

## CHAPTER 15

---

# INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THEIR LANGUAGES

---

PIA LANE AND MIKI MAKIHARA

## INTRODUCTION

---

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS of language and nation have been reshaped through colonial and other kinds of cross-cultural encounter and domination over the past five centuries (e.g., Anderson, 1983; Errington, 2007; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1990; Irvine and Gal, 2000; Makihara and Schieffelin, 2007; Makoni and Pennycook, 2007). Colonial and missionary representations of languages have located, categorized, and fixed fluid and changing language practices into named, bounded, and ahistorical indigenous languages and ethnolinguistic groups, often in the forms of dictionaries, grammars, instructional texts, and translations. Such representations frequently became tools of government and the conversion of colonized populations in the context of what were often referred to as “civilizing missions.” These representations of indigenous languages filled the colonizers’ imagined void of historical and linguistic knowledge by constructing languages as primitive and peoples as savages to be civilized, serving the colonizers’ interests in extending military, economic, political, and cultural control. While such objectives have been challenged and reconceptualized, these and similar representations continue to exert influence in more recent efforts to shape postcolonial multicultural civil societies where members of indigenous communities now participate more actively. In recent decades, recognition and inclusion of indigenous and other minority languages in national language policies have typically been achieved as the result of grassroots social movements contributing to decolonization and multicultural nation building. Such national policies are in many cases leading to further standardization and other kinds of linguistic construction of indigenous languages. For example, particular linguistic varieties are chosen, valorized, and developed for use in national educational curricula, not only influencing their structure and use in school and media, but also transforming the linguistic economy of the wider local communities. Such projects

of conceptualization and change are often challenged and contested from within local communities, for example raising discussions on who has the authority to lead standardization processes, whose varieties are to be included, and who will have intellectual ownership of dictionaries and grammar books. Thus indigenous experiences are shaped and characterized by various tensions, which not only involve negotiation with national and regional governments, but also arise from local community dynamics. Many sociolinguistic changes occurring in the world today have to do with such different understandings of language, and linguistic diversity and change, and the consequences of language revitalization and standardization, especially as carried out through schools. The focus on indigenous peoples' ways of using language and their perspectives has shifted our traditional understandings of many of these sociolinguistic phenomena and in some cases has influenced these changes.

## DEFINING INDIGENOUS

---

The transnational category of *indigenous people* emerged and has been repeatedly redefined in the context of postcolonial political struggles for justice in multicultural societies during the twentieth century. The International Labour Organization (ILO)'s Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention (No. 107, 1957) established "indigenous" as an international legal category, and included linguistic rights along with land rights and other protections. Another significant step was taken on this front by the 2007 adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

A working definition commonly cited by nongovernmental organizations working with indigenous people is the following:

Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system. (Martínez Cobo, 1986/1987)

In working toward a definition of indigenous, we foreground group self-identification and subjectivity: people come to identify themselves as indigenous by recognizing shared cultural practices and experiences, and close connections to homeland. Indigenous peoples commonly also share a concern for increased collective self-determination based on preexisting entitlement claims. Thus, two important dimensions have emerged in the construction of indigenous identity: a cultural one and a political one. The cultural dimension emphasizes self-identification with the collective

history, traditions, and cultural and linguistic practices of a group. The political dimension describes indigenous peoples as “survivors of colonialism and resource exploitation on territories” (Patrick, 2012: 30) and thus as entitled to reclaim their dignity and sovereignty. The concept of indigenous simultaneously draws on discourses of local belonging to place and territory and the global discourse of indigeneity, underlying an inherent dynamic between rootedness and global identity processes. The category of indigenous thus serves as a tool for creating and negotiating identity on a global, local, and individual level, reclaiming rights within the framework of the nation-state and differentiating indigenous minorities from other migrant minority groups who may not so easily lay similar claims to territory and linguistic and other resources and rights, or retribution for past historical wrongs.

Anteriority, deep rootedness, and historical dispossession provide moral authority and a strong basis for indigenous peoples’ claims in negotiating terms of belonging and reparation with larger nation-states. The processes of negotiation for restoration are, however, inherently locally different, complex, and multifaceted, as they require reorganizations of the existing patterns of settlement, rights, and expectations. In the United States, grassroots initiatives of indigenous peoples have successfully led to federal recognitions of over 560 tribes, with tribal governments being granted a measure of sovereignty, reservation lands, and other benefits. However, the federal acknowledgment process is lengthy and costly, and objections might come from other tribal organizations and individual US states, and many organizations find it difficult to demonstrate that their tribes have maintained continuous and autonomous communities since prior to 1900. For example, it took over thirty-five years for the Muscogee Nation of Florida to gain federal recognition. Indigenous peoples’ struggles for justice and claims for reparation have brought about fundamental transformations in indigenous peoples’ lives and are bringing improvement of social, material, and cultural conditions. Such reparation processes often involve rectifying injustices of the past, but this is not without challenges, as undoing a wrong of the past may affect other groups negatively in the present (see, e.g., discussions in Waldron, 2003, and Bennett, 2005).

In many parts of Africa and Asia, on the other hand, long histories of large-scale migration conquest and labor contracting, including those prior to European colonization, have complicated the contexts, making claims to anteriority (or first occupancy) multilayered, historically precarious, and often controversial. Some national governments have been reluctant to recognize indigenous peoples, who have been working under the international rubric and struggling for better economic and political situations. Many Asian governments have sought to define indigenous as result of European colonial settlements and consider it a category not applicable to their citizens. Australia and Canada have official policies of multiculturalism promoting diversity and local democracy. However, indigenous and other scholars and activists have critiqued multiculturalism for failing to endorse anti-colonialism (see, e.g., Docker, 1995; Povinelli, 1998; St. Denis, 2011). They point out that the dominant discourses of multiculturalism in Australia and Canada often construct binary distinctions between settler and non-settler (including migrant) societies, the former standing for the unmarked and

dominant white nation in ways that erase the distinction of indigenous peoples and the history of colonization. In the European context, the terms *autochthonous* or *national minorities* are used with reference to non-immigrant minority groups and their languages, such as Basque and Welsh, though some segments of these groups would prefer a status of indigenes because of political rights and identity issues. In Africa, decolonization, democratization, and decentralization have led to increased concern with national belonging and access to natural and state resources (Geschiere, 2009). Geschiere (2009) argues that while regional differences exist in the way autochthony discourses are developed and deployed, autochthony (as well as indigeneity) presupposes national citizenship in both contexts. In many African settings, indigeneity is associated with, in addition to territoriality and marginalization in the state system, rural and “traditional” ways of life, such as hunting and gathering, and the term *indigenous* is often used to refer to non-European languages in general (see also Vigouroux and Mufwene, 2008). Such locally specific processes underscore that, even though there is a global discourse of indigenous rights, nation-states and local discourses have a significant role in shaping how struggles for linguistic, cultural, and political rights are carried out within the frame of nation-states.

Due to different precolonial, colonial, and postcolonial histories, the term *indigenous* is used and understood in different ways in different contexts. The peoples we are considering together in this chapter may or may not use the term *indigenous* (and its cognates or equivalents), or they may use other terms denoting indigenes or indigeneity. For example, in Australia and Canada, the terms *aboriginal* and *first peoples* are often used to denote an identity similar to indigenous. In Canada the term “First Nation” generally does not include Métis and Inuit, whereas the term *first peoples* encompasses these groups. Writing in a period when the term *tribe* was being replaced by *indigenous* in anthropological research, the Indian sociologist Bêteille (1998) describes the notions of tribe and tribal population as linked to the idea of types of society or stages of evolution, whereas indigenous focuses on territoriality or priority of settlement (Bêteille, 1998: 188).

The notion of territoriality also underlies May’s definition of indigenous peoples:

groups that are historically associated with a particular territory (i.e. they have not migrated to the territory from elsewhere) but because of conquest, confederation or colonisation are now regarded as minorities within that territory. (May, 2012: 136–137)

Groups may claim indigeneity without living on a “traditional” territory, as indigenous groups often have been forcefully relocated from their traditional lands or have migrated to other regions and countries or urban areas. Indigeneity may also be claimed without speaking an indigenous language. Therefore while the link between territoriality and cultural practices, including language, is a key part of many definitions of indigenous, this is a complex issue. Most indigenous peoples are multilingual in national, indigenous, and other languages. A monolingual bias coupled with this

notion, linking indigenous identity and rights to an indigenous language and a territory, has informed policies promoting indigenous languages as educational and public languages. Blommaert (2004), for example, highlights the importance of bilingual educational policies in indigenous and national languages as a way of ensuring the linguistic rights of indigenous peoples while also facilitating social and geographic mobility for marginalized groups.

In this chapter, we use indigenous as a multifaceted and deeply context-dependent category, encompassing terms such as *aboriginal*, *first nations*, *first peoples*, *tribal populations*, *autochthonous minorities*, and *natives* in historical, cultural, and political circumstances, as discussed earlier. These terms have regional histories, have taken on different connotations in different contexts and time periods, and are used to perform different aspects of indigeneity. Experiences of indigeneity vary, both on the group and individual level, and there are many different ways of being indigenous. The quest for defining what indigenous means and what it entails is part of becoming indigenous and privileging indigenous voices.

## SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND LINGUISTIC CHANGES IN INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

---

Prior to colonialism, some indigenous communities comprised relatively small ethnolinguistic groups who traditionally participated in relatively egalitarian multilingual communicative networks of neighboring peoples (e.g., the Vaupés River region of northwest Amazonia, as described by Jackson, 1983) or in sociolinguistic regions characterized by linguistic and cultural pluralism (e.g., precolonial South Asia, as reconstructed by Khubchandani, 1997). Precolonial communities did not exist in isolation; they interacted with each other through local and interregional trade, migration, marriage, war, and other kinds of exchange. The extent and nature of inequality and language hierarchies among linguistic groups in precolonial periods become more uncertain the further back in time, especially in orality-based communities, but European colonial projects imposed new and significantly larger scale economic, political, and linguistic hierarchies, which greatly disrupted local dynamics and set in motion deep processes of change in many of these communities. In the contexts of colonization, slavery, and plantation economies during the sixteenth–nineteenth centuries, mostly European language-based creoles arose (e.g., Chabacano in the Philippines, Haitian Creole). Some of these contact languages have since become main languages for communication, conquering more domains and replacing indigenous minority languages, resulting in ongoing widespread language shift. For example, in Papua New Guinea, the English-based creole language Tok Pisin (a national language of Papua New Guinea, along with English) and in the Solomon Islands Solomon Island Pijin (spoken extensively, although English is the official language) are displacing indigenous minority languages in the post-independence period (Jourdan, 2007; Kulick, 1997).

At times, indigenous peoples and their languages seemed destined to disappear, as their cultural and linguistic practices were suppressed, sidelined, or silenced as a consequence of European colonization and/or economic development, and by colonial and postcolonial assimilationist policies. Indeed, most indigenous communities are experiencing language shift and loss today. *Language shift* is a process by which “the habitual use of one language is being replaced by the habitual use of another” in communities (Gal, 1979:1) (see Engman and King, Chapter 10 of this volume). This community-level replacement is referred to as shift, whereas *language loss* refers to these replacement processes in habitual use at the individual level.

Language shift can occur as a direct consequence of disruptive and oppressive policies, for instance by physically relocating indigenous children to boarding schools, or can be propelled by ideology exercised via consent, for instance as parents may become convinced that giving up their mother tongue is what is best for their children (Lane, 2010). Fishman (1991) emphasizes intergenerational continuity in the family domain as one of the most important factors in language transmission and in reversing language shift. While the imposition of colonial and national languages has led in many cases to language shift and language death in indigenous communities, language shift is rarely a unilinear process. It is a complex and varied process that often involves interactions of a number of factors contributing to the cultural, political, and economic marginalization of indigenous minority language communities and the creation of sociolinguistic hierarchies (e.g., House, 2002; Kulick, 1997; Pietikäinen et al., 2010; Schmidt, 1985). The consequences of language shift are often manifested in intergenerational differences in communicative competence, as well as in language preferences and attitudes. Elders may express sentiments of discontinuity and loss, which can contribute to the estrangement and alienation of the youth who do not speak the ancestral language, even as youth often find ways to express their identities and continue to participate in their communities, often based on receptive linguistic skills (e.g., Kroskrity and Field, 2011; McCarty et al., 2006; Meek, 2010; Wyman et al., 2013). Works on indigenous peoples and their languages have thus highlighted the importance of cultural and ethnographic understanding of language practices and ideologies, underlying the dynamic and heterogeneous nature of language socialization, use, and ideologies. Linguistic anthropological studies have shown that *language ideologies*, or cultural conceptions of language, are particularly important in understanding changing sociolinguistic hierarchies and in directing sociolinguistic changes such as language shift, maintenance, and revitalization.

Makihara (2004, 2013) describes transformations in communicative practices and ideologies in Rapa Nui (Easter Island), a Polynesian indigenous community that is part of Chile. The normalization and extension of bilingual practices, widely held positive attitudes toward linguistic heteroglossia that are associated with modern Rapa Nui identity, and the rise of strong political indigenous movements have challenged and displaced the earlier “colonial diglossia,” a sociolinguistic hierarchy in which Spanish (the colonial and later national language), and Rapa Nui (the indigenous Polynesian language) had been more clearly compartmentalized by institutional spheres. This had helped to break down the earlier pattern—one common to indigenous and ethnic

minority language communities around the world—in which the speaker community's devaluation of their own language had led to the confinement of their language to fewer domains of use and even to the breakdown of intergenerational language transmission in the family domain. Through the indigenous political movements in more recent years, the Rapa Nui are reclaiming public domains that were previously dominated by Spanish and Continental Chileans. This has led to a remaking of the Rapa Nui language as a public language and the increased use of Rapa Nui language and bilingual practices in the community and family life.

Growing appreciation for their ancestral language and critical reflection on the processes of language shift and acculturation have led the community to turn greater attention to their language issues and to begin language and culture documentation and revitalization projects. The publications of dictionaries, grammars, and school textbooks were followed by the creation of a Rapa Nui immersion school program in 2000. The general sentiment of the community favors the idea of Rapa Nui language and its revitalization, but language activists and teachers have had to work very hard to establish and continue this program. Some local perceptions about language, its change, and its relation to people pose potential challenges to successful language revitalization. First, though many adult community members recognize that the children do not speak Rapa Nui, a commonly expressed attitude is that Rapa Nui does not need to be explicitly taught and that children can eventually and “naturally” learn “their” language because knowledge of language and culture is “in the blood,” thus allowing their speakers to overlook the importance of language socialization and use. While the extensive passive knowledge held by young people is an important resource in (re)claiming their ancestral language, language revitalization requires conscious efforts on the part of a significant portion of the community members to revise widely held dispositions toward language use. Many parents, however, prioritize their children's acquisition of Spanish as the language of social advancement and furthermore hold a notion of subtractive bilingualism in which the acquisition of Rapa Nui is thought to have a negative effect on children's acquisition of Spanish. Increased linguistic consciousness in the community and these ideas about languages are also redrawing language boundaries in some selective contexts where speakers make efforts in speaking Rapa Nui and Spanish separately. There are also emerging purist and policing linguistic practices that, when targeted toward nonfluent speakers or learners, may instill linguistic insecurity. These local perceptions pose potential challenges to successful language revitalization, which must strike a balance between focusing community efforts on the reinstitutionalization of the previously displaced language and fostering liveliness and creativity of language in everyday life to engage new generations.

The processes of colonization and decolonization, nation building, missionization, industrialization, urbanization, intermarriage, schooling, migration, globalization, and market economy expansion have all formed contexts and catalysts for sociolinguistic changes. The rate at which language death has been occurring is unprecedented in the history of humankind. According to one estimate, more than half of the world's languages are “moribund”—that is, spoken only by adults (Krauss, 1992). Hill (2002) and

Duchêne and Heller (2007) warn, however, that discourses of endangerment arise and are circulated by researchers and in public discourse and can possibly themselves contribute to the reification and simplistic enumeration of languages that risk essentializing speaker communities and reducing them, rather than promoting ethnolinguistic diversity (see Del Percio, Flubacher, and Duchêne, Chapter 3 of this volume). We will next discuss ways in which shifting research paradigms have informed indigenous language documentation and planning efforts.

## INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE DOCUMENTATION AND PLANNING

---

### Missionary and Colonial Linguistics

Beginning in the sixteenth century, a period of colonial exploration and expansion, European missionaries encountered languages that were often radically different from their own. In order to preach to potential converts, they learned, developed writing systems for, and created grammatical descriptions of and liturgical texts in local indigenous languages. In some cases, their activities led to the development of new linguistic varieties in indigenous communities. For example, Hanks (2010) describes how Spanish missionaries developed a new variety of Maya in the sixteenth century, based on existing Maya phonology and grammar, but with a reorganized lexicon and semantics in order to make it easier to translate and convey Christian ideas. He argues that this colonial variety of Maya became an essential linguistic tool in the social production of new colonial subjects. What is interesting to note is that the colonial variety of Maya subsequently came to be adopted by Maya writers outside of religious and governance contexts in ways that profoundly influenced Mayan language and culture. It is likely that linguistic descriptions and liturgical materials in many other indigenous languages have had similar enduring impacts on the use and form of these languages outside of religious contexts. For instance, missionaries played an important role in the standardization of African languages, even in situations where these standards might have been (and remain) at odds with everyday communicative practices (Deumert and Mabandla, forthcoming).

European colonial powers took advantage of the work of Christian missionary linguists in acquiring territories, exploiting labor and resources, and appropriating and subordinating indigenous languages and peoples (Errington, 2007). As Shellington (2005) remarks on the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, even where missionaries were for the most part not directly employed as agents of European imperialism, and may even have spoken out against abuses, they played a significant role in promoting and facilitating nineteenth- and twentieth-century European colonial activities in Africa and elsewhere. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986: 16) argues that colonialism aimed to control "the



mental universe of the colonized” by shaping “how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world” through the domination of their language. Many of the ideological and political economic legacies of European colonialism have carried into postcolonial periods. Describing the experience of many indigenous peoples in the nineteenth-century United States, Spack (2002) argues that English-only education promoted English as a path to Christian salvation and a way to instill a supposedly superior European American ethos, all while devaluing native ways. However, she also documents the ways in which native writers adopted the new language to represent and defend themselves and their own languages and to critique European-American values. Ideas and materials from the missionary and colonial contexts continue to shape language revitalization and revival projects today, as many are based on written sources such as dictionaries and Bible translations (e.g., the widely adopted Cree syllabic writing system, which was originally introduced by a missionary; the use of the Bible in the Wópanâak Language Reclamation Project).

## Structuralist Linguistic Description

Works contributing to the description of the world’s indigenous languages were started by missionary and academic linguists, many of whom produced reference grammars and dictionaries. In the United States, linguistics emerged as a field in the 1920s, influenced by the Swiss linguist de Saussure and led by Bloomfield, who emphasized the scientific method and the rigorous study of linguistic form. Chomsky criticized the behaviorist characterization of the human mental state at birth as *tabula rasa*, and postulated that language was innate. He argued that universal grammar (UG) consists of universal mental constraints on human language. Chomsky also explained similarities among human languages in terms of innate structures and language acquisition stages as results of UG. Since the 1960s, Chomsky’s influence moved the discipline of linguistics away from the descriptive paradigm toward one based on a mentalist conception of language as an abstract structural and cognitive system with a universal grammar (Chomsky, 1969, 1986). Although many scholars do not think of categorizing the Chomskyan framework as structuralist, the concern with form and grammatical structure continued to dominate Chomskyan linguistics. The study of the world’s indigenous languages, in particular those with rare linguistic features, has provided UG theory with examples of what is possible in human language. Evans and Levinson (2009) argue, however, that such universals are overgeneralized, as they are based on only several hundred described languages of the world today, which constitutes a fraction of the estimated 500,000 human languages that may have existed over time.

The structuralist heritage influenced the documentation of language as well as research on bilingualism. The bilingual was often considered as a combination of two perfect monolinguals with two bounded self-contained separate language systems, as in Bloomfield’s (1933: 56) frequently cited definition of bilingualism: “native-like control of two languages,” though Bloomfield mentions that there are degrees of bilingualism.

Bilingual and multilingual language practices, such as the alternation between languages (i.e., the practice known as code-switching), used to be considered as unsystematic and sometimes as an indication of incomplete acquisition.

Since the 1960s, bilingual language acquisition, code-switching, and bilingual immersion programs (particularly French-English programs in Canada and English-Welsh programs) have been investigated, and no evidence for negative cognitive development has been identified. A considerable amount of research has shown that contrary to the earlier negative views of bilingualism and multilingualism, multilingual practices have positive effects. But to some extent the monolingual bias continued in bilingual education and second language acquisition research and educational practices, which tended to evaluate the knowledge of bilinguals in the light of adult monolingual native speakers, privileging monolingual practices (e.g., Cook, 2003; García, 2009; Kramsch, 2009).

This convergence of ideas and expectations may create difficulties for indigenous communities seeking recognition and sovereignty: language tends to be a core aspect of the definition of indigenous, and notions of what constitutes “real” language often implicitly take monolingualism as a point of departure, and thus, mixed varieties may be seen as less authentic. In other words, if a language has to be native of a territory and linked to belonging and rootedness, there is no room for speakers of mixed varieties and nonfluent speakers of an indigenous language. For example, some question the Métis Nation’s status and rights as indigenous people. Being dispersed across a wide geographic area between Canada and the northern United States complicates the Métis situation; in addition, the Michif language is a contact language created out of Cree and French. For some, this does not qualify as an indigenous language (Iseke, 2013). The Lumbee people of North Carolina (southeastern US) are another example of a group whose status and rights as indigenous people is questioned. An important reason that the Lumbee people have not been able to gain federal recognition as an “Indian tribe” with entitlements from the US government is that their ancestors have a high degree of mixed blood that includes Native American tribes, African Americans, and Europeans. Another reason is the loss of their indigenous language, a result of early contact with Europeans (Hutcheson and Wolfram, 2001; Lowry, 2010). Such limiting and purist notions of indigenous language in particular may be a reason for the difficulties experienced by some indigenous communities and individuals.

## **Integrating Ethnography and Linguistics in Language Documentation and Revitalization**

Prior to and during the structuralist period, linguists and linguistic anthropologists in the United States began documenting American indigenous languages. In many cases, their aim was twofold: describing linguistic structure and documenting texts such as myths, and underlining that these languages had complex grammatical systems and should not be regarded as “inferior languages.” Social anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski’s work on the Trobriand Islanders culture and language (1935)

was important in formulating the research methodology of ethnography and participant observation for the discipline of anthropology. Although without linguistic training, his ethnographic theory of language, with its emphasis on meaning and function of utterances in cultural contexts of situation, the role of the individual in the society, and the notion of speech as action, became influential and informed subsequent works among linguistic anthropologists. It was Franz Boas (1902, 1911), however, who established a framework for description of Amerindian languages and the subdiscipline of linguistic anthropology. He rejected the evolutionary approaches to the study of culture that were dominant in nineteenth-century science and emphasized historical particularism and cultural relativist perspectives on the close link between language and classification. Along with Malinowski, Boas believed in the importance of ethnographic data collection and furthermore in long-term and close collaboration with native speakers to collect and transcribe corpus of texts across varied genres. This framework was followed by his student Edward Sapir and Sapir's students, and in fact continues in the tradition of field linguistics.

Indigenous communities have begun to make efforts to maintain and revitalize their languages, with increased participation in language policy and language education by parents, students, educators, activists, political leaders, and researchers, among others. In many cases, the initial efforts—academic or community based—have tended to focus on *language description* such as dictionary and grammar creation. Thus, these initial efforts show the heritage from missionary linguistics and structural linguistics.

More recent works on the documentation and revitalization of endangered languages have recognized the importance of *ethnographic* and socio-historical understandings of the language community and use. *Language documentation* began to integrate the study of language and culture, and to foreground communicative practices that characterize the community of language users, rather than focusing solely on the description of the abstract language system (Hill, 2006; Himmelmann, 1998). Description of indigenous languages traditionally relied on field linguistic methods for collecting primary data consisting of texts and native speakers' introspective comments. But more recent efforts in language documentation strive to portray language as a living entity, firmly grounded in the life experiences and social activities of the individual members of the community and their changing life circumstances. Austin (2014) describes how the focus on linguistic description was replaced by documentary linguistics, a more critical and reflexive approach not restricted to theory and methods from linguistics, but including more ethnographically inspired methods and foci. Furthermore, researchers have begun to bring techniques of ethnography of communication, developmental pragmatics, conversation analysis, folklore, poetics, and oral history into language documentation.

The ethnographically grounded language documentation of the rich, diverse, and changing repertoires of genres, communicative events and acts, and ethnolinguistic history of the community, as envisioned by Hymes (1996), would also help many indigenous language communities who are making efforts to revitalize their languages. In this context, language documentation is drawing anthropology and linguistics closer to each other, in particular in the study of language structure and use. This is a trend that can

be identified in several traditions within humanities and social sciences that tend to see language as socially constructed, situated, and fluid; thus, the focus is on language practices rather than linguistic structure. Technological advances, such as better recording possibilities, affordable cameras, and searchable corpora, have contributed to the view of language as culturally grounded and shaped by societal and cultural factors (Lane, 2012). Furthermore, the use of new media has contributed toward language documentation and learning.

Hill (2006) points out that documentary linguists in indigenous settings need to be ethnographers because norms of language use may be very different from the ones linguists adopted through socialization and academic training. Hill also problematizes the role of the documentary linguist who often is an outsider and acquires the language that he or she is documenting (see Moore, Chapter 11 of this volume). Often there is no traditional space for an adult second language learner (let alone linguists) in indigenous communities, and hence, the linguists and community members will negotiate patterns of speaking and communicating, which in turn become part of the data for the linguistic description.

Decolonization and indigenous reclamation of language and culture have coincided with this paradigm shift in research on language. Language is seen as more than a system of units and grammatical rules, and hence, researchers describing indigenous languages frequently highlight that language documentation is part of a reclamation process, contributing to giving indigenous peoples a voice today and for the future. Indigenous language documentation strives to be a dynamic, forward-looking project, as opposed to colonial and missionary linguistics documentation that segmented language as an object from the past, whose effects still linger in many contexts.

## INDIGENOUS POLITICAL MOVEMENT AND LANGUAGE RIGHTS

---

After decolonization, most of the former colonies opted to continue to use the colonial language as the official national language. The privileged position of European languages was based on power and pragmatics. Often the local elites were the driving forces behind status planning, and European languages were seen as beneficial for education because of their strong literary tradition and their association with modernization, technology, and progress.

Language awareness arises in the context of rapid transformation of language competence, use, and attitudes, and more characteristically in the context of conflicting ideological discourses. In the context of globalization and dealings with post- (or neo-) colonial national governments and institutions, indigenous people have actively participated in political movements to advocate for self-determination, recognition, increased political autonomy, and reconciliation. They have done this by negotiating and

cooperating with local as well as international organizations. International networks and support have served important roles in their negotiation with the state institutions.

In the last three decades, an important advancement has been observed in the areas of legal recognition of indigenous minority groups in numerous countries (see May, Chapter 2 of this volume). Many issues and challenges indeed face the indigenous communities, such as land ownership, health, education, employment and economy, political participation, representation and autonomy, human rights, and development. These issues began to be addressed by international, national, and local organizations. Language issues, which received symbolic attention initially as the emblem of indigenous communities, also began to receive substantive attention. The discourse of language rights and legislation has become central in many parts of the world, following the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1957 ILO convention. National governments began to formulate language policies to recognize indigenous languages and the rights of their speakers, and to include them in education. For example, since the mid-1990s, a framework that combines interculturalism and decolonization has emerged as a philosophy of education in Latin America, following the democratization of political and social institutions. Indigenous languages have been incorporated as part of national curricula in countries such as Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, attempting to replace the older assimilationist transitional bilingual programs. The ongoing efforts reflect the negotiation between the states and indigenous communities, and notably strong initiatives taken by the indigenous communities in various countries such as Bolivia (Gustafson, 2009; Hornberger, 2009). In Norway, such negotiations have led to an improved situation for Northern Sámi (the largest of the three Sámi languages spoken in Norway) after education in Northern Sámi was introduced gradually during the 1970s and became a legal right in 1998. In tandem with social networks of extended family and friends and increased demand for knowledge of Sámi on the labor market, education in Sámi has resulted in greater linguistic vitality of Northern Sámi (Rasmussen, 2013).

In the European context, measures have been taken to recognize the linguistic and cultural rights of European indigenous minority language speakers, primarily through the European Charter for the Protection of Regional or Minority Languages under the auspices of the Council of Europe. The aim of the Charter is to protect and promote regional and minority languages as an aspect of Europe's cultural heritage. The Charter does not give a precise definition of what is to be considered a regional or minority language, as these languages are defined rather in terms of opposition: they are not immigrant languages or dialects of the national languages. The Charter covers both languages that traditionally have been considered as indigenous, such as Sámi, Basque, Aranese, Provençal, and Cyprus Arabic, and languages that could be seen as having a "mother language" in another country (German and Hungarian). As is the case for indigenous and minority groups in many parts of the world, speakers of these languages have a history of oppression and alienation. They are now seen as belonging to Europe's cultural heritage, thus as indigenous languages of Europe, and the Charter includes many of the recurrent themes in global discourses of indigeneity, such as shared cultural heritage,

belonging, territory, and past oppressive policies. The efforts of indigenous political movements have resulted in the recognition of language rights for indigenous peoples, which in turn have led to a larger role for indigenous languages in various domains, such as education.

## LANGUAGE EDUCATION, NEW SPEAKERS, AND STANDARDIZATION

---

Indigenous movements at the turn of the twenty-first century have brought debates over language education to the forefront. Indigenous communities' efforts to regain their languages and to integrate their languages and learning systems into national educational curricula have in many instances led national governments to respond and support such efforts. For example, the Māori of Aotearoa (New Zealand) since the 1980s have led in the creation of indigenous "language nest" education models founded on community-family immersion settings for preschool children. These programs have contributed to expanding communities of speakers and domains of use (May, 1999). With community and government support, indigenous language activists successfully pushed for the creation and expansion of Māori language-medium education (including language-immersion primary and secondary schools, bilingual classes, universities, and classes for adults) and for other revitalization initiatives, such as TV and other media channels. The existence of sizable speaker communities at the initial stages of these programs and of written records such as Māori language newspapers from the nineteenth century were important factors for the success of these revitalization programs. The practice of language nests has been implemented in many indigenous contexts, which illustrates the global flows of indigenous practices and discourses.

In California, where many indigenous languages are spoken only by handful of people, a master-apprentice language learning method was developed where an elder speaker and a young adult learner spend ten to twenty hours per week together, conducting daily activities, speaking only in the target indigenous language (Hinton, 2002). The master-apprentice model is used also in other communities, for instance by Inari Sámi in Northern Finland.

Indigenous immersion education models aim to teach and revitalize not only endangered ancestral languages, but also traditional cultural practices and values. These models have been adopted by an increasing number of indigenous language communities who wish to revitalize their languages and cultures (e.g., Cree, Hawaiian, Mohawk, Ojibwe, Sámi). Even indigenous languages without speakers have also begun to be revitalized through documentation, e.g., work by Jessie "Little Doe" Baird [Fermino, 2000] with Wôpanâak [Wampanoag] language). Despite an enormous amount of challenges facing emerging and established immersion programs—such as inadequate resources, teacher training, curriculum materials, assessment instruments, and support from

families, community, and wider society—grassroots efforts have begun to produce difference.

Educational institutions, which in many locations across the globe were instruments for assimilation and control of indigenous peoples, are now increasingly being reclaimed as arenas for the teaching and learning of indigenous languages and cultures. Formal instruction is seen as a way of maintaining and rebuilding indigenous knowledge. Many speakers acquire their heritage languages in a formal setting and do not socialize regularly with traditional speakers, as many of their communities are in the advanced stages of language shift and/or because of urbanization or migration. These speakers do not fit neatly into the categories of *native speaker* or *second language learner*. Originating from research on indigenous minorities in Europe, the term *new speakers* has been introduced as an analytical category for this group of speakers. O'Rourke, Pujolar, and Ramallo (2015: 1) define new speakers as “individuals with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual educational programs, revitalization projects or as adult language learners.” The goal of language revitalization efforts is to educate new speakers, but the varieties spoken by these new speakers may come to be seen as less authentic by traditional speakers and sometimes even by the new speakers themselves (Lane, 2015; O'Rourke et al., 2015). King and Hermes (2014: 277) show how fear of belittlement for trying out the indigenous language in conversation encourages learners to favor more passive (book learning or submersion) or more performance-based activities (such as participating in ceremonies and settings where language use is ritualized). Hence, new speakers may perpetuate their feeling of inauthenticity through their own practices.

For many new speakers, becoming an authentic legitimate speaker seems like an unreachable goal. Legitimate uses of dominant languages are associated with anonymity (Woolard, 2008). Indigenous languages, on the other hand, are often seen as belonging to a specific group of people and rooted in a cultural context and geographic territory, and hence, authentic and legitimate speakers are expected to embody this situatedness and rootedness. In many cases, new speakers fail to meet this target, and their use of a standardized version of the indigenous language may be seen as a lack of authenticity.

Codification and standardization, which were supposed to be emancipatory and empowering for indigenous language speakers, may create a new form of stigma for those who feel that they cannot live up to the codified standard. Gal (2006: 171) argues that “by the nature of the standardization process, every creation of a standard orientation also creates stigmatized forms—supposed ‘nonlanguages’—among the very speakers whose linguistic practices standardization was supposed to valorise.” One risks establishing a standard that the language users themselves cannot meet, and potentially, they can be faced with a double stigma (Lane, 2015). Their language falls short when measured against the official national language, and it fails in terms of meeting the standardized version of the indigenous language.

The processes of documenting and standardizing indigenous languages thus have a double-edged sword. On the one hand, “real” modern languages often are perceived as having a written form, and standardization as a process that turns indigenous, oral

languages into “real languages.” Documentation and standardization may also be portrayed as a way of ensuring indigenous heritage, but both documentation and standardization abstract away from variation and therefore may not come to include forms and patterns that for the speakers index rootedness and belonging (see Moore, Chapter 11 of this volume).

## CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

---

Two major and interrelated trends of the past decade have had a considerable impact on research on indigenous peoples and languages and also on academic and educational practices, namely the critical turn of the social sciences and humanities, and the greater involvement of scholars and collaborators of indigenous background in the study and planning of indigenous languages. The critical turn has led to the problematization of key concepts of linguistics, such as mother tongue, speech community, native speaker, linguistic competence, multilingualism, and even the notion of language itself. Researchers have also adopted a more critical approach to language documentation, pointing out that linguists have been complicit in shaping the very notion of language, sometimes in ways that are at odds with the understanding of the communities they were working with, which are themselves heterogeneous and non-monolithic. Today, many indigenous scholars and other scholars working with speakers of indigenous languages see language not only as grammatical structures, but as culturally situated practices. Likewise, there is growing awareness of the need for pedagogical approaches to indigenous language education that are centered on, and embedded in, the cultural and linguistic practices of indigenous communities. Indigenous scholars have also emphasized the transformative and healing potential of academic inquiry and that research should promote self-determination for research participants (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008). Both critical research and indigenous research are inherently political. When language, education, and also the process of language documentation are seen as socially situated, language can no longer be an object that can be delimited, classified, and described only or primarily by professional linguists. When documenting indigenous languages, linguists work in tandem with members of indigenous communities and participate in community efforts to sustain languages. Such participation in turn influences the balance of power and opens up space for new types of knowledge, as outlined by Eira (2007):

in fieldwork contexts we have to re-learn not being an authority, re-learn that there are many kinds of knowledge and ways of becoming knowledgeable, and re-learn that the academic way of knowing is only one way. It is no better than other ways. [no pagination in document]



As researchers and collaborators, we often see ourselves as having the knowledge and power to act on behalf of indigenous groups and to bring about change. When working in indigenous settings, linguists may see themselves as benefactors, advocates, and empowerers, but as Eira (2007) also reminds us, all these roles are based on a position of power. For many researchers and language activists (both of indigenous or non-indigenous background), the next vital step is to understand our roles as participants in the project of decolonization. Taking this critical perspective on indigenist research, Rigney (1999), for example, proposes three core principles for work in indigenous settings: involvement in resistance, political integrity, and giving privilege to indigenous voices. However, critical approaches have some pitfalls. Paradoxically, the concern with power and oppression may cast and perpetuate indigenous people as victims with limited agency and voice and thereby as dependent on researchers who can recognize oppression and through their research and action enable indigenous people to take action themselves. Hence, the approach that was intended to be emancipatory and inclusive may continue to cast the researcher as the expert and indigenous peoples as those in need of expertise from the outside (see West et al., 2012, for further discussion). The deeper incorporation of indigenous peoples' language practices and perspectives, we argue, has provided an impetus for reconceptualizing language in its sociocultural and historical context. It has also led to a shift on the appropriate role of language researchers, teachers, policymakers, activists, and speakers in decolonizing methodologies and pedagogies.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

This work was partly supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding scheme, Project Number 223265, and the project Standardising Minority Languages, funded by the Research Council of Norway and the University of Oslo. The writing of this chapter has benefited from ongoing discussion on the theme of “new speakers” as part of the COST EU Action IS1306 entitled “New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges.”

## REFERENCES

---

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso: London.
- Austin, P. K. (2014). “Language Documentation in the 21st Century.” *Gefährdete Sprachen* [Endangered Languages] 23: 77–71.
- Bennett, M. (2005). “Indigeneity as Self-Determination.” *Indigenous Law Journal* 4(1): 71–115.
- Béteille, A. (1998). “The Idea of Indigenous People.” *Current Anthropology* 39(2): 187–192.

AQ: Please check  
the page Range  
77–71

- Blommaert, J. (2004). "Rights in Places: Comments on Linguistic Rights and Wrongs." In J. Freeland and D. Patrick (eds.), *Language Rights and Language Survival* (pp. 55–65). Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Boas, F. (1902). *Tsimshian Texts*. Washington, DC: Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Boas, F. (1911). "Introduction." In *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (Vol. 1, 1–83). Washington, DC: Government Print Office.
- Chomsky, N. (1969). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Cook, V. (2003). "Introduction: The Changing L1 in the L2 User's Mind." In V. Cook (ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (pp. 1–18). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Denzin, N. K., and Y. S. Lincoln. (2008). "Introduction: Critical Methodologies and Indigenous Inquiry." In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith (eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (pp. 1–21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deumert, A., and N. Mabandla. (forthcoming). "Beyond Colonial Linguistics: The Dialectic of Control and Resistance in the Standardization of isiXhosa." In P. Lane and J. Costa (eds.), *Standardizing Minority Languages in the Global Periphery: Competing Ideologies of Authority and Authenticity*. Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism.
- Docker, J. (1995). "Rethinking Postcolonialism and Multiculturalism in the *Fin de Siècle*." *Cultural Studies* 9(3): 409–426.
- Duchêne, A., and M. Heller (eds.). (2007). *Discourses of Endangerment: Interest and Ideology in the Defense of Languages*. New York: Continuum International.
- Eira, C. (2007). "Addressing the Ground of Language Endangerment." In M. David, N. Ostler, and C. Dealwis (eds.), *Working Together for Endangered Languages: Research Challenges and Social Impacts—Proceedings of Foundation for Endangered Languages Conference XI Kuala Lumpur, October 26–28* (pp. 82–90).
- Errington, J. J. (2007). *Colonial Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Evans, N., and S. C. Levinson. (2009). "The Myth of Language Universals: Language Diversity and Its Importance for Cognitive Science." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5): 429–448.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Fermino, J. L. D. ("Jessie Little Doe Baird"). (2000). "An Introduction to Wampanoag Grammar." Master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gal, S. (2006). "Contradictions of Standard Language in Europe: Implications for the Study of Practices and Publics." *Social Anthropology* 14(2): 163–181.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Geschiere, P. (2009). *The Perils of Belonging: Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gustafson, B. (2009). *New Languages of the State: Indigenous Resurgence and the Politics of Knowledge in Bolivia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hanks, W. F. (2010). *Converting Words: Maya in the Age of the Cross*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Hill, J. H. (2002). "Expert Rhetorics' in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who Is Listening, and What Do They Hear?" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2): 119–133.
- Hill, J. H. (2006). "The Ethnography of Language and Language Documentation." In J. Gippert, N. Himmelmann, and U. Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of Language Documentation* (pp. 113–128). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Himmelmann, N. P. (1998). "Documentary and Descriptive Linguistics." *Linguistics* 36(1): 161–195.
- Hinton, L. (2002). *How to Keep Your Language Alive*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990). *Nation and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2009). "Multilingual Education Policy and Practice: Ten Certainties (Grounded in Indigenous Experience)." *Language Teaching* 42(2): 197–211.
- House, D. (2002). *Language Shift among the Navajos: Identity Politics and Cultural Continuity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Hutcheson, N., and W. Wolfram (producers). (2001). *Indian by Birth: The Lumbee Dialect*. Raleigh: North Carolina Language and Life Project.
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Irvine, J., and Gal, S. (2000). "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 35–83). Santa Fe, NM: School for American Research.
- Iseke, J. M. (2013). "Negotiating Métis Culture in Michif: Disrupting Indigenous Language Shift." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 2(2): 92–116.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (1957). *Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention, C107*, June 26, 1957, C107. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ddb66804.html>. Accessed June 1, 2015.
- Jackson, J. E. (1983). *The Fish People: Linguistic Exogamy and Tukanoan Identity in Northwest Amazonia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jourdan, C. (2007). "Linguistic Paths to Urban Self in Post-Colonial Solomon Islands." In M. Makihara and B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Consequences of Contact* (pp. 30–48). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khubchandani, L. M. (1997). *Revisualizing Boundaries: A Plurilingual Ethos*. New Delhi: Sage.
- King, K. A., and M. Hermes (2014). "Why Is This So Hard?: Ideologies of Endangerment, Passive Language Learning Approaches, and Ojibwe in the United States." *Journal of Language Identity and Education* 13(4): 268–282.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The Multilingual Subject: What Foreign Language Learners Say about Their Experience and Why It Matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krauss, M. (1992). "The World's Languages in Crisis." *Language* 68(1): 1–42.
- Kroskrity, P. V., and M. C. Field (eds.). (2011). *Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Kulick, D. (1997). *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction Socialization, Self and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lane, P. (2010). "We Did What We Thought Was Best for Our Children: A Nexus Analysis of Language Shift in a Kven Community." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202: 63–78.
- Lane, P. (2012). "Multimodality and Culture." In C. A. Chapelle (ed.), *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Lane, P. (2015). "Minority Language Standardisation and the Role of Users." *Language Policy* 14(3): 263–283.
- Lowry, M. M. (2010). *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*. Chapel Hills: University of North Carolina Press.
- Makihara, M. (2004). "Linguistic Syncretism and Language Ideologies: Transforming Sociolinguistic Hierarchy on Rapa Nui (Easter Island)." *American Anthropologist* 106(3): 529–540.
- Makihara, M. (2013). "Language, Competence, Use, Ideology, and Community on Rapa Nui." *Language & Communication* 33(4): 439–449.
- Makihara, M., and B. Schieffelin (eds.). (2007). *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Makoni, S., and A. Pennycook. (2007). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Malinowski, B. (1935). *Coral Gardens and Their Magic: A Study of the Methods of Tilling the Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands*. 2 vols. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Martínez Cobo, J. R. (1986/1987). *Study of the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations*. New York: United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. UN Doc E/CN.4/ Sub.2/1986/7.
- May, S. (ed.). (1999). *Indigenous Community-Based Education*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- May, S. (2012). "Language Rights: Promoting Civic/Multilingualism." In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, and A. Creese (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 131–142). New York: Routledge.
- McCarty, T. L., M. E. Romero-Little, and O. Zepeda. (2006). "Native American Youth Discourses on Language Shift and Retention: Ideological Cross-Currents and Their Implications for Language Planning." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9(5): 659–677.
- Meek, B. (2010). *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Nairobi, Kenya: East African Educational Publisher.
- O'Rourke, B., J. Pujolar, and F. Ramallo. (2015). "New Speakers of Minority Languages: The Challenging Opportunity—Foreword." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231: 1–20.
- Patrick, D. (2012). "Indigenous Contexts." In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, and A. Creese (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 29–42). New York: Routledge.
- Pietikäinen, S., L. Huss, S. Laihiala-Kankainen, U. Aikio-Puoskari, and P. Lane. (2010). "Regulating Multilingualism in the North Calotte: The Case of Kven, Meänkieli and Sámi Languages." *Acta Borealia: A Nordic Journal of Circumpolar Societies* 27(1): 1–23.
- Povinelli, E. (1998). "The State of Shame: Australian Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Indigenous Citizenship." *Critical Inquiry* 24(2): 575–610.
- Rasmussen, T. (2013). "Go Ealáska, de lea Váttis Dápmat': Davvisámeigiela Etnolingvistalaš Ceavzinnávccaid Guorahallan Guovtti Gránnjágielddas Deanus ja Ohcejogas 2000-logu Álggus ['When It Revives, It Is Almost Impossible to Tame': An Analysis of Northern Sámi Ethnolinguistic Vitality in the Two Neighboring Municipalities Deanus and Ohcejogas in the Early 21st Century]." PhD dissertation, UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. Sámi.

- Rigney, L. I. (1999). "Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and Its Principles." *Wicazo Sa Review* 14(2): 109–121.
- Schmidt, A. (1985). *Young People's Dyrbal: An Example of Language Death from Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shellington, K. (2005). *History of Africa*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spack, R. (2002). *America's Second Tongue: American Indian Education and the Ownership of English, 1860–1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- St. Denis, V. (2011). "Silencing Aboriginal Curricular Content and Perspectives through Multiculturalism: 'There Are Other Children Here.'" *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 33(4): 306–317.
- Vigouroux, C. B., and S. S. Mufwene. (2008). "Colonization, Globalization and Language Vitality." In C. B. Vigouroux and S. S. Mufwene (eds.), *Globalization and Language Vitality: Perspectives from Africa* (pp. 1–31). London: Continuum Press.
- Waldron, J. (2003). "Indigeneity? First Peoples and Last Occupancy." *New Zealand Journal of Public and International Law* 1(1): 55–82.
- West, R., L. Stewart, K. Foster, and K. Usher. (2012). "Through a Critical Lens: Indigenist Research and the Dadirri Method." *Qualitative Health Research* 22: 1582–1591.
- Wópanâak Language Reclamation Project. <http://www.wlrp.org/>. Accessed June 1, 2015.
- Woolard, K. A. (2008). "Language and Identity Choice in Catalonia: The Interplay of Contrasting Ideologies." In K. Süselbeck, U. Mühlischlegel, and P. Masson (eds.), *Lengua, nación e identidad: La regulación del plurilingüismo en España y América Latina* (pp. 303–323). Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Wyman, L. T., T. L. McCarty, and S. E. Nicholas (eds.). (2013). *Indigenous Youth and Multilingualism: Language Identity, Ideology, and Practice in Dynamic Cultural Worlds*. New York: Routledge.

