Spring 5-12-2017

Endangered Language Pedagogy & Teaching Methodology

Brandon J. Martínez
University of New Mexico - Main Campus, bjmartinez2695@gmail.com

Endangered Language Pedagogy & Teaching Methodology

Brandon Joseph Martinez

University of New Mexico

12 May 2017

Endangered Language Pedagogy & Teaching Methodology

Overview

§§§

1. Introduction: Soy Lo que Dejaron

> "I am what they left behind,
> The remnants of what they stole,
> A people hidden in the mountaintops,
> My skin is made of leather, and can withstand any weather,
> I am a factory made of smoke,
> A farmhand providing for your consumption..."
>
> Cabra & Arcaute, "Latinoamérica" (translated by the author)

Of the estimated 6,000-7,000 languages in the world today, over half of them will be extinct by the end of the century, which labels them as 'endangered' languages (Simons & Fennig, 2017; Woodbury, 2012). But what is an endangered language?

An endangered language is one that is fast falling out of use as the main language of a society, being replaced by the language of a more dominant or powerful group, for example, English in the United States, Spanish in Latin America, and Mandarin in China. There is not just one factor that influences language shift. Many of the forces driving change are political, economic, and social in nature. As these forces wreak havoc on a marginalized population, adults stop speaking the language, so that their children are not learning it; In many instances, children were discouraged or even punished for attempting to speak the language. All that is left is the grandparent generation, who are still fluent in the language, but have no one to pass this linguistic legacy on to. When they die, their language dies with them.

When I first started studying linguistics, I had no idea what an endangered language was, and at first overlooked the topic in favor of other areas of linguistic study that were a bit more tangible at the time: Phonology, Semantics, Syntax, etc. It wasn't until I read a book for a sociolinguistics class, called *Vanishing Voices*, by anthropologist Daniel Nettle and linguist Suzanne Romaine, that I first discovered just how interesting a topic this actually was, and realized just how much it would shape my personal study of linguistics. Over the course of the book, the authors compare linguistic diversity to biodiversity, demonstrating how both are critical to further study of the social and natural world (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). They demonstrate that minority languages are just as precious and linguistically rich as majority or 'world' languages, and list a number of reasons why we as a global society should take steps to preserve them. I divide these reasons into two categories:

The first is the vast amount of knowledge contained in every language. All languages develop over the course of thousands of years, and are perfectly adapted to the needs of the speakers and environment in which they are used. Western science has accumulated a good

amount of knowledge, but even today, there are things that are only known to the indigenous peoples of the world, and that at the moment are only transmittable through their language; To lose knowledge of the medicinal plants of the Amazon, agricultural methods preventing crop infestation in Indonesia, and spawning cycles of different species of fish in Polynesia, for example, would be a tragedy. All of this information is encoded in the now-endangered languages of these people (Nettle & Romaine, 2000); When they are gone, who can say just how much knowledge of the world we will lose?

The second is that linguistic theory depends on linguistic diversity (Hinton, 2001). Linguistics itself is the scientific study of languages, and attempts to analyze and classify the complexity and variation found in the world's languages. If most of them were to die off before we had a chance to learn more about them, how they work, how they were formed, and the effects they have on the human psyche, then there is no telling just how much we as a human species do not know, and may never know. To quote famous linguist, Ken Hale (1992): "Language loss is part of a much larger process of loss of cultural and intellectual diversity in which politically dominant languages and cultures simply overwhelm indigenous local languages and cultures."

With both of these reasons in mind, we can take a step back and ask, 'What can be done?' This paper sets the stage to answer this question, and explores the topic of endangered languages in-depth, synthesizing information from a number of different sources into four main parts. In the first, we will review some of the history of endangered languages, that gave rise to the exponential rate of language loss experienced in the last few centuries; Then, we will analyze some of the past and present issues that have been encountered by groups who have sought to revitalize their language; Thirdly, we will focus on some of the languages of New Mexico, which

includes information taken from interviews with speakers of these endangered languages; The paper concludes with a section devoted to the teaching of endangered languages, and presents some suggestions and information that can be used by speakers seeking to bring their language back into prominence within their community.

Through this paper, I seek to provide another resource for indigenous communities in their fight for language preservation and revitalization. It is by no means an end-all solution, nor is it perfect. It has been written with the goal in mind of assisting language revitalization. My dream is that the voices of these communities may be in their heritage languages, and that they may be preserved for generations to come.

§§§

2. How & Why Do Languages Become Endangered?

> "We have room but for one language in this country and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns out our people as Americans, of American nationality and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house, and we have room for but one loyalty and that is a loyalty to the American people."
>
> Theodore Roosevelt, *Winning the West*

How many times has rhetoric of this style been perpetuated amongst the peoples of today's world? We have seen it repeated numerous instances around the world, by numerous governmental bodies: Turkish, Chinese, and American, to name a few (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). But whereas one hundred years ago these change-driving forces were caused primarily by nationalistic fervor, as in the case of Teddy Roosevelt's turn-of-the-century America, these days the increasingly rapid rate of language endangerment and extinction are primarily driven by the forces of globalization; In the following section I will analyze both of these powers, nationalistic and globalistic, and the impact that they both have had on the world's languages.

Throughout history, cultural assimilation has been standard practice, once a governmental body or religious group have conquered another. By making use of political rhetoric, and where that fails, oppressive measures, governmental bodies have sought to bring these conquered people into the fold: It is easier to control someone when they have been assimilated into the mainstream culture, no matter how marginalized they remain in that society. Even in the face of demands for cultural autonomy and the preservation of their most basic human rights, which unsurprisingly often includes linguistic factors (Wardhaugh, 1992), a conquering power nevertheless seeks to force their newfound citizenry to adapt to the conquering society's social norms, to forgo their cultural heritage and identity, and to forget their language and traditional way of life in order to move forward into 'civilization,' (Hinton, 2011). By doing this, the conquering government is seeking to suppress the 'power' inherent in these languages, the power to cause change or drive a people to resist outside control. As written by a Cheyenne language activist, "When the U.S. government acted to silence our languages, it was acknowledging how our languages empowered and united us when we spoke them," (Littlebear, 1999).

Oftentimes, the languages and cultures of the marginalized peoples of the world are devalued and viewed as backwards and outdated (England, 2003). Cultures that are non-European or non-politically dominant are held to be a hindrance to acceptance and upward mobility, first in the national, and later in the global society. It is purportedly for this reason that the governments of the world force-feed their language and culture upon their minority populations, regardless of the wishes of the people themselves. At times, however, this shift can be made voluntarily by the group itself, in order to improve their chances for upward mobility (Anonby, 1999; Hinton, 2001).

We see this pattern repeated the world over. Take, for example, conquering languages such as Arabic, Turkish, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, and English: Governments that use these languages make use of propaganda that is inherently nationalistic or unifying in nature, seeking to unify the people under a common doctrine or way of thinking.

In the Arab World, it is the all-encompassing arm of Islam that is primarily the driving force behind this change. Because Standard Arabic is viewed as the divine language of Allah, it is promoted as the way forward throughout North Africa and the Middle East. While the spread of Islam throughout this region of the world has proven beneficial in terms of raising international dialogue, it is also pushing many minority peoples to the wayside, such as that of the Amazigh Berber in Morocco, whose culture, religion, and language (Thmazight) is viewed as inferior to those belonging to the Arab world: For example, this is conveyed through the story of how the Archangel Gabriel, after having given the people of the world their languages, had none left for the Amazigh people, so that they were forced to "...make some words, but they could not understand each other," (Almasude, 1999). This caused the storyteller to conclude that he did not believe Thmazight was even a real language (Grabe, 1979). The Amazigh people have been brought under the wing of Islam and Arabic, with Arabic activists giving reasoning eerily similar to that used by President Roosevelt: "We have one religion, which is Islam, and one language, which is Arabic," (Khlief, 1991).

Two other contemporary examples come from Turkey and China. Ever since the days of the Ataturk, the Turkish government has sought to create one Turkish state, with a unified citizenry. Of their Kurdish population, who are a unique and ancient Middle Eastern people with their own heritage and language, the Turkish government has issued statements such as: "Turkey has no Kurds, only mountain Turks who have forgotten their own language," (O'Ballance, 1995).

A similar situation can be seen in modern day China. Since defeating the Kuomintang in 1949, the Communist Party-controlled government has fostered the misleading notion that there is just one Chinese language, Mandarin, and that every other vernacular is only a dialectical variant of Mandarin, or *Putonghua*, "normal language." Having studied Mandarin Chinese and spent some time in China, however, I can most assuredly confirm that that is not the case at all; While the use of Standard Mandarin is on the rise, China still remains linguistically diverse in many areas. The sole reason this misguided belief exists is because the Chinese government wants it to appear that way; For it to seem like there exists anything less than one unified people under one unified government is anathema (Brady, 2007).

Throughout the New World, Spanish and English have come to become the majority languages, due to their long imperial control of the Western Hemisphere. The conquerors of these regions forced the indigenous groups who came under their control to only be educated in Spanish or English, and to convert to Christianity (Sims, 2001). The Europeans also enacted a number of oppressive policies that sought to silence traditional language and religion, which were forced underground in order to survive. To assist in conversion, missionaries were often the first creators of writing systems for these indigenous languages, thus setting the framework for language shift (Reyhner, 1999). Over time, these new dominant languages slowly moved out of the religious contexts in which they were initially used into all other aspects of life, including government, business, and eventually the home (Sims, 2001); It has been said that writing sets the first stage for language loss, as it provides a stepping-stone to literacy in the dominant language (Blum-Martinez, 2000; England, 2003).

The shift from a multilingual country to a nation composed almost entirely of monolingual-English speakers is especially visible here in the Southwest. Ever since the rise of

American nationalism throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, which included both racial and social prejudices such as the ideology surrounding 'Manifest Destiny,' the United States have increasingly moved towards having an English-only social mentality. This is especially evident in light of renewed xenophobia and linguistic prejudice over the past several years; Oftentimes, this animosity towards languages besides English is not only directed towards foreign languages, but also applies to indigenous American languages (Hinton, 2001).

Current national sentiments aside, as can be seen above, the English-only social movement is by no means a recent development (Reyhner, 1999). For example, the first English-only legislation was passed as early as 1896, outlawing the use of the Hawaiian language in Hawaii. These measures were enacted in order to benefit the white plantation owners, and hinder the advancement of the indigenous Hawaiian population, ignoring the fact that the Hawaiian language had already developed its own writing system, and was the only language in use in the public school system (Bielenberg, 1999; Nettle & Romaine, 2000).

Another example of the havoc wreaked by English on minority groups is the shift from the use of Kwak'wala, a Native American language found in the Canadian province of British Columbia. Even though many Kwakwaka'wakw people today believe that their language is critical to who they are as a people, an indispensible aspect of their culture, there has been a long history of colonization and forced linguistic shift through the use of boarding schools and pressure from the national government. This has deprived the language of a sufficient amount of fluent or semi-fluent speakers, who would have otherwise been able to fill in the gaps in the language and jumpstart the revitalization process (Anonby, 1999). Kwakwaka'wakw children, like many other Native American children in the 19th and 20th centuries, were sent to government-funded boarding schools, where they were forbidden to speak their language,

punished when they did use it, and indoctrinated with the belief that they must speak English in order to succeed (Blum-Martinez, 2000; Fishman, 1991; Sims, 2001). This has caused a drastic shift in the primary language used on the Kwakwaka'wakw and other Native American reservations (Anonby, 1999; Bielenberg, 1999). By having statuses of lower prestige attributed to them, indigenous languages have seen a hasty decline in their use, with a common moral quandary among marginalized people being "remain[ing] loyal to their traditions and language and...remain[ing] socially disadvantaged...or...abandon[ing] their distinctive practices, traditions, and language, and thereby...improv[ing] their own and their children's lots in life," (Anonby, 1999).

The belief that children who are raised multilingual later become disadvantaged has made it extremely difficult for minority populations to reverse the direction of language shift, becoming at the very least a bilingual population (Blum-Martinez, 2000; Hinton, 2001). What members of majority populations fail to grasp, however, is just how detrimental assimilating a minority group into the mainstream society can be. In many cases, this forces them to deny their heritage, and weakens their connection to their native culture and language (Garrett, M., 1996; LaFromboise et al, 1993). Beyond that, assimilating people tend to have many medical and psychological issues, not to mention problems with crime and violence (Fishman, 1991). And while many would argue that there is no reason that a minority group cannot maintain their culture and language during the assimilation process, this is also an unfounded belief, as by gaining English they are more often than not losing their language, and by losing their language they are at the same time losing their entire culture, an entirely different and unique worldview. A sacred song loses its power when the people singing it cease to understand its underlying meaning (Anonby, 1999; Blum-Martinez, 2000; Fishman, 2001; Rubin, 1999); When meeting

Marie Smith, the last speaker of the Alaskan Eyak language, Richard Littlebear understood all too well the gravity of the situation, and the power that is embodied in each and every language; But where there exists such power, there also exists a degree of fragility, "...a whole universe of knowledge that could be gone in one last breath," (Littlebear, 1999).

We will now briefly examine how language shift happens in marginalized populations, both indigenous and immigrant. Generally speaking, when a minority population is assimilated into the mainstream society, they go through a three-stage shift: Grandparents who are monolingual in the minority language raise children who are bilingual in both the minority and majority languages; They in turn raise grandchildren who are monolingual in the dominant language. This creates a population where the only L1 speakers of the minority language left are the elderly, thus creating a cultural divide between the old and the young in only two generations. While this three-stage model is typically modeled over a three-generational difference, depending on the situation, the rate at which this happens can vary (Hinton, 2001; Sims, 2001). To further illustrate this concept, I will use a personal example, in the loss of the language of my ancestors, Spanish. While Spanish as a whole is not in any way considered an endangered language, the Spanish dialect of New Mexico is unique, with roots in the Spanish of the *conquistadores*. Upon its entrance to the Union, however, English rapidly displaced Spanish as the primary language of use. In fact, my grandparents first language was Spanish, but upon attending school they made the shift to English. Due to this, my father grew up a semi-lingual speaker of Spanish, but no one in his generation has any sort of mastery of the language. My generation, in contrast, grew up entirely monolingual in English, not being able to understand Spanish whatsoever.

I am the first Spanish speaker who has attained any degree of proficiency in the language in two generations, but my idiolect resembles the Spanish spoken throughout Latin America rather than New Mexico, as I only learned the language once I began attending college. Many times, I have trouble understanding what is being said by my grandparents when they speak Spanish, if they actually speak it with me; More often than not, I will speak in Spanish to my grandparents, only to have them respond almost entirely in English. I am thoroughly convinced that this is due to this deep-rooted idea that New Mexican Spanish, like many indigenous and other minority languages and dialects, is not suitable for upward mobility. It is a pity that this language, which has been spoken by my ancestors since they first came to New Mexico directly from Spain starting in the 16th century, along with unique aspects of our culture and heritage, may be entirely lost within the next few decades.

Besides nationalism, a factor that is not as well-known but equally as destructive to the maintenance of endangered languages is globalism, which is increasingly moving the world's mindset away from nationalistic and localist sentiments. Arguably, since the formation of the United Nations after the cessation of hostilities in World War II, the world has become a tighter-knit society; With the advent of the internet, coupled with the now exponential rise of world languages such as English, Spanish, and Mandarin, this has hastened the endangerment and extinction of the world's languages, while any efforts to preserve and revitalize these languages are viewed as anti-modern and disruptive to the globalist cause (Fishman, 1991). However, while instances of forced language shift and assimilation have been less common and less severe in the past half-century, marginalized people now feel a different kind of pressure to assimilate to the greater society and adopt a language of more international prominence. This economic, social, and political pressure, albeit indirect and mostly unintentional, typically does not aid in

language preservation. It creates first a bilingual population, which in itself is not a bad thing. Fishman (1991) states that "bilingualism should be viewed as life enriching and a bridge to other cultures," but unless the group takes measures to ensure that this transition is to maintained bilingualism, the people over time will eventually shift to only using the dominant language.

Many people that I have met have failed to see the benefits of endangered language revitalization, and have been confused as to the purpose of this sort of work. These include a Dutch man asking me what is the point of saving these 3000-odd languages; A young Native American from Nevada telling me he was happy that not many people speak his ancestral language anymore, because it will not help them become part of the global society; And most recently, an ex-soldier from Israel, who is now a peace-advocate, telling me that while it is sad these people are losing their culture and heritage, he believes it is in the long run better, because it will more effectively promote world peace, breaking down barriers between peoples and cultures. While these points of view are all equally valid, and fueled by an ideology of peace and prosperity for all, I don't believe they can see the impact that losing these unique languages and cultures will have on our world heritage and individual identities.

§§§

3. Endangered Languages Today: Issues with Literacy & Current Instruction Methods

"Languages die like rivers
Words wrapped around your tongue today
And broken to the shape of your thought
Between your teeth and lips speaking
Now and today
Shall be faded hieroglyphics
Ten thousand years from now."

Carl Sandburg, qtd. in *Vanishing Voices*

For the last half century, the topic of language revitalization has been on the rise amongst minority groups, as endangered language advocates have fought to stem the tide of language shift, convincing people that language loss does not have to be the norm. To combat this, measures already taken include actions by global institutions, for example the United Nations with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as measures taken by national governments and local communities, for example Title IV (21st Century Schools) and Title VII (Civil Rights Act of 1964) funding available through the U.S. Federal government (U.N. General Assembly, 1948; U.S. Dept of Education, 2004; U.S. Equal Employment, 2017; Yellow Bird, 1999). This is a good start, and has possibly created at least some semi-fluent speakers of endangered languages, delaying their death by another generation.

Language revitalists have not made strides without hindrances, however, and for every success there are still a hundred other obstacles in their way. I split these obstacles into two categories, the first being social issues, and the second being pedagogical & methodological issues.

Moving beyond the outside influences that have in the past prevented intergenerational language transmission, another major social issue that can be seen in language revitalization is disunity between individual communities of the ethnic group, which occur for a number of different reasons. Groups seeking to preserve and revitalize their language must consider the impact caused by this disunity. If the language is to be saved, they must present a unified front, rather than each individual community addressing the problem separately. This will boost group solidarity, assisting the population in achieving its goals (Anonby, 1999).

It is useful to note the difference between a ‘language’ and a ‘dialect.’ A language may consist of various dialects; Each dialect is unique, and would have diverged at some point in the

past due to a number of political, social, economic, and geographic factors. Linguistically speaking, a significant amount of similarities between the various dialects will still exist, that lend themselves to mutual intelligibility. However, over time, the linguistic distance between dialects will have expanded significantly enough to reclassify them as separate languages. While the languages will still maintain a certain degree of similarity, they would have diverged far enough apart to impair mutual intelligibility.

When speakers of different dialects come together to preserve a language, they must agree on a standard vocabulary that may be compiled in a dictionary for future use. Amongst some groups, it has been seen that when words from different dialects express the same concept, individual communities have in the past focused only on the word used in 'their' dialect, and resisted labeling both words as synonyms of one another (England, 2003). This could possibly impair future revitalization efforts, because it resists creating the aforementioned unified front; Instead, it may prove more useful to educate all members of the society as to the different words used by other members of the group, emphasizing the rich diversity found within the language itself.

In her work with the various Mayan dialects of Guatemala, linguist Nora England has had more than her fair share of trouble when encountering these localist ideologies. In her article "Mayan Language Revival and Revitalization Politics" (2003), she reviews this issue of group solidarity, and identifies three obstacles that must be overcome in order to unify a people in the face of language loss:

The first is the halting of natural processes of language fragmentation into various dialects, which over time would eventually become separate languages altogether; The second is the tendency to identify related dialects as altogether different languages, despite the relatively

small differences between them; And the third is that all possible attention must be given to finding the common ground between each dialect and social group, overcoming their perceived cultural, political, and linguistic divide, and establishing both a written and oral standard for the language. By taking these steps, the group will "unify [their] languages as much as possible [in order to make them] adequate modern means of communication that can hold their own against [the majority language]," thus laying the groundwork to reverse language shift in these populations (England, 2003).

At other times, the problem lies not with disunity, but with the methodologies currently used in language revitalization efforts. In many groups, there is an overwhelming sense of cultural and linguistic pride, particularly among today's youth; For example, those encountered in Anonby's experiences with the Kwakwaka'wakw (1999). However, current ineffective teaching methods have stifled the young people's motivation to learn and use the language, as these methods only expand the student's basic vocabulary, rather than creating proficient, conversational speakers. This can be attributed to the fact that many groups try to implement a formal educational program too early in the process, when the students still do not have a good foundational base in the language. As Anonby (1999) points out, "Even if students learn Kwak'wala in school, they will soon forget it if they can't use it in their family or community," thus depriving the language itself of the next generation of fluent speakers. A group must first lay a strong linguistic base before trying to implement many of the methodologies currently in use. Ways to combat this problem will be covered more in-depth later in this paper.

Further complicating matters is the decision that must be made by each group whether to try and maintain the language in its traditional context, keeping it as 'pure' as possible, or

whether to adapt it to the modern world, allowing it to evolve, so that it may be written down, used in the classroom, etc (Graymorning, 1999).

A theme that is common across cultures is the belief that each individual group is entrusted by their deities with a certain amount of wisdom and knowledge, that is conveyed through their language (Bielenberg, 1999). In the past, when missionaries have come into these societies seeking to convert them to the dominant religion, they have used the indigenous language as the basis for this conversion (Reyhner, 1999). Wary of this outside control, the indigenous group is forced to take their traditional religion underground, often the last domain where the endangered language is used almost exclusively. At other times, academics, anthropologists, and linguists have come into a community seeking to learn the language, with the sole purpose of publishing their findings, rather than using their skills and knowledge to give back to the community by helping them to preserve the language. This complicates language revitalization, especially evident when it comes to writing, as many believe that by writing their language down, this will present another avenue for outside control of their culture and their religion (Bielenberg, 1999).

For example, several years ago I was having a discussion with a classmate about this very topic, asking: If I, as an outsider and a linguist, wanted to come into your community, learn how to speak your language, and worked to help preserve and revitalize it, would you let me? Their answer was an emphatic 'no.' They were of the opinion that they would prefer to see their language 'go to sleep' rather than allow an outsider to learn to speak it, much less write it down for future use. This disregards the fact that by allowing outside linguists to come into their community, they may more easily create learning materials, codify and document their language, and train community linguists, all of which would be extremely useful to their cause.

The desire for the language to remain as indigenous as possible is entirely warranted, given the history of contact between majority and minority groups. However, a group should consider the purpose for keeping the language locked away from the rest of the world, and for forbidding others the opportunity to experience this beautifully different worldview. Although there exists this idea that each group's knowledge is unique, entrusted to them alone, it can also be argued that languages do not belong to any particular group, and are better off when shared (Bielenberg, 1999; Blum-Martinez, 2000; Graymorning, 1999) While decisions such as these must out of necessity be left to the people themselves, and respected no matter their decision, it can be extremely difficult to preserve a dying language if it is only being maintained in secret.

Which brings us to the next big issue, the use of conventional schooling in order to try and teach an endangered language to the next generation of speakers. While formal schooling will at some point be necessary in order to properly revitalize a language, the methodology currently in use has in the vast majority of cases proven inefficient and unsuccessful. We will now critically analyze previously used methods, so that we may lay a groundwork for future discussion.

To begin, there are two mindsets associated with endangered languages that in many cases have made revitalization programs difficult to implement: The first is the idea that schooling alone can save a language, and that you can teach it in the same way that you can teach other subjects such as mathematics or science, or using the same methods as in majority language instruction; The second is that endangered and minority languages belong in the home and not the public domain (Anonby, 1999; Cantoni, 1997; Graymorning, 1999). Because these two mindsets are frustratingly linked and intertwined, and can be held by both members of the majority and minority populations, my analysis approaches both simultaneously.

A common question posed by frustrated parents to teachers of endangered languages is: "After studying for X years in school, why can't my kids speak the language yet?" This may seem like an entirely valid question, however, the fault here lies not with the teachers, and not with the students, but with the parents and the greater community as a whole. Simply learning the language in school is not enough to make a lasting impact in the student's psyche. Similar to learning a new instrument or other skill, language learning requires a tremendous amount of practice and work, both in and out of the classroom. In Cantoni (1999), the author asserts that if "...the Native language teacher is almost the only source of Native language input, and the instruction time allocated to...teaching is limited, the learners are not to blame for their limited progress." If any sort of meaningful change is to be expected, the language must also be used at home and in the public domain (Anonby, 1999; Miyashita & Moll, 1999).

Historically speaking, where successful bilingual school programs have been instituted, they were set up by the government, and sought not to create and maintain a bilingual population, but instead to educate students to the point where they have some mastery of the dominant language (Blum-Martinez, 2000). At this point, the vast majority of instruction time would be in the dominant language. In many of these programs, the only time the indigenous language would continue to be used is for disciplinary action, as in the case of Acoma, which will be covered more in Part Four (Sims, 2001). As the government well knows, the better educated you are in the dominant language, the less likely you are to speak and use your native language regularly (Anonby, 1999).

Within schools today, if any sort of endangered or heritage language courses exist, they are only taught in short 15-30 minute intervals in the same way that a subject such as science would be taught, that is, primarily through lecture and rote memorization, with little room for

actual practice of the language. It becomes a passive task, not a communicative one, that does not prevent language death, but only delays it. Furthermore, this is often only a required subject in elementary school, becoming optional as the students advance into higher levels.

In the past, it has been suggested that class time devoted to endangered language instruction should be equal to other subjects, at least one hour a day, and extended to grades K-12, so that the students may begin to make real progress in the language. However, the school administrators and other faculty are usually unable to comply; They too are under increasing pressure to meet standards, with a shortage of time and resources. However, it is not the administrators but the instructors who are brought to bear for the students's apparent inability to learn the language well, and the current methods are denounced as ineffective (Graymorning, 1999; Rubin, 1999; Yellow Bird, 1999). This subject is given careful attention by Graymorning (1999) in his dealings with the Arapaho language, and he poses the question: "...why are you requiring our language instructors to teach under a format that you have expressed as ineffective?"

As mentioned previously, a conflict arises over the need to teach the written as well as the spoken language. Many language activists argue that writing is critical to language preservation and linguistic autonomy, as it not only creates a corpus of reference materials, but also lends a sense of legitimacy to the language, elevating its level of prestige, and proving to its speakers that it is just as good a medium of communication as English, Spanish, or other majority languages (Bielenberg, 1999; Yellow Bird, 1999). This elevation of a language's prestige was proven with some small success by Yellow Bird in her work with the Arikara language: When writing in Arikara was first introduced into the school system, it showed the community that their language was good enough to be written, and inspired the school faculty to further develop the program by making them aware of the importance of their endeavors (Yellow

Bird, 1999). Furthermore, Bernard (1997) argues that literacy can be used to publish a robust amount of literature in the language, and Crawford (1990) goes so far as to claim that for languages such as Cherokee, the availability of literature is one of the primary factors that has assisted in the language's long-term survival. That being said, the vast majority of domains where the language is still in use are oral ones, so it must also be learned in that context (Bielenberg, 1999).

Conversely, to only teach the language orally is to also imply that it is not good enough for the professional domain (Palmer, 1997). As mentioned before, endangered languages are just as linguistically complex and rich as 'world' languages, but due to the belief that these languages are not fit for use outside of the home, their death is hastened (Graymorning, 1999). Therefore, a balance must be struck, where students are effectively learning to both speak and write in their heritage language, and where they are not simply imitating the teacher, or only learning to write the language at a basic level (Bennett et al, 1999; Bielenberg, 1999; Yellow Bird, 1999).

At the same time, a serious hindrance is the lack of effective pedagogical and printed material available for most endangered languages, that present both traditional and modern culture in an interesting and engaging manner (Kushner, 1999; Miyashita & Moll, 1999; St. Clair et al, 1999). While a learner of a major language may simply search the internet or turn on the television in order to further interact with the language they are learning, this easy-accessibility simply does not exist for most endangered languages. To combat this, these sort of pedagogical materials must now be created, so that the average person may further their own learning outside of the classroom, and that both the resources and methods to teach the language must be developed at the local level, perhaps based upon but distinct from more traditional language learning materials. For example, speakers of Cherokee have in recent years taken many steps to

boost interest in the language and access to materials outside of the classroom, with web-based resources such as Cherokee101 and CherokeeLessons simplifying the language-learning process for the individual learner. There are also groups such as the Cherokee Preservation Foundation who are now taking the steps necessary to revitalize the language over a 10 year period (Cherokee Preservation Foundation, 2014). Within the classroom, instructors must also learn to develop a curriculum that is both timely and effective, that balances the need to meet a standard with being flexible, and that attends to the individual needs of their students (Rubin, 1999).

The aforementioned changes cannot be limited to children, however, and the adult population must also shoulder some of the burden of learning and maintaining their language. Given the fact that adults learn differently than children, having their own strengths and weaknesses when acquiring a new language or expanding upon an old one that has fallen into disuse, the needs of the adult learners must be met by the community as well. The journey to learn a language is by no means a solitary one, and while it does require a certain amount of individual effort, if we are to succeed in this plight we must each do our part, together.

To see just how effective language revitalization can be when the obstacles mentioned above are taken into careful consideration, then overcome, we have only to look at a handful of languages who have come back from complete 'extinction,' such as Wampanoag, Miami, and perhaps the most well-known, Hebrew. For the first time in hundreds or even thousands of years, these languages have their first native speakers, and their usage is yearly being expanded and modernized, keeping their respective cultural and linguistic heritages alive.

For our purposes, we will look briefly at the Hebrew language, which for the most part fell out of daily use, but did not go entirely extinct due to its importance in Jewish and Christian religious domains. The attempted extermination of the Jews during the Holocaust, followed by

the establishment of the Israeli State, provided a necessary catalyst for revitalization. Through the linguistic reconstruction of the Hebrew language, the establishment of multi-national communities in Israel (*kibbutz*) that lacked a lingua franca, and the promotion of its use by the Israeli government, Hebrew in a matter of decades went from a language whose status was similar to that of Latin, to having a couple of million L1-speakers. It is every year being adapted and modernized to keep up with 21st century technology and culture, and is by no means Classical Hebrew; However, it is still a marvelous example, and an excellent model for future revitalization projects. We will return to Hebrew and some of the specific methods used to revive it later (Hinton, 2011; Hinton, 2001).

To conclude, a language out of necessity cannot be learned only in the classroom, but must also be fostered and cultivated at home and in the community. Furthermore, the goals developed for these language projects must not only focus on the short-term, that is, the next few years, but also must the long-term, that is, over the next few decades and generations (Anonby, 1999; Rubin, 1999; Yellow Bird, 1999). To quote Anonby (1999), "Unless [groups] are willing to radically change the way they approach [language revitalization], unless they are willing to spend the time and effort required to learn and promote [the language], it will die."

§§§

4. New Mexican Languages

> "The Cheyenne language is my language. English is also my language. Yet it is Cheyenne I want to use when my time is completed here on this earth and I journey on to the spirit world. I want to greet in our Cheyenne language those who've journeyed on before me because I know that Cheyenne is the only language they know, the only language they ever needed to know. And I hope when I meet them on the other side they will understand me and accept me. *Thank you for listening to me*."
>
> Richard Littlebear, qtd. in *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages* (emphasis added)

Many are unaware of the rich linguistic diversity found in New Mexico, due to its relatively high concentration of endangered Native American languages, primarily from the Apachean, Keres, and Tanoan language families; Specific languages include Navajo, Apache (Jicarilla & Mescalero), Keres (Western & Eastern), Tanoan (Tiwa, Tewa, Towa), and Zuni (N.M. Secretary of State, 2017).

In this section, I will briefly analyze some of the history behind language revitalization in the State of New Mexico, focusing primarily on two groups: The Pueblo of Acoma (Western Keres) and the Navajo Nation, both of whose reservations border the small town where I grew up. I have decided to focus on these specific New Mexican languages for two reasons, the foremost being that I was able to interview three educators who speak them, two Navajo and one Acoma; The second reason, why I chose Navajo specifically ,is that is has to date had some marked successes in language revitalization. With it being the largest autonomous Indian tribe on the North American continent, with over 250,000 tribal members, it has perhaps the greatest chance to bounce back from the inevitable brink of language extinction, to potentially being the dominant or at least co-dominant language of government, education, and everyday use in the Navajo Nation (Navajo Nation, 2011).

What would eventually become the State of New Mexico was first settled by nomadic tribes in two waves, with the various Pueblos beginning to be established around 1200 AD; The Apacheans arrived later, beginning in the mid-1400's (N.M. State Historian, 2017). After these waves of migration into the region, which gave rise to 'linguistic equilibrium,' the arrival of the Spanish *conquistadores* in 1598 began the process of language shift that continues today.

The relationship between the Spanish and the Native Americans proved tenuous at best, as can be seen in events such as the First Pueblo Revolt of 1680, which ejected the invaders from

the region for over a decade. New Mexico's indigenous population later came under the control of the Mexican government, when Mexico declared itself independent in 1821 (N.M. State Historian, 2017). During both the Spanish and Mexican eras, these people were forcibly converted to Catholicism, forced to submit to outside control, engaged in constant border wars with the Hispanic citizenry, and oftentimes enslaved (Sando, 1992; Sides, 2007). When the New Mexico Territory came under the control of the United States after the Mexican-American War of 1846, life did not improve, but instead further deteriorated. This is illustrated by the Navajo Wars and the 'Long Walk' to the Bosque Redondo reservation. After finally being subdued by the Americans, the Navajo people were forced into a pseudo-sedentary lifestyle on a reservation now located in the present-day States of New Mexico and Arizona (N.M. State Historian, 2017; Sides, 2007).

The United States government, as mentioned in previous sections, were no better than the Spanish in protecting their new citizen's political and linguistic rights. They instead did everything in their power to eradicate the languages and traditions of these peoples, so that they may assimilate into white, Christian America. They were forced to adopt a different way of life, having no choice but to take their culture, religion, and language underground, so that they may be brought into the greater American society, while their children were shipped off hundreds or even thousands of miles to government-sanctioned Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding schools. There, they lived in horrendous conditions, were physically and sexually abused, and punished for the use of their native language (Gover, 2000). Even given the use of the Navajo Code Talkers in the Second World War, whose native language proved indispensable to the war effort in the Pacific, the state of the language was no better off, and their participation even

hindered its preservation, as it was illegal to produce materials in the language, for national security reasons, until it was declassified in 1968 (Nez & Schiess-Avila, 2012).

4.1 – Acoma (Western Keres)

The Pueblo of Acoma is the westernmost of the 19 New Mexican Pueblos, and the last language in the Keres dialect continuum; It is most easily understood by speakers of Laguna, the next group in the chain, and the least understood in Cochiti Pueblo, where the language becomes Eastern Keres. Besides Western and Eastern Keres, there are 5 other Puebloan languages (Sando, 1992). A language isolate, outside of New Mexico there are no languages that are related to Keres, making it extremely unique and indispensible to linguistic study (Sims, 2001).

The main village, Old Haak'uma or 'Sky City,' still has no modern conveniences, and it is here that the traditional religious and government system is based, which has for the most part remained unchanged since the Spanish occupation. Of the 3000-5000 members of the Acoma tribe, however, relatively few still live in this traditional setting; Many live in the surrounding villages of Acomita and McCartys, or the larger city of Grants. Of those who do still live in the old village, most are elderly speakers of the language. This implies that it is fast passing out of use, and there have been no native speakers of the language born since 1997. First replaced by Spanish, and now by English, this language shift is causing a rapid deterioration of not only the Acoma language, but also the Acoma culture (Sims, 2001).

There have in the past been some attempts at revitalizing the language; However, none have been met with great success. These include some bilingual programs during the 1970's and 80's that were funded by the US government, intended to raise the number of English speakers, as well as create a writing system for the language. However, these programs were not

particularly successful, and until the late 1990's these efforts were for the most part halted (Sims, 2001).

Beginning in 1997, two-week summertime immersion camps were implemented for children and teenagers, grades K-12, and were such a great success that they were extended to six weeks in 1998. They included daily instruction and games using Keres, with a culminating storytelling event, that presented an opportunity to invite the entire community to attend and view the strides made in revitalization efforts. These culminating events were aimed at not only increasing the confidence of the students speaking the language, but also increasing interest in the greater community, especially the adult population, hoping to inspire them to relearn their language, making it an integral part of their daily lives (Sims, 2001).

The main purpose of these programs were for learners to at the very least develop a basic understanding of the Keres language, and maintain enough interest in the language to continue learning throughout the year. While in Part Five I will analyze factors apparent in these programs that have led to some success in revitalizing the language, I will briefly touch upon some recommendations made by the students who attended them.

The first is that the students feel that the best way for people to learn the language will be at home, where their fluent parents can raise them from childbirth in the language. In the short term, however, because that is not possible without first building a foundation of at least semi-fluent speakers, the other two options are to continue hosting community-organized programs to help teach the language, ran by elderly and middle-aged fluent speakers, and to implement successful bilingual education in the public school system (Sims, 2001).

4.2 – Navajo (Diné Bizaad)

As mentioned previously, of all of the Native American tribes of North America, the Navajo Nation possibly has the best opportunity to revitalize their language on the large scale, due to three factors: A large land area, which makes incursion by outside influences more difficult; An autonomous and independent tribal government that has access to both local and Federal funds, with the power and influence to implement a language revitalization program on a national scale; And a large population of over 250,000 Navajo people, the vast majority of whom still live on or near the reservation (Navajo Nation, 2011).

One has only to look at the bilingual education system found at the Rock Point Community School in Rock Point, Arizona, to see an endangered language successfully used in a formal educational setting. For almost 50 years, Rock Point has run a Navajo/English bilingual program, where Navajo is used 67% of the day in kindergarten, 50% of the day in grades 1-3, and 20-25% of the day in grades 4-12. Using the language to teach other academic subjects, and not teaching it as a subject by itself, has been a primary cause for the successful implementation of this program. If every school in the Navajo Nation were to adopt this system, ideally expanding the amount of time Navajo is used throughout grades K-12, the effects would be extraordinary (Reyhner, 1990). However, due to the tremendous influence exercised by the government and the church in Navajo language instruction, especially in the area of literacy, many are still apprehensive about implementing such a drastic program. McLaughlin (1992) suggests using organically-developed Navajo language texts in order to further legitimize these programs, and also encouraging the use of writing in the Navajo language outside of the classroom, for everything from creative writing to something as mundane as making a to-do list.

Beyond primary education, Navajo is also one of the most advanced groups for use in institutions of higher education. Dine College was established in 1968, and sparked a tribal college movement across America; Now, over 30 groups have their own Native American-run colleges. Beyond that, Navajo is offered as an elective institution at nearby colleges such as Northern Arizona University and the University of New Mexico, both of which boast a significant demographic of Navajo students (Reyhner, 1999).

To mentally prepare myself for this thesis, and to legitimize in my own mind the reasons why I would like to write about endangered language preservation, in the fall of 2016 I took the introductory Navajo language course at UNM. It is easy for me to see now just how grammatically complex the language is, and over the course of the semester learned some basic Navajo vocabulary and phrases, including how to introduce myself the traditional Navajo way. In this course, I not only attempted to learn the language, but also sat through lectures and listened to the instructor passionately relate to us her experiences growing up. She talked about the traditional Navajo way of life, and the rich culture and history of this proud people. I finally realized just how unique and beautiful a thing the world would lose if this culture and language were to return to the Earth forever, as the Navajo people were finally and fully assimilated into American culture, where all that remains are distant memories in the minds of the elderly.

4.3 – Thank you for listening to me: Perspectives from Speakers of Endangered Languages

Over the course of preparing for this thesis, I have had the pleasure of interviewing three Native American women, all fluent speakers of their languages. In my correspondence with them, learning of all the work that they have put into preserving, teaching, and revitalizing their languages, and of the hope that they have for their people, one overarching theme is that they just want to make a difference, for their voices to be heard. They all seem to share the same ideology,

that their languages are unique and sacred to them and to their group, that these are the gifts entrusted to them by their gods and their ancestors, and the legacy which they shall pass on to their children and grandchildren, for countless generations to come. To conclude this section, I will review some of the personal experiences of these women in their struggle to preserve their language, as well as their suggestions on how to move forward with endangered language preservation, before tackling this topic in-depth in the next section.

Before getting into the interview content itself, there are 6 main topics that I focused on when developing questions. They are:

- What first sparked their interest in preserving their language;
- What methods have they found most effective;
- What are their biggest challenges in language revitalization;
- What advice might they have for groups who have not yet started the language revitalization process;
- What experiences, if any, have they had with discrimination for using their language;
- And finally, what do they see as the future for their community and their language.

Throughout the correspondence, some of the interviewees had more to say, some had less; Some stuck pretty closely to the main idea of the topic, while others ran on particular tangents. Nevertheless, every answer and every response proved useful and informative; Moving forward, we will generally cover each topic as presented in the order above.

We will begin with the speaker of Western Keres, who comes from Acoma Pueblo. The Acoma woman, an instructor at the University of New Mexico, has spoken the language since childhood, but her first formal experience with language revitalization came in the 1990's, when she began teaching Keres at the local high school. It was during this time frame, just prior to the 21st century, that a major linguistic shift can be seen, as the Acoma community was further

assimilated into mainstream American society. Starting around this time, the majority of children grew up speaking English rather than Keres. It was during this period that our subject went from simply teaching Keres, to further studying language maintenance and revitalization.

Given her twenty-odd years of experience in teaching and revitalizing the Keres language in Acoma Pueblo, she reaffirmed the general trend that I had gathered from my personal research, the idea that there is no one-size-fits-all solution for language revitalization, what she terms a "silver bullet." Because every group is unique, being affected by different worldviews, cultural constraints, and outside influences, each method must be tailored to each community, under their direction. Generally speaking, however, the first step that must be taken is that the problem must be identified and made known to the greater community, in order to mobilize the general populace to this cause. Then, community-led efforts must be attempted, rather than the more conventional methods of either school-based instruction or simply documenting the language. While at some point in the revitalization process, these other steps must be taken in order to ensure the longevity of the language, attempting them too early will fail to create actual speakers of the language. But in order to actually get these community-based revitalization programs up and running, you must first overcome both internal and external factors; These factors were covered in some detail in a previous section.

The final take-away from this encounter was the idea that, in terms of the preservation of an indigenous culture, the simultaneous revitalization of the language should not be a changing priority from year-to-year, and from administration-to-administration. Now more than ever, there exists a small window of opportunity to lay a strong foundational base for the next generation, so that they may someday bring the Keres language back into everyday use, in every domain possible.

We now move onto the Navajo speakers, both instructors at the University of New Mexico, the second being my Navajo teacher.

Beginning with the first woman, who is a lifelong speaker of Navajo, she has said that there was a period of time before she became interested in preserving the language. It took the realization that her language is an integral part of her identity, and is what makes her a part of the Navajo Nation, for her to begin working to revitalize it. Since embracing this, however, she feels more positive and open to everything – to other human beings, other perspectives, and life in general. This is the first integral change that must be made, before any other methods are attempted, in order to begin the revitalization process for her language, and others. Each and every language is irreplaceable, and she believes that the knowledge, power, and creativity that is available in every one makes them priceless. Therefore, the first step that must be taken is encouraging people in their language-learning journey, and convincing them as to the value that their language carries. This can be done through ensuring that every single member of the community is learning and using the language to some extent, from the youngest to the oldest. Everyone has a part to play, in providing new viewpoints and perspectives, different skill and knowledge sets, etc. Everyone must work together to create a shared belief that the language is priceless – an asset that makes them who they are as a community and as a people.

For every step forward, however, there are mountains to be overcome. For the Native peoples of North America, these are a combination of poverty and negative attitudes towards traditional languages & cultures, caused by hundreds of years of oppression. Education, while it may be the one thing that will make or break language revitalization, is in her opinion the biggest obstacles that must be overcome. This includes both informal and formal education, in educating

people about the benefits of maintaining their traditional language, and in trailblazing new methods for teaching the language both at home and in school.

By creating an ideology that the language is priceless, you are fostering pride in the language. Because she is a proud member of the Navajo community, she prefers to use Navajo in all aspects of her life. While she cannot recall an instance of discrimination against her personally for speaking Navajo, she did recount a story where she was in the register in Wal-Mart, speaking Navajo with a friend. When the friend suggested they use English because the cashier was giving them unfriendly looks, she turned to and blatantly told the cashier that it was her job to take their money and sell them the laundry soap. This, while perhaps somewhat blunt, is the mindset that must be adopted by every speaker of an endangered language: To proudly and stubbornly use their language no matter the circumstance.

In closing, the Navajo speaker told me of her concerns that Navajo is more endangered than is commonly believed, and that in a matter of thirty to fifty years, it will finally hold the endangered status that it should now have. This is due to a mindset change in the Navajo community and government to accommodate those Navajos who cannot speak the language, or redefining what a speaker is, the current standard 'speaker' being anyone who can introduce themselves the traditional Navajo way, and who can understand a little spoken Navajo. Using this logic, the fact that I can introduce myself would make me a Navajo speaker, even though I do not have any sort of conversational proficiency in the language whatsoever.

Even given the relative successes of past projects such as the Rock Point School, there now exists little to no governmental or community support for large-scale revitalization efforts. There are no major community-run programs, language immersion schools such as those run by the Hawaiians and Maori, and no funds from the Navajo Nation government. The government

and people, due to the overwhelming belief that the language is no longer valuable and applicable to the modern age, are now unwilling to take the steps to preserve it, as they believe it does not provide any opportunity for upward mobility.

To conclude this section, I will relate the conversation that I had with my Navajo language instructor. We talked at-length and in greater detail than the previous two subjects, which I believe provides a well-rounded conclusion to this section.

A member of the Chiricahua Apache clan, and originally from Tuba City, Arizona, in the heart of the Navajo Reservation, my teacher spoke only Navajo until she was seven years old. She learned to live the Navajo way from her grandmother, their belief system and cultural legacy, and it is this early instruction in her language and customs that made her interested in passing it on to the next generation. In the stories relayed to her by her grandmother, she was taught that Navajo was a sacred language, and the catalyst that created the whole world. Her grandmother told her that she must never forget her language, because when the whole world speaks one language, that means that the end is nigh, and humans will pass out of existence. This is a sentiment that has stayed with her to this day, even in the face of adversity and forced indoctrination in American culture, at a boarding school located on the other side of the country. Her grandmother passed away after she left for school, but she never gave up on her charge, and used the language in secret throughout her school years. It was through this continued practice that she was able to come back and re-immerse herself in Navajo society, even being crowned Miss Navajo Nation in the 1980's.

Like many others before her, she believes that a cultural revolution is needed within indigenous communities, in order to revitalize their languages and bring them back into prominence. This must start in the home, with reinforcement from the community, government,

and school system; There must be a role-reversal in which language is dominantly used, with Navajo given the number one position, and English taught later on as a second language in school. Every community member must be involved in the process, with Navajo being the language of the workplace and everyday life.

To do this, the flawed ideology that Navajo is not useful must be overcome, and it must be conveyed that being able to speak both Navajo and English is not a bad thing, because many people all over the world speak multiple languages. This idea is remarkably reminiscent of the ideas presented in *Vanishing Voices*, where it is argued that multilingualism is the natural state of man, and provides numerous benefits socially and cognitively (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). To bring Navajo back into daily use and change this ideology, my instructor believes that it would prove fruitful to incentivize learning the language, with benefits being provided to those who have a command of the language. For example, tribal members should be able to display a marked proficiency in the language in order to receive their monthly General Assistance funds; Furthermore, they must demonstrate that their children are also being taught the language. When she retires, she would like to return to her hometown and start up a school where she can educate children in traditional Navajo culture and language.

When asked how other people, especially outsiders, react when she uses Navajo, she does feel that she had been discriminated against for using the language. For example, when she was a small child, she would act as a interpreter for her father, because his English was not very good. During such interactions, she would receive comments such as “This is what happens when you don’t know English.” However, she believes she has more commonly been met with ignorance, rather than discrimination, when using Navajo. While attending boarding school in Massachusetts, instead of being met with hostility by non-Native Americans, she would instead

encounter people who were curious as to what language she was speaking, and some who were not even aware that American Indians existed.

We next discussed her criticisms of previous efforts at revitalizing Navajo, which she believes can be traced back to the 1970's, after the Navajo Code Talkers were declassified. Now they could finally talk about their language, a process which should have started much sooner, making use of the large number of fluent speakers at the time, and less use of missionaries and government programs. She does not believe that revitalizing the language is the government's place, but that it ought to provide funds and services upon request. Primary responsibility for revitalizing the language should instead come from the local Navajo government and people, with little to no oversight from the U.S. government. Furthermore, as mentioned before, she believes that Navajo should be the only language of education on the reservation, particularly in early education, but also through high school, and even to the university level. To aid in this process of adopting an all-Navajo educational policy, Navajo language literacy should be fostered on an unprecedented scale, to truly make it a modern language.

Because of this desire to make Navajo a modern language, it must be allowed to change, evolve, and adapt to modern contexts. There is no use in criticizing young speakers for not using the language perfectly, in the traditional way; So long as they are speaking it, that is all that matters. They must be encouraged to use the language, and opportunities should be provided to help them, through both traditional activities and the use of modern media. Out of necessity, these opportunities must also be open to the adult population.

Speaking from experience, she knows what it's like to be a parent who speaks their native tongue, but have children who don't. Due to a number of factors, especially the English-dominated environment where she was forced to live for education and work, her children were

not totally immersed in the language and culture. She did what she could, however, and when they did return to the Navajo Reservation, her children were still ahead of the learning curve for peers their age in terms of knowledge of Navajo, and now have taken further steps to reclaim their culture and language.

In terms of sovereignty in the United States, the Navajo Nation at the moment is leading the pack, and has every requirement that could define them as their own nation, given the opportunity: A government, land, population, religion, etc. The large area commanded by the Navajo Nation lends itself to the preservation of the language, and sets the stage for what truly could be a successful language revitalization program, if they do not allow the outside world to influence them, killing what makes them who they are as a people. "It's up to us," she told me, and that is truly the mindset that must be adopted if our endeavors are to be successful.

§§§

5. Framework for Language Revitalization

> "Language is the only thing worth knowing even poorly."
>
> Lomb Kató, *Polyglot: How I Learn Languages*

The final portion of this paper, the part intended to be the most useful, focuses on providing a suggested framework for language revitalization, using information that has been collected and synthesized from many linguists, educators, and endangered language advocates. It is divided into three major sections, listed below:

- Fishman's Eight Stages of Language Loss
- Characteristics Promoting Successful Language Revitalization
- The Use of Formal Schooling

Before getting into the content itself, we must first review an important disclaimer: This is only a suggested or proposed framework, based off of a limited number of resources, and is by no means all-encompassing. As mentioned previously, due to the nature of endangered languages and the distinctiveness of every single cultural group known to man, the amateur linguist or language revitalist must out of necessity be flexible, open to new ideas, and willing to tailor their work to the needs of the community with whom they are working. As the saying goes, 'there are a thousand ways to skin a cat,' and that is exactly the mindset we must adopt when moving forward with a new language project, or in working to revamp an old one.

5.1 – Fishman's Eight Stages of Language Loss

> "...from Sacred ground we will guide our paths into the future."
>
> Graymorning, "Running the Gauntlet of an Indigenous Language Program"

In his book *Reversing Language Shift*, sociolinguist Joshua Fishman, known for his work with endangered languages, identified eight key stages in the loss of a language, based primarily off of the system used to revive Hebrew (Hinton, 2001):

- Stage One: The ideal and most secure stage, this involves at least some language use in official domains, that is, in national government and institutions of higher education.
- Stage Two: While the language is not in use at the national level, it is still being used in the local government and in the media.
- Stage Three: The language is commonly used in the workplace, amongst employees and with customers.
- Stage Four: The language is a required course at the elementary school level, and still widely used in the community.
- Stage Five: While the language is still common in everyday life, it is not in use in any sort of formal setting whatsoever.

- Stage Six: There is some intergenerational use of the language, but fewer children speak it as their first language every year, because every year there are fewer young parents who are able to speak the language themselves.
- Stage Seven: The language is only in use by adults past middle-age, with no intergenerational transmission; It is expected to go extinct within a matter of decades.
- Stage Eight: The final stage has the language on its last legs, with only the elderly speaking the language; Once they are gone, it will pass from this world forever.

Joshua A. Fishman, *Reversing Language Shift*

A language could move through each of these stages over the course of several centuries before becoming extinct, or it could only take a matter of one generation for a language to move from Stage One to Stage Eight, depending on a number of social and environmental factors that affect the rate of language loss. This well-known model, besides being an informative resource, also provides a good basic framework for how to move in the opposite direction to regain a language. By determining at which stage the language currently rests, the model can be used to establish realistic short-term goals. For example, a group with a Stage Seven language may within the next two years take retired, fluent speakers of the language, and employ them as caretakers at an immersion pre-school. It can also be used to make long-term goals, for example moving that same language from Stage Seven to Stage Five within the next twenty to thirty years (Reyhner, 1999). If you know where you are at now, you can more efficiently determine where you are going in the future.

In this section, we will review the threat present at each stage, and various countermeasures that may be taken to combat them; We will review them in Fishman's original order, starting with Stage Eight and working our way up to Stage One:

a. Stage Eight

This is by far the most dire stage, and it is here that, unless drastic countermeasures are taken on a community-wide scale, the language will be lost entirely. The most important step to take at this point is documenting as much of the language as possible, making use of all methods available, in order to preserve the language for future use. While there is no way that you can preserve the language in its entirety, by documenting it, creating dictionaries, a grammar, and a corpus of both oral and written samples that make use of stories, conversations, etc, you can take the first steps to perhaps someday bring the language back from extinction. Where there are no living speakers, if the language was adequately documented, then using modern linguistic methods the language may be reconstructed and taught to the population as an L2 language. It will never be what it once was, but as in the case of Hebrew and several other languages, it may be brought back into use sometime in the future (Hinton, 2001).

b. Stage Seven

It is at this stage that at least some hope remains for the language, however small that may be, due to the fact that there is still a fluent population of adult and elderly speakers. However, because children are not learning the language at home, and with every passing year more and more of these fluent speakers are passing away, all haste must be made to revitalize it. Less care should be given to preservation at this point, and efforts can begin in earnest at actual revitalization. When in doubt, it is always better to revitalize rather than preserve a language, because a preserved language that falls out of use will become more akin to a museum exhibit, interesting to ponder and learn about, but with no room for growth, expansion, or revolution, all necessary parts of living languages (Hinton, 2001).

Even given the fact that at this stage it is imperative to take measures in fostering intergenerational transmission of the language, these do not necessarily have to be drastic in nature. In the past, a big problem that has been encountered by Stage Seven language communities is that they have attempted to start too big, by moving to Stage Four or Five, rather than starting small and taking the baby-steps necessary to build a good linguistic foundation in the community. Rome was not built in a day, nor rebuilt in a day after the barbarians sacked it, and a language is very much the same way. It took thousands of years for these languages to develop, and many times took decades if not centuries for it to fall out of use; To bring it back into prominence could take a comparable amount of time. The basic goal here must be intergenerational transmission; It does not have to be correct, traditional, or even particularly pretty, so long as the language is being used and passed on to the younger generations (Anonby, 1999).

During Stages Seven, and even Stage Eight, a good way to lay the foundation for this intergenerational transmission is the establishment of 'language nests,' similar to the ones used by the Hawaiians and Maori. These are pre-school/daycare institutions, run primarily by elderly speakers of the language, who care for the young children while their parents are at work (Hinton, 2011; Hinton, 2001). It takes surprisingly little exposure to a language for a child to begin to understand it, and 8 month old infants begin to detect word boundaries and begin picking apart the language within just a two minute period (Saffran et al, 2001). It is easy to imagine the progress that could be made if children were exposed to a language from the time they were an infant, throughout their adolescent years, and onwards to adulthood.

More than likely, a language at Stage Seven does not have the resources nor time available to expose all children to the language through adolescence. However, the

establishment of language nests is still the ideal starting place for the group, because at such a young age, the infant's neuroplasticity is at its most optimal for language acquisition. This is the so-called 'critical period,' a topic of much controversy in linguistics, that supposedly ends when the child reaches puberty (Abello-Contesse, 2008; Vanhove, 2013).

Equally as important as ensuring that children are learning is ensuring that the adult population are also receiving language instruction (Fishman, 1991). Due to the fact that they are starting so late in life, few may reach actual fluency in the language, and will speak it imperfectly; However, much in the same way that pidgins evolve into creoles, where an adult population speaks a broken form of a language, so long as they are using it at home, their children will come together and make the language whole again, and fully functioning (Holm, 2000).

While formal instruction of adult learners can be useful and successful to some extent, i.e. evening classes or seasonal workshops, in order to foster love for the language within the adult population, a much more powerful and useful model is the Master-Apprentice method used by some California tribes. This entails an elderly fluent speaker of the language being paired with a young adult who is learning it, typically a woman of childbearing age (Anonby, 1999; Hinton, 2011). They are expected to spend virtually every available moment together, doing seemingly mundane tasks: Cooking, cleaning, grocery shopping, strolling through the park, etc. What makes this method work is that they are supposed to only use the endangered language, rather than English, when communicating with one another. The Master-Apprentice Method allows the learner to organically acquire the language, almost baby-style, using real-life human interactions; In some cases, it has been proven to be extremely successful, its only drawback being that it requires an enormous amount of time and dedication (Hinton, 2011).

By using a system such as the Master-Apprentice method, in conjunction with 'language nests,' a community may create a truly solid base from which intergenerational transmission may begin to occur, providing children the opportunity to learn the language at home and in the community, and preparing them for the day when they may be able to speak it in a formal setting, such as at school.

c. Stage Six

What hope there is at Stage Seven is magnified during Stage Six, because at least some children are still learning the language. At this stage, due to a number of social, economic, and political influences, a relatively small number of children grow up speaking the language; The fact that there is still some intergenerational transmission, however, sets the stage for further revitalization efforts (Fishman, 1991). Here, as at Stage Seven, both language nests for children and Master-Apprentice partnerships for adults would prove particularly useful. A group may also institute more conventional, less intense environments for learning; An example can be seen in the weeklong Kwak'wala language retreats described in Anonby (1999), for adults, teenagers, and older children who have perhaps passed the 'critical period' to acquire Kwak'wala naturally as a first language. As time goes on, and more interest is raised in the community, these retreats can be scheduled more frequently and for longer periods of time, until there exists a whole community of people using their language. Each speaker's level may vary, but the fact that they are using the language is all that really matters at this point. It is imperative that the community first and foremost devote as much energy as possible to ensuring that the language is being used within the smallest social units, starting with the family and moving outward until the entire community is involved (Hinton, 2001).

At this stage, if a community were to act quickly, then it is conceivable that they could move into the much more secure Stage Five within a matter of decades, if not sooner, depending on the commitment and passion displayed by the people in relearning their sleeping language.

d. Stage Five

Moving an endangered language to Stage Five is the minimum prerequisite to ensure the long-term survivability of the language, because prior to this, the support or even approval of the dominant society is not needed, as the language is still primarily used only in the home and in informal social functions. However, short of cutting themselves off from the world entirely, as some Aboriginal tribes in Australia have done, thus preserving their language by having minimal contact with the outside world, the factors that drive language shift will still be present (Fishman, 1991).

All care must be given to ensure that the language is not only being maintained at Stage Five, but moving forward to Stage Four as soon as possible, at which case it will become more of a legal issue (Reyhner, 1999). In any case, ostracizing a group from the outside world and the more powerful languages is not the goal, nor should it be; In this case, the means do not justify the end, because by cultivating who we are as individual people and as sovereign groups, we are defining our place in the greater human society, and contributing to the greater human cultural legacy by reacquiring that which was lost (Fishman, 1991).

At Stage Five, there are several steps that can be taken by a community to successfully pave the way for progression to the next stage. To do this, we must shorten the gap between the dominant and endangered language, so that they are beginning to share at least some societal functions (Fishman, 1991). The best place to start is within the school system, as that is the basis for the next stage.

In a community where a significant portion of the population is comprised of members of an ethnic minority, it is feasible to start applying for help through the school system, who likely has the ability or the contacts necessary to fund extracurricular programs for children and their families. These extracurricular programs would be outside of normal school hours, perhaps only a couple of times a week, and would bring in speakers of the language to teach it to children (and their parents) who are interested. If the community is unable to receive funds via the school system, they may be able to appeal to the local government or a non-profit organization to receive funding in the form of grants. This method could also be used to provide incentives for participating in the aforementioned Master-Apprentice partnerships (Rubin, 1999).

Instruction of the language at this stage does not have to be formal, and could make use of games or storytelling, using simple vocabulary and grammatical structures, as well as visual aids such as pictures, video clips, toys, and costumes. Beyond that, the language instructors could develop simple 'homework' assignments to be completed by the students and their parents, to further foster the use of the language at home. They may also create supporting documents and instructional materials that could be reused and refined year after year (Hinton, 2001). Beyond programs for children, opportunities for the adult population must also be created, where they can refine their language skills through clubs or other regular social events, where the dominant language is used minimally. They may also begin to use their language amongst themselves in the greater community, such as in the workplace. Where an official lexicon committee does not exist to coin new words, the people themselves may come up with them as necessity arises, or simply borrow words from the dominant language (Anonby, 1999).

At this stage, the goal of the community should be to make significant progress in creating fluent (if not literate) speakers of the language over the course of several generations

(Graymorning, 1999; Hinton, 2011). By the time a speaker community reaches Stage Five, and before they move forward to Stage Four, they must take several things into consideration. These include:

- Who will provide future formal instruction in the language, and how will the community go about training them?
- If a written form of the language exists, where will it be used outside of school; If it does not already exist, how will the community go about creating a writing system?
- How will the community get the families involved on a grander scale?
- Finally, what will be the minimal required ability to be considered a fluent speaker of the language?

The last question is particularly important, and should be given the utmost care, as Rubin (1999) defines five different levels of fluency: The first is *passive* fluency, where the listener only has a basic and superficial understanding of the language; The second is *symbolic* fluency, where the speaker can use several common phrases, more for the sake of cultural identity than actual communication, as is the case with Navajo today; The third is *functional* fluency, where the speaker can just 'get by' in the language; The fourth is the actual *fluent* stage, where the speaker can use the language easily and confidently, with few if any breakdowns in communication; And the fifth, *creative* fluency, where the speaker has command of the language in all of its complexity.

e. Stage Four

At Stage Four, the language has achieved at least a modicum of legal status and protection, and has become a required course in school, indicating that the community's previous efforts at Stage Five have proven effective. A Stage Four language that is now being taught in school should have at least an hour of the day devoted to it, with the end-goal, if possible, being

elevating its status to a level equal to the dominant language (Reyhner, 1999), each being used for half of the day. In an ideal situation, the language would be used entirely throughout the day, as some immersion schools throughout the Americas and Europe have done (Fishman, 1991; Hinton, 2011); This lends itself the most to long-term revitalization efforts. To meet the need for the community to still be able to communicate with the outside world, the dominant language would then be taught as an academic subject, relegated to the status of a foreign or second language (Hinton, 2011); Unless the majority of the population is from the minority group, however, this is unlikely to happen. In any case, an hour of study a day is both a realistic and achievable goal to set, and could do wonders in promoting use of the language outside of the school.

Assuming that the early childhood immersion has proven successful, which it should have to truly be considered a Stage Four language, the children will arrive at the classroom with basic conversational fluency in the language. This should be the bedrock upon which their formal studies will be built upon, using Reyhner's Three "M's" of Indigenous Language Education (1999): The Methods that will be used for each level, in order to get the greatest output in terms of language mastery, will vary widely from group to group and from school to school; The Materials that will need to be developed so that the methods can be appropriately applied (which we will explore in more depth in the next section); And finally how to increase Motivation among the students to achieve further mastery of the language with every passing year. These Three "M's" must be carefully applied to ensure that the learning environment is both fun and spontaneous, exposing the students to minimal stress, where they can learn about both their traditional culture and its place in the modern world in a relaxed and nurturing way (Hinton, 2011).

Before the classes can be constructed and put to use, the community must make the decision to train teachers who are already fluent in the language, as well as semi-fluent assistants seeking to improve their own language capabilities (Yellow Bird, 1999). Furthermore, the community must make the decision to either bring in linguists to help document and analyze the language, or to have young, willing, and fluent adult speakers train as community linguists. This will prove useful in the long run, as it can provide a good linguistic analysis of the language, providing language information that can be used by teachers and linguists to produce sound pedagogical materials (Rubin, 1999). An example of the potential created when using a community linguist can be seen in the work of Jesse Baird and her work in revitalizing the previously extinct Wampanoag language (Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project, 2014).

In conjunction with intensive short-term programs and the immersion environments mentioned previously, a non-intensive school based program, while not ideal, can still be effective in the long-term, as it both teaches the language and brings it into everyday use, for at least an hour a day. For smaller minority groups, who typically are not as powerful nor as well funded, this may be their only option (Hinton, 2011; Hinton, 2001). It cannot be stressed enough, however, that only teaching the language in school is not sufficient to promote language revival, as it does not create fluent speakers, and should only be attempted after a sturdy linguistic foundation has been established in the community (Penfield & Tucker, 2011; Rubin, 1999). If the suggestions made above are taken into careful consideration, and altered as is fitting by each individual group, the community can move its language forward into Stage Three within one to two generations, where it will see its societal domain expanded.

f. Stage Three

At Stage Three, the language has worked its way towards becoming the dominant language of the workplace, a concept that was first set in motion during Stage Five. It should be used at least 90% of the time, starting at the highest level, that is, the boss or owner of the company, and going all the way down to the lowest level employees. It should also be the primary language of use between the employees and the customers, assuming that the demographic of the community in which the business is based is primarily drawn from the minority group.

For a language at this stage, two factors must be brought into consideration, the first being simplifying the process required to open up businesses on indigenous land, so that they may be run by the community, for the community; The second is the coining of new vocabulary that the adult population, presumably already fluent, may learn and put to use. If a Lexicon Committee has not been previously established, whose job it is to coin new words based off of the formal rules of the language, then it is at this point that one should be set up by the leaders of the community (Reyhner, 1999; Rubin, 1999). My suggestion here is that this Committee should consist of: At least one fluent speaker, perhaps an elder; One educator who can pass the information on to other teachers; And one community linguist, knowledgeable regarding the phonological and morphological rules related to word formation in the language.

g. Stage Two

When a language has reached Stage Two, it is at the point where it is used to some extent in the local government and the mainstream media, for example, the current status of Hawaiian. In the vast majority of cases, it is not conceivable for a minority language to move past this stage into Stage One, as that would involve expansion to the national level. Due to the lesser amount

of power wielded by these groups, as well as the smaller population size, especially in such a culturally diverse nation as the United States, to reach even Stage Two is a commendable and maintainable level, and the language would now have reached the point where it is no longer in any sort of danger of becoming extinct.

There is something that groups with Stage Two languages can do, however, and that is to pass on the knowledge and lessons they have learned to less experienced indigenous groups, helping them in their own struggle to preserve their language (Reyhner, 1999). Nowadays, endangered language communities are hurt by not knowing what to do and where to start in terms of revitalization, because of the lack of adequate materials on the subject (Miyashita & Moll, 1999). This can be done at all levels of this process, in order to create a better, more linguistically diverse world, and can be initiated with something as simple as a regional conference where multiple groups are invited to attend (Rubin, 1999).

The language has reached a point where it is now safely un-endangered, but unless a group such as the Navajo, Sioux, or other relatively large indigenous groups were to assert their sovereignty by declaring their independence from the greater nation, or experience a tremendous population boom, it would be extremely difficult for them to achieve Stage One status.

h. Stage One

The final, ideal stage of language revival involves the language being used to some extent in both the national government and institutions of higher education; There is also the possibility that the language will occasionally be used in international relations, as an assertion of sovereignty or to prove a point of cultural significance. This stage is exemplified by such cases as Maori in New Zealand, Guarani in Paraguay, & Quechua/Kichwa in the Andean countries of Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. At this point, it is conceivable that a linguistic group could declare

its sovereignty and be successful, moreso than at any previous stage, because now more than ever they have the power as well as the attributes of a country to assert said sovereignty (Littlebear, 1999). This is the most secure stage, and guarantees to the language its best chance for long-term survival.

Having reviewed Fishman's framework, we can see how difficult a journey language revitalization can be. On the other hand, we can get a feel for how fruitful an endeavor this is, and the increase in national pride and cultural revival that it would also undoubtedly cause. To make this task a little easier, in the next section we will review some further characteristics that have made past revitalization projects successful.

5.2 – Characteristics Promoting Successful Language Revitalization

> "No language is studied merely as an aid to other purposes. It will in fact better serve other purposes, philological or historical, when it is studied for love, for itself."
>
> J. R. R. Tolkien, "English & Welsh"

Beyond the recommendations made above, there are a number of other characteristics that distinguish successful language revitalization efforts from unsuccessful ones. Drawing from a number of sources, I have classified them into three separate categories, listed below:

- Fosters Group Identity & Solidarity
- Provides an Immersive Learning Environment
- Properly Documents the Language & Encourages Dissemination of Resources

a. Foster Group Identity & Solidarity

As mentioned in previous sections, one of the most important accomplishments in language revitalization is fostering a sense of linguistic pride and cultural identity within the community. Where the language is spoken in multiple communities, which likely will have created diverging dialects, a further sense of solidarity amongst all groups must be fostered,

creating this idea that they are one people speaking variations of one language (England, 2003). In order to accomplish this, several things may be done.

On the more drastic end of the spectrum, entire communities may be established of what Anonby (1999) calls back-to-language advocates, where the speaker group withdraws almost entirely from the wider world, as in the case of some Australian Aboriginal tribes in the previous section. Due to the inability of most groups to enact such measures, however, they may instead choose to remove all speakers of the majority language from positions of potential influence, for example in education. In Mexico, some indigenous groups such as the Me'phaa have done exactly that, replacing Spanish-speaking teachers with ones who speak the minority language, providing a connection to their traditional culture in the classroom. Anonby (1999) relates the experience of a colleague who had worked with the Me'phaa, Mark Weathers: "In 1992, Weathers revisited Ilianteco and was amazed to find that although people could speak Spanish better than before, they had switched back to speaking Me'phaa." More conservative measures include teaching different words for the same concept as synonyms, taking care to include all possible forms (England, 2003; Hinton, 2001).

Next, the concept that the language is an indispensible part of the culture must be reinforced from above and below, from both the highest possible level, such as the local government and school system, as well as at the lowest level, in the home. By creating this ideology within the community, that it is *their* language, that without it they will lose what makes them who they are as a people, the language revitalist can get the entire community involved in the process, from making that crucial decision to revitalize the language, to implementing its use at all levels of society (Fishman, 1991; Parks, 1999; Reyhner, 1999; Rubin,

1999). This can be seen in the successful efforts of Hawaiian, on a local, State-wide level, as well as Maori, on a national level (Long Soldier, 2009).

This is only one of several key characteristics that must be fostered within the community; Others include dedication to the cause, the creation of skilled and knowledgeable language activists, insistence that something be done every day to further learning of the language, & honesty with oneself and the community as whole as to the importance of preserving the language, the achievability of goals, and the effectiveness of the methods currently in use. If current methodologies are not working, the community needs to come together to create a new approach that will better suit their needs and resources (Hinton, 2001; Parks, 1999).

b. Provides an Immersive Learning Environment

Perhaps the greatest single method that has been used in the past has been an immersive language environment: While this does apply to the society as a whole, where every opportunity to use the language is taken advantage of or created, we will primarily focus here on lessons learned from past attempts at immersion schools or programs. Anderson (2014) refers to some past programs used by the Hawaiians and Cherokee that have proven extremely successful in not only producing fluent bilingual speakers of both English and the minority language, but also in educating students that also "have higher graduation rates, higher average salaries, and lower rates of incarceration."

In creating an effective immersion program, there are four important factors that ought to be considered, based off of Sims's (2001) analysis of teaching methods of Acoma Keres. These are a comfortable learning environment, interaction between children and adults, a patient and encouraging language instructor, and the prodigious and creative use of fluent speakers in the learning environment.

A big issue amongst minority groups who are attempting to revitalize their language today is perfectionism, the perceived need to maintain the 'purity' of the language in its traditional and historical context; While this is perhaps noble and would lend itself to preserving the cultural legacy of the people, it creates an oftentimes insurmountable amount of stress for potential language learners, and hinders or even halts the revitalization effort altogether. Instead, the program must foster the idea amongst instructors, students, and volunteers that language out of necessity must evolve. Especially in the early stages, it will be used incorrectly and with many faults, as the learners begin to grasp the language, and make their own changes; So long as it is still being spoken, however, this doesn't matter. It is a natural part of the process, and is required to get the language back on its feet (Bennett et al, 1999; Hinton, 2001). As noted by Richard Littlebear (1999): "Words change; Cultures change; Social situations change...one generation does not speak the same language as the preceding generation, [but] languages are living, not static. If they are static, then they are beginning to die."

The next characteristic is getting the adults as involved as possible in the language learning process, in order to encourage its use at home, and to increase desire for further learning. This can be done through various methods, including the establishment of adult after-school programs and language courses, such as those used by the Maori, already well-known for their language nests. Within six years of their implementation, 2000-3000 children had already attended these Language Nests, creating a large number of fluent bilinguals. When these now-bilingual students returned home speaking Maori, it inspired their non-speaking or semi-lingual parents to further their own knowledge of the language, leading to the establishment of intensive Maori programs for adults. Here, they were expected to use only Maori, possibly for the first

time in their lives (Spolsky, 1990). Another well-known instance of community-wide immersive language learning occurred with Hebrew in the Israeli *kibbutz* (Anonby, 1999).

The third factor is the careful selection of instructors, who are not only fluent in the language, and knowledgeable about effective teaching methods, but are also patient, kind, and encouraging of their students (Hinton, 1994; Sims, 2001). They should use the endangered language the vast majority of the time, in order to increase its level of prestige, rarely, if ever, using the dominant language (Anonby, 1999; Hinton, 2001; Reyhner, 1999). They must also maximize opportunities for learning, making use of gestures, objects, drawings, etc, to get across their point, and must not pressure their students to perform at a level they are not yet comfortable with (Bennett et al, 1999; Hinton, 2001). A more effective approach lies with providing the students with a basic repertoire of useful vocabulary and conversation starters, that will encourage interaction in the language (Hinton, 2001).

Finally, the program must, to the greatest extent possible, make creative and prodigious use of fluent speakers, not only teachers and aides, but also volunteers who can come into the classroom on a regular basis to interact with the students (Sims, 2001). Potential activities may include telling old stories, and exposing the children to traditional art forms, music, and food.

c. Properly Documents the Language & Encourages Dissemination of Resources

The final factor characterizing successful language revitalization is extensive documentation, as well as the production and dissemination of language resources throughout the society. There are three main factors that will assist in this: A language authority, literacy, and multimedia resources. These factors were primarily based off of lessons learned from Anonby's work with Kwak'wala (1999), Kushner's work with Arikara (1999), and Rubin's work with Sm'algyax (1999), amongst others.

As early as possible in the revitalization process, a language authority or lexicon committee should be established, whose primary purpose is to settle issues of internal dispute relating to the language, as well as create new words as needed (Bielenberg, 1999; England, 2003; Rubin, 1999). As mentioned previously, this authority ought to be composed of linguists, educators, and other fluent speakers. Community linguists can further be used to create linguistic materials such as a grammar and dictionary for the language, as well as assist in creating a language standard and educational material. They may also create a corpus of the language that includes lists of vocabulary, discourses, and stories, using both oral and written samples (England, 2003; Hinton, 2011; Hooper & Flavin, 1999; Parks, 1999).

The second factor, and arguably the most important of the three, is the need for literacy in the language. In an article prepared for the Canadian Child Care Federation, which focuses primarily on the struggles encountered by young children in Canada's First Nation peoples, Jessica Ball (2010) notes the importance of endangered language revitalization efforts, arguing that beyond being able to read and write in English and French, Canada's indigenous population should also be supported in gaining literacy in their heritage language. This early support for child speakers of a language is crucial for the long-term preservation of the language, as was noted previously in Crawford (1990).

After a language authority has been established, if a writing system has not yet been developed, it should with all haste be created. A writing system allows the language to be more properly and accurately documented, and is especially important for languages that are on the brink of extinction (Anonby, 1999; Bennett et al, 1999; Parks, 1999). Furthermore, having a corpus of written text can prove a great help to L2 speakers of the language, as it reinforces

speaking skills by providing tools that, if properly used, will greatly improve retention of new material (Bennett et al, 1999).

Although reading and writing should never be given more prominence than speaking and listening when learning a new language, especially an endangered one, the advantages of having a written form of the language greatly outweigh the disadvantages, and should be taught as soon as possible, given a strong verbal foundation is already in place. By using a written system, the individual learner is able to encounter and study new material in the language, review old content, analyze and mimic grammatical patterns, and further learn how to creatively use the language through the study of stories, the daily news, and other literature. Used in conjunction with regular speaking practice, reading and writing in the target language are highly effective educational aids (Anonby, 1999; Bennett et al, 1999).

Once a writing system has been established, documentation of the language and production of new material can be undertaken at an exponential rate. Because the vast majority of endangered languages lack any sort of literary tradition (Kushner, 1999), it is today indispensible for analyzing the functional structure of the language; With this idea in mind, an initial goal for the language revitalization project could be compiling a basic dictionary, with perhaps 2000-3000 common terms, a grammar for the language, and a set of basic texts which provide an initial corpus of language samples, and could include the people's traditional stories and folktales (Parks, 1999; Rubin, 1999).

When this initial goal has been accomplished, the community can begin working on producing various kinds of language materials that can be used in the classroom: A series of textbooks, grammatical reference tools, and workbooks. Recreational texts that can be used outside of school should also be developed (Ditmar, 1999).

In addition to the guided development of literature, opportunities for community involvement should also be created. These can include writing competitions, a monthly publication in the language, etc. Literary works can be translated from the dominant language, however if the language is expected to continue to grow and modernize, a strong, autonomous literary tradition must also be developed, which implies the need for a publishing house dedicated to texts in the language and open for use by the community (Bernard, 1997; Blum-Martinez, 2000; St. Clair et al, 1999). Some languages that have in the past effectively used literacy to come back from the brink of extinction, in some instances growing to become the majority language in their respective region, include Kaurna, Cherokee, Mohawk, Basque, Swahili, and of course, Hebrew (Anonby, 1999).

The third factor to help ensure the survivability of a language in the modern world is the effective use of the computer and multimedia sources, not only to document but propagate the use of the language. Given the stark contrast in the state of technology from even 10-20 years ago, and the relative ease with which oral and textual samples of the language can now be stored, coupled with the affordability of personal computers and smartphones, there is no reason a community cannot make use of these resources in language revitalization. Already, there are many groups that have made successful use of modern technology to promote language revitalization, such as Hebrew, Swahili, Irish Gaelic, Maori, and Quechua/Kichwa (Anonby, 1999).

Beyond simply codifying and documenting the language for future reference, the use of computer programs can be developed as user-friendly learning aids (Kushner, 1999; Rubin, 1999; Yellow Bird, 1999). Sound recordings and video samples of the language can be combined with written texts and learning exercises, creating a learning system that can be accessed from

anywhere in the world (Parks , 1999; Rubin, 1999). It may consist of more conventional methods, such as an online textbook with accompanying exercises and recorded dialogues, or be more informal and fun, such as a game or online chat group (Rubin, 1999). A community could also create a program similar to that used by the company Italki, where students with access to the internet can learn the language remotely via video chat with a teacher or language partner.

Familiarizing a language group with computers and the internet is critical, especially among elderly fluent speakers. For example, if they can properly and confidently use a computer, they could by their own volition record themselves speaking the language and upload it to an online database (Yellow Bird, 1999). In the 21st century, the use of technology, multimedia, and the internet all come together to be a useful resource in language revitalization.

To conclude this section, all of these efforts will be wasted if they are not properly implemented in the community. Oftentimes, fluent speakers are recorded both orally and in written form, but their words are never translated (Graymorning, 1999); For a language where there is no one left who can understand these recordings and pass its knowledge on to the next generation, the words will become devoid of meaning, and future learners will have no way to know what is being said. Dictionaries and grammars are put on a pedestal for their own sake, and not for their potential use, causing groups to content themselves with this effort alone, and not develop the language further (Anonby, 1999). If these efforts are not expanded upon, the language will become like a museum exhibit, preserved for all of time, but dead nonetheless.

5.3 – The Use of Formal Schooling

> "Teachers open the door. You enter by yourself."
>
> Chinese Proverb, qtd in Lewis (2017)

Although the best way for a child to learn a language is in the home, from their parents and grandparents, given the current state of endangered languages, coupled with the school-centric learning ideology common today, it is useful for each group to take the steps necessary for establishing formal education in the language. While formal schooling will by itself not create fluent speakers, if used correctly, it can still prove to be a great asset (Reyhner, 1999; Rubin, 1999). In this final section, we will review suggested objectives for each level of education, the guiding principles that ought to be followed in establishing a formal educational program, and a general methodology that can be applied to attain the desired results.

a. Objectives

It goes without saying that the desired goal for endangered language instruction should be the creation of speakers from non-speakers (Kushner, 1999); I would further expand on this by saying that the goal of language instruction should be the creation of speakers from non-speakers in a stress-free, encouraging environment, where the language is being acquired in a natural yet effective way. For a society that does not have a population of fluent speakers, and who are limited to instructional periods of one hour a day, a realistic objective could be to build a population of bilingual students who have basic conversational fluency and novice reading skills by the end of elementary school, with more advanced (if not fluent) conversational skills and a high-intermediate/low-advanced reading ability by the end of high school. If the skills learned by the students in this program are maintained over a lifetime, in conjunction with early childhood immersion for the next generation, this process will be further streamlined, and the reversal of the language shift model mentioned in previous sections will be well underway.

Bennett et al (1999), further breaks down the objectives into five groups: Preschool, Early Elementary School, Late Elementary School, Middle School, and High School:

- Preschool: During this time, ideally in a Language Nest institution, the main focus of language instruction should be to help the children perfect their pronunciation and their ability to comprehend basic sentences, in a stress-free, fun-oriented environment, where actual 'class time' is little to none.
- Early Elementary School (Grades K-2): In the early grades of elementary school, the children should further practice their spoken language skills, as well as be exposed to a wider range of vocabulary and sentence structures. The very basics of writing should be introduced at this time, but only enough to aid in instruction, with the majority of the focus being on improving speaking and listening skills.
- Late Elementary School (Grades 3-5): Later in elementary school, the students should progress from single sentences to more complex sentence structures in narrative or discourse format. More importance should be given to reading and writing, but still should not eclipse speaking and listening.
- Middle School (Grades 6-8): During middle school, the students should now have a good working understanding of both the spoken and written language, opening the door for more technical study. This includes the analysis of longer texts, more in-depth writing assignments, and practicing their listening and speaking skills by being exposed to spontaneous speech in the language, then having to relay the main points of the speech, perhaps overlooking the finer details.
- High School (Grades 9-12): High school ought to be more of a challenge for the student, as by the end of their formal education prior to university, they should have achieved a low-advanced grasp of the language in all its richness and technicalities. At this stage, to develop this ability, they should analyze complex texts that require in-depth exploration of its themes and topics, maintain a discussion with a native or fluent speaker at length in the language, with little to no breakdowns in communication, and be given the freedom to conduct individually-guided research using the language, exploring topics they find of interest.

To conclude, a final objective that ought to be taken into consideration is the successful instruction of the traditional culture and way of life, fostering love, respect, and pride for their heritage, and their legacy as speakers of a unique and beautiful language (Kushner, 1999).

b. Guiding Principles

When creating these school programs, there are some guiding principles that should be implemented, the first being the need to start young, in institutions such as immersion nests. Although the older generations may suffer as a result, primary focus should always be on the youngest speaker group available, to build a steady foundation for the future: Start with one age group, and if possible follow them upward throughout their education (Graymorning, 1999).

Next, every effort available must be directed towards revitalizing the culture also, teaching the children about the world that their newfound language developed in. As mentioned previously, to know where you're going, you must know where you have been, and knowledge about their traditional way of life is important for the community's future leaders (Blum-Martinez, 2000; Hinton, 2001).

Thirdly, selection of teachers for the language is critical. They must be fully fluent in the language, knowledgeable about its linguistic nuances and finer points of grammar, educated to as high a level as possible, up-to-date on modern teaching methods and pedagogical tools, flexible and creative when creating or using content, committed to the cause, empathetic, compassionate, and engaging. It is also critical that the teachers be well-supported, well-supplied, and well-funded (Graymorning, 1999; Hinton, 1994; Reyhner, 1999; Rubin, 1999). The endangered language instructor should also draw upon the five principles of effective language instruction advocated by Reyhner & Tennant (1995), when formulating and implementing lesson plans:

- Putting the emphasis on *communication*, not grammar;
- Using *context* that is real or at least realistic;
- Processing *content* of high interest to the learner;

- Adjusting the pace of instruction to the students's progress, including moving from simple to complex, emphasizing speaking over speaking correctly, and putting comprehension before completion;
- Correcting students through modeling.

When developing their personal teaching style, and in helping their students find their personal learning style, the teacher may also find it useful to refer to Hinton's Eight Point of Language Learning (Hinton, 1994):

For Teachers:

1. Be an active teacher.
2. Don't use English.
3. Use gestures, context, objects, actions.
4. Rephrase for successful communication.
5. Rephrase for added learning.
6. Be willing to play with the language.
7. Know that understanding precedes speaking.
8. Be patient.

For Students:

1. Be an active learner.
2. Don't use English.
3. Use gestures, context, objects, actions.
4. Practice.
5. Don't be afraid of mistakes.
6. Be willing to play with the language.
7. Know that understanding precedes speaking.
8. Be patient with yourself.

c. General Methodology

To conclude this section, we will now review some methodological as well as pedagogical considerations that should be taken into account when creating a course for the instruction of a second language.

To begin, there are two schools of thought when it comes to language instruction/language learning: Those who believe grammar should be explicitly taught from the beginning (Hatch, 1974), and those who believe that grammatical patterns will be learned organically through simple exposure to the language (Krashen, 1981; Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

Personally, I tend to subscribe to the latter school; There is a time and a place for instruction in the finer points of grammar, but I believe it is far more usefully employed when the student already has a good grasp of the language, because explicitly teaching grammar does not create communicative competence (Garrett, N, 1986). It is through substantial exposure to and use of the language in a stress-free and enjoyable environment that it will be more effectively mastered. That is not to say that there are not students who benefit from explicit grammatical instruction, as a significant body of research has shown (Paulston, 1992; Pienemann, 1984; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993); What I find fault with is the teaching of a language like it is some sort of academic subject, for example physics or calculus, rather than as a living entity that can open up to the student a whole new world of opportunity and discovery. As a student of languages for several years now, I can attest to the dislike for learning that this methodology can breed, rather than making it a pleasurable and exciting experience (Garrett, N., 1986).

In California, many indigenous language groups make use of variations of the Language Proficiency Method, summarized here from Bennett et al (1999). The basic principle behind this method is furthering the student's skill set from listening, to speaking, to reading, and finally to writing, to create well-rounded and well-versed speakers of the language. There are six levels of the Method:

1. Setting the Scene: At this level, the teacher introduces new words and concepts, allowing for the students to slowly but surely absorb and begin to comprehend the language. All the students are expected to do is listen, the so-called 'Silent Period,' which I will discuss further later in the section.
2. Comprehensible Input: The idea of introducing comprehensible input, that is, language samples that the student can understand in order to further their knowledge, and increasing the difficulty of the examples over time, is based off of the research conducted by linguist Stephen Krashen (for further information, refer

to Krashen's *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning* (1981) and *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition* (1982)). Here, the teacher will introduce a plethora of new written and spoken samples of the language, teaching the basics of reading, and further improving upon the student's comprehension skills.

3. Guided Practice: When the students are ready, it is time for them to begin to use the language, in short written and oral responses, encouraged and guided by the teacher. To develop their speaking skills, they should be given ample opportunity to not only hear the spoken language, but also imitate it in order to condition their brains and their mouths to the sounds of the language (Yellow Bird, 1999).
4. Independent Practice: At this point, the students can begin to work on their own, generating their own topics through spontaneous language use, both spoken and written. Their language development at this stage may not be particularly complex, but is getting there.
5. Challenge: Now, the student may take everything they have learned so far, and put it to use in the real world, in the form of a play, a discussion with a native speaker, a public presentation, etc, using significantly more complex words and grammatical structures.
6. Expansion: Finally, the student can take everything they have learned, and should not only be able perform it, as in the Challenge phase, but also should have attained such a mastery of it that they themselves could teach it. The extent to which they can do this will vary.

The strength of this method is that it can be applied at all levels of the learning process, from the short-term, over the course of one lesson, to the long-term, over the course of their entire formal schooling experience. It can be tailored from student-to-student, sped up for particularly fast learners, and slowed down for students struggling with mastering the material. All of this will be at the teacher's discretion, based upon their own intuition, and the student's feedback (Bennett et al, 1999).

Given the one-hour class model discussed previously, I will now present a proposed schedule for the class, based primarily on the models used for Arapaho and Arikara.

First, the minimum required personnel that should be used in both developing and teaching each lesson should be one fluent teacher, and one semi-fluent teacher's aide. By pairing a fluent speaker with a semi-fluent speaker of the language, the classroom setting somewhat mimics the Master-Apprentice program; The semi-fluent speaker gets an opportunity to further their own linguistic knowledge and capabilities, while at the same time assisting the fluent speaker in teaching the students. Depending on the class size, more aides or teachers may be required (Yellow Bird; 1999). When it was just starting out, a kindergarten class, described in Graymorning (1999), that was learning the Arapaho language made use of a one-hour class period, split up into four 15-minute segments, with the class itself split up into three groups of five students each. During the first three segments, a different area of the language was taught, for example, conversation, vocabulary, and culture. For each lesson, a potential teacher may refer to the Arikara Multimedia Lesson model, described in Kushner (1999), for some ideas as to what to cover in each of the first three segments. These can be divided into five main areas: Phonology, Vocabulary, Conversation, Grammar (a simple explanation regarding sentence structure), and Culture. To make each lesson more interactive and engaging, scholars such as Graymorning (1999) and Kushner (1999) suggest making Culture a crucial part of each lesson.

For the last 15-minute segment, the class would be brought together and the information they learned at each station would be combined and used together to solidify the information. Using this model, over the course of an 18-week period, the students had a greater mastery of the language, learning five times the amount of words and phrases than classes where more

traditional methods of instruction were implemented. After several years of success using this model, the class curriculum was expanded to a half-day immersion course (Graymorning, 1999).

Next, we will briefly review what many would consider one of the most important parts of learning a language, the so-called "Silent Period," where the students are under no pressure to talk or use the language beyond simple 'yes' and 'no' responses, and are instead bombarded by a huge amount of comprehensible input, both in the spoken and written form (Bennett et al, 1999; Cantoni, 1999).

While it has been estimated that it takes an average of 60 exposures to a word to learn it (Collier, 1989), it can be easily seen that the traditional method of rote memorization is not only ineffective at teaching word use in context, but is also not enjoyable for the learner (Rubin, 1999). What is by far more enjoyable, and therefore more effective in the long-term, is simple exposure to resources that the student can understand. Reading stories, watching performances, listening to jokes, and reinforcing what is being learned by recording the new word or phrase in a notebook for later reference, will help the student to learn the language in a more natural way, and will better prompt the student to ask questions for clarification or further explanation. When introducing new concepts, the teacher can use a scaffolding strategy of instruction, where first the word is introduced, then used in a sentence, and finally used in a dialogue or narrative, until its full semantic meaning is organically grasped by the student. The instructor may find it even more useful to use visual aids for this, such as puppets or flashcards with pictures on them. This is a basic description of comprehensible input, and in language instruction, it is useful to remember that the accuracy with which the student learns depends on the quantity of the input, the quality of the input, and the frequency with which the student encounters the input (Bennett et al, 1999; Cantoni, 1999).

After the Silent Period, the students can now begin to effectively use writing to accelerate their learning. Writing is a particularly important tool because it provides tactile reinforcement for previously learned material, allowing the information that is now stored in the student's brain to pass from passively-learned information, which may or may not be remembered in two weeks, two months, or two years, to experientially-learned information, which has a much higher likelihood of being recalled in the long-term. Having students perform writing activities that are either extensive, where they "produce a significant quantity of work," or intensive, where they "focus on and revise one small piece of writing for clarity," will support the other skill areas of language learning - reading, speaking, and listening - and will increase overall general proficiency; It can also be applied in both first and second language instruction (Homstad & Thorson, 1996). Especially used in conjunction with a real-life event, for example, having a fun and interesting conversation with a fluent teacher, then summarizing and writing down what they learned immediately afterwards, can help to further solidify the experience. There are a plethora of other activities as well that will further develop the student's language skills, after a strong conversational foundation is established, including writing their own stories, making lists, writing short dialogues for a play, or keeping a diary (Bennett et al, 1999; Rubin, 1999).

Finally, and by far most importantly, when implementing a language revitalization program, the dedicated instructor ought to make the experience fun. Develop games for the children; Allow them to perform plays, write poetry, tell stories and be silly. Play music for them and encourage them to sing along. Teach them to enjoy learning and using the language, and encourage them to speak it at every possible opportunity (Rubin, 1999). Learning another language is truly a wonderful adventure, and every step of the language-learning process should be a fun and memorable experience, because it is the motivated student, who finds what they're

learning interesting and enjoyable, that will more fully master the content (Rehman & Haider, 2013; Subramanian, 2009). It is estimated that it can take anywhere from four to seven years to reach fluency in a language (Collier, 1989), but the language learning journey should be one that lasts a lifetime. By removing stress and tailoring the early stages to the student's interests, the teacher can help to set the stage for the student's own further development of their language skills. If this fight to bring endangered languages back from the brink of extinction is to be successful, then the student's interest must be piqued as soon as possible, and maintained. No amount of documentation or instruction in the language will save it if the students are not having fun with the language and learning to use it creatively. If we cannot get the students involved, if we cannot make them passionate about learning their language and pass it on to further generations, then all of the work that would have been done would have come to nothing, and the language at this point will inevitably pass out of existence, forever.

§§§

6. Conclusion: Endangered Languages as World Languages

> "...when a language dies, a world dies."
>
> Stan J. Anonby, "Reversing Language Shift: Can Kwak'wala Be Revived"

Over the course of this paper, we have reviewed many different topics pertinent to the subject of endangered language revitalization, including what causes languages to become endangered, obstacles encountered in revitalization, first-hand experiences from educators, and an analysis of both successful and unsuccessful methodologies, that will hopefully help people in their future endeavors. So what's next?

If the world's languages are to be saved, steps must be taken now, because time is the enemy. Linguists and endangered language advocates all over the world are fighting against

time, seeking to ensure successful intergenerational transmission of these languages, proving to the world that they are just as capable as world languages, and ought to be saved. But linguistic study of a language alone is not enough to save it, and it is the community that must come together if success is to be achieved (Blum-Martinez, 2000; England, 2003).

So why does it matter? Why must everyone work together to preserve and propagate these languages? When alone in a foreign land, surrounded by people with unfamiliar customs, whose tongues are indecipherable, it is a lonesome existence. To hear someone speak your native tongue, even just a few words, can provide a great comfort. Now, imagine that you are the only person left alive who can speak your language. When you too have gone on into the next world, your language goes with you. Everything you have done, the places you went, what makes you *you*, will pass away, like dust in the wind. But there is still hope.

Endangered Language Pedagogy & Teaching Methodology

Works Cited

Abello-Contesse, C. (2008). "Age and the critical period hypothesis." *Oxford Academic ELT Journal*, 63:2, p.170-172.

Almasude, A. (1999). "The New Mass Media and the Shaping of Amazigh Identity." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Anderson, G. D. S. (2014). "Saving Endangered Languages Before They Disappear." *The Solutions Journal*, 5:2, p.76-83.

Anonby, S. J. (1999). "Reversing Language Shift: Can Kwak'wala Be Revived." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Ball, J. (2010). "Promoting Young Indigenous Children's Emergent Literacy in Canada." Available at http://www.ecdip.org/docs/pdf/Emergent%20literacy%20Revised%20Apr%2027%20811.pdf [Accessed 12 May 2017].

Bennett, R., et al. (1999). "The Place of Writing in Preserving an Oral Language." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Bernard, H. R. (1997). "Language Preservation and Publishing." In *Indigenous Literacy in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Qtd in Reyhner (1991).

Bielenberg, B. (1999). "Indigenous Language Codification: Cultural Effects." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Blum-Martinez, R. (2000). "Languages and Tribal Sovereignty: Whose Language Is It Anyway?" *Theory Into Practice*, 39:4, p.211-219,

Brady, A. (2007). *Marketing Dictatorship: Propaganda and Thought Work in Contemporary China*. Washington, DC: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Cabra, E., & Arcaute, R. (2010). "Latinoamérica." [Performed by Calle 13] on *Entre Los Que Quieran* [digital]. Miami: Sony Music Latin.

Cantoni, G. P. (1999). "Using TPR-Storytelling to Develop Fluency and Literacy in Native American Languages." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Cantoni, G. P. (1997). "Keeping minority languages alive: The school's responsibility." In Reyhner, *Teaching Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Cherokee Preservation Foundation. (2014). "Cherokee Language." Available at https://www.cherokeepreservation.org/what-we-do/cultural-preservation/cherokee-language/ [Accessed 10 May 2017].

Collier, V. (1989). "How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language." *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, p.509-531. In Kushner (1999).

Crawford, J. (1990). "Language freedom and restriction: A historical approach to the official language controversy." In Reyhner, *Effective language education practices and Native language survival*, Choctaw: Native American Language Issues Institute.

Ditmar, S. (1999). "Nakoda Language Program at Fort Belknap College." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

England, N. C. (2003). "Mayan Language Revival and Revitalization Politics: Linguists and Linguistic Ideologies." *American Anthropologist*, 105:4, p.733-743.

Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (2001). *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift: Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Qtd in Anonby (1999).

Garrett, N. (1986). "The Problem with Grammar: What Kind Can the Language Learner Use?" *Modern Language Journal,* 70, p.133-148.

Garrett, M. (1996). "Two people: An American Indian narrative of bicultural identity." *Journal of American Indian Education,* 36:1, p.1-21.

Gover, K. (2000). "An Apology: Remarks of Kevin Gover, Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs." Speech transcript available at www.tahtonka.com/apology.html [accessed 30 April 2017].

Grabe, W. (1979). "Morocco: Diglossia?...Triglossia?" *Working papers in applied linguistics*. Athens: Ohio University.

Graymorning, S. (1999). "Running the Gauntlet of an Indigenous Language Program." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Hale, K. (1992). "Endangered Languages: On endangered languages and the safeguarding of diversity." *Language*, 68:1, p.1-42.

Hinton, L. (2011). "Language revitalization and language pedagogy: new teaching and learning strategies." *Language and Education*, 25:4, p.307-318.

Hinton, L. (2001). "Language Revitalization: An Overview." In *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, Hinton & Hale (2001).

Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (ed.) (2001). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Hinton, L. (1994). *Flutes of Fire*. Berkeley: Heyday Books. Qtd in Reyhner (1999).

Holm, J. (2000). *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Homstad, T., & Thorson, H. (1996). *Technical Report Series No. 14: Using Writing-to-Learn Activities in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Board of Regents.

Hooper, W., & Flavin, F. (1999). "The Development of Linguistic Tools at the American Indian Studies Research Institute." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Khlief, B. (1991). "The place of Arabic in identity maintenance of Moroccans in The Netherlands: An exploratory study of some school textbooks." In *Ethnic Minority Languages and Education*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger. Qtd in Almasude (1999).

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kushner, J. (1999). "Tradition and Innovation: Multimedia Language Preservation." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

LaFromboise, T., et al. (1997). "Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory." In L. A. Peplau & S. E. Taylor, *Sociocultural perspectives in social psychology: Current Readings*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Lewis, B. (2017). "Encouraging quotes, Chinese proverbs with original translations, and inspirational thoughts for language learners." Available at: https://www.fluentin3months.com/quotes/ [accessed 30 April 2017].

Littlebear, R. (1999). "Some Rare and Radical Ideas for Keeping Indigenous Languages Alive." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Lomb, Kató. (2011). *Polyglot: How I Learn Languages*. Berkeley: TESL-EJ.

Long Soldier, L. (2009). *Building on Experiences of Maori and Hawaiian Language Revival*. Santa Fe: Indigenous Language Institute.

McLaughlin, D. (1992). *When Literacy Empowers: Navajo Language in Print*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico. In Bielenberg (1999).

Miyashita, M., & Moll, L. A. (1999). "Enhancing Language Material Availability Using Computers." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Navajo Nation Government (Official Site). (2011). "History." Available at: www.navajo-nsn.gov/history.htm [accessed 30 April 2017].

Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

New Mexico Office of the Secretary of State. (2017). "Native American Languages in New Mexico." Available at:

www.sos.state.nm.us/Voter_Information/Native_American_Languages_in_New_Mexico.aspx [accessed 30 April 2017].

New Mexico Office of the State Historian. (2017) "Time Periods." Available at http://newmexicohistory.org/historical-events-and-timeline [accessed 30 April 2017].

Nez, C., & Schiess-Avila, J. (2012). *Code Talker: The First and Only Memoir By One of the Original Navajo Code Talkers of WII*. New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.

O'Ballance, E. (1995). *The Kurdish Struggle, 1920-94*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Palmer, S. (1997). "Language of work: The critical link between economic change and language shift." In Reyhner, *Teaching Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Parks, D. R. (1999). "Genesis of the Project." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Paulston, C. B. (1992). *Linguistic and communicative competence: Topics in ESL*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Qtd in Kushner (1999).

Penfield, S. D. & Tucker, B. V. (2011). "From documenting to revitalizing an endangered language: Where do applied linguists fit?" *Language and Education*, 25:4, p.291-305.

Pienemann, M. (1984). "Psychological constraints in the teachability of languages." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, p.186-214. Qtd in Kushner (1999).

Rehman, A., & Haider, K. (2013). "The Impact of Motivation on Learning on Secondary School Students in Karachi: An Analytical Study." *Educational Research International*, 2:2, p.139-147.

Reyhner, J. (ed.) (1999). *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Reyhner, J. (1990). "A description of the Rock Point Community School bilingual education program." In *Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival*, Reyhner. Choctaw: Native American Language Issues.

Reyhner, J., & Tennant, E. (1995). "Maintaining and renewing native languages." *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19, p.279-304. Qtd in Reyhner (1999).

Roosevelt, T. (1896). *Winning the West*. New York: G. Putnam's Sons. Qtd in Nettle & Romaine (2000).

Rubin, D. S. (1999). "Sm'algyax Language Renewal: Prospects and Options." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Saffran, J. R., et al. (2001). "The acquisition of language by children." *PNAS*, 98:23, p.12874 -12875.

Sandburg, C. (1916). *Chicago Poems*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. Qtd in Nettle & Romaine (2000).

Sando, J. (1992). *Pueblo Nations: Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers.

Sides, H. (2007). *Blood and Thunder: The Epic Story of Kit Carson and the Conquest of the American West*. New York: Anchor Books.

Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2017). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twentieth Edition*. Dallas: SIL International.

Sims, C. P. (2001). "Native Language Planning: A Pilot Process in the Acoma Pueblo Community." In *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, Hinton & Hale (2001).

Spolsky, B. (1990). "Maori bilingual education and language revitalization." *Vox*, 4.

St. Clair, R. N., et al. (1999). "Self-Publishing Indigenous Language Material." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Subramanian, P. R. (2009). "Motivational Effects of Interest on Student Engagement and Learning in Physical Education: A Review." *International Journal of Physical Education*, 46:2, p.11-19.

Tolkien, J. R. R. (2007). "English and Welsh." In *The Monsters and The Critics: And Other Essays*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

U.N. General Assembly. (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 217 A (III). Available at: http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/ [accessed 30 April 2017].

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). "Title IV – 21st Century Schools." Available at: https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg51.html [accessed 30 April 2017].

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2017). "Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." Available at: https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm [accessed 30 April 2017].

Vanhove, J. (2013). "The Critical Period Hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition: A Statistical Critique and a Reanalysis." *PLoS One*, 8:7, p.e102922.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). "Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction." *Modern Language Journal* 77, p.45-57. Qtd in Kushner (1999).

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Woodbury, A. C. (2012). "What is an Endangered Language?" *Linguistic Society of America*. Available at http://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/what-endangered-language [accessed 01 May 2017].

Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project. (2014). "Project History." Available at: www.wlrp.org/project-history.html [accessed 30 April 2017].

Yellow Bird, D. (1999). "The White Shield Arikara Language Program." In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*, Reyhner. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.