 2, February 1979, 141-145.

Zaharlick, Amy. "Native Americans and Literacy", in Robert St. Clair and William Leap,(editors) Language Renewal Among Indian Tribes: Issues, Problems and Prospects. Arlington, Va.,: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1982, 42-49.

Government Documents

Alberta, Northern Alberta Development Council, Adult Literacy in Northern Alberta, A Background Report, March 1989.

Alberta, Northern Alberta Development Council, Adult Literacy in Northern Alberta, Position Paper, July, 1989.

Alberta, Northern Alberta Development Council, Early School Leavers in Northern Alberta, Summary Report, June, 1984.

Alberta, Northern Alberta Development Council, Early School Leavers in Northern Alberta, Workshop Report, June, 1984.

British Columbia, Native Literacy and Life Skills Curriculum Guidelines. Victoria, B.C.: Ministry of Education, 1984.

British Columbia, Opening the Doors to Lifelong Learning: Empowering Undereducated Adults, Report of the Provincial Literacy Advisory Committee to the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology, Victoria, B.C.: Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology, 1989.

British Columbia, Report of Provincial Committee on Post-Secondary Education for Native Learners, March, 1990.

Government of the Northwest Territories, The Report of the Task Force on Aboriginal Languages, February 28, 1986.

Government of the Northwest Territories, The SCONE Report: Building Our Economic Future, October 1989.

Ontario, Ministry of Education, Ontario Government Literacy Programs and International Literacy Year Activities, Literacy Branch, 1990.

Saskatchewan Education, A Five Year Action Plan for Native Curriculum Development, The Report of the Native Curriculum Review Committee, March, 1984.

Saskatchewan Education, Northern Education Task Force Report to the Minister of Education Summary of Findings, November, 1989.

Saskatchewan Education, Recommendations to the Minister of Education on the Saskatchewan Literacy Campaign, 1987-1990, February 14, 1990.