

Native American Languages as Heritage Mother Tongues

Teresa L. McCarty

M.L. Fulton College of Education, Arizona State University, Farmer Building 120 – PO Box 872411, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411, USA

This article examines current efforts to revitalise, stabilise, and maintain Indigenous languages in the USA. Most Native American languages are no longer acquired as a first language by children. They are nonetheless languages of identity and heritage, and in this sense can and should be considered mother tongues. The article begins with a discussion of the concept of heritage mother tongues. This is followed by an overview of the present status of Native American languages, the historical and ideological bases of Native American language shift, and the policy framework for current language reclamation efforts. I then discuss four cases of grass-roots or 'bottom up' language planning that illustrate the ways in which Native American communities are working around and through historical and institutional constraints to reclaim and maintain their heritage mother tongues. I conclude with a reflection on the challenges and possibilities these efforts raise, their significance as part of a global language rights movement, and their potential to strengthen linguistic and cultural diversity in the USA.

doi: 10.1080/07908310802385881

Keywords: Native American/Indigenous languages, language endangerment, language revitalisation, language planning and policy

Native American communities face the imminent extinction of their ancestral languages, as the speakers grow older and children are increasingly socialised primarily or solely in English. This article examines a range of community- and school-based language reclamation efforts, drawing on my long-term ethnographic and collaborative work with Native American communities and schools. I begin with the notion of Native American languages as *heritage mother tongues*, which I posit as a unique case that does not fit conventional frameworks for mother tongue education. Nor are the interests of Native communities vis-à-vis their languages isomorphic with those of immigrant, refugee, and diasporic communities typically thought of as heritage-language speakers. Although most Native American languages are no longer acquired by children as first languages, they are nonetheless languages of heritage and identity, and in this sense, I will argue, can and should be considered mother tongues. Foregrounding their status as mother tongues also mutes potentially negative or backward-looking conceptions of heritage languages as things of the past with little utility or value in the present or future. As the cases presented here show, Native American languages are very much alive in the context of grass-roots or 'bottom-up' language planning (see, e.g., Hornberger, 1996; McCarty *et al.*, 1999). This is not to dismiss the gravity of Native American

language endangerment, but rather to recognise and valorise the efforts of those who are fighting to reposition Indigenous languages, and the rich local knowledges they embody, from the margins to the centre of everyday life.

The article begins with an elaboration of the notion of heritage mother tongues. I then discuss the present status of Native American languages, the sociohistorical and ideological forces that have fuelled language shift, and the larger policy framework for present language reclamation efforts. This is followed by descriptive portraits of four ongoing language planning initiatives. The four cases represent different geographical regions, language families, histories of inter-group contact and incorporation into the US political system, and stages of language shift. Two are primarily community-based, and two have their locus in schools, with strong parent-community components. For the latter two cases, I consider their impacts on both language regeneration and student achievement. All four cases illustrate the ways in which Native American communities are strategically working around and through historical and institutional constraints, carving out new 'implementational and ideological spaces' (Hornberger, 2002, 2005, 2006) for revitalising and maintaining their heritage mother tongues. I conclude by considering the challenges and possibilities these initiatives represent and their significance for a larger movement for Indigenous linguistic rights and self-determination.

Conceptualising Heritage Mother Tongues

What counts as a 'mother tongue'?

'Mother tongue' is typically thought of as the language one learns first and knows best, as this UNESCO definition suggests: '[A] person's mother tongue... is... "the language which a person has acquired in early years and which normally has become his [sic] natural instrument of thought and communication"' (cited in Fishman, 1968: 698). By extension, mother tongue education is concerned with providing early instruction 'in a language children will understand and then [adding] a second language for wider communication' (Dutcher, 2003: 4). In this conceptualisation, the mother tongue is a bridge to the language of wider communication and mother tongue education is legitimised by the salutary effects of providing a 'basic education' in the child's 'own language' (Dutcher, 2003: 1, 4; cf. Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1999). Herein lies an additional facet of this notion of mother tongue education; because the proposition that children learn more easily in a language they already control goes unchallenged for speakers of dominant languages (Hale, 2001: 199), mother tongue education is, by definition, schooling in a minoritised or non-dominant language for children from minoritised or non-dominant speech communities.

This conceptualisation only imperfectly fits the situation of contemporary Native American communities. Yet there is another dimension of 'mother tongue' that makes this term apt for analysing Native American language issues. Mother tongue denotes a deep, abiding, even cord-like connection between language and identity. Native American discourses make frequent reference to these connections between language, community, place, and time.¹ '[E]mbedded in the [Native] language are the lessons that guide our

daily lives', Northern Cheyenne language educator Richard Littlebear writes; '[w]e cannot leave behind the essence of our being' (2004: 11). 'A person is known primarily by [the] use of language and song', says Acoma poet Simon Ortiz '...and my sense of language, my awareness of words, becomes entangled with songs, memories, history and the land' (1987: 54). In these discourses, the Native language is, literally and symbolically, the life-giver. Lucille Watahomigie, an educator and native speaker of Hualapai, a Yuman language spoken in northern Arizona, provides this example from the origin account of her people:

In the beginning, after the creation of the people at Spirit Mountain, Elder Brother and Younger Brother were instructed through visions by the breath-giver to teach the people about cultural values and mores, and how the newly created people were to live. All the instructions were in the native language...[T]he Hualapai language...is a gift to us from the Creator...And the sacred gift must be passed on from generation to generation; it cannot be allowed to die... (Watahomigie, 1998: 5)

Official tribal language policies contain similar references to the Native language as a sacred gift: 'The Yaqui language is a gift from Itom Achai, the Creator of our people', the Yaqui Tribal Language Policy begins, 'and, therefore, shall be treated with respect'

Our ancient language is the foundation of our cultural and spiritual heritage without which we could not exist in the manner that our Creator intended...Since time immemorial Yaqui has been, and will continue to be, *our mother or native tongue* which is the natural instrument of thought and communication. (Cited in Zepeda, 1990: 250–251; emphasis added)

According to Tohono O'odham linguist Ofelia Zepeda, the Tohono O'odham language policy 'also makes clear...that language is the gift from the Creator and, "...no other tribe can claim it. It is what makes us Tohono O'odham..."' (1990: 251).

These discourses clearly index *both* life beginnings *and* life in the present and future, the connecting thread being a shared heritage or ancestral language. Language is '*the very essence of...selfhood or ethnicity*', Schiffman states (1998: 3). Thus, even if members of an Indigenous speech community do not know (much of) their ancestral language, it is properly considered a mother tongue on the basis of personal identification with it (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty, 2008: 11).

What counts as a 'heritage language'?

In the Native American references to language above, mother tongue and linguistic lineage (or heritage) are intermeshed concepts. As used in the United States, heritage-language speakers include immigrant, refugee, diasporic, and Indigenous groups (Cummins, 2005: 586); Wiley (2005: 595) adds to this list former colonial languages. Opinions differ as to whether heritage-language speakers are those who speak or understand the ancestral language, or those with no spoken proficiency at all. The 2000 Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (HLRPCR) says 'the term "heritage language"...may refer to

any ancestral language that may, or may not, be spoken in the home and the community' (HLRPCR, 2000: 335). Valdés defines a heritage speaker as 'a student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language' (cited in Wiley & Valdés, 2000: 1). And the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages provides this definition: 'Heritage language speakers are those whose home or ancestral language is other than English, including those whose ancestors lived in this country prior to the establishment of the United States and those who have come in recent years' (cited in Cummins, 2005: 586). There 'is no consensus that [the term] can be used as a one-size-fits-all brand', Wiley (2005: 595) emphasises, 'because the labels ascribed by academics, applied linguists, and missionaries to languages have not always been the same as those used by their speakers in the community' (see also Baker & Prys Jones, 1998: 509).

Nevertheless, definitions and terms are important, especially in contested fields such as language education, because they index the social status of languages and speech communities (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty, 2008; Wiley, 2001). I take the same position on heritage languages and heritage-language speakers as that discussed above for mother tongues: An Indigenous language is properly conceived as a heritage language on the basis of personal and collective affiliation with it (see also Fishman, 2001; Valdés, 2001; Wiley, 2001). Hornberger states it this way: Heritage-language learners 'are defined not only by their familial or ancestral ties to a particular language that is not English, but also by exerting their agency in determining whether or not they are heritage-language learners of that heritage language and heritage culture' (Hornberger, 2005: 607).

The problem with the term, as many have pointed out, is that it seems to hark back to a long-ago time and a faraway place, making heritage languages passé in the 'here-and-now' of the modern, technologising world. García (2005: 601, 605) calls this 'rear-viewing' and expresses concern that the term 'relegates languages other than English to a powerless position – backward and unimportant'. Indeed, in recent interviews my colleagues and I conducted with Native American youth, some referred to their tribal language as 'just the past' (McCarty *et al.*, 2006). I believe the downside of the term can be counter-balanced by its coupling with the notion of mother tongue – a conceptualisation of language as the living root of contemporary identities. This is the notion of heritage mother tongues developed here – a view of Native American languages and communities as dynamic, vital, and emplaced – and, even under the weight of enormous external pressures, refusing to be silenced.

Native American Languages and Communities

Demographic profile

At the turn of the twenty-first century, 4.1 million people in the United States (1.4 per cent of the total population) identified as American Indian and Alaska Native. This includes 2.5 million people who reported only American Indian and Alaska Native heritage (US Census Bureau, 2002). An additional 874,000

people identified as Native Hawaiian and 'other Pacific Islander' (US Census Bureau, 2001). Native Americans reside in every state of the union and its territories, representing more than 560 federally recognised tribes and 619 reservations and Alaska Native villages (see Figure 1).

More than one-third of the Native American population are children who attend public, federal, parochial, or private schools. Although many of these schools are located in rural, reservation areas and have a majority American Indian/Alaska Native enrolment, the vast majority of Native students attend public schools in which they comprise less than 25 per cent of the student body (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2008). Less than one per cent of teachers in these schools are American Indian or Alaska Native (NCES, 1997), making the preparation of Native teachers and preservice and inservice training in linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies major educational needs.

The status of Native American languages

Spoken languages

Of 300 languages indigenous to what is now the United States, 175 are still spoken (Krauss, 1998). Table 1 provides an overview of major Native American language groups. It is important to point out that classifications differ throughout the literature, due to differing views of what constitutes a 'language' versus a 'dialect'. And, different as they are among themselves, Native American languages are typologically quite distinct from Indo-European languages. These marked linguistic differences have significant implications for decisions about the development of writing systems as well as language pedagogy. For example, sociolinguist Clay Slate notes that for Navajo, '[a] single...verb can have more than 10 morphemes. Syntactically, Navajo is SOV in word order, and about two-thirds of its phonemes differ from English', making Navajo difficult for English speakers to learn and vice versa (Slate, 2001: 391).

In 2000, 72 per cent of American Indians and Alaska Natives 5 years of age or older reported speaking only English at home (US Census Bureau, 2006: 7). This leaves roughly 28 per cent who reported speaking a Native American language along with English 'very well' (18 per cent) or English 'less than very well' (10 per cent) (US Census Bureau, 2006: 7). Krauss (1998: 12) classifies the present status of Native American languages in the USA as follows:

- Class A, the 20 languages still spoken by all generations;
- Class B, the 30 languages spoken by the parental generation and older;
- Class C, the 70 languages spoken by the grandparent generation and older; and
- Class D, the 55 languages spoken only by the very elderly, often less than 10 people.

Krauss's framework can be compared to Fishman's (1991) Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) for threatened languages:

- Class D = GIDS stage 8 ('most vestigial users...are socially isolated old folks');

Table 1 Some American Indian and Alaska Native languages in the United States

<i>Category</i>	<i>Language family</i>	<i>Locations and examples of speakers[†]</i>
Algic	Algonquian-Ritwan	Great Lakes/Northeast (<i>Chippewa, Ojibwe, Abenaki, Menominee, Wampanoag, Mohegan-Pequot</i>); Southeast (<i>Powhatan</i>); Central States (<i>Shawnee, Omaha, Kickapoo</i>); Northern Plains (<i>Cheyenne, Arapaho, Blackfeet, Cree</i>)
Aztec-Tanoan	Uto-Aztecan	Plains (<i>Comanche</i>); Southwest (<i>Hopi, O'odham, Southern Paiute, Yaqui/Yoeme</i>); Great Basin/Nevada/California (<i>Shoshone, Bannock, Paiute, Chemehuevi</i>)
	Tanoan	Arizona/New Mexico (<i>Tewa, Tiwa, Jemez</i>)
	Kiowan	Plains (<i>Kiowa</i>)
Caddoan	Caddoan	Eastern Plains (<i>Arikara, Pawnee, Wichita</i>)
Eskaleut	Eskimo-Aleut	Alaska (<i>Yup'ik, Aleut, Inupiaq</i>)
Gulf	Muskogean	Southeast/Okalahoma (<i>Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, Seminole</i>)
	Natchez	Gulf Coast (<i>Natchez</i>)
Hokan	Hokan	Northern California (<i>Karuk, Washo</i>); Central California (<i>Chumash</i>)
	Yuman	Arizona/Southern California (<i>Cocopa, Havasupai, Hualapai, Yavapai, Kumeyaay, Ipai, Maricopa, Mohave, Tipai, Quechan</i>)
	Salinian-Seri-Shastan	Northern California (<i>Shasta</i>)
	Pomoan	Central and Northern California (<i>Northern, Northeastern, Eastern, Central, Southeastern, Southern, and Kashaya Pomo</i>)
Iroquoian	Iroquois	Great Lakes/Northeast (<i>Seneca, Oneida, Onandaga, Mohawk</i>); Southeast/Atlantic Coast/Oklahoma (<i>Cherokee</i>)
Mosan	Chimakuan	Northwest Pacific Coast (<i>Quileute</i>)
	Salishan	Northwest Plateau and Coast (<i>Quinault, Coeur d'Alene, Shuswap, Cumbia, Flathead</i>)
Na-Déné	Athabaskan	Western Sub-Arctic (<i>Athabaskan</i>); Northeast Plateau (<i>Carrier-Chilcotin</i>); Plains (<i>Kiowa-Apache</i>); Southwest (<i>Navajo, Western Apache</i>); California/North Pacific Coast (<i>Hupa, Tlingit</i>)
Penutian	California Penutian	Northern California (<i>Maidu, Wintu, Patwin, Miwok</i>)
	Chinook-Tsimshian	Northwest Pacific Coast/Washington/Oregon (<i>Chinook</i>)
	Klamath-Sahaptin	Northwest Plateau/Washington/California (<i>Nez Perce, Sahaptin, Yakima, Klamath, Modoc, Warm Springs</i>)

(Table Continued)

Table 1 Continued

Category	Language family	Locations and examples of speakers [†]
Siouan-Yuchi	Siouan	Eastern Plains (<i>Mandan, Hidatsa, Winnebago, Ponca, Osage</i>); Western Plains (<i>Teton, Yankton, Assiniboine, Crow</i>); Northern and Central Plains (<i>Dakota/Lakota</i>)
	Yuchi (Euchee)	South Carolina/Gulf Coast/Oklahoma (<i>Euchee</i>)

Source: Adapted from McCarty and Watahomigie (2004: 85–86); see also Goddard (1996), Hinton (1998), and Mignon and Boxberger (1997).

[†]Information on location includes Indigenous homelands and current locations of speakers resulting from forced relocation (e.g., Cherokee, Kickapoo, and Euchee). Note that this list does not include Hawaiian.

- Classes B and C=GIDS stage 7 ('most users...are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age');
- Class A=GIDS stage 6 (the 'watershed' stage 'of intergenerational informal oralcy and its demographic concentration and institutional reinforcement'), and perhaps stages 1 through 5 (the Native language as a language of literacy, schooling, media, government, and business) (Fishman, 1991: 88–89, 92, 95–109).

To this, Krauss (1998) adds Class E, the 125 languages now 'extinct' – or, as linguistic anthropologist Leanne Hinton (2001a) describes languages with no remaining speakers, those 'silent' or 'sleeping'. As Krauss's classification shows, of the 175 Native American languages still spoken, 155 have no children acquiring them as first languages. Krauss (1998: 11) warns that even those languages in class A are 'not guaranteed to last forever at the rate things are going...Every one of these languages is severely endangered'.

The causes of Native American language endangerment

While no single factor is determinative in all cases, Native American language attrition (as the cases that follow will show) can be traced to diffuse and locally specific responses to policies of containment, dislocation, enslavement, and genocide that characterised four centuries of Anglo-European imperialism. Following the American Revolution, the new federal government turned its attention to pacifying and 'civilising' Native peoples as part of a larger campaign to dispossess them of their lands (Adams, 1995; Spring, 1996). English-only schooling became a primary mechanism for this policy of planned cultural transformation. By the late nineteenth century, the federal government assumed ever-greater control over American Indian education, opening on- and off-reservation boarding schools which children were compelled to attend. Accounts abound of children being beaten, made to stand for hours holding stacks of books over their heads, or having their mouths 'washed' with bar soap for speaking the Native language (see, e.g., Benally & Viri, 2005; McCarty, 2002: ch. 5; Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Although important reforms were initiated during the 1940s and 1950s, the government's assimilationist agenda was never seriously threatened. It was not until the Civil Rights

Movement in the 1960s and a concurrent movement for American Indian self-determination that some schools for Native students came under Indigenous control.

The boarding schools did not fully succeed in their assimilationist aims, but the experience did leave a residue of linguistic ambivalence and mistrust of Anglo-American education. 'I was not taught my language', a young Hualapai man relates; 'my dad didn't want us to learn, because when he was going through school he saw what difficulty *his* peers were having because they had learned Hualapai first, and the schools were all taught in...English' (Watahomigie & McCarty, 1996: 101). These influences on language shift are compounded by a plethora of others – the transition from traditional subsistence systems to a cash economy and wage labour in English-only domains; English media, technology, and schooling; transportation improvements that facilitate greater contact with English speakers; intermarriage with speakers of other languages; and externally imposed changes in settlement patterns that break up extended families and intergenerational communication – to name just a few. Add to these factors the hegemony of English and a pervasive monolingualist ideology in the USA, and the challenges to Native American language maintenance come into sharp focus. Even where Indigenous languages are still acquired as first languages, children learn early that English is the language of power and that they can accomplish most of life's necessities without the Native language.

Written-language traditions

From the time of the initial European invasion, literacy in both colonial and Indigenous languages was a 'tool of conquest' (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000: 506). Jesuits, Franciscans, and Protestants all committed Native American languages to writing as part of the quest for Indigenous souls and lands. In 1663, Congregationalist minister John Eliot, working with a young Nipmuck man the Whites called James, completed the first bible translation in a Native American language (Massachusetts). Native peoples also established their own written-language traditions, as exemplified by Sequoyah's famed Cherokee syllabary completed in 1821. The majority of practical writing systems for Native American languages, however, have emerged in the last 60 years, with many being developed even more recently as part of federally funded bilingual education programmes. Orthographies differ widely, with some using adaptations of the Roman alphabet and others using locally developed symbols or a combination of orthographic conventions.

For virtually all Native American peoples, spoken language has historically taken precedence over written language. '[T]he primary function of these tribal languages', Acoma language educator Christine Sims stresses, 'has always been their use as the foundation of essentially oral tribal societies' (Sims, 2005: 105).

Legal–Political Framework for Native American Language Rights

Tribal sovereignty

A foundational principle for understanding the unique properties of Native American language planning is tribal sovereignty: the 'right of a people to

self-government, self-determination, and self-education', including the right to linguistic and cultural expression according to local languages and norms (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006: 9). Native Americans are distinguished from other ethnolinguistic groups in the USA by their status as First Peoples and members of sovereign Native nations.² Tribal sovereignty both predates and is recognised by the US constitution. From their first encounters, Native peoples and federal authorities operated on a government-to-government basis. The tribal–federal relationship was subsequently codified in treaties, executive orders, legislation, court decisions, and bureaucratic rules that establish a binding trust responsibility on the part of the federal government 'to represent the best interests of the tribes and their members', including education (American Indian Policy Center, 2002: 1). The federal government has frequently violated its trust responsibility; tribal sovereignty has been particularly contested in the arenas of education and language policy (see, e.g., Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; McCarty, 2002; Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Thus, issues concerning Native American languages and identity are not purely linguistic or cultural, but implicate language, culture, politics, and legal status, all of which are 'inextricably bound together in the fabric of U.S./Indian relations' (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006: 7).

Medium-of-instruction policies and Indigenous self-determination

Hard-won battles by Native American leaders, educators, and other activists resulted in the passage of the 1972 Indian Education Act, which provides for Native language and culture instructional programmes, and the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act, which enables tribes and Native communities to operate their own schools. Together with the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (renamed the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act in 2001), this federal legislation provided a financial and legal framework for foundational work in American Indian bilingual-bicultural education during the latter part of the twentieth century (for a discussion, see McCarty, 1993; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006: ch. 6).

More recently, Congress passed the 1990/1992 Native American Languages Act (NALA), which vows to 'preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop' Native languages, including as media of instruction in Native American schools (US Congress, 1990: Sec. 104[1], 5). Although funding allocations have been meagre (about \$1.5 million per year), NALA has supported some of the most ambitious Native-language reclamation efforts to date, including some of the cases that follow. In 2006, NALA was augmented by the Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act (NALPA), which authorises Native American 'language nests' (site-based Native-language immersion programmes for young children), language classes for parents, language survival schools, teacher training, and materials development (US Congress, 2006: Sec. 2[C][iv]).

NALPA and NALA are resources for and expressions of Native American self-determination. Like other legal victories seized through windows of policy-making opportunity, these policies are the product of Indigenous vision, intent, and design. For Native American communities, the stakes are

high, for unlike immigrant languages, there is no external pool of speakers to help secure the future of Indigenous mother tongues. The next section suggests the ways in which Native American communities are addressing this challenge.

Native American Language Reclamation: Four Cases

This section provides descriptive portraits of four ongoing Native American language reclamation projects. The cases exemplify a range of contexts and language planning goals, from languages with few or no native speakers (Wôpanâak and Native California languages – Krauss’s classes D and E), to a language still being acquired as a first language by children (Navajo – Krauss’s class A), to one that at various points in time could be classified as class B, C, or D (Hawaiian). Two cases involve primarily community-based language revitalisation efforts; two are situated in schools with strong parent-community components. A key strategy in all four cases is Native-language immersion, instruction that provides all or most content in the Native language. ‘There can be no doubt that [Indigenous-language immersion] is the best way to jump-start the production of a new generation of speakers’, Hinton states (2001b: 8).

For each case, I begin with a brief linguistic profile and a sketch of the historical circumstances leading to language loss. These are situated, peopled accounts that testify to the power of human agency to work around and through historical-institutional constraints. Remarkably – and despite those constraints – these efforts are, in fact, ‘jump-starting’ a new generation of Native-language speakers.

‘We are still here on our ancestral lands’: The Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project

Wôpanâak (also called Wampanoag, Natick, and Massachusett) is an Algonquian language spoken by peoples indigenous to what is now southeastern New England (see Table 1). The Algonquian language family extends from Canada to the southeastern USA; languages related to Wôpanâak include Narragansett, Mohegan-Pequot, and Western Abenaki (Goddard, 1996: 5; Hale, 1997: 8). These speech communities were among the first to be impacted by the European invasion. Even before the Pilgrims’ arrival at Plymouth Rock in 1620, the Native population in the region had been decimated by diseases introduced by European fishing and trading expeditions (Rees-Miller, 1998: 536). Following the Pequot War of 1637, the British massacred and enslaved large numbers of Massachusett people, and by the latter part of the seventeenth century, they ‘were economically, politically, and militarily subject to the English’ (Rees-Miller, 1998: 596). By the nineteenth century, a constellation of factors – including the movement of families from traditional wigwams to houses, the confiscation of tribal farming and fishing grounds by Whites, and schooling in English – had conspired to produce the ‘first generation of children [who] no longer used the ancestral language among themselves as adults and did not speak it to their own children’ (Rees-Miller, 1998: 547). In 1908, the last native speaker of Mohegan-Pequot, Mrs Fidelia Fielding, passed away. The great polyglot linguist Kenneth Hale, who worked with the

Wôpanâak language revitalisation programme until his death in 2001, described the late-twentieth century situation this way: 'The few people who know phrases and texts in the language have learned them from written sources or have learned to recite them from older relatives' (Hale, 1997: 8).

The 3000 Wôpanâak on Cape Cod and Martha's Vineyard are nonetheless implementing bold efforts to resurrect the heritage language from the resources that remain. Fortunately, Wôpanâak has a relatively large corpus of written texts that are being used for this purpose. A primary resource is the 1663 Eliot Bible, 'the undisputed treasure of Massachusetts linguistics' (Hale, 1997: 9). Native-language literacy was common among Wôpanâak/Massachusetts speakers throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, and lexicons, letters, diaries such as Fidelia Fielding's, and legal documents still exist, including a petition to the Massachusetts legislature to prevent White settlers from taking Wôpanâak land (Kageleiry, 2001: 19). In 1903, the Bureau of American Ethnology published a Natick dictionary (Trumbull, 1903), and in 1988, linguists Ives Goddard and Kathryn Bragdon assembled extant Massachusetts texts in a 791-page book, *Native Writings in Massachusetts* (Goddard & Bragdon, 1988). All of this is 'fortunate indeed', Hale (1997: 9) writes, 'since it provides a foundation upon which the linguistic phase of the Wampanoag project can begin with dispatch'.

The Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project started in 1993 as a collaborative effort between the councils of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head/Aquinnah, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, and the Assonet Band of the Wampanoag Nation. The effort was spearheaded by Mashpee tribal member Jessie Little Doe Fermino Baird. Working with Hale at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, she mastered the language, earned a master's degree in linguistics, began formulating a Wampanoag dictionary and language curriculum, and, in 1997, began teaching Wôpanâak classes at Mashpee and Aquinnah, including an advanced immersion course (Feldman, 2001). The courses are for tribal members only. 'We have nothing we can claim as exclusively ours', Baird explains; '[t]he only thing we truly have is our language' (cited in Kageleiry, 2001: 18). Although challenged by the fact that there are no first-language speakers ('no one alive knows what [the Native language] sounded like', a tribal leader points out (Daly, 2002: 4)), the goal is for tribal members to relearn the heritage language and use it with their children (Hale, 1997: 10).

The Wôpanâak project illustrates what can be accomplished with determination, knowledge, and commitment, even for 'sleeping' languages lacking native speakers (Hinton, 2001a). 'We are still here on our ancestral lands', Baird points out: 'We have survived and gained enough strength once again to not only assert ourselves as a strong Wampanoag nation, but more importantly, to reclaim what is ours by sacred privilege and right' (Little Doe, 2000: 3).

'We wanted language learning to be family based': The California Master-Apprentice Language Learning Programme

A continent away, Native people in what is now the State of California felt the presence of Europeans as early as the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries,

when Spanish and British expeditions reached the Colorado River and Pacific Coast, bringing with them epidemic diseases (Bean & Vane, 1997: 333). Prior to European contact, this was one of the most linguistically and culturally diverse regions of the world, with 300,000–400,000 Native people who spoke some 100 languages (Hinton, 1998: 85, 2001c: 217). Successive waves of colonisation, first by Spanish missionaries, then by Mexican ranchers, and finally by Anglo-Americans in the wake of the Gold Rush, brought devastating disease, indiscriminate slaughter, and enslavement (Hinton, 2001c: 217; Sims, 1998: 97). By 1850, when California was incorporated as the 31st US state, fewer than 30,000 Native people remained. The survivors had been dispossessed of their lands and were ‘often unrecognized by the federal government and thus unable to receive aid’ (Hinton, 2001c: 217). The federal boarding school system and campaigns to eradicate Native religious, social, and economic systems further broke down traditional village life. By the early twentieth century, these disruptions had ‘set the stage for an increasingly tenuous linguistic situation’ (Sims, 1998: 99–100).

Today, 50 California Native languages are still spoken as first languages, all by elders. ‘At last count’, says Hinton (2001c: 217), who has worked with Native California language revitalisation for many years, ‘only 4 of these 50 languages have more than 100 speakers. [Twelve]... have somewhere between 10 and 60 speakers; 13 have 6 to 10 speakers; and 21 have fewer than 5 speakers’.

In this context, a radically different approach to language revitalisation is being used. Native California tribes do not have a single identity or language into which human and financial resources can be invested, nor is there a large corpus of written materials in these languages (Hinton, 1998: 86, 2001c: 218). Instead, tribal members have looked to the elders and inter-tribal networks as resources for language reclamation. In the 1980s, the federal Bilingual Education Act provided funding for up to 21 Native language and culture programmes. As those funds disappeared, NALA has provided new sources of support. In 1992, the Native California Network (NCN) was established, providing additional funds for Native language and culture programmes. NCN and a daughter organisation, the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS), provide the structure for training, administration, and funding of an ambitious language revitalisation effort called the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Programme (MALLP) (Hinton, 1998: 87–88).

The MALLP pairs master speakers/teachers with younger language learners who work together for months and years at a time. Often the pairs are family members. The most important criteria for the selection of teams are fluency for the master and demonstrated interest in learning and teaching the Native language by the apprentice (Hinton, 2001c: 218). Each team member receives a small stipend and training in these principles of heritage-language immersion:

- (1) Both master and apprentice use only the Native language (no English).
- (2) Both master and apprentice are active communicators.
- (3) Oral, not written language is emphasised.
- (4) Language learning occurs in everyday situations (e.g., gardening and taking walks together, participating in traditional ceremonies).

- (5) Activities provide the context for language comprehension. (Hinton, 2001c: 218).

By 2001, there were 55 master-apprentice teams representing 15 languages (Hinton, 2001c). The teams' work is often complemented by immersion camps that bring together children, parents, and elders. 'We wanted language learning to be family based', Karuk immersion camp organisers Terry and Sarah Supahan state (Supahan & Supahan, 2001: 197). In some cases, public school classes also are offered (Sims, 1998; Supahan & Supahan, 2001). The desired result of the MALLP, Hinton states, is that by the end of three years, apprentices will be 'at least conversationally proficient in their language' and ready to teach it to others (2001c: 223).

The MALLP has been adopted by Native communities and organisations across the country. According to Hinton, many apprentices have become conversationally proficient and the MALLP movement continues to grow. Other benefits include strengthening intergenerational ties and 'bringing people back in touch with their roots' (Hinton, 2001c: 225). 'The passion and dedication of those who are working with their languages is obvious and inspiring to others', Hinton (1998: 92) adds; '[i]t is a healthy movement. . .toward recovery from the devastating social and cultural wounds inflicted by the European incursion into California'.

'Holding Hawaiian language and culture high': Hawaiian-medium education

A Polynesian language within the Austronesian family, Hawaiian is a 'vowel-rich musical language' (Wilson, 1999: 95) closely related to Māori and Samoan, and more distantly to Fijian, Malay, and languages indigenous to the Philippines and Taiwan. Although Native Hawaiians were only recently incorporated into the federal system, their experiences with that system bear the same imprint as those of other Native Americans. From A.D. 1000 to 1778, Hawaiian was the only language used in the Hawaiian archipelago, and for generations, it developed with little outside influence (Wilson, 1998: 126). With the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778, Hawai'i was drawn into an international trade and political system, and the years that followed saw the emergence of the Hawaiian Kingdom under an Indigenous monarchy. Hawaiian was the language of business, government, religion, education, and intercultural communication. Newspapers were published in Hawaiian, and even the children of immigrants 'spoke Hawaiian with native-speaker fluency' (Wilson, 1998: 127).

In 1893, backed by powerful American business interests, the US military mounted an illegal takeover of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Hawai'i was annexed as a US territory, and in 1959, it became the 50th state. Following the US takeover, bans ensued on Hawaiian-medium instruction along with mandates that all business be conducted in English. By the end of the nineteenth century, introduced diseases had decimated the Native population from a pre-contact figure of 800,000 to 47,500. In the growing cash economy, Native people were disenfranchised from their lands and traditional subsistence practices. According to Sam No'eau Warner, a Native Hawaiian scholar and leader in

the Hawaiian language revitalisation movement, within a single generation (1900–1920), most Hawaiian children began speaking a local variety of English called Hawaiian Creole English (Warner, 2001: 133, 135).

By the mid-twentieth century, Hawaiian was spoken only by a few hundred inhabitants of the island of Ni‘ihau. It was not until the 1960s and 1970s, in the context of broader civil rights reforms, that a ‘Hawaiian renaissance’ took root. ‘From this renaissance came a new group of second-language Hawaiian speakers who would become Hawaiian language educators’, Warner writes (2001: 135). In 1978, Hawaiian and English were designated co-official languages in the new state constitution, which also mandated the promotion of Hawaiian language, culture, and history (Warner, 2001). By this time, the ‘number of children speaking Hawaiian was less than 50 statewide’ (Wilson *et al.*, 2006: 42).

Encouraged by these political developments and news of Māori-language preschools in New Zealand, in 1983 a small group of parents and language activists established ‘*Aha Pūnana Leo* – Hawaiian language nests. The family-run preschools enable children to interact with fluent speakers entirely in Hawaiian, with the goal of cultivating fluency and knowledge of Hawaiian language and culture in ‘much the same way that they were in the home in earlier generations’ (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001: 151). As their children prepared to enter Hawaiian public schools, Pūnana Leo parents successfully lobbied for Hawaiian-medium tracks in those schools. This requires Native-language teachers and materials, and cultivating these personnel and materials is an ongoing project in university and community settings.

Hawaiian-medium education now serves approximately 2000 students of Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian ancestry in a coordinated set of schools, beginning with the preschools and moving through full Hawaiian-medium elementary schools (W.H. Wilson, personal communication, 6 January 2007). As many as 15,000 Hawaiians use or understand Hawaiian, Wilson reports: ‘[T]he vast majority of these are the products of second language learning in university classes, advanced high school classes, and community classes’ (W.H. Wilson, personal communication, 6 January 2007). Wilson and Kamanā (2001: 153) cite two other outcomes of these efforts: the development of an interconnected group of young parents who are increasing their proficiency in Hawaiian, and the creation of a more general social climate of Native-language support.

Although it has emphasised language and culture revitalisation over academic achievement, Hawaiian-medium instruction has yielded impressive academic results. Wilson and Kamanā report on the Nāwahīokalani‘ōpu Laboratory School in Hilo (called Nāwahī for short), a full-immersion, early childhood through high school affiliation of programmes with a college preparatory curriculum and ‘an explicit understanding that use of the Hawaiian language has priority over...English’ (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001: 158; see also Wilson *et al.*, 2006). Nāwahī students, many of whom come from poor and working-class backgrounds, surpass their non-immersion peers on a variety of measures. Many are concurrently enrolled in university classes and have won prestigious college scholarships. On English standardised tests, Nāwahī students score as well as or better than their non-immersion peers, and the school has a ‘100% high school graduation rate and a college attendance rate

of approximately 80%' (Wilson *et al.*, 2006: 42). According to Wilson, the school has succeeded 'because we have rejected the measure of success used by the dominant society – speaking English and academic achievement – even though our children all can do that...we judge the school on Hawaiian language and culture achievement and holding Hawaiian language and culture high' (W.H. Wilson, personal communication, 6 January 2007).

'Navajo immersion gave students Navajo pride': Tséhootsooí Diné Bi'ólta'

The Navajo self-referential term is Diné, The People. The Navajo (Diné) Nation is geographically the largest Indian reservation in the USA, occupying more than 27,000 square miles of high desert, plateau lands, and mountain ranges that stretch across three Southwestern states (see Figure 1). The Navajo Nation also has the second-largest Native American population in the USA – more than 298,000, or nearly 12 per cent of the 2000 population who identified solely as Native American (Navajo Nation Washington Office, 2005). Approximately 36,000 Navajo school-age children live on or near the reservation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah (US Census Bureau, 2000).

Navajo is an Athabaskan language, a family of languages spoken from the circumpolar north to the US border with Mexico. Navajo is most closely related to Western Apache and Mescalero-Chiricahua Apache, and is included in the Apachean branch, the southernmost division of Athabaskan languages (see Table 1). Although consensus is lacking on the number of speakers, a generally accepted range is 100,000–178,000 (Benally & Viri, 2005; Crawford, 1995). Navajo has a particularly rich print history dating back at least to the mid-nineteenth century. Missionaries, military personnel, linguists, anthropologists, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs – working with native speakers – produced a significant corpus of Navajo-language materials, including 'one of the very best indigenous language dictionaries in the Americas' by Robert Young and William Morgan (Hale, 2001: 83; Young & Morgan, 1987). In the heyday of federally funded bilingual education (roughly 1970 to the mid-1980s), myriad Navajo schools and curriculum development centres produced a corpus of high-quality Navajo-language teaching materials (for a discussion, see Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006: ch. 6; McCarty, 2002: ch. 9; Silentman, 1996).

Despite its relatively large number of speakers and robust literacy history, the Navajo language faces an uncertain future. In 1970, sociolinguist Bernard Spolsky conducted a survey of 3500 Navajo six-year-olds, which revealed nearly 90 per cent to be fluent Navajo speakers. Just 20 years later, a survey of 682 Navajo preschoolers by Navajo linguist Paul Platero found that over half were considered by their teachers to be English monolinguals (Platero, 2001). In 1993, language educator Wayne Holm conducted a study of more than 3300 kindergarteners in 110 Navajo schools and found similarly that less than a third were 'reasonably fluent' speakers of Navajo (Holm & Holm, 1995; W. Holm, personal communication, 14 February 2000). 'The Navajo language is at a crossroads', Benally and Viri (2005: 106) state: 'It is at a stage

where it can be revived to the extent that it can be strengthened in daily use, or it can continue to decline’.

Given this situation, the Navajo Nation has mandated Navajo-medium instruction in all its Head Start (federally funded) preschools. Some K-12 schools also have Navajo-immersion programmes. One of the better-documented programmes operates in the Window Rock Unified School District on the reservation’s eastern border. When the programme began in 1986, less than a tenth of the school’s five-year-olds were considered ‘reasonably competent’ speakers of Navajo; a third were judged to have some passive knowledge of the language (Arviso & Holm, 2001: 204; Holm & Holm, 1995: 148). At the same time, many of these students were considered ‘limited English proficient’; they possessed conversational proficiency in English but had difficulty with decontextualised academic English (Arviso & Holm, 2001: 205; see Cummins (1989: ch. 3, 2000: chs. 3 and 4) for a discussion of conversational and academic language proficiencies).

In light of these circumstances, the programme’s cofounders opted for a voluntary immersion programme similar to those developed for Hawaiian and Māori. Starting with a K-5 Navajo-immersion track in an otherwise all-English public elementary school, the programme has blossomed into a full-immersion K-8 school called *Tséhootsooí Diné Bi’ólta’* (TDB, The Navajo School at the Meadow Between the Rocks) (Johnson & Legatz, 2006: 27). In the lower grades, all instruction, including initial literacy, occurs in Navajo. English is introduced in the second grade and gradually increased until a 50–50 distribution is attained by grade 6. Johnson and Legatz (2006: 27), who were instrumental to the programme’s expansion, explain that it affords ‘maximum exposure to the Diné language...to provide for the greatest effect on acquiring (and instilling) the Diné language (heritage language) as a second language’. TDB’s curriculum incorporates tribal standards for Navajo language and culture and content-area standards required by the state. It also emphasises a ‘Diné language and culture rich environment...including lunch room, playground, hallways and the bus’ (Johnson & Legatz, 2006: 30). Like Hawaiian immersion, a key programme component is the involvement of parents and other caretakers, who commit to spending time interacting with their children in Navajo after school. Parents enrol their children at TDB, Johnson and Legatz (2006: 30) say, ‘in hopes that the Diné language could be revitalized within their families through these children’.

Longitudinal programme data show that Navajo-immersion students consistently outperform their peers in English-only classrooms on assessments of English reading, writing, and mathematics; not surprisingly, they also develop much stronger Navajo oral language and literacy skills (Holm & Holm, 1995; Johnson & Legatz, 2006; McCarty, 2003; Romero-Little & McCarty, 2006). In short, immersion students are accomplishing what research on second language acquisition predicts: They are acquiring Navajo as a second, heritage language ‘without cost’ to their English-language development or academic achievement (Holm & Holm, 1995). Moreover, Holm (2006: 33) states, ‘What the children and their parents taught us was that Navajo immersion gave students Navajo pride’.

Reimagining Possibilities for Indigenous Heritage Mother Tongues


In the foregoing accounts, I have deliberately foregrounded the *persons* who are creating new niches for strengthening Indigenous languages as heritage mother tongues. These efforts exemplify the power of human agency to pry open windows of language planning and policy-making opportunity. Hornberger (2002, 2005, 2006) refers to this as the creation of 'new ideological and implementational spaces' where multiple languages and literacies can be fostered. Such spaces are 'carved out from the bottom up', she adds, via individual and collective reimaginings of the possible (Hornberger, 2006: 233).

Table 2 summarises factors that have facilitated these possibilities in the four cases presented here. Using Krauss's (1998) classification of Native American languages, the table shows changes in language statuses from the inception of these projects to the present. At the bottom of the far-left column is an upward-reaching arrow indicating that the changes have grown out of grass-roots efforts – that is, from the bottom up.

Wôpanâak is perhaps the most dramatic illustration of these processes. Despite being silenced for more than a century, the Wôpanâak language is being repositioned from the pages of history to the mouths, minds, and hearts of the twenty-first century speakers. This remarkable language revival effort has occurred through a combination of Native vision and leadership, support from a coalition of tribes, partnerships with external allies, and a corpus of Native-language texts. For Native California tribes, a statewide Indigenous-language infrastructure has emerged alongside a network of master-apprentice language learning teams. That infrastructure now supports Indigenous-language revitalisation efforts in other states. Hawaiian-language revitalisation began with a few activist parents who envisioned a different future for their children and the Hawaiian language through radically different schooling possibilities. Hawaiian-medium education is now available from preschool to graduate school (there is even a Ph.D. programme in Hawaiian and Indigenous language and culture revitalisation), and is producing a new generation of speakers. At TDB within the Navajo Nation, human and material resources, including a substantial number of literacy materials and bilingual teachers, are being marshalled to strengthen the Navajo language and enhance student achievement. The salutary academic benefits have been ideological resources for programme expansion. This has been helped by the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act, which places supervision of reservation schools, including curriculum and assessment, under tribal authority.

Although they differ in their social-linguistic circumstances and programme strategies and goals, these cases exemplify language revitalisation possibilities in Native America (see, e.g., Cantoni, 1996; Hinton & Hale, 2001; McCarty & Zepeda, 2006; Reyhner *et al.*, 1999). Bottom-up programmes such as these also undergird a national and international language rights movement, reflected in NALA, NALPA, AILCS, and such organisations as the American Indian Language Development Institute (McCarty *et al.*, 2001), the Indigenous Language Institute, the Foundation for Endangered Languages, the annual Stabilising Indigenous Languages Symposium, and the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

Table 2 Comparison of four Indigenous heritage mother tongue (HMT) cases

<i>Native-language community</i>	Wôpanâak	Native California tribes	Hawaiian	Navajo (TDB)
<i>Language status</i> (based on Krauss's 1998 classification)	Class E → Class B/C/D	Class D → Class B/C	Class D/C → Class A/B	Class A/B/C → Class A/B
<i>Locus of language revitalisation efforts</i>	Tribal/community-based	Tribal/family/community-based	Family/community/school/university-based	School/community-based
<i>Factors supporting new ideological and implementational possibilities</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corpus of Native-language texts • Strong Native leadership and vision • Individual commitment to learn the HMT • Coalition of tribal interests and community support • External allies (e.g., MIT linguists) • Examples of other Indigenous-language programmes • NALA, NALPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence and commitment of elderly HMT speakers and younger language learners • Statewide infrastructure of financial and technical support (e.g., Native California Network, AICLS) • Intertribal networking • Examples of other Indigenous-language programmes • NALA, NALPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of HMT speakers (elders) • Corps of Hawaiian L2 teachers • Strong parent involvement and support • Hawaiian as co-official language; constitutional mandates (Hawaiian renaissance movement) • Statewide public education system • Strong university and community leadership • Examples of other Indigenous-language programmes (e.g., Māori) • NALA, NALPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navajo as 'class A' language (intergenerational HMT transmission) • Significant corpus of HMT print materials • Corps of Navajo L1 teachers • Strong parent involvement and support • Salutary academic benefits • Tribal language education policies (e.g., 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act) • Examples of other Indigenous-language programmes (e.g., Māori) • NALA, NALPA

This combination of local and global activism is a force for linguistic self-determination and *choice* (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; see also May, 1999). 'Learning the language of one's people does not force you to live your life in one and only one way', Holm (2006: 41–42) points out; '[a]s a young adult, you can choose *whether* to use your language, *who* to use your language with, and *what* things you will talk about in your language'. But choice operates in contested social and political terrain. In the USA, the right to educate Native American children in their heritage language is increasingly threatened by policies of standardisation and English-only, reflected in state laws banning bilingual education and in the renaming (and reframing) of the Bilingual Education Act noted previously.

Native American education has been the proving ground for the waste, destructiveness, and foolishness of language-restrictive policies. Yet language reclamation efforts such as those highlighted here are cause for hope. 'There is no language for which nothing can be done', Fishman (1991: 12) reminds us. Indigenous language reclamation demonstrates the veracity of that claim, and the human potential to reclaim America's multilingual, multicultural heritage for generations to come.

Acknowledgements

I thank Professor Harold Schiffman of the University of Pennsylvania for graciously reviewing and commenting on an earlier draft of this article, and Professor Norvin Richards of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for his very helpful feedback on the Wôpanâak Language Revitalisation Project. I am indebted to Editor Eoghan MacAogain for his attentive editing. Any errors are my own.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Teresa L. McCarty, M.L. Fulton College of Education, Arizona State University, Farmer Building 120 – PO Box 872411, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411, USA (Teresa.McCarty@asu.edu).

Notes

1. Schiffman's (1998: 1) translation of Herder's work bears remarkable resemblance to the Native American discourses cited here: 'Maternal language was our first world, it conveyed the first sensations that we felt. ...all is thus perpetuated, and language becomes a stock'. In another parallel to Native American discourses, Schiffman notes the life-giving properties of the spoken word in the Judeo-Christian tradition, in which God *speaks* the world into existence (*Book of Genesis*, ch. 1: 3) (H. Schiffman, personal communication, 27–28 July 2007; see also Schiffman, 1996: ch. 3).
2. Tribal sovereignty is complex, as political incorporation into the USA has been different for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, and among American Indian tribes themselves. The sovereignty of some tribes is recognised by states but not by the federal government; some tribes are not recognised either by states or the federal government. Native Hawaiians, whose internationally recognised sovereign kingdom was illegally overthrown by the US government in 1893 and who were officially incorporated into the USA upon Hawaiian statehood in 1959, are still fighting for federal recognition, although the US Congress acknowledged the illegality of the takeover in the 1993 Hawaii Apology Act (US Congress, 1993). The experience of Alaska Natives is different still. Nevertheless, all Native

American share a distinct status as Indigenous peoples, which entails sovereignty and a singular legal–political relationship with the US government.

References

- Adams, D.W. (1995) *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience 1875–1928*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- American Indian Policy Center (2002) American Indian Tribal Sovereignty Primer. On WWW at <http://www.airpi.org/pubs/indiansov.html> (accessed 30 July 2006).
- Arviso, M. and Holm, W. (2001) Tséhootsooídi Ólta'gi Diné bizaad bihoo'aah: A Navajo immersion program at Fort Defiance, Arizona. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 203–226). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Baker, C. and Prys Jones, S. (1998) *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bean, L.J. and Vane, S.B. (1997) The California culture area. In M. Mignon and D.L. Boxberger (eds) *Native North Americans: An Ethnohistorical Approach* (2nd edn). (pp. 309–350). Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt.
- Benally, A. and Viri, D. (2005) *Diné bizaad* (Navajo language) at a crossroads: Extinction or renewal? *Bilingual Research Journal* 29 (1), 85–108.
- Cantoni, G. (ed.) (1996) *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Center for Excellence in Education.
- Crawford, J. (1995) Endangered Native American languages: What is to be done, and why? *Bilingual Research Journal* 19 (1), 17–38.
- Cummins, J. (1989) *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2005) A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 89 (4), 585–591.
- Daly, G.E. (2002) 'Dreaming' a language back to life. *Canku Ota (Many Paths)* (April 6) (58), 1–5. On WWW at http://www.turtletrack.org/Issues02/Co04062002/CO_04062002_Dreaming_Language.htm (accessed 9 August 2006).
- Dutcher, N. (2003) Promise and perils of mother tongue education. On WWW at http://www.silinternational.org/asia/ldc/plenary_papers/nadine_dutcher.pdf (accessed 27 July 2007).
- Feldman, O. (2001) Inspired by a dream. *Spectrum*, IIX (2). On WWW at <http://web.mit.edu/giving/spectrum/spring01/inspired-by-a-dream.html> (accessed 31 July 2007).
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (1968) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991) *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (2001) 300-plus years of heritage language education in the U.S. In J.K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard and S. McGinnis (eds) *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics., (pp. 81–97).
- García, O. (2005) Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal* 89 (5), 601–605.
- Goddard, I. (1996) Introduction. In I. Goddard (volume ed.) and W.V. Sturtevant (general ed.) *Handbook of North American Indians Volume 17: Languages* (1–16). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Goddard, I. and Bragdon, K. (1988) *Native Writings in Massachusetts*. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society.
- Hale, K. (1997) Reasons to be optimistic about local language maintenance and restoration. Paper prepared for the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO) Conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- Hale, K. (2001) The Navajo language: I. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 83–85). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (HLRPCR) (2000) Heritage language research priorities conference report, University of California, Los Angeles, September 21–23, 2000. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24 (4), 333–346.
- Hinton, L. (1998) Language loss and revitalization in California: Overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132 (1), 83–93.
- Hinton, L. (2001a) Sleeping languages: Can they be awakened? In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 413–417). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hinton, L. (2001b) Language revitalization: An overview. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 3–18). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hinton, L. (2001c) The Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 217–226). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hinton, L. and Hale, K. (eds) (2001) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Holm, W. (2006) The ‘goodness’ of bilingual education for Native American children. In T.L. McCarty and O. Zepeda (eds), with V.H. Begay, S. Charging Eagle, S.C. Moore, L. Warhol and T.M.K. Williams, *One Voice, Many Voices: Recreating Indigenous Language Communities* (pp. 1–46). Tempe: Arizona State University Center for Indian Education.
- Holm, A. and Holm, W. (1995) Navajo language education: Retrospect and prospects. *Bilingual Research Journal* 19 (1), 141–167.
- Hornberger, N.H. (ed.) (1996) *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2002) Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy* 1 (1), 27–51.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2005) Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal* 89 (4), 605–609.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2006) Nichols to NCLB: Local and global perspectives on U.S. language education policy. In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas and M. Torres-Guzmán (eds) *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization* (pp. 223–237). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, F.T. and Legatz, J. (2006) Tséhootsooí Diné Bi’ólta’. *Journal of American Indian Education* 45 (2), 26–33.
- Kageleiry, J. (2001) Wampanoag 101. *Yankee Magazine*, (October), 18–19.
- Krauss, M. (1998) The condition of Native North American languages: The need for realistic assessment and action. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132 (1), 9–21.
- Littlebear, R. (2004) One man, two languages: Confessions of a freedom-loving bilingual. *Tribal College Journal* 15 (3), 11–12.
- Little Doe, J. (2000) The ‘re-awakening’ of the Wôpanâak language. *Native Language Network*, (Winter), 3.
- Lomawaima, K.T. and McCarty, T.L. (2006) *To Remain an Indian’: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- May, S. (ed.) (1999) *Indigenous Community-Based Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, T.L. (1993) Federal language policy and American Indian education. *Bilingual Research Journal* 17 (1 & 2), 13–34.
- McCarty, T.L. (2002) *A Place To Be Navajo – Rough Rock and the Struggle for Self-Determination in Indigenous Schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McCarty, T.L. (2003) Revitalising Indigenous languages in homogenising times. *Comparative Education* 39 (2), 147–163.
- McCarty, T.L. and Watahomigie, L.W. (2004) Language and literacy in American Indian and Alaska Native communities. In B. Pérez (ed.) *Sociocultural Contexts of Language and Literacy* (pp. 79–110) (2nd edn). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- McCarty, T.L., Watahomigie, L.J. and Yamamoto, A.Y. (1999) (guest eds) Reversing language shift in Indigenous America – collaborations and views from the field. Theme issue. *Practicing Anthropology* 20 (2), 1–47.
- McCarty, T.L., Watahomigie, L.J., Yamamoto, A.Y. and Zepeda, O. (2001) Indigenous educators as change agents: Case studies of two language institutes. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 371–383). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McCarty, T.L., Romero, M.E. and Zepeda, O. (2006) Reimagining multilingual America: Lessons from Native American youth. In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas and M. Torres-Guzmán (eds) *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization* (pp. 91–110). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, T.L. and Zepeda, O. (eds), with V.H. Begay, S. Charing Eagle, S.C. Moore, L. Warhol and T.M.K. Williams (2006) *One Voice, Many Voices – Recreating Indigenous Language Communities*. Tempe: Arizona State University Center for Indian Education.
- Mignon, M. and Boxberger, D. (eds) (1997) *Native North Americans: An Ethnohistorical Approach* (2nd edn). Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1997) *Characteristics of American Indian and Alaska Native Education*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education, On WWW at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/web97451.asp> (accessed 30 July 2006).
- National Center for Education Statistics (2008) *National Indian Education Study 2007, Part I: Performance of American Indian and Alaska Native Students at Grades 4 and 8 on NAEP 2007 Reading and Mathematics Assessments*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, On WWW at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nies> (accessed 9 June 2008).
- Navajo Nation Washington Office (2005) Navajo Nation Profile. On WWW at <http://www.nnwo.org/nnprofile.htm> (accessed 26 July 2006).
- Ortiz, S. (1993) The language we know. In P. Riley (ed.) *Growing up Native American: An Anthology* (pp. 29–38). New York: Morrow.
- Platero, P. (2001) Navajo Head Start Language Study. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 87–97). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Rees-Miller, J. (1998) Stages in the obsolescence of certain eastern Algonquian languages. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40 (4), 535–569.
- Reyhner, J. and Eder, J. (2004) *American Indian Education: A History*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- St. Reyhner, J., Cantoni, G., St. Clair, R.N. and Parsons-Yazzie, E. (eds) (1999) *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona Center for Excellence in Education.
- Romero-Little, M.E. and McCarty, T.L. (2006) Language Planning Challenges and Prospects in Native American Communities and Schools. Tempe: Arizona State University Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Language Policy Unit, On WWW at <http://edpolicylab.org> (accessed 9 June 2008).
- Schiffman, H. (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Schiffman, H. (1998) Language, primordialism and sentiment. In G. Palmer and D. Occhi (eds) *Languages of Sentiment* (pp. 25–38). Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, On WWW at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/handouts/emotion/sentimen/node3.html> (accessed 27 July 2007).
- Silentman, I. (1996) (guest ed.) In honor of Robert Young and William Morgan. Theme issue. *Journal of Navajo Education* 8 (2), entire.
- Sims, C. (1998) Community-based efforts to preserve Native languages: A descriptive study of the Karuk Tribe of northern California. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132, 95–113.
- Sims, C. (2005) Tribal languages and the challenges of revitalization. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36 (1), 104–106.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000) *Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and McCarty, T.L. (2008) Key concepts in bilingual education: Ideological, historical, epistemological, and empirical foundations. In J. Cummins and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Bilingual Education* (Vol. 5, pp. 3–17). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd edn). Springer Science+Business Media.
- Slate, C. (2001) Promoting advanced Navajo language scholarship. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 389–410). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Spring, J. (1996) *The Cultural Transformation of a Native American Family and its Tribe 1763–1995, a Basket of Apples*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Summer Institute of Linguistics (1999, July) What is a mother-tongue education literacy program? On WWW at www.sil.org/linguaLinks/literacy/ReferenceMaterials/GlossaryOfLiteracyTerms/WhatsAMotherTongueEducationLi.htm (accessed 27 July 2007).
- Supahan, T. and Supahan, S. (2001) Teaching well, learning quickly: Communication-based language instruction. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 195–197). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Trumbull, J.H. (1903) *Natick Dictionary*. Washington, DC: Bureau of American Ethnology/Reprint Services Corp.
- US Census Bureau (2000) *Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000. Geographic Area: Navajo Nation Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land, AZ-NM-UT (AZ Part)*. On WWW at <http://www.indianaffairs.state.az.us/tribes/Navajo.pdf> (accessed 19 July 2007).
- US Census Bureau (2001) *The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population: 2000. Census 2000 Brief*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- US Census Bureau (2002) *The American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2000. Census 2000 Brief*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- US Census Bureau (2006) *We the People: American Indians and Alaska Natives in the United States. Census 2000 Special Reports*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- US Congress (1990) United States Public Law 101-477. 101st Congress (Native American Languages Act of 1990). Washington, DC: United States Congress, On WWW at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/stabilize/ii-policy/nala1990.htm> (accessed 9 June 2008).
- US Congress (1993) United States Public Law 103-150. 103d Congress Joint Resolution (Hawaii Apology Act). On WWW at <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/publawall.html> (accessed 12 December 2005).
- US Congress (2006) United States Public Law 109-394. 109th Congress (Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006). Washington, DC: United States Congress, On WWW at <http://npl.ly.gov.tw/pdf/5642.pdf> (accessed 9 June 2008).
- Valdés, G. (2001) Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J.K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard and S. McGinnis (eds) *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving and National Resource* (pp. 37–77). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Warner, S.L.N. (2001) The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 133–144). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Watahomigie, L.J. (1998) The Native language is a gift: A Hualapai language autobiography. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132, 5–7.
- Watahomigie, L.J. and McCarty, T.L. (1996) Literacy for what? Hualapai literacy and language maintenance. In N.H. Hornberger (ed.) *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up* (pp. 95–113). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Wiley, T.G. (2001) On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J.K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard and S. McGinnis (eds) *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (pp. 29–36). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wiley, T.G. (2005) The reemergence of heritage and community language policy in the US national spotlight. *Modern Language Journal* 89 (4), 594–601.
- Wiley, T.G. and Valdés, G. (2000) Editors' introduction: Heritage language instruction in the United States: A time for renewal. *Bilingual Research Journal* 24 (4), i–v.
- Wilson, W.H. (1998) I ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i ke ola, 'Life is found in the Hawaiian language'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132, 123–137.
- Wilson, W.H. (1999) The sociopolitical context of establishing Hawaiian-medium education. In S. May (ed.) *Indigenous Community-Based Education* (pp. 95–108). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilson, W.H. and Kamanā, K. (2001) 'Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini.: Proceeding from a dream'. The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton and K. Hale (eds) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 147–176). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilson, W.H., Kamanā, K. and Rawlins, N. (2006) Nāwahī Hawaiian Laboratory School. *Journal of American Indian Education* 45 (2), 42–44.
- Young, R.W. and Morgan, W. Sr. (1987) *The Navajo Language: A Grammar and Colloquial Dictionary*. (Revised Edition) Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Zepeda, O. (1990) American Indian language policy. In K.L. Adams and D.T. Brink (eds) *Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the USA* (pp. 247–256). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Copyright of Language, Culture & Curriculum is the property of Multilingual Matters and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.