

This article was downloaded by: [University of Winnipeg]

On: 03 May 2014, At: 06:45

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Language and Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rlae20>

Language revitalization and language pedagogy: new teaching and learning strategies

Leanne Hinton^a

^a Department of Linguistics , University of California , Berkeley, California, USA

Published online: 22 Jun 2011.

To cite this article: Leanne Hinton (2011) Language revitalization and language pedagogy: new teaching and learning strategies, *Language and Education*, 25:4, 307-318, DOI:

[10.1080/09500782.2011.577220](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.577220)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.577220>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Language revitalization and language pedagogy: new teaching and learning strategies

Leanne Hinton*

Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA

(Received 30 March 2011; final version received 30 March 2011)

Language learning and teaching of endangered languages have many features and needs that are quite different from the teaching of world languages. Groups whose languages are endangered try to turn language loss around; many new language teaching and learning strategies are emerging, to suit the special needs and goals of language revitalization. The teaching of ‘foreign languages’, ‘majority languages’, ‘heritage languages’ and endangered languages is compared in this paper. Because of the paucity of language teaching resources for endangered languages, and especially because of the special goals of learning for language revitalization, individuals and communities and the professionals who work with them are developing novel ways of teaching and learning their ancestral language, to meet the goals of language learners and their communities.

Keywords: language revitalization; Indigenous languages; immersion schools; languages without speakers; language teaching methods; language learning methods

Introduction

Indigenous and minority communities around the world are making strong efforts to regain knowledge and use of their endangered languages. Even the so-called ‘extinct’ languages are being revitalized through the use of documentation. Depending on the size of the group and their available human resources, there are different opportunities and limitations on the kinds of program that they can realistically muster. Language immersion schools (e.g. Hawaiian, Ojibwe, Mohawk), where the language of instruction is the endangered language, are highly successful, but small communities with few speakers and little control of their education system may not be able to implement this kind of program. Other options being implemented include summer immersion programs (e.g. Cochiti), or language classes in otherwise English-medium schools (e.g. Hupa, Acoma). One problem for many groups is that the language is natively spoken only by elders, who are often too old to teach. Adult programs such as intensive college programs (Hawaii again) and the Master-Apprentice language learning program are being used to train the ‘missing generations’ who are of professional age and able to go on to teach children. Another kind of program is aimed at families rather than schools, supporting and training parents who want to use their endangered language with children at home (e.g. Gaelic). Finally, even languages with no speakers left at all can begin the process of revitalization through the utilization of linguistic documentation that was done with the last speakers (e.g. Miami, Wampanoag).

*Email: lhinton@berkeley.edu

See also Hinton (2008) and Hinton (2011) for a fuller description of some of these and other language programs. Here, we focus primarily on what these programs show us about second language learning and teaching.

Second language teaching and endangered languages

Second language learning and teaching are key components in all of the above kinds of language revitalization programs. For many communities involved in language revitalization, there are few programs or experts who can help them develop workable methods of second language teaching and learning. And in fact, the ways in which languages are taught in the classroom do not generally fulfill the needs of language revitalization (Penfield and Tucker 2011). To a large extent, the models, methods and materials for second language teaching and learning are developed by bootstrap strategies within revitalization programs. The resources, motives and desired outcomes for second language instruction are very different from the teaching of foreign languages, and also from the majority of language programs such as English as a Second Language (ESL).

One of the most important things for communities doing this kind of work is the theory and methodology of second language teaching and learning (Hinton 2007). Although pedagogical courses on endangered Indigenous languages are available in some colleges and universities, it is rare to find a program leading to second language fluency for its students. This is partly because most of the endangered Indigenous languages have few fluent speakers of a professional age who could teach, and in many cases, those speakers are untrained in language pedagogy. Furthermore, materials and curricula usually have to be designed by the teachers themselves, rather than having any such thing as a state-of-the-art curriculum handed to them as would be the case with world languages. Thus, language teaching and learning of endangered languages is a pioneering process that involves the development of new models of language teaching.

Some of the differences between teaching a foreign, majority or heritage language and the teaching of endangered languages are summarized in Table 1. A few words need to be said about the definitions of these language categories. By ‘foreign language’, I mean a language spoken primarily in places other than the country in which the language is being taught. By ‘majority language’, I mean a language that is supported by the government within a nation and spoken by the majority of citizens. (There are of course countries, such as many in Asia and Africa, for which this definition is problematic – but my primary focus for this category is on hegemonic languages such as English in the USA.) ‘Heritage languages’ and ‘endangered languages’ have various definitions, some of which overlap. ‘Heritage language’ has come to mean, in its narrow conception, a language different from the majority language of the country, which is spoken at home but was only partially acquired by the children of the home (Polinsky and Kagan 2007; Valdés 2000).

While endangered languages are frequently viewed as a subcategory of heritage languages (e.g. Valdés 2005), for the sake of contrast, I will reserve the term ‘heritage languages’ to refer to those languages which are not the majority language of the country, but where there is also some place in the world where the language is not endangered. Thus, German, French, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and many other languages are heritage languages in the United States, but are not endangered languages (even if their tenure in the United States is in question. Also see Cope 2011).¹ To separate this definition of heritage languages from endangered languages, I will use the term ‘ancestral languages’ or just ‘endangered languages’ for the latter. Furthermore, ‘endangered languages’ include ancestral

Table 1. Differences in teaching languages of different status.

	Foreign languages	Majority languages	Heritage languages	Endangered languages
1. Primary goal of the program	Helping people gain knowledge of language and culture of another society	Helping people function in the dominant language of the society	Helping people gain ability in their ancestral tongue	Save language from extinction; bring it back into use
2. Learner's motives	Communication with foreigners or immigrants at home or abroad; develop literary knowledge of another language	Acquire a sense of membership in the dominant culture; gain economic power	Ability to speak to older relatives; retain or regain ties to one's home country; belonging to a minority culture; political stance about cultural and linguistic autonomy	Sense of identity, belonging to a minority culture; resistance to assimilation; political stance about cultural and linguistic autonomy; spiritual and cultural access
3. Expected future relationship of the learner to the language	Tourist, teacher, job where the language is used	Linguistic assimilation to the dominant society	Speaking or writing to friends and relatives; visits and other ties to one's country of origin	Become a language activist and a transmitter of the language to future generations (through teaching, parenthood); help form a language community
4. Possible influence on the language being learned	None	None (or New Englishes)	None on the language as spoken in the home country; possible establishment of a new dialect in the new country	Influence of a dominant language (e.g. English) on the endangered language; modernization of the endangered language
5. Considerations for teaching	Big literature on language teaching, lots of research, lots of available tools and materials	Big literature on language teaching, lots of research, lots of available tools and materials	Development of heritage learner courses to accommodate differences in learning needs	Evolving strategies, including 'bootstrap' methods

Note: I will examine the items in the table in more detail in the following sections.

languages that may not have been heard or learned in the least by people who see them as an important part of their identity, thus separating them further from the narrow definition of heritage languages. I am also using the term 'endangered languages' rather loosely here to cover even those languages with no speakers left at all, but where revitalization might nevertheless take place.

Goals of the program

For learning foreign and heritage languages, and majority languages, a primary goal of a language program is to give the learners competency in communicating with the native speakers of that language. For endangered languages, there may be very few monolingual native speakers, and perhaps none at all. Instead, the goal would be to create the speakers who will themselves carry the language on even if the last native speakers have passed away. This has many important implications for teaching methods and philosophies that will be discussed throughout the paper. As for learning the culture along with the language, frequently that aspect too is being revitalized, so that rather than learning 'how others do things', as would be the case for foreign and majority languages, a goal may be to have the learners themselves become able to carry on and enhance the practice of the traditions of their culture.

Motives of the learners

One difference between the learning of endangered languages versus foreign and majority languages is that in most cases, the endangered language is the ancestral language of the learners. Endangered languages are usually endangered because conquest, oppressive policies or economic needs have resulted in a language shift. That this shift is unacceptable to the current generations of the minority groups is clear from the fact that efforts at language revitalization are taking place. Thus, learners (or, in the case of children, their parents), teachers and program administrators alike have a resistance to language loss that provides a different kind of motivation toward learning the target language. For some, it is a personal desire to regain a sense of their native identity and belonging to a community. For others, it is a political act, part of a desire to assert cultural autonomy or sovereignty.

Some of the personal motives of the second or third generations of immigrants whose families have shifted to the dominant language of the culture are similar to the motives of the learners of endangered languages (and of course their own languages may also be endangered in some cases). There is a strong tendency for the younger generations in immigrant families to enroll in foreign language courses to gain competency in their heritage language (Cope 2011; Hinton 2001).

Expected future relationship of the learner to the language

A difference between most heritage languages and endangered languages is that for the latter, there is no real speech community using the language anywhere. While the descendants of the immigrants might wish to redevelop ties to speech communities of the old country, in the case of the endangered languages, the goal might be to *recreate* a language community, which will primarily consist of the second language learners themselves. Thus, the learners are taking on a responsibility that far outweighs the responsibility of the learners to the other three kinds of languages. It is recognized that the goal of bringing an endangered language back into use again, to once more have native speakers using their language in a speech community, is a long-term goal and one that takes generations of people who continue to engage in language activism. It is expected, or at least hoped, that the child learners will take on the language values of their parents or community activists who set up learning opportunities for them, and carry on the goals of language revitalization. It may be hoped that the learners will teach the language themselves, and perhaps bring the language

into their own home. Some language programs specifically target increasing the fluency of the people who are being hired to teach the language, or teaching parents the language for use at home (see, e.g., MacLeod n.d.). Language activists may hope that child learners will grow up to become language teachers, or even fantasize that a learner will marry another learner of the language in order to raise a generation of native speakers.

Possible influence on the language being learned

In general, second language learners will speak at least somewhat differently than native speakers. If the learner is still a young child, the differences may be almost unnoticeable (so long as she/he learns from native speakers in an immersion context), but for adult learners, there will be at least an accent. Learners are also likely to have some lexical and grammatical influence from their native language, and there will perhaps be simplification of some of the grammatical systems such as loss of some affixes or complex syntactic structures. Thus, a learner's talk may have many discernable differences from a native speaker's talk, depending on the learner's language exposure and native talents. However, in the case of foreign languages, it is hard to imagine a situation in which the learners would have any influence on the language as it is spoken by the native-speaking community as a whole.² The same is true for majority languages, and of immigrant minorities in a country where one language is dominant.³ This is not the case for endangered languages. If the language is to survive, it is going to be carried on by the learners themselves, and thence by their own pupils or children. So, any difference from the native speech that the learner carries on will become a feature of the language itself in the future. By going through this bottleneck, the language may be simplified, or pidginized, or gain calques from the first language, as well as differences in pronunciation, and so on. How the language changes, and how much it changes, will be a function of how thoroughly the language is learned during the era of the last native speakers. Whether the change is considered a 'bad' thing or just accepted as an example of the universal fact of language change is a matter of opinion within the activist community. (See Ramirez 2009 and Holton 2009, for opinions that massive language change may even be desirable.⁴)

Another aspect of language change for endangered languages is language modernization – the development of new vocabulary and genres of speech that are part of our everyday living. If the language had stopped being used, say 50 years ago, then there would not be any words for objects and activities that developed in the last half century. Depending on the nature of the program, it may be that teachers and learners would be making up new vocabulary themselves. Or else in larger programs such as the Hawaiian immersion school system, a 'new word' committee may be set up to handle the vast amount of vocabulary needed to teach subjects in that language – such as mathematics and chemistry (see Kimura, The Hawaiian Lexicon Committee, and I.A.G.L. Counciller 2009).

Many Indigenous languages do not have standardized writing systems, so literacy itself represents a change in the language. Some programs focus entirely on oral competency, including oral literature – storytelling and song. But in school-based revitalization programs, where literacy may be a big part of the school program, there are genres of language use that may never have existed before, such as essay writing and tests. Even telephone calls might be a new genre of speech, along with texting and other modern forms of long-distance communication. So, we see that the mere fact of teaching an endangered language in the context of language revitalization may bring a great change to that language.

Considerations for teaching

Foreign language teaching and majority language teaching are based on many decades of research, literature development on language teaching theory and methods, and the development of massive amounts of materials to assist in language teaching. Heritage language teaching can also make use of the materials available to the foreign language classroom, but there are some differences in the needs of heritage language learners. At this time, there are generations of people who have some knowledge of their heritage language – either passive competence or even some speaking ability. When taking language classes at the college level, the heritage learner may be way ahead of the beginners in terms of understanding and speaking, which might mean that the student should be put in an intermediate language class, but she/he may have little or no literacy skills, which would argue for placing the student in a beginning class. To meet the different needs of heritage language students, some university campuses are actually designing special heritage language classes (Sweley 2006).

For endangered languages, there is much less support available for language teaching. Research on ‘what works’ is just beginning; pedagogical books, reference dictionaries and culturally appropriate curricula and language teaching materials are few and far between unless the teachers themselves make them. (In fact, this is just what the teachers of endangered languages do.) The worst problem, however, is the simple lack of native-speaking teachers. In some cases, there are no speakers at all (which will be discussed further in this paper). Commonly, the only speakers are the elders nowadays, who are past their retirement age and are untrained in language teaching. Most revitalization programs must depend partially or fully on teachers who are themselves second language learners. But how do they learn the language? College- and community-based adult language learning programs for endangered languages are rare and often insufficient to develop fluency in the learner. This is not always true – larger populations with endangered languages have often been able to develop excellent second language learning programs in the college setting (see, e.g., Wilson and Kamanā 2001 for a description of the Hawaiian language programs at the University of Hawaii). But smaller language groups find that they must seek new strategies for learning and teaching.

New strategies for teaching and learning endangered languages

Since endangered languages frequently have few resources available to them in the way of adequate pedagogical materials or teachers fully competent in the language, new and ingenious strategies for language teaching and learning have developed to meet the goals of language revitalization.

School programs

Schools are an attractive venue for producing new speakers of a language because a relatively large number of children can learn the language at the same time, at an age when language acquisition comes most easily and holds most promise for fluency. It is also a sweet irony to use schools for language revitalization since they have played such a large role in language death. But language classes in otherwise English-medium schools are not sufficient to create fluent speakers. Only a serious bilingual education program can raise fluent speakers. By that, I mean that the endangered language is given at least as much time and attention as English – or even more, since the children already know conversational

English when they come to school, but may have no ability in the endangered language. (See McCarty 2003 for a fuller discussion of the benefits of well-run bilingual education programs for endangered languages.)

The most successful are the 'language survival schools', as the Hawaiians call Language Nests and immersion schools. These have been the most effective means of developing a large number of new speakers of endangered languages. Through well-run language survival schools, children learn their language at a young age and can become fully fluent. Beyond this, education is more under the control of the speech community, which can model their children's education more to their own values and culture. The preschool Language Nests, followed quickly by immersion schools, began in the 1980s, led by the Maoris (1981) and the Hawaiians (1983; King 2001). Maoris and Hawaiians now have dozens of immersion schools and even more Language Nests, giving a Hawaiian-medium or Maori-medium education through the 12th grade in many places.

To go on with the Hawaiian example, a student can go from preschool to K-12 schooling in Hawaiian and, if desired, continue on to college at the University of Hawaii and go all the way to a PhD with most of his classes being taught in Hawaiian (Wilson and Kamanā 2001). Academic English (the children all know conversational English from the general environment outside of school) is taught in the later grades as a class, like other 'foreign' languages. The students do well in school, with a nonexistent dropout rate, and have a very high rate of going on for higher education, both in Hawaii and elsewhere. The result so far is several thousands of young fluent speakers.

Other immersion schools include the Akwesasne Freedom School in New York (Mohawk), the Cutswood School (Blackfeet) in Montana, the Sniiio Salish immersion preschool and primary school, also in Montana, the Tsunadeloquasdi School (Cherokee) in Oklahoma, the Niigane Ojibwemowin immersion school (Ojibwe) in Minnesota, the Faithkeepers School (Seneca) in New York, Chief Atahm School (Secwepemc) in British Columbia and others. The first 'Nidos de Lengua' in Mexico were set up starting in 2008 (Meyer and Soberanes 2009). There are also immersion schools and preschools in Europe for Saami, Gaelic, Manx and a variety of other languages.

'Boot-strapping': adult second language learning of endangered languages

While language immersion is the goal of the language survival schools, full-time immersion is not feasible for many of them because of insufficient fluency among the staff. For example, Melissa Borgia writes of the Faithkeepers' School:

At the present time, immersion teaching accounts for about ten percent of the school's curricula. Staff at the school is trying every possible means to get learners to utilize the language and strengthen the community as a result. (2009, 190-1)

The difficulty with the immersion school movement is the 'Missing Generation' – the paucity of teachers and potential teachers, and parents as well, who can think and speak in the language. The Language Nest movement was founded with the goal of having the grandparent generation, the last generation to grow up as native speakers, being the people caring for the children. But once the children reach school age, professional teachers are needed. Even in the Language Nests, younger adults are often important for many of the functions. In most of the immersion schools, many if not all of the professional teachers are second language learners. Thus, an adult language program is an essential part of teacher training and preparation. The larger language groups have good college programs that can help develop fluency in adults. For example, the University of Hawaii at Hilo

has an excellent Hawaiian Language Program, where six full years of Hawaiian language courses are offered, all but the first semester in full immersion. But the smaller endangered languages in areas of more diversity and fewer resources per language are often not able to develop programs of this caliber. This is where ‘bootstrap strategies’ develop.

Master-Apprentice programs

Compare Hawaii with California, where there are about 50 languages that have a handful of elderly speakers, and another few dozen languages left with no speakers at all. Not only is the language situation much more dire for these languages than for Hawaiian, but also the very diversity of Indigenous languages in California, and the smallness of the population of each speech community, make it impossible for universities to have language programs to teach any, much less all, of them.

To answer this challenge, the nonprofit group Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS) developed the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program (MAP). MAP is a rather informal program that can be readily varied according to the situation. The teams trained by AICLS usually consist of as little as one master (a fluent speaker) and one apprentice (a dedicated learner), and a mentor to help guide their work through occasional phone calls and visits. This same model is used in British Columbia for a MAP program run by the First Peoples’ Heritage, Language and Culture Council (FPHLCC). For community-run MAP programs that focus on a single language, there may be many one-on-one teams or there may be variations such as several masters and apprentices all working together under the guidance of a single mentor (e.g. the Oklahoma’s Sauk language program). The goal in all the cases is for apprentices to gain conversational proficiency by spending time immersed in the language with the masters (10–40 hours per week, depending on the program, or even more if they actually live together). Since there is no professional teacher of the language, the team is a true partnership between masters and apprentices, with the apprentice usually actively guiding his own learning process. The teams receive training in weekend-long workshops, with refresher workshops twice a year. The training focuses on how to achieve language immersion, planning for activities they can do together and ways to overcome plateaus. Single-language Master-Apprentice programs, such as the Sauk program and the Chickasaw program, may have multiple teams that spend more time together for additional training and problem solving.

There are now many MAP programs throughout the United States and Canada, and other countries, such as Australia and Brazil, are starting to try out the model as well. There are a number of characteristics of the Master-Apprentice program that make it suitable for the unique needs of language revitalization that are listed below (for more on the Master-Apprentice program, see Hinton 2002):

- (1) The concept is simple (though implementation can be hard).
- (2) There is no need for books, a classroom, licensed teachers, professionals, or even a writing system or funding.
- (3) It is done in the context of daily life. People can still do what they need to do with their day, whether it is housework, shopping, planting a garden or hunting – they just need to do it together, and in the language.
- (4) There is a seamless relationship to cultural maintenance and revitalization since activities involving ceremony and traditions are, like any other activity, part of the team’s work together.

- (5) It can be fun, informal and spontaneous.
- (6) It provides oral competency and conversational skills, with grammar being acquired naturally rather than being studied formally.
- (7) It provides a real partnership between generations, thereby providing valuable contact for isolated older speakers, and has been shown to have a healing power that overcomes the generational rifts that were one of the results of language loss.
- (8) Finally, it also serves as a training tool for teaching, and is used by language revitalization programs as a way of increasing the teachers' fluency (e.g. the Blackfeet and the Sauk).

Learning a language from documentation

Many endangered languages are actually 'dormant' – no speakers left at all. The only feasible way for learners to increase their knowledge in those cases would be from documentation.

Two success stories

Two successful language learners – Jessie Little Doe Baird (Wampanoag) and Daryl Baldwin (Myaamia) – are living proof that one can revitalize a language from documentation. There have been no speakers of Myaamia for at least 50 years, and none of Wampanoag for 150 years. Little Doe and Baldwin followed similar paths in their work – each received MAs from linguistics departments, Daryl at the University of Montana and Jessie at MIT. Each worked closely with a linguistic mentor who had knowledge of the language – Jessie with Ken Hale and Daryl with David Costa. Both Daryl and Jessie have deep familiarity with the old documentation of their languages by missionaries, anthropologists and linguists, and are working on developing the documentation into user-friendly products, such as dictionaries, books of narrative texts, etc. Each of them has been able to use the documentation to learn their language orally, and both have reached high levels of proficiency. They are fluent enough in their respective languages to have made it the language of their homes, and are each raising their children as native speakers, bilingual in English and their ancestral tongues. Each are also the leaders of the language revitalization process in their own communities. Daryl works with the Myaamia people to develop programs and materials for language and cultural learning. During the academic year, he acts as the director of the *Myaamia Project* at Miami University, which conducts research and oversees classes on Myaamia language, culture and history. Jessie is working with the Wampanoag people on multiple projects of language and cultural revitalization. In 2010, she received the MacArthur 'genius' Award for her tremendous contributions to language revitalization (see also Penfield and Tucker 2011).

The Breath of Life Language Workshops

The Breath of Life Language Workshops follow the example of Daryl Baldwin and Jessie Little Doe. The Breath of Life Language Workshop for California Indians without speakers is a biennial workshop established in the early 1990s. Every other summer, the University of California at Berkeley and the AICLS combine forces to offer a week-long gathering to assist California Indians to learn how to find archival materials on their languages, learn enough about linguistics to interpret them and discuss methods of utilizing them for language learning and teaching. About 60 California Indians per year come to the workshop,

along with 30-some linguistics graduate students and faculty who serve as mentors. ‘Breath of Life’ has spread to other institutions as well; the University of Oklahoma hosted one in 2010, and there will be a National Breath of Life Archival Institute in Washington, DC, in 2011, to research the materials in the National Anthropological Archives and the Library of Congress.

There is no literature on the ways to learn how to speak a language using only raw field notes or other documentation such as old letters, traditional tales or Bible translations. One thing that is clear, however, is that people trying to use documentation for language learning must become researchers. If the documentation is only on paper, a researcher/learner must become an expert in the pronunciation of phonetic writing – and usually not just one form of phonetic writing, but several, since there are many different variations of the phonetic alphabet that have been used over time. Linguistic analysis of the documentation is essential in order to figure out the grammar well enough to be able to create novel sentences. In the past, linguists rarely documented everyday conversation, so conversation has to be essentially reinvented. The effort that it takes for a learner/researcher to actually become a speaker of the language is multifaceted and vast. And like other learners, the learner/researcher will also probably become a teacher, holding classes or using the language with his or her children. Since the process of teaching others will mostly be via very different processes than the learner/researcher used to learn the language himself/herself, a great transition has to be made toward using the teaching methods – and often these will include the immersion methods we have discussed earlier.

CILLDI

The Canadian Indigenous Languages and Literacy Development Institute (CILLDI) goes several steps further than the Breath of Life model by training community linguists through an intensive summer workshop in linguistics and language pedagogy. Through the institutionalization of this kind of training for community language activists, larger groups of people can become proficient in the skills they need for developing effective teaching strategies for endangered languages.

Family language revitalization

Daryl Baldwin and Jessie Little Doe are two of the increasing number of parents who are choosing to use their endangered language at home with their children. But parents who wish to teach their children their ancestral language often have to face the problem of their own lack of fluency. Frequently, even when parents have learned their language in immersion schools or college programs, they find that they do not know how to talk about the various things that families talk about with children. Changing diapers, playing with a baby and talking to one’s child using affectionate terms are not generally taught in language classes. Thus, some communities are in the beginning stages of developing parental support programs. The Myaamiya are focusing much of their work on developing children’s books and other materials and distributing them directly to families, using technology such as the Smart Pen (Daryl Baldwin, pers. comm., December 1, 2010). The Chickasaw language program is considering a modified Master-Apprentice program that pays one parent per household to be a stay-at-home parent who is simultaneously learning the language from an elder person and using it with their children (Joshua Hinson, pers. comm., December 1, 2010). In California, the AICLS is developing ways to assist families – Kawaiisu, Karuk, Tolowa, Pomo, Mutsun and Tachi – trying to learn their languages while also bringing them

into their homes. In Europe, the Welsh Language Board, funded by the National Assembly of Wales, runs a project for families, ‘Twf’, with programs for parents to learn Welsh to be used at home, and support groups for families raising their children with Welsh. Twf is well connected to the larger health system of Wales, which allows contact with and training of parents interested about the Welsh language before their child is even born. Their excellent website (<http://www.twfcymru.com>) is full of information and advice for families who wish to raise their children to be bilingual in Welsh and English.

The Scots Gaelic organization Comhairle Nan Sgoiltean Araich (CNSA), now known as Taic, has also developed a set of language courses and programs for families – the Family Language Plan, Language in the Home and Bumps and Babies. Like the Welsh Twf, Scots Gaelic language learners focus on vocabulary, speaking styles and genres of speech that they can use directly with their children (MacLeod n.d.). There are also many more families around the world working on their own to use the language with their children, without help from community programs.

Conclusion

Most of the strategies and methods of language teaching and learning presented here are original, creative ‘bootstrap’ ways people have developed as a response to the goals of and obstacles to language revitalization. Absent from second language pedagogy for endangered languages, in many cases, are applied linguists who specialize in language teaching theory and methodology. In general, outside experts who work with communities on language revitalization are documentary linguists, theoretical linguists and linguistic anthropologists – most of whom do not have an educational background in language teaching and learning. These experts know a great deal about the structure of the languages, and are especially helpful in the provision of recorded and written data, and in the development of reference materials – reference dictionaries and grammars, for example. Some have also worked to help develop some of the novel language learning models that were discussed in this paper. But the guidance of experts in language and teaching methods and models could be of great assistance in language revitalization. Research by applied linguists on the effectiveness of the new models and how they could be improved would be especially helpful. But meanwhile, communities, families and individuals are creating new and unique strategies all the time to bring their endangered languages back into use.

Notes

1. Some heritage languages with a long-standing history in the United States have developed unique dialects spoken nowhere else. Linguists studying these varieties point out that we must also recognize the existence of ‘endangered dialects’ (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1995).
2. Julia Sallabank (pers. comm.) mentions, however, that there is a current debate about norms for English as a lingua franca, in response to the fact that there are now more nonnative speakers than native speakers.
3. In colonized or previously colonized countries, on the other hand, where the colonizing language is widely spoken, new varieties of the colonizer language may develop. ‘New Englishes’, for example, abound in the postcolonial world.
4. Heritage languages may behave in a manner somewhat similar to what I have said here about endangered languages. As mentioned in Note 1, a language that is spoken by a long-standing immigrant community is likely to exhibit differences from the language as spoken in the home country, both by the retention of archaisms and by an influence from the majority language, as well as by just taking a different path of language change from the home country (see Cope 2011). In fact, as these local speech varieties begin to disappear, they too are endangered, and will change yet in more and different ways in the context of language revitalization.

References

- Borgia, M. 2009. Modifying assessment tools for Ganōhsesge:kha: Hē:nōdeyē:stha: A Seneca culture-language school. In *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned*, ed. J. Reyhner and L. Lockard, 191–210. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University Press. <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILR/> (accessed February 1, 2011).
- Cope, L. 2011. From ethnocultural pride to promoting the Texas Czech vernacular: Current maintenance efforts and unexplored possibilities. *Language and Education* 25, no. 4: 361–83.
- Hinton, L. 2001. Involuntary language loss among immigrants: Asian-American linguistic autobiographies. In *Language in our time: Georgetown University Round Table in Language and Linguistics, 1999*, ed. J.E. Alatis and A. Tan, 203–52. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Hinton, L. 2002. *Keeping your language alive: A common-sense approach to language learning and teaching*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
- Hinton, L. 2007. Teaching and learning endangered languages. In *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2nd rev. ed., ed. N. Van Deusen-Scholl and N.H. Hornberger, vol. 4, 157–68. Berlin: Springer.
- Hinton, L. 2008. Language revitalization. In *Indians in contemporary society. Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. G.A. Bailey and W.C. Sturtevant, vol. 2, 31–58. Washington, DC: National Museum of Natural History.
- Hinton, L. 2011. Revitalization of endangered languages. In *Handbook of endangered languages*, ed. P. Austin and J. Sallabank, 291–311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, G. 2009. Relearning Athabascan languages in Alaska: Creating sustainable language communities through creolization. In *Speaking of endangered languages: Issues in revitalization*, ed. A.M. Goodfellow, 238–65. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kimura, L., The Hawaiian Lexicon Committee, and I.A.G.L. Counciller. 2009. Indigenous new words creation: Perspectives from Alaska and Hawaii. In *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned*, ed. J. Reyhner and L. Lockard, 121–39. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University Press. <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILR/> (accessed February 1, 2011).
- King, J. 2001. Te Kōhanga Reo: Māori language revitalization. In *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. L. Hinton and K. Hale, 119–28. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- MacLeod, F. n.d. The Taic/CNSA Gaelic in the home course. Electric Scotland Community. <http://www.electricscotland.com/gaelic/finlay/finlay2.htm> (accessed March 4, 2011).
- McCarty, T.L. 2003. Revitalizing Indigenous languages in homogenizing times. *Comparative Education* 39, no. 2: 147–63.
- Meyer, L., and F. Soberanes. 2009. *El Nido de Lengua: Orientación para sus 'guías'* [The Language Nest: Orientation for the 'guides']. Mexico, DF/Oaxaca: National Congress of Indigenous & Intercultural Education. http://www.cneii.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10:nueva-publicacion (accessed March 4, 2011).
- Penfield, S.D., and B.V. Tucker. 2011. From documenting to revitalizing an endangered language: Where do applied linguists fit? *Language and Education* 25, no. 4: 291–305.
- Polinsky, M., and O. Kagan. 2007. Heritage languages: In the 'wild' and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1, no. 5: 368–95.
- Ramirez, L.J. 2009. Breathing language. *News from Native California* 22, no. 2: 8–12.
- Sweley, M.H. 2006. Heritage language learning: Where we stand today. *The Language Educator* 1, no. 3: 20–5. http://www.actfl.org/files/members/TLEApril_article.pdf (accessed March 4, 2011).
- Valdés, G. 2000. The teaching of heritage languages: An introduction for Slavic-teaching professionals. In *The learning and teaching of Slavic languages and cultures*, ed. O. Kagan and B. Rifkin, 375–403. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, Indiana University.
- Valdés, G. 2005. Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal* 89, no. 3: 410–26.
- Wilson, W.H., and K. Kamanā. 2001. 'Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini: Proceeding from a dream' – The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. L. Hinton and K. Hale, 147–76. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wolfram, W., and N. Schilling-Estes. 1995. Moribund dialects and the endangerment canon: The case of the Ocracoke Brogue. *Language* 71, no. 4: 696–721.