Introduction

The contents of *Indigenous Language Revitalization* come from the 14th and 15th annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages conferences. Our subtitle, *Encouragement, Guidance & Lessons Learned*, comes from Darrell Kipp’s 2008 keynote address. We would like to thank Margaret Noori for making the 14th annual symposium “Working Together We Can Bring Back the Language: How Technology Can Make it Happen” in Mount Pleasant, Michigan, on June 1-3, 2007 a success and Evangeline Parsons Yazzie for co-chairing the 2008 symposium, “Language is Life: Strategies for Language Revitalization.”

Over 300 attendees gathered together in Flagstaff, Arizona, on May 1-3, 2008 to honor the Indigenous languages that are still being heard and spoken by the youth and to remember and honor the languages that have fallen silent among the youth. They honored the elders who continue to speak their languages with the hope that their language survives another generation. They met with the belief that each Indigenous language is the heartbeat of its respective culture and that the key to the revival of a language is to ensure that each generation transmits their language and culture to their children. We express our thanks for the support given for the 15th conference by Northern Arizona University’s Office of the President, Institute for Native Americans, College of Education and Department of Educational Specialties, Arizona State University’s Mary Lou Fulton College of Education, Leonard Chee (Navajo Nation Council Delegate for Leupp, Tolani Lake and Bird Springs) and the Lannan Foundation.

We start this 6th Stabilizing Indigenous Languages monograph with Darrell Kipp’s keynote address at the 15th annual conference, which presents some of his learning and experiences from the Cuts Wood Blackfeet K-8 immersion school in the Blackfeet Nation in Montana that he cofounded. As the Piegan Institute’s web site notes:

Cuts Wood School is nationally recognized as a successful and effective model for Native language immersion with a multi-generational approach. Cuts Wood School’s mission is to use the Blackfeet language as the tool (not object) of instruction within a local context to produce fluent speakers of the Blackfeet language. In operation since 1995, Cuts Wood School offers full day programming for children age 5-12. Our objective is to develop highly skilled learners who are knowledgeable in both Blackfeet and world academia. (http://www.pieganimstitute.org/cutswoodschool.html)

Then Margaret Noori describes in her essay “Wenesh Waa Oshkii-Bmaadizijig Noondamowaad? What Will The Young Children Hear?” her efforts as a university level teacher of her Ojibwe language and as a mother raising her children as Ojibwe speakers. She discusses the practical realities of creating a bilingual home, specifically with an endangered language. She begins with a brief introduction to Anishinaabemowin and then describes language activism at several levels—from

informal community instruction to full-credit post-secondary courses. Organized around the steps taken to produce fluency and transfer a full aesthetic and cultural understanding of the language, Noori conveys the need for both language curriculum and community support for language revitalization.

We continue with four papers from linguists Margaret (Peggy) Speas, Keren Rice, Lenore Grenoble and Paul Kroskrity who describe the sometime contentious relationship between linguists and language activists and suggest ways that these two groups can cooperate to revitalize Indigenous languages. Peggy Speas discusses her experience as a speaker of a dominant language who is trying to assist in Navajo language stabilization and revitalization efforts. She sets the stage by calling into question whether such efforts need professional linguists at all, given the often divergent goals of linguists and community members. This is not to say that linguists shouldn’t contribute to such efforts, or that community members might not be interested in linguistics. Rather, Speas suggests that linguists re-examine their eagerness to clear up public misconceptions about language and bilingualism, listen to what community members say they need or want and be willing to participate in community-centered projects even if they do not directly make use of a linguist’s training. She describes her experiences as a founding member of the Navajo Language Academy and coauthor with Dr. Parsons Yazzie of the Navajo textbook *Diné Bizaad Bináhoo’áah* (Rediscovering the Navajo Language), which has been officially adopted as a state textbook for New Mexico.

In “Must There Be Two Solitudes? Language Activists and Linguists Working Together” Keren Rice suggests that there can be two solitudes that divide linguists and language activists and argues that there needs to be a mutual recognition that linguists and Indigenous communities must work together to help revitalize Indigenous languages. She maintains that it takes a community of people for language revitalization to take place and that in order for linguists and language activists to truly work together relationships, respect, reciprocity and recognition are critical.

Lenore Grenoble in “Linguistic Cages and the Limits of Linguists” continues the discussion started by Speas and Rice, noting that language documentation has largely been driven by the needs and goals of the community of outside linguists, with less attention to the needs of communities of language users and potential speakers. The result is a mismatch between the materials produced by linguists and the needs of communities. Yet in order for any revitalization program to be successful, it must be community driven. She calls for a reassessment of the goals and methods of linguistic research on endangered languages, with collaboratively determined research agendas.

In “Language Renewal as Sites of Language Ideological Struggle: The Need for ‘Ideological Clarification’” Paul V. Kroskrity draws from his 25 years of experience with linguistic documentation and language renewal to explore the conflicts over the beliefs and feelings about languages and the importance of early-on resolving these conflicts at a local level to enhance language revitalization efforts.
In the next section four papers describe some of the challenges facing the successful revitalization efforts in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Hawai‘i and Alaska. The Māori of Aotearoa made one of the earliest and most successful efforts to revitalize an Indigenous language, and other Indigenous peoples have learned a lot and still have a lot to learn from their experiences as Darrell Kipp noted in his keynote speech at the May 2008 symposium. The first article in this section “Changing Pronunciation of the Māori Language: Implications for Revitalization” by Jeanette King, Ray Harlow, Catherine Watson, Peter Keegan and Margaret Maclagan deals with how second language learners have their work cut out for them if they want to pronounce their new language in the same way as Native speakers. The authors note how over the last century the pronunciation of the Māori language has changed. Analysis of these changes indicates that the phonology of the dialect of English spoken in New Zealand is having a far-reaching impact on a number of aspects of Māori phonology. They discuss the implications of these changes for Māori language revitalization and preliminary developments in the production of a Māori pronunciation aid.

Jeanette King notes in “Language is Life: The Worldview of Second Language Speakers of Māori” how it takes a “fanatic” to put in the time and effort to learn an Indigenous language as a second language. She describes how the bulk of proficient Māori speakers have learned it as a second language and how they are motivated by a strongly-held worldview centered on personal transformation that enables them to engage with and maintain a relationship with their Māori language, a worldview that has a different focus from that held by national and tribal language planners and speakers of other indigenous languages.

In “Reo o te Kāinga (Language of the Home): A Ngāi Te Rangi Language Regeneration Project” Ngareta Timutimu, Teraania Ormsby-Teki and Riri Ellis present the preliminary findings of a twelve month collaborative research project. Researchers and whānau (family) members worked together to identify barriers and solutions associated with increasing the speaking of the Māori language in the home. The researchers emphasize the key role of Māori families in language revitalization.

Then in “Indigenous New Words Creation: Perspectives from Alaska and Hawai‘i” Larry Kimura and April Counceller describe Hawaiian efforts to make their language vital in this modern world and how the Hawaiians reached out to help Alaskan Natives. They give the context, background and history of the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee and Alutiq New Words Council, discussing committee membership, word formation techniques and other relevant issues involved in developing new vocabulary for indigenous languages so that these languages can be used to discuss new things and concepts that were not known previously to speakers of these languages.

The next four papers describe some of the uses of technology in language revitalization. While technology is very useful in archiving the words of Native speakers, its role in language teaching can be more controversial. One important role technology can play in language revitalization is bringing together geographically dispersed speakers over the Internet in real time with both sound
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and video to converse together in their language as was demonstrated in a live presentation at the 14th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Language Symposium in Michigan. In “The Pedagogical Potential of Multimedia Dictionaries: Lessons from a Community Dictionary Project” Haley De Korne describes how she worked with The Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians to develop a user-friendly dictionary. She discusses issues surrounding the creation of a dictionary aimed at facilitating Indigenous language acquisition, including the possibilities and limitations of multimedia, educational approaches and the needs of Heritage language learners along with some specific approaches to enhance the educational potential of a multimedia dictionary.

In “Developing Intermediate Language Learning Materials: A Labrador Inuktitut Story Database” Joan Dicker, Ewan Dunbar and Alana Johns describe the collaboration between two linguists and a public school language teacher in the making of a story database for use in the second language learning of Labrador Inuktitut in Canada, including the process through which the collaboration took place and the development of a story database that can be used by intermediate language learners with a large amount of original Inuktitut data.

In “Indigenous Language Revitalization and Technology” Candace K. Galla explores ways in which Indigenous communities have used and are using computer technology and describes areas in which these technologies can be used to help revitalize Indigenous languages, including various efforts using technology to help revive Hawaiian and other languages. In “Blackfoot Lullabies and Language Revitalization” Mizuki Miyashita and Shirlee Crow Shoe describe how they, a linguist and a native speaker, worked together to record Blackfoot lullabies to both help preserve them and to use them as language teaching tools. They discuss the implications of using lullabies in language revitalization and describe their fieldwork of lullaby collection, data organization and the transcription of lyrics and melody.

In the final section on Assessing Language Revitalization Efforts, Melissa Borgia describes how the Ganôhôsege:kha: Hê:nôdeyê:stha (Faithkeeper’s School), a small Onôn:dowaga: (Seneca) Culture-Language School in upstate New York, modified existing language assessment tools so they could measure the progress of their students. She presents background information on the school, analyzes its curriculum and teaching methodologies and reviews the importance of data collection and student/teacher assessments and the particular implications of assessments for a specific type of school such as the Faithkeepers. After describing the commonly-used FLOSEM oral language skills evaluation matrix and New York State assessment tools, she explains the new rubrics developed for the Faithkeeper’s School, which are displayed in the appendices.

Together, we hope the papers collected here will help both linguists and community language activists advance the goal of Indigenous language revitalization.

Jon Reyhner, Louise Lockard
College of Education, Northern Arizona University