2
Why language revitalisation sometimes works

Michael Walsh[1]

Abstract

The last 20 years have seen a global upsurge in language revitalisation but some of these efforts prosper while others falter. Focusing mainly on language revitalisation initiatives in south-eastern Australia an attempt is made to consider what sort of factors contribute to successful language revitalisation. Among these are some that are relatively obvious, like a sizeable knowledge base, access to linguistic expertise and sustained commitment from Elders. However there are other factors perhaps less often considered, such as cultural awareness (Spindler 1999; Spindler & Spindler 1994). These and other factors will be described and then applied to a number of language revitalisation initiatives in south-eastern Australia. Hopefully this will trigger discussion and debate about the prerequisites for more effective language revitalisation as well as its sustainability.

Preamble: from the general to the particular

To consider some of the factors that contribute to the success of language revitalisation initiatives I will review some general ideas drawn from commentators from around the world and then focus on some of the efforts undertaken in recent years in south-eastern Australia. Obviously these remarks should only be thought of as general guidelines rather than as definitive answers. As Ash, Fermino and Hale point out:

> local conditions are very particular and, in the final analysis, unique. Programs in support of local languages necessarily address local conditions. The sharing of materials and ideas among language projects and the use of consultants in relevant fields (for example, linguistics, education, and computers) are good and often absolutely necessary, of course, but the structure of a local language program is determined by local considerations. We have seen no exceptions to

1 Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney.

this, neither in places we have worked – Australia, Central America, and North America – nor in places we have visited or read about, including Europe, China, Northern Ireland, North Africa, and Polynesia. Realism is no less essential in this regard than in relation to the challenges confronting the movement as a whole. (2001, p. 20)

This particularistic approach is in contrast to the forthright pronouncements of the Blackfeet language activist, Darrell R. Kipp (2000):

Rule 1: Never Ask Permission, Never Beg to Save the Language. Go ahead and get started, don't wait even five minutes. Don't wait for a grant …

Rule 2: Don't Debate the Issues

Rule 3: Be Very Action-Oriented: Just act

Rule 4: Show, Don't Tell. Don't talk about what you will do. Do it and show it. (cited in Reyhner 2003, p. 3)

While it's possible that this approach has been effective for the Blackfeet, I doubt that it could be applied to situations with which I am familiar in Australia. There are situations which require some adjustment before there can be much hope for success in language revitalisation. For instance Fettes (1997, pp. 307–08) observes:

The first strand of language renewal does not depend on the indigenous language itself at all. It is the task of confronting, marginalizing, and dismantling the secondary discourses of alienation carried by the invading language. Critical illness, here, is the state of a community whose members see themselves as powerless to change their lives; whose families are being destroyed by abuse; and whose leadership, whether in the fields of politics, health, education, social welfare, or whatever, is locked into distant, impersonal structures and meaning systems.

… an Apache, Bernadette Adley-SantaMaria, told us that some tribal members view the language as evil, as contrary to the teachings of the Bible. Such a discourse will doom a language in the long run, unless you can either marginalize it or replace it with a different, language-friendly one.

Self-respect and empowerment

The literature on endangered languages, however, does throw up some themes that fall somewhere between the highly particular and highly general ends of the spectrum. A number of commentators for instance (see also Amery 2000; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998) have emphasised the need for self-respect and empowerment:

revitalization is not about recreating a community of native speakers; it is rather about issues of self-respect and empowerment, and about reclaiming one's ethnic identity – issues of human value which cannot necessarily be measured in number of words or phrases learned. (Craig 1992, p. 23)

Consistent with these sentiments one group of New South Wales Aboriginal people (in some areas referred to as Goories, also known as Koories), the Gumbaynggirr, presented an eloquent manifesto in 1991:

> We believe
>
> * that we Goories are our culture
> * that home is the place where our culture is passed on. We have learnt that schools are only good as back-ups; they are not the first place where culture is taught
> * that we and our culture have been invaded and hurt over the last 203 years.
> * that we need to talk about the way we are now, and about our roots, so that we can be clear about what we want to pass on to our kids
>
> If we are confident about our Goorie culture, it will help us not just to cope with the society around us, but to stand strong in our identity and share this strength with our kids. (Muurrbay cited in McKay 1996, p. 48)

Indigenous control

Another recurring issue is the need for Indigenous control of the process. Too often language revitalisation attempts to focus excessively on educational institutions that are usually not under the control of the Indigenous community. The Gumbaynggirr manifesto stresses 'that schools are only good as back-ups; they are not the first place where culture is taught'. A more strident rejection of schools as a primary focus is provided by Johnson (1987, p. 56):

> the school is usually the major non-Aboriginal organization in a community [referring especially to northern Australia], and its ways of working are alien to Aboriginal society. It is probably the major instrument of assimilation at work, and as such acts as an agent of the outside government and society. Any language maintenance project should be very wary of working directly with and through the non-Aboriginal education system. The fate of language is very closely bound up with that of local control and understanding of educational goals, and language maintenance must include this as one of its basic aims.

Some examples of what is needed for 'successful' language revitalisation

Yamamoto (1998, p. 114) sets out nine factors 'that help maintain and promote the small languages':

* the existence of a dominant culture in favour of linguistic diversity
* a strong sense of ethnic identity within the endangered community
* the promotion of educational programmes about the endangered language and culture
* the creation of bilingual/bicultural school programmes
* the training of native speakers as teachers
* the involvement of the speech community as a whole

- the creation of language materials that are easy to use
- the development of written literature, both traditional and new
- the creation and strengthening of the environments in which the language must be used.

These are all worthy ingredients and should be considered when assessing an existing language revitalisation effort or planning a proposed one. But there are other approaches which, in my view, overreach what is needed – at least in Aboriginal Australia. One such approach has been advanced by David Crystal (2000, pp. 130–41):

> [six] postulates for a theory of language revitalization (i.e. prerequisites for progress towards the goal of language being used in the home and the neighbourhood as a tool of inter-generational communication):
>
> 1. An endangered language will progress if its speakers increase their prestige within the dominant community
> 2. An endangered language will progress if its speakers increase their wealth relative to the dominant community
> 3. An endangered language will progress if its speakers increase their legitimate power in the eyes of the dominant community
> 4. An endangered language will progress if its speakers have a strong presence in the educational system
> 5. An endangered language will progress if its speakers can write their language down
> 6. An endangered language will progress if its speakers can make use of electronic technology.

Most of these I would see as possibly desirable but not necessary for success, and indeed most of them are not achievable in Aboriginal Australia. For instance in the near future it's neither likely that speakers will increase their wealth relative to the dominant community nor that they will increase their prestige within the dominant community. Literacy in one's own language and use of electronic technology might be desirable but are by no means necessary for an endangered language to progress.

There are now sets of guidelines available (for example Assembly of Alaska Native Educators 2001; Grenoble & Whaley 2006, especially pp. 202–04; Ignace 1998; Linn et al. 2002; Paton et al., forthcoming). There is also program-specific advice like Hinton (2002, pp. 91–105) on the master–apprentice system. Reyhner (1999, p. vi) sets out suggested interventions based on different stages of language endangerment. Hinton (1994, pp. 243–44) presents eight points of language learning in terms of what the teacher should do with a counterpart activity for the learner.

An example of success in an Australian school-based program

This case study of St Mary's Primary School in Bowraville, NSW will present some of the features that I regard as contributing to a general wish list for successful language revitalisation programs:

Three key features contribute to the success of the language program at St Mary's.

First, the support provided by the Muurrbay and the MRALC [Many Rivers Aboriginal Language Centre] enhances program quality by providing appropriately trained teaching staff.

Second, the Gumbaynggirr language program at St Mary's fits within the context of the school's social justice vision. In particular, the vision, energy, and commitment of the principal to make a difference in the lives of the students and their families – to break the cycle of poverty and powerlessness experienced by many of the schools' students and their families – has created a context in which the Gumbaynggirr language program can thrive. The principal has fostered this commitment among her staff.

Third, there is a clear understanding of the necessary components of a successful language program. For instance, in 2005 when several local schools expressed an interest in introducing Gumbaynggirr language classes they did not proceed because of the lack of Gumbaynggirr language teachers. In response to this need, Muurrbay developed a course that not only helps students learn Gumbaynggirr, but that also assists them in developing skills in *how to teach language*. Muurrbay staff recognise that simply knowing some Language is not enough; people need to develop their teaching skills before they can work successfully with children in classrooms. (Purdie et al. 2008, pp. 174–75)

A wishlist for successful language revitalisation programs

The language-culture connection and cultural awareness

Particularly in south-eastern Australia there are Aboriginal individuals and groups who assert that they have lost their language and therefore their culture. I witnessed statements of this kind many times during a survey of NSW Aboriginal languages undertaken with two Aboriginal co-researchers in 1999–2000 (Palmer 2000). Sometimes it was followed up with remarks such as: 'We've got nothing!' Such comments were around before that survey and still persist. One reaction is for some Aboriginal people – usually youngish men, in my experience – to undertake what I have referred to as the cultural 'grand tour' (Walsh 2009). This is a reference to the practice undertaken by the young elites of England during the 17th and 18th centuries where they would spend two to four years travelling across Europe experiencing its languages and cultures. The modern Aboriginal practitioners of the cultural grand tour are in search of 'culture' and roam mainly across northern Australia looking for 'real Aborigines' with 'real culture'. Sometimes they encounter Aboriginal people in a town like Darwin who tell them that in fact real culture is not there but thousands of kilometres to the south in the desert country or hundreds of kilometres to the east in north-east Arnhem Land. Some may realise that they had culture all the time and, while it may be interesting to observe cultural practices at the other end of Australia, one should accept that culture is inside a person and their group. As the

Gumbaynggirr expressed it: 'We believe that we Goories are our culture … that we need to talk about the way we are now' (Muurrbay, cited in McKay 1996, p. 48).

It seems to me that this kind of cultural awareness is absolutely critical for success in a language revitalisation initiative. One must acknowledge that there is a deep connection between one's language and culture, that they are legitimate as they are now and that the culture and language of other groups is not somehow better than one's own. To that end the Spindlers, specialists in the anthropology of education (for example Spindler & Spindler 1994; Spindler 1999), have identified different kinds of cultural knowledge and see *cultural therapy* as a means to improving the cultural awareness of students and teachers. In particular, *submerged cultural knowledge* (Spindler 1999, pp. 468–70) is especially relevant for a significant number of Aboriginal people. In my view Aboriginal people who are comfortable using the word culture will also be more accepting of practices that will assist the delivery of a language revitalisation program (Walsh 2009). This acceptance of culture can also allow a people to get over some of the wrongs they have experienced in the past.

Stebbins (2003, pp. 10–11), referring to the Tsimshian people of British Columbia, comments on the link between language and social justice. The renewal of their language has the potential to be a source of strength for the community. This is important as these and other First Nations peoples are frequently looked down upon by other Canadians, but:

> Even within the Tsimshian community there is a dearth of positive ways of expressing and elaborating on Tsimshian identity. For example, in making statements about themselves or their community to me, Tsimshian people regularly said things like: 'We have to argue,' 'There's a lot of jealousy in our community,' 'You won't want to come back to us dumb Indians.' I am unable to recall an example in which a Tsimshian person made a positive statement about their community. (Stebbins 2003, p. 11)

The very act of promoting the language assists potential speakers to confront some of the negative attitudes towards the language that they have acquired after a long period of discrimination. For example consider the Tlingit people of south-east Alaska:

> In reality, many people are afraid of the traditional language. It is alien, unknown, and difficult to learn. It can be a constant reminder of a deficiency and a nagging threat to one's image of cultural competence.
>
> …
>
> It is not easy to overcome this pain. Many potential language teachers have commented with bitterness, 'They beat the languages out of us in school, and now the schools want to teach it.' (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998, p. 65)

Community cohesion

Assuming that a group or at least most of its members have achieved cultural awareness, an important prerequisite for effective language revitalisation is community cohesion. Without a degree of consensus, it is difficult to resolve language issues – such as the practice of dual naming in New South Wales. Dual naming is a minimal form of language revitalisation in which pre-existing Aboriginal names are reinstated for places already commonly known by a non-Aboriginal name, and is an initiative of the Geographical Names Board of NSW (GNB). Dawes Point, for example, is the non-Aboriginal placename for the southern foot of the Sydney Harbour Bridge that has had the Dharug name *Tar-ra* re-instated.

I have participated in quite a few meetings with Aboriginal groups on dual naming, at which it has been pointed out that the GNB has no intention to coerce Aboriginal people into reaching a decision. If there is a division of opinion about how to proceed then the GNB will withdraw until a consensus has been reached (see also Troy & Walsh 2009). This is an instance of divided community opinion in miniature; in the delivery of a full-language revitalisation program there will be numerous decisions to make, most of them much more pressing than a dual naming exercise. If the community cannot reach consensus often enough on even small issues, then the success of language revitalisation programs will be put in jeopardy.

Community control

Another recurring theme is that the process of language revitalisation needs to be under Indigenous community control. This is sufficiently obvious that little more needs to be said. However as the Indigenous community becomes enmeshed in a network of non-Aboriginal organisations there need to be constant reminders to these other agencies that community control must be respected and genuinely embraced in their negotiations (see also Penfield et al. 2008).

More than language

Numerous language revitalisation programs have stressed that language is just one part of the process and that other cultural activities need to be integrated into that process.

Sizeable knowledge base and access to information on endangered languages

If the knowledge base for an endangered language is minimal then there are limits on what can be achieved in a language revitalisation program. For instance the Yitha-Yitha/Dadi-Dadi language, traditionally spoken along one part of the NSW-Victoria border, is one example of insufficient data to allow a major language revitalisation initiative, with just 150 items of vocabulary and five pages of grammar (Blake 2002, p. 164). Nevertheless significant progress has been made for a number of Victorian Aboriginal languages in spite of their relatively meagre documentation (see also J. Reid; Eira & Solomon-Dent, this volume).

Another issue is access to information on endangered languages. In the past some Aboriginal groups were barely aware of the recordings of their ancestral languages held in libraries and archives. Even when they have been aware of such resources there can be a considerable amount of processing required before they can be converted into a form suitable for language revitalisation. This processing often requires expertise in linguistics. In some instances a community may wish to restrict access to their information (see, for instance, Newry & Palmer 2003). This is a matter that must be addressed on a case by case basis.

Access to linguistic expertise

Having surveyed numerous language revitalisation programs in Australia and around the world (Walsh 2005) I do not know of any that have been successful and have not had the sustained input of expertise in linguistics. Input from a linguist may be necessary but it can cause disquiet in an Aboriginal community. Increasingly linguists have questioned their role in the process (see also Dobrin 2005, 2008; Grenoble 2009; Kroskrity 2009; Musgrave & Thieberger 2007). For example Rice (2009, p. 38) poses these among other questions:

> Putting language activists and linguists together, we can then ask questions such as the following: How do the goals of linguists and the goals of language activists mesh with one another? Can they contribute to each other's enterprises? Importantly, in a situation where the linguists tend to be outsiders to a language community, what do linguists have to offer?

In an article tellingly titled 'What I didn't know about working in an endangered language community' Nagy (2000) presents the linguist as wearing five hats: being involved in general social science, theoretical linguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and technology. So the multifaceted nature of this work places high demands on the next generation of scholars. They will need appropriate training in the first instance and a reward structure that will advance rather than retard their careers. The linguist also needs to explore ways in which the community can be better integrated into their process as Grinevald (2007, p. 43) observes:

> A future perspective in terms of the community also means considering the sustainability of the work done on the language, through empowerment of members of the community, particularly in the form of continued training of speakers and semi-speakers capable and interested, and participation and support to the production of language materials, with a view to producing material that is actually usable in the field and by the community.

In addition, Eira (2008) explores some of the ways in which linguists may be unaware of how some of their underlying discursive practices impede collaborative efforts (see also Eira 2007).

Overcoming the genetic fallacy

Frequently members of an Aboriginal community will claim that the best (or even the only) people who should teach the language are the Elders and the only people who should learn it are descendants of speakers of the ancestral language. It is also sometimes claimed that it will be easier for those descendants to learn that language because it is part of them. These views can have disastrous consequences for a successful language revitalisation program, particularly when the Elders have little or no knowledge of the language and may be ashamed and, at the same time, younger people find learning the language not at all an easy process but a highly demanding and demoralising one. The Dauenhauers (1998, p. 84) have dubbed this the *genetic fallacy*, that is the 'assumption that the ancestral or heritage language will be easier for a person of the same ethnic background … [and] teachers must also be of the ethnic group'. This genetic fallacy needs to be acknowledged and people need to accept that regaining a language is not easy for anyone – indeed it is a formidable task requiring long-term commitment and continuing support.

The need to foreground oracy rather than fall back on the 'easier' option: literacy

For Aboriginal languages which have not been spoken much in recent decades it can be tempting for members of the community to rely on literacy, and the same is true of teachers whether they be community members or not (see also Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998, pp. 86–91). This is not a matter of all or nothing: both oracy and literacy should have a place but, in my view, regaining oral skills should be the primary goal. One means of foregrounding oracy is through technology.

Technology

It needs to be emphasised that the use of technology in a language revitalisation program needs to be appropriate. Sometimes it can amount to an avoidance strategy, a technical fix (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998, pp. 70–71) which actually impedes genuine training and interaction. However there are uses which can be beneficial, such as talking dictionaries, where a resource that is otherwise predominately literate gains an oral dimension through audio-clips. An example is the very substantial materials developed for South Australian languages like Arabana (Wilson & Hercus 2004) and Adnyamathanha (Tunstill 2004). This is particularly valuable for Aboriginal people who may be less than comfortable with the orthography developed for their language (see also N. Reid, this volume). The talking dictionary gives them direct access to the voices of their ancestors or older community members. Interestingly, computer technology can also be used to improve literacy as Auld (2002) reports on the use of talking books in Ndjébbana, a language with around 200 speakers in central Arnhem Land. In their case oracy is not really the problem but the talking books assist people to become print-literate. In some instances technological solutions may have particular appeal to younger people as with the deployment of dictionaries into mobile phones (Wilson, this volume).

Trained teachers of languages

One of the more significant ingredients for success in language revitalisation is having trained teachers of languages (Hobson 2006). As indicated earlier in discussing the genetic fallacy, it is not enough just to be a member of the community; teaching languages effectively requires targeted training. Sometimes in the past, teachers of Aboriginal languages have had no teacher training of any kind – let alone specific training in languages pedagogy. This shortfall is now being addressed by such targeted programs as the Master of Indigenous Languages Education based at the Koori Centre at the University of Sydney.

Sustained commitment from Elders

This is another factor that may seem so obvious as to be not worth raising. However I believe it is something that needs to be kept in the foreground as other essential factors like community cohesion and community control crucially hinge on a sustained commitment from Elders.

Regional support network

To sustain a language revitalisation effort it is essential that there be a regional support network. It cannot be over-emphasised how herculean a task such efforts can be. Particularly when there are just a few people working in isolated centres, the constant difficulties can prove overwhelming. Opportunities to share experiences with others engaged in similar activities is necessary on a fairly regular basis not just to learn from others but to recharge one's batteries.

Willingness to draw on existing resources from elsewhere and adapt them to the local situation

There is now a wealth of resources developed elsewhere which have the potential to be adapted. For instance the Yup'ik of Alaska have made their bilingual curriculum available (Norris-Tull 2000) and there are online resources for various languages including Hawaiian,[2] Māori,[3] and Comanche.[4] Within Australia the NSW Department of Education and Training has produced an online guide entitled 'Introducing an Aboriginal languages program'.[5]

Funding

Finally it is worth mentioning funding. I have left it until last because, in my view, while financial support is very useful it is not what I would see as a primary ingredient for success. One can think of programs operating side by side: one relatively well

---

2 See www.ahapunanaleo.org/eng/.

3 See www.rakaumanga.school.nz.

4 See www.comanchelanguage.org.

5 See www.curriculumsupport.education.nsw.gov.au/primary/languages/aboriginal/.

resourced and achieving very little, the other not well resourced at all but making significant progress. Indeed one commentator has given advice on 'What to do before the grants come through' (Ahlers 2009).

Addressing problems but not being overwhelmed by them

As a postscript to this wish list it is appropriate to acknowledge that there are numerous problems in the delivery of a successful language revitalisation program – Tsunoda (2005, pp. 179–200) presents a comprehensive account of them – but one should not become overwhelmed by them.

A wishlist in relation to a successful language revitalisation program

While it is unlikely that any one program will have all of these, those that are working better will probably have most of them. For example we can apply these factors to the Gumbaynggirr (see also Walsh 2001). Given the previously mentioned Gumbaynggirr manifesto it is clear that cultural awareness has underpinned this program from its earliest days. Whatever the internal issues that may have been going on in the background, the Gumbaynggirr appear to have maintained unity in their language revitalisation efforts. It is also clear they have maintained community control of the process. It is no accident that the Gumbaynggirr organisation responsible for language revitalisation, the Muurrbay Aboriginal Language and Culture Co-operative, contains the word culture: it is apparent in their publications and activities that they see language as being grounded in a broader cultural context. Regarding the knowledge base, the Gumbaynggirr have been fortunate to be able to draw on fairly substantial materials, not just written but audio recordings. They have also had the long-term commitment from Brother Steve Morelli who made a point of gaining expertise in linguistics so that he could better assist the process. More recently members of the Gumbaynggirr community have been gaining skills in linguistics as well. The Gumbaynggirr clearly have a preference for sourcing teachers from their own community but they have allowed outsiders to be involved in the process, and these teachers have gained the appropriate level of training. They have maintained a good balance between oracy and literacy and have embraced technology in appropriate ways. There is little doubt that there has been a sustained commitment from Elders and they have been part of a regional support network. They have shown a willingness to draw on existing resources from elsewhere and adapt them to the local situation, and have been fortunate enough to gain a certain amount of funding.

While they have been one of the more successful language revitalisation programs it has not been easy for the Gumbaynggirr and remains a struggle. But their progress shows it can be possible and provides a ready example for others to follow.

References

Ahlers JC (2009). Language restoration before funding: or, what to do before the grants come through. In WY Leonard & SEB Gardner (Eds). *Language is life* (pp. 48–59). Proceedings of the 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference. Berkeley: Survey of California and Other Indian Languages.

Amery R (2000). *Warrabarna Kaurna! reclaiming an Australian language.* Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Ash A, Fermino J & Hale K (2001). Diversity in local language maintenance and restoration: a reason for optimism. In L Hinton & K Hale (Eds). *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 19–35). San Diego: Academic Press.

Assembly of Alaska Native Educators (2001). *Guidelines for strengthening indigenous languages.* Anchorage: Alaska Native Knowledge Network [Online]. Available: www.ankn.uaf.edu/ Publications/language.html [Accessed 26 March 2009].

Auld G (2002). The role of the computer in learning Ndjébbana. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(2): 41–58 [Online]. Available: llt.msu.edu/vol6num2/auld/ [Accessed 25 March 2009].

Blake B (2002). Reclaiming languages in Aboriginal Victoria. In D Bradley & M Bradley (Eds). *Language endangerment and language maintenance* (pp. 156–66). London: Routledge Curzon.

Craig C (1992). A constitutional response to language endangerment: the case of Nicaragua. *Language*, 68(1): 17–24.

Crystal D (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dauenhauer NM & Dauenhauer R (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from southeast Alaska. In L Grenoble & L Whaley (Eds). *Endangered languages: language loss and community response* (pp. 57–98). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobrin L (2005). When our values conflict with theirs: linguists and community empowerment in Melanesia. In P Austin (Ed). *Language documentation and description.* Vol 3 (pp. 42–52). London: School of Oriental & African Studies.

Dobrin L (2008). From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia. *Language*, 84(2): 300–24.

Eira C (2007). Addressing the ground of language endangerment. In MK David, N Ostler & C Dealwis (Eds). *Working together for endangered languages: research challenges and social impacts* (pp. 82–98). Proceedings of the Foundation for Endangered Languages Conference XI, Kuala Lumpur, 26–28 October 2007. Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Eira C (2008). Linguists and communities: discursive practice and the status of collaborative language work in Indigenous communities. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 8(4): 278–97.

Fettes M (1997). Stabilizing what? An ecological approach to language renewal. In J Reyhner (Ed). *Teaching Indigenous languages* (pp. 301–18). Flagstaff, Arizona: Center for Excellence in Education.

Grenoble L & Whaley D (2006). *Saving languages: an introduction to language revitalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grenoble L (2009). Linguistic cages and the limits of linguists. In J Reyhner & L Lockard (Eds). *Indigenous language revitalization: encouragement, guidance & lessons learned* (pp. 61–69). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

Grinevald C (2007). Linguistic fieldwork among speakers of endangered languages. In O Miyaoka, O Sakiyama & ME Krauss (Eds). *The vanishing languages of the Pacific rim* (pp. 35–76). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hinton L (1994). *Flutes of fire*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Hinton L (2002). *How to keep your language alive: a commonsense approach to one-on-one language*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Hobson J (2006). Who will teach our languages? In N Parbury & R Craven (Eds). *Aboriginal studies: making the connections* (pp. 166–74). Collected Papers of the 12th national Aboriginal Studies Association Conference; Bankstown, 2–3 November 2006. Sydney: Aboriginal Studies Association.

Ignace MB (1998). *Handbook for Aboriginal language program planning in British Columbia.* North Vancouver: First Nations Education Steering Committee [Online]. Available: www.fnesc.ca/publications/pdf/language.pdf [Accesssed 25 March 2009].

Johnson S (1987). The philosophy and politics of Aboriginal language maintenance. *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 1987(2): 54–58.

Kipp DR (2000). *Encouragement, guidance, insights, and lessons learned for native language activists developing their own tribal language program.* St Paul, Minnesota: Grotto Foundation.

Kroskrity P (2009). Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle. The need for 'ideological clarification'. In J Reyhner & L Lockard (Eds). *Indigenous language revitalization: encouragement, guidance & lessons learned* (pp. 61–69). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

Linn MS, Naranjo T, Nicholas S, Slaughter I, Yamamoto A & Zepeda O (2002). Awakening the languages. Challenges of enduring language programs: field reports from 15 programs from Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma. In B Burnaby & J Reyhner (Eds). *Indigenous languages across the community* (pp. 105–26). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

McKay G (1996). *The land still speaks: review of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander language maintenance and development needs and activities.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Musgrave S & Thieberger N (2007). Who pays the piper? In MK David, N Ostler & C Dealwis (Eds). *Working together for endangered languages: research challenges and social impacts (pp. 47–*

55).Proceedings of the Foundation for Endangered Languages conference XI, Kuala Lumpur, 26–28 October 2007. Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Nagy N (2000). What I didn't know about working in an endangered language community. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 144: 143–60.

Newry D & Palmer K (2003). 'Whose language is it anyway?' Rights to restrict access to endangered languages: a north-east Kimberley example. In J Blythe & RM Brown (Eds). *Maintaining the links: language, identity and the land* (pp. 101–06). Proceedings of the 7th Foundation for Endangered Languages conference; Broome, Western Australia, 22–24 September 2003. Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Norris-Tull D (2000). *Our language our souls. The Yup'ik bilingual curriculum of the Lower Kuskokwim school district: a continuing success story*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network [Online]. Available: ankn.uaf.edu/curriculum/Yupiaq/DelenaNorrisTull/bLower%20 Kuskokwim%20bilingual.htm [Accessed 26 March 2009].

Palmer K (Ed) (2000). *Strong language, strong culture: New South Wales strategic language study. Final report and strategy action plan* [compiled by DF Hosking, TJ Lonsdale, JF Troy, & MJ Walsh]. Canberra: Australian Institute for Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Studies.

Paton D, Pascoe B & Eira C (forthcoming). Peetyawan weeyn: a guide for community language programs. Melbourne: Victorian Aboriginal Corporation for Languages.

Penfield SD, Serratos A, Tucker BV, Flores A, Harper G, Hill J Jr & Vasquez N (2008). Community collaborations: best practices for North American indigenous language documentation. Small languages and small language communities. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 191: 187–202.

Purdie N, Frigo T, Ozolins C, Noblett G, Thieberger N & Sharp J (2008). *Indigenous languages programmes in Australian schools: a way forward.* Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research [Online]. Available: www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/FBEAC65B-3A11-41F0-B836-1A480FDD82F9/25487/LPfinal130109NP.pdf [Accessed 25 March 2009].

Reyhner J (1999). Some basics of indigenous language revitalization. In J Reyhner, G Cantoni, RN St Clair & E Parsons Yazzie (Eds). *Revitalizing indigenous languages* (pp. v–xx). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

Reyhner J (2003). Native language immersion. In J Reyhner, O Trujillo, RL Carrasco & L Lockard (Eds). *Nurturing native languages* (pp. 1–6). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

Rice K (2009). Must there be two solitudes? Language activists and linguists working together. In J Reyhner & L Lockard (Eds). *Indigenous language revitalization: encouragement, guidance & lessons learned* (pp. 37–59). Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University.

Spindler G & Spindler L (Eds) (1994). *Pathways to cultural awareness: cultural therapy with teachers and students*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Spindler G (1999). Three categories of cultural knowledge useful in doing cultural therapy. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 30(4): 466–72.

Stebbins T (2003). *Fighting language endangerment: community directed research on Sm'algyax (Coast Tsimshian)*. Osaka, Japan: Osaka Gakuin University.

Troy J & Walsh M (2009). Reinstating Aboriginal placenames around Port Jackson and Botany Bay. In H Koch & L Hercus (Eds). *Aboriginal placenames: naming and re-naming the Australian landscape* (pp. 55–69). Aboriginal History Monograph 19. Canberra: Aboriginal History Inc and ANU E Press.

Tsunoda T (2005). *Language endangerment and language revitalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tunstill G (2004). *Adnyamathanha years R-10: a teaching framework for revival and second language learning in years reception to ten.* Hindmarsh, South Australia: Department of Education & Children's Services Publishing.

Walsh M (2001). A case study of language revitalisation in 'settled' Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2(2–3): 251–58.

Walsh M (2005). Will indigenous languages survive? *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34: 293–315.

Walsh M (2009). Losing the plot in Aboriginal Australia? Loss of culture, loss of language. Paper presented at the Aboriginal Policy Research Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, 12 March 2009.

Wilson G & Hercus L (2004). *Arabana, years R to 10: an Arabana teaching framework for reception to year ten: language revitalisation and second language learning.* Hindmarsh, South Australia: Department of Education & Children's Services Publishing.

Yamamoto A (1998). Linguists and endangered language communities: issues and approaches. In K Matsumura (Ed). *Studies in endangered languages* (pp. 231–52). International Clearing House for Endangered Languages, Linguistic Studies Vol 1. Tokyo: Hituji Syobo.