



Morphological Integration of English-Origin Loanwords in Inuktitut

Connor Mi

Colonel By Secondary School, Ottawa, K1J 7N4, Canada

*Corresponding Author e-mail: connor.mi0803@gmail.com

Received: March 2025; Revised: July 2025; Published: July 2025

Abstract

English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut are integrated morphologically. As an example, the Inuktitut word *guulu*, from English “gold”, can undergo affixation with the bound morphemes *siuq*, meaning “to search for”, and *vik*, denoting a place where an action takes place, to create the word *guulusiurvik*, meaning “gold mine”, then attach to grammatical markers that indicate the function of the new word within the sentence. This paper investigates how and why these loanwords are morphologically integrated, as well as the variation observed in this integration. The corpus used for this investigation was The Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 2.0, containing transcripts of all the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut from April 1999 to November 2007, excluding 2003. Within the corpus, the following selection of English-origin loanwords was assessed: paper, company, license, cigarette, tobacco, cheque, skidoo, gold, bus, and coffee. It is suggested that an established morphological framework for integrating loanwords in Inuktitut stems out of necessity due to the typological differences between Inuktitut and English, however individual deviations arise from liberties taken by bilingual speakers in their speech when drawing on both Inuktitut and English grammatical and morphological systems while using an English-origin loanword. These findings are relevant to the linguistic documentation of Inuktitut and shed light on the language contact situation between the Indigenous language Inuktitut and the settler language English.

Keywords: Inuktitut, loanwords, language contact, corpus, bilingualism

How to Cite: Mi, C. (2025). Morphological Integration of English-Origin Loanwords in Inuktitut. *International Journal of Linguistics and Indigenous Culture*, 3(2), 106–118. <https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v3i2.2660>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v3i2.2660>

Copyright© 2025, Mi.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) License.



INTRODUCTION

English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut are integrated morphologically. The loanwords investigated were defined as lexical items borrowed into Inuktitut as a result of language contact with English, regardless of their etymological origin. Loanwords undergo affixation which integrate the word into the complex morphosyntactic structure of Inuktitut, where a word can comprise of over 10 morphemes and entire sentences can be expressed through a single word (Johnson and Allen, 2022).

This integration is linguistically interesting as it results from contact between typologically different languages: Inuktitut, an Inuit-Yupik-Unangan language native to the Indigenous Inuit people of the Arctic, and English, an Indo-European language brought by European settlers. In this language contact situation, Inuktitut is a minority language while English is a majority language, though both

languages are recognized as official languages of the Canadian territory Nunavut. Points of modern-day Inuktitut-English language contact include education, health, administration, and government, and bilingualism is observed in these language communities (Dorais, 1989).

Historically, English was introduced to Inuktitut-speaking Inuit populations of the Canadian Eastern Arctic through British colonization in the 18th century, originally resulting in lexical influence in areas involving governance, religion, and culture. Education was controlled by private religious groups who enforced an English-only policy in an attempt to assimilate Inuit children into Euro-Canadian culture (Berge and Kaplan, 2006). These children were forcibly taken from their homes and sent to residential schools where they were punished for communicating in their native language. Due to the colonial context of the language contact, Inuktitut is currently classified as an endangered language. In the modern-day Canadian territory of Nunavut, Inuktitut is recognized alongside English, French, and Inuinnaqtun, which is very closely related to Inuktitut. Inuktitut is the mother tongue for the majority of Inuit youth, and it is generally the main language used in home life, traditional activities such as camping, hunting, and speaking with elders. Domains where both Inuktitut and English are commonly used include community interaction, such as speaking with friends, in the workplace, and some government offices. English is the main language used in professional services such as healthcare and banking. In Inuit regions, schooling for lower grades is often in Inuktitut while schooling for higher grades is typically carried out in English or French, though Inuktitut is a subject studied by students through grade 12 (Tulloch, 2004). While some media exposure is in Inuktitut, a large portion of media exposure, such as television and radio programming, is in English or French (Allen, 2007). As a result, English-Inuktitut bilingualism is prevalent in Inuit communities, particularly among younger speakers (Dorais, 1989), where a substantial number identify English as their dominant language (Tulloch, 2004).

Beyond loanwords, several other effects of language contact with English have been observed in Inuktitut. An example is the number of new phones not part of the Inuktitut phonemic inventory that have appeared in lexical borrowings, such as the voiced labial-velar approximant in the English-origin name *William*, the voiceless labiodental fricative in *fuunamma* (from English *phone number*), and the voiced velar plosive in *gavama* (from English *government*). On the level of semantics, semantic expansion has occurred in the Inuktitut lexicon to mirror English categorizations in lexical terms. For example, the Inuktitut word *natsiq*, traditionally referring to a 'ringed seal', is now used in a generic sense to refer to a seal, despite the existence of other Inuktitut words designating different types of seals (Harnum, 1989). Additionally, patterns of Inuktitut-English code-mixing have been observed in adult and child bilinguals (Allen et al., 2002). On the basis of this Inuktitut-English language contact situation which has resulted in bilingualism within Inuit communities and given rise to numerous instances of language contact phenomena, the Inuktitut-English language pair proves interesting.

Inuktitut is a polysynthetic language that demonstrates a complex morphological structure where several morphemes can be attached to a noun or

verb root and where words generally contain between two and ten morphemes (Allen et al., 2002). Affixes attached to roots serve four possible grammatical functions: noun to noun affixes are attached to noun roots or noun affixes and can be followed by noun affixes; noun to verb affixes are attached to noun roots or noun affixes and change the word to a verb; verb to verb affixes are attached to verb roots or verb affixes and can be followed by verb affixes; verb to noun affixes are attached to verb roots and change the word to a noun (Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit, 2020). Affixes can be classified as inflectional or derivational, although this form of classification presents challenges as some affixes do not fit neatly into these categories. For example, some evaluative morphemes can be placed between inflectional morphemes as well as outside inflectional suffixes, which is unusual for derivational morphology, leading some to argue that this morphology behaves more like syntax (Compton, 2015).

While previous studies have documented the presence of English loanwords in Inuktitut and the sociolinguistic dynamics of bilingual communities (Dorais, 1978, 1989; Allen et al., 2002), relatively little attention has been paid to the specific morphological mechanisms by which these loanwords are integrated into Inuktitut's polysynthetic structure. Furthermore, there is a lack of detailed analysis regarding the variation in integration. This study seeks to fill this gap by offering a systematic investigation of the morphological behavior of English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut using corpus-based data.

Accordingly, this paper aims to investigate this linguistic contact through examining the following research questions: (1) How are English-origin loanwords morphologically integrated in Inuktitut? (2) Why are they morphologically integrated? (3) Why is there variation to this integration? The corpus used for this investigation was the Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 2.0, which contains the transcripts of all the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut from April 1999 to November 2007, excluding 2003 (Farley, 2009).

The findings of this investigation indicate that the majority of loanwords are morphologically integrated into Inuktitut through affixation that serves at least a grammatical function. However, unexpected instances of morphological non-integration occur when English-origin multi-word expressions, calquing, and code switching are involved. Most loanword noun-incorporation is achieved through a fairly functional Inuktitut light-verb system. These observations suggest that while an established morphological loanword integration framework in Inuktitut exists, individual deviations arise when bilingual speakers take liberties in their speech, drawing on both Inuktitut and English structures when incorporating an English-origin loanword.

METHOD

The research question "How are English-origin loanwords morphologically integrated in Inuktitut?" was operationalized by investigating the affixation of the loanwords, since Inuktitut is a polysynthetic language where free morphemes are integrated into sentences through attaching bound morphemes which can serve both grammatical and lexical functions. The affixes used to integrate the loanwords, including whether they were present as well as their classifications,

were examined. The research questions “Why are they morphologically integrated” and “Why is there variation to this integration?” were operationalized by investigating general patterns within the affixation of different loanwords. Outliers were further examined to provide insight into factors affecting the variation in the integration. Variation was observed as differences in the degree of morphological integration of different items and the classifications of affixes attached to the loanword, as well as language contact features observed within the affixation.

Data

The Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 2.0 was used to investigate the morphological integration of the loanwords. It contains the transcripts of all the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut from April 1999 to November 2007, excluding 2003 (Farley, 2009). It comprises 5,589,323 English words and 2,651,414 Inuktitut words. Since the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut take place in Iqaluit, transcription conventions lead towards the North Qikiqtaaluk (Baffin Island) dialects of Inuktitut, though speakers come from all across Nunavut and are not limited to a particular language variety (Joanis et al., 2020). A more recent version of the corpus, the Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 3.0 has been produced by Joanis et al. (2020), which includes the proceedings from the previous corpora as well as the additional proceedings up to June 2017. However, the 2.0 version of the corpus was chosen for the purposes of this investigation for a few reasons. There is a greater presence of resources that have been designed for the 2.0 version of the corpus, such as the Uqailaut morphological analyzer developed in the Interactive Information Group of the Institute for Information Technology (IIT) of the National Research Council of Canada (NRC) (Farley, 2009) and the web application of the corpus (Farley, 2009). Additionally, the corpus exists as a single, aligned file, making it easier to search for items. This is necessary when identifying the Inuktitut counterparts of English words in order to find loanwords in Inuktitut despite phonological variation. The Inuktitut text in the 2.0 version of the corpus uses the Latin alphabet, while the Inuktitut text in the 3.0 version uses Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics. Working with text in the Latin alphabet facilitates the annotation of the corpus as it is used and better processed by tools and grammar references consulted during the investigation, such as *Inuktitut Grammar Handbook* (Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit, 2018) and *Inuktitut Affix Dictionary* (Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit, 2020).

The first step in data collection was creating the pool of loanwords to investigate. Dorais’s study *Lexique analytique du vocabulaire inuit moderne* (1978) and Harnum’s thesis *Lexical Innovation in Inuktitut* (1989) provide a comprehensive list of English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut. To identify a pool of loanwords for investigation, a frequency analysis of English-origin loanwords in the corpus was conducted to identify how often each English-origin loanword in the lists provided by Dorais (1978) and Harnum (1989) appeared in the corpus. The English word was searched in the corpus instead of the Inuktitut word in order to account for variation within the phonological integration of the loanword in Inuktitut; for example, the loanword from English *coffee* appeared in the corpus as *kaapi*, *kapi*, *kaavi*, *kaapii*, and

qaapi, so searching a single form of the loanword in Inuktitut would yield unrepresentative results. Then, the corresponding Inuktitut loanwords were identified through the corpus alignment.

Once all the English-origin loanwords that appeared in the corpus were identified, the list was narrowed down to create a pool of loanwords to investigate by removing loanwords that fit into certain categories. Loanwords with under 50 instances were removed on the basis of insufficient data. Since the purpose of this investigation is to investigate the integration of loanwords at a basic level, proper nouns and units that serve a different syntactic function and thus may be integrated differently were removed. Words that are specific to the context of the Nunavut Hansard Corpus, such as *government*, *minister*, and *taxes* were removed since their integration may be specific to the corpus and unrepresentative of broader integration patterns. After filtering out the above categories of loanwords, the following pool of loanwords and their frequencies in the corpus were identified in Table 1.

Table 1. Pool of loanwords in the corpus

English-Origin Word	Number of Appearances in the Corpus	Inuktitut Forms Identified in the Corpus
paper	841	paippaaq, paippaa, paippa, paikpa, paikpaa, paikpaaq, paikpaq, paipa, paipaa
company	312	kampani, kaampani, kaappani, kappani, kammapani
cigarette	196	siggaliaq, siggalia, siggaliuq
bus	165	paasi, pasi, vaasi, vasi, vaasu, paasii, vasii, vaasii, vas
license	153	laisansi, laisa, laaisansi, naisansi, laisangsi, laaisa
gold	121	guulu, gulu, guuluu, guu, guuluk
cheque	85	sikki, sikkik, sikkii, siki, sikkiiq
skidoo	85	sikituuq, sikisuu, sitituu
tobacco	79	tuvvaaka, tavnaka, tavvaaka, tupaaki, tavnaki, tavaaki, tuvvaata, tupaaki, tupaki, tupaka, tupaaka, tupaaku, tipaaqtaq
coffee	52	kaapi, kapi, kaavi, kaapii, qaapi

Data Analysis

All instances of the loanwords in their morphological context were first annotated for the identifying features of the English word of origin and the root as they appear in the Inuktitut word. In order to examine morphological integration, they were then annotated for the presence of affixation, the specific affixes attached to the loaned root, the types of affixes they were followed by (grammatical, lexical affixes, or both), and noun incorporation. There is debate around the categorization of Inuktitut morphemes.

Though traditionally categorized as derivational morphemes, a number of syntactic properties have been observed in them as well (Compton, 2015). Compton (2012) seems to take a lexical approach towards evaluative morphemes, suggesting analyzing them as adjectives and adverbs, while Cook and Johns (2009) propose a

grammatical approach, analyzing them as functional heads. When identifying grammatical and lexical affixes, a strict interpretation was adhered to for this investigation. Affixes serving a purely grammatical function (tense, aspect, mood, and polarity for verbs; number and case for nouns; and affixes serving only to transform part of speech) were categorized as grammatical. All other affixes were categorized as lexical.

Noun incorporation in Inuktitut is achieved when a noun is morphologically attached to a verb. Regarding noun incorporation in Inuktitut, Johns (2007) demonstrated that “the entire set of incorporating verbs...consist only of light verbs...their structure is never more than little *v*, i.e. no manner, nor change of state, nor any adjectival property”. When annotating noun incorporation methods, Johns’s definition of Inuktitut light verbs as all bound morphemes that serve a verbal function was observed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The morphological integration of English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut was investigated through assessing the category of affixes (lexical or grammatical) attached to the loanword as well as noun incorporation methods.

The majority of loanwords are integrated through either both grammatical and lexical affixes (representing 41.55 % of all instances) or grammatical affixes only (representing 43.32% of all instances). While most loanwords are integrated through grammatical affixes, a minority of items are not classified as being integrated through grammatical affixes: in 11.68% of instances, loanwords appear attached to lexical affixes only, and in 4.98% of instances, loanwords appear without affixation. All the items in the subsample of integration through lexical affixes only were found to be integrated through lexical affixes that also serve a grammatical function although these affixes had been categorized as lexical due to the strict interpretation outlined earlier.

For example, affixes functioning as modal verbs were classified as lexical despite also carrying a grammatical function since they did not fit into the previously stated criteria of grammatical affixes used in this investigation. Thus, all items that are integrated through affixation display integration on at least a grammatical level, if not both grammatical and lexical. This large presence of grammatical affixation suggests that most loanwords are well integrated into the morpho-syntax of Inuktitut.

Table 2 outlines the general loanword integration patterns based on affixation type. For each loanword, it shows the number and percentage of instances where it appears without the presence of affixation, attached to lexical affixes only, attached to grammatical affixes only, and attached to both lexical and grammatical affixes.

The items that appear as a borrowed root on its own without affixation (representing 4.98% of all instances) were further examined within the context they appear in in the corpus to determine why they appear alone. Out of 104 such items identified, 92 items do not attach to affixes due to their grammatical role in the sentence and thus do not emerge as an interesting sample since native-Inuktitut items would have appeared alone in their place too. For example, these include loanwords that appear as part of titles and numbers as well as subjects that do not require a

subject marker and definite objects that do not require an object marker. 12 items emerge as an interesting sample of items that do not seem to follow conventional integration patterns of words in Inuktitut and show evidence of language contact phenomena as well as non-integration. The reasons for non-integration include multi-word expressions, calquing, and code switching.

Table 2. Affixation type found attached to loanwords

loanword	% no affixes	% lexical affixes only	% grammatical affixes only	% lexical and grammatical affixes
coffee	5.77	7.69	5.77	78.85
bus	5.45	5.45	35.15	61.82
gold	8.26	11.57	31.40	52.07
skidoo	3.53	8.24	74.12	15.29
cheque	9.41	14.12	38.82	37.65
tobacco	11.39	5.06	55.70	30.38
cigarette	5.10	4.08	21.43	70.41
license	2.61	15.69	20.92	63.40
company	3.53	14.42	73.08	11.54
paper	4.40	13.91	43.28	38.29
total	4.98	11.68	43.32	41.55

In 2 of the 12 items, the non-integration is due to imported multi-word expressions and phrases, such as in the following instance from the corpus:

piqattangittugu tupaaku taaksijarutinginnik ammalu ilijaulluni ilinniaqtulirinirmut piliriaksanut.

We don't have that tobacco tax and put it towards tobacco education initiatives.

Tupaaku, a loan from the English-origin word *tobacco*, does not appear with an affix but rather as part of a structure that resembles a multi-word expression: it is directly followed by the noun *taaksijaruti*, meaning tax, to form the phrase *tobacco tax*. It is unusual in Inuktitut for two freely occurring noun roots to combine directly without any additional affixes, such as a possessive affix (Compton, 2015). Thus, this structure may have been borrowed from English in the context of loanword integration.

In 6 of the 12 items, the non-integration is due to calquing, such as in the phrase *tivani ammalu kappani* which appeared in the corpus, translating to *Tiffany & Co.* The word *Kappani*, loaned from the English-origin word *company*, appears as part of a literal translation of the *Tiffany and Company*. The calque is not integrated into the sentence.

4 of the 12 items display code switching, where the English word was used directly within the Inuktitut sentence, such as in the following instance from the corpus:

kisianittauq ilangit inuungittun piluaqtumik Construction Companies ilanginni quviasuqattangittutiummata.

But some people, particularly some construction companies, are not happy.

This instance is interesting as the entire phrase *construction companies* acts as a non-integrated unit within the sentence. There is no affixation to combine the two individual words, similarly to the example of the multi-word expression. Additionally, the word *companies* is pluralized as it is employed in the context of *some people* and *some companies*, however its pluralization is done through English morphology rather than Inuktitut morphology within the Inuktitut sentence.

In addition to the categories of affixation, noun incorporation was also examined. Noun incorporation was observed when loanwords were verbalized during the morphological integration. Noun incorporation was found to occur through light verb constructions and the verbalization affix *q*. A small subsample of loanwords was verbalized without such noun incorporation processes.

Table 3. Light verbs appearing with the loanwords

Loanword	# of instances integrated through light verbs	% of instances integrated through light verbs out of all instances the loanword appears in corpus	Light verbs the loanword appears with and frequency
coffee	24	46.15%	tuq (to use/consume): 15; qaq (to have): 3; other: 6
bus	94	56.97%	qaq (to have): 81; taaq (to get): 2; other: 11
gold	67	55.37%	taaq (to get): 30, qaq (to have): 1; other: 36
skidoo	11	12.94%	qaq (to have): 5; taaq (to get): 3; other: 3
cheque	31	36.47%	taaq (to get): 20; other: 11
tobacco	20	25.32%	tuq (to use/consume): 8; qaq (to have): 7; taaq (to get): 3; other (2)
cigarette	136	69.39%	tuq (to use/consume): 132; qaq (to have): 1; other: 3
license	105	68.63%	qaq (to have): 55; taaq (to get): 38; other: 12
company	22	7.05%	qaq (to have): 3, other: 19
paper	165	19.62%	taaq (to get): 75, qaq (to have): 47, other: 43

The majority of noun incorporation instances occur through usage of affixes acting as light-verb constructions as outlined by Johns (2007) in section 3. Three primary light verbs emerge: *qaq*, meaning *to have*, at 30.07% of all light verb instances; *taaq*, meaning *to get*, at 25.33% of all light verb instances; and *tuq*, meaning *to use/consume*, at 23.26% of light verb instances. 14 other light verb affixes appear marginally, with the next most commonly observed affix being *u* (*to be*), representing only 5.78% of all light verb instances. The fairly balanced distribution of the three primary light verbs, consisting of the stative *qaq*, the passive *taaq*, and the active *tuq*, suggest a functional light verb construction system in Inuktitut. However, these light verbs do not appear to be fully productive as they do not pair with each

loanword to the same extent. For example, the Inuktitut loanword for *coffee* predominantly appears with *tuq* (*to use/consume*), indicating a strong association with the act of consumption, while the Inuktitut loanword for *bus* does not appear with it at all, suggesting a selective nature of these constructions. Table 3 outlines the frequencies with which the three primary light verbs pair with each loanword. The rest of the light verbs are grouped into the category *other*, as their limited occurrences provide insufficient data for individual analysis.

Some loanwords also combine with the derivational verbalization affix *-q* as observed by Harnum (1989). This seems to be a noun-specific construction, with a total of 18 instances that all involve a loanword derived from English *coffee*. An example that appears in the corpus is *kaapirvinga*, translating to *coffee room*, where *kaapi* is the noun root, the verbalization affix *q* which changes to *r* before an affix beginning with a consonant, *vik* which follows a verb to denote the place or time the action takes place, and *nga* which is a possessive marker. Literally, the word can be translated as *room for coffeering*.

A subsample of six loanword items in the corpus are verbalized without the use of noun-incorporation or verbalization affixes. In these cases, the loanword root seems to have been borrowed with a verb function. An example that appears in the corpus is *paasiqattarniq*, which translates to *bussing*. The root *paasi*, from the English word *bus*, is directly followed by the affix *qattaq*, which attaches to verbs to signify that the action happens regularly. There is no affix to integrate the loanword into this verbal structure, and in this case, the loanword seems to be treated as a verb root.

Over the course of the investigation, three key findings emerge. First, it is demonstrated that in the majority of instances, loanwords are morphologically integrated in Inuktitut. These morphologically integrated loanwords appear attached to affixation that serve at least a grammatical function if not both a lexical and grammatical function. This consistency in loanword affixation suggests a functional and established grammatical loanword integration system. This grammatical integration seems to arise from necessity due to the significant typological differences between the two languages: while English is a primarily lexical language, Inuktitut conveys meaning through complex functional morphology. If a loanword from English was used in Inuktitut without morphological integration on a grammatical level, the function of the word within the sentence would be unclear, particularly in the absence of contextual cues. Though, the frequent presence of lexical affixation demonstrates that speakers integrate loanwords morphologically not only out of grammatical necessity but also to use Inuktitut's affixation system to convey additional lexical content. The individual speaker-by-speaker basis of loanword treatment from a lexical standpoint contributes to the variability in such integration.

The second key finding reveals that some bare roots are imported from English without the expected morphological integration due to multi-word expressions, calquing, and code-switching phenomena. All of these three linguistic processes are foreign to the Inuktitut language and likely appeared in context-specific constructions from individual instances of Inuktitut-English language contact; two freely occurring noun roots combining directly without any additional affixes does not naturally occur in Inuktitut (Compton, 2015), calquing

involves a word-for-word translation of an English phrase into Inuktitut, and code switching occurs when the speaker switches to English to express a specific term. In each case, the lack of morphological integration seems to stem from a speaker spontaneously drawing from both English and Inuktitut during their discourse when confronted with the option of using an English loanword. For example, in one instance from the corpus as noted in section 3, the English plural morphology was used instead of the Inuktitut plural morphology when the loanword *company* was used within an Inuktitut sentence. As observed by Tuloch (2004), Inuktitut-English bilingualism is very prevalent in Inuktitut speaking communities, so loanword integration does not happen in a vacuum where most speakers treat the loanword as a native Inuktitut item without recognizing it within its language of origin. Instead, as demonstrated by the English structures observed in Inuktitut in the context of loanword importing, bilingual speakers may also incorporate the original English context of the loanword in which they interpret the word. This basis of loanword integration may lead to variation in morphological integration as they are imported from English based on sporadic individual interpretation of the semantic and pragmatic context of the term.

The third key finding indicates that three common light verbs – the active *tuq* (to use/consume), the passive *taa*q (to get), and the stative *qaq* (to have) – allow for a fully functional light-verb system. However, they are not fully productive as they do not appear with each loanword to the same extent. Light verb constructions are found to be the primary method when morphologically integrating loanwords through noun incorporation. The variation in light verbs that pair with individual loanwords indicates that light verbs provide a grammatical framework for morphological integration of loanwords, however not all loanwords fit into this system. This indicates a degree of stability within the morphological integration of English loanwords as light verbs function as expected without being overused.

These three findings suggest that mechanisms have been established for loanword integration in Inuktitut, and unexpected morphological variation tends to appear marginally. This indicates that the affixation system of Inuktitut remains stable and that morphological integration mechanisms have not been fundamentally altered by the influx of loanwords. However, individual instances of variation in loanword usage and integration patterns seem to arise from the individual preferences of bilingual speakers, who may take certain liberties in their speech as they draw from the respective grammatical and morphological systems of English and Inuktitut while using the English-origin loanword. This leads to individual differences in how bilingual speakers interpret an English-origin loanword and integrate it into Inuktitut (Maswandi, 2024).

CONCLUSION

This paper investigated Inuktitut-English language contact through the morphological integration of English-origin loanwords in Inuktitut, focusing on affixation patterns and noun incorporation methods. A pool of English-origin loanwords was identified and annotated within the Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 2.0 for the category of affixation attached to the loaned

root and loanword noun incorporation. Most loanwords attached to affixes demonstrated integration on at least a grammatical level, though within the instances that lacked affixation, a subsample deviated from conventional integration patterns due to the loanword being part of multi-word expressions, calquing, or code-switching. In terms of noun incorporation, light verb constructions were most common, and three primary light verbs, consisting of the stative *qaq* (to have), the passive *taa*q (to get), and the active *tu*q (to use/consume), were identified. Other loanwords were verbalized through the affix *-q* or imported as verbs. It is suggested that an established morphological framework for integrating loanwords in Inuktitut stems out of necessity due to the typological differences between Inuktitut and English, however individual deviations arise from liberties taken by bilingual speakers in their speech when drawing on both Inuktitut and English grammatical and morphological systems while using an English-origin loanword.

Throughout the course of this investigation, it has been shown that Inuktitut integrated English-origin loanwords through an established morphological framework though variation exists due to the majority of speakers being Inuktitut-English bilingual. This paper investigated three research questions: (1) How are English-origin loanwords morphologically integrated in Inuktitut? (2) Why are they morphologically integrated? (3) Why is there variation to this integration? In response to the first, an established morphological integration framework exists that integrates loanwords through affixation on a grammatical level. In response to the second, loanwords are grammatically integrated out of necessity. Due to the typological differences between Inuktitut and English, directly importing a loanword from English into Inuktitut without this integration would render the function of the word within the sentence unclear in many instances. Lexical affixation is frequent, indicating that loanwords are also morphologically integrated to convey additional lexical content. In response to the third, variation exists within the morphological integration of loanwords due to the bilingual language situation. The majority of speakers are Inuktitut-English bilingual and are able to draw on both Inuktitut and English structures when using an English-origin loanword during speech, which can lead to deviations from standard Inuktitut morphological integration patterns.

The Inuktitut-English language contact situation examined in this paper, while revealing interesting linguistic phenomena, has also been responsible for the decline in usage of the Inuktitut language, particularly among younger generations (Tulloch, 2014). Thus, in the context of language planning, prioritizing native vocabulary over foreign borrowing as a method for lexical expansion is often preferred (Berge and Kaplan, 2006; Zulkiflee and Chuchu, 2025). Further efforts to support its speaker base and the language resourcing are certainly crucial.

RECOMMENDATION

During this investigation, a few areas that could have been explored further. A pattern seemed to emerge that the loanwords with instances of morphological non-integration were those that displayed instances of phonological non-integration. This potential link between morphological and phonological integration could

indicate varying degrees of loanword adaptation. However, it was not possible to draw a definitive conclusion on this relationship due to insufficient data. Another noteworthy phenomenon that emerged was the presence of imported multi-word expressions in Inuktitut, though this lexical phenomenon was not explored in depth as it falls out of the scope of morphological integration. Moving forward, promising avenues for further investigation include the phonological and lexical integration of loanwords in Inuktitut. These areas may provide insights into how language contact influences both the structure and usage of loanwords and shed light on the degree to which loanwords are integrated into Inuktitut.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Allan, S. E. M., Genesee, F., Fish, S., & Crago, M. (2002). Patterns of code mixing in English-Inuktitut bilinguals. *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 37, 171–188.
- Berge, A., & Kaplan, L. (2006). Contact-induced lexical development in Yupik and Inuit languages. *Études/Inuit/Studies*, 29(1–2), 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.7202/013946ar>
- Bordin, G. (2011). Phasages et déphasages. Représentations du temps chez les Inuits de l'arctique oriental Canadien. *Globe*, 8(1), 99–133. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1000897ar>
- Compton, R. J. (2012). *The Syntax and Semantics of Modification in Inuktitut: Adjectives and Adverbs in a Polysynthetic Language* (thesis).
- Compton, R. J. (2015). Inuktitut. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 559–567. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754-062>
- Cook, C., & Johns, A. (2009). Determining the semantics of Inuktitut postbases. *Typological Studies in Language*, 149–170. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.86.10det>
- Department of Culture and Heritage. (2012). (rep.). *Uqausivut – The Comprehensive Plan Pursuant to the Official Languages Act and the Inuit Language Protection Act - 2012-2016 Government of Nunavut*. Government of Nunavut.
- Dorais, Louis-Jacques. (1977). La structure du Vocabulaire Moderne de la Langue inuit du Québec-labrador. *L'Homme*, 17(4), 35–63. <https://doi.org/10.3406/hom.1977.367808>
- Dorais, Louis-Jacques. (1978). *Lexique analytique du Vocabulaire Inuit Moderne au Québec-Labrador*. Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Dorais, Louis-Jacques. (1989). Bilingualism and diglossia in the Canadian Eastern Arctic. *ARCTIC*, 42(3). <https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic1658>
- Farley, B. (2009). *The UQAILAUT project. Inuktitut Computing*. <https://www.inuktitutcomputing.ca/NunavutHansard/info.php>
- Harnum, E. R. (1989). (thesis). *Lexical innovation in Inuktitut*.

- Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit. (2018). *Inuktut Uqausiup Aaqquisuutingit Inuktut Reference Grammar*. Pirurvik Centre.
- Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit. (2020). *Inuktut Uqausiliurut Inuktut Affix Dictionary*. Pirurvik Centre.
- Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtiit. (n.d.). *Uqausiit*. Uqausiit The Inuktut Grammar Dictionary. <https://uqausiit.ca/index.php/>
- Joanis, E., Knowles, R., Kuhn, R., Larkin, S., Littell, P., Lo, C., Stewart, D., & Micher, J. (2020). The Nunavut Hansard Inuktitut-English Parallel Corpus 3.0 with preliminary machine translation results. *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*.
- Johns, A. (2007). Restricting noun incorporation: Root Movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 25(3), 535–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-007-9021-1>
- Johnson, O. A., & Allen, S. E. (2022). The use of complex structures with a word class change in Inuktitut child-directed speech. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.971395>
- Zulkiflee, Z., & Chuchu, I. (2025). Belait Language Maintenance in Brunei Darussalam. *International Journal of Linguistics and Indigenous Culture*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v3i1.2617>
- Legislative Assembly of Nunavut. (n.d.). *Hansard*. <https://www.assembly.nu.ca/hansard>
- Maswandi, E. (2024). Interdisciplinary Insights: Sociocognitive Approaches in Malay Applied Linguistics –A Bibliometric Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics and Indigenous Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v2i1.1829>
- Micher, J. (2019). Bootstrapping a neural morphological generator from morphological analyzer output for Inuktitut. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Computational Methods for Endangered Languages*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.33011/computel.v2i.455>
- Moore, R. C. (2002). Fast and accurate sentence alignment of bilingual corpora. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 135–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45820-4_14
- Tulloch, S. (2004). *Inuktitut and Inuit youth: Language attitudes as a basis for language planning* (thesis). *Inuktitut and Inuit youth: language attitudes as a basis for language planning*.