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Some food for thought

Our language is like a pearl inside a shell. The shell is like the people that carry the language. If our language is taken away, then that would be like a pearl that is gone. We would be like an empty oyster shell.

Yurranydjil Dhurrkay from Galiwin’ku in North East Arnhem Land

This is something that is very precious for people; it’s their original instrument of expression, their own language. And it’s also a matter of common sense that in all education, whether you’re teaching people of five, nine or 90, you’ve got to go from the known to the unknown.

Christine Nicholls, former school principal, Lajamanu School NT Australia

Language is not everything in education but without language everything is nothing in education’ (Wolff 2006).

‘When I use a word’, Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, ‘it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less’. ‘The question is this’, said Alice, ‘whether you can make words mean so many different things’. ‘The question is’ said Humpty Dumpty, ‘who is to be master – that’s all’. (Carroll 1872)
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Foreword

Indigenous Language Foreword

The body of research that shows that young children learn best first in their mother tongue is indisputable. Yet, across the globe, education systems pay no, or little, heed to this fact. Children fail to learn in the early grades, not because they cannot learn, but because they have difficulty learning in a foreign language. Furthermore, many teachers lack of familiarity with the language of instruction is, in many cases, an additional factor in poor learning outcomes.

In addition, a quality education is about more than pure academics. It is about contributing to the foundation of citizenship. It is about enabling individuals to live lives of dignity and to contribute to their lives and those of their families, communities, and nations—their societies and cultures. A quality education contributes to identity and to the ability to make good decisions. As such, language is a key element in this aspect of building lives and nations.

This paper uses this over-arching framework to summarize what is known about the linkages between indigenous languages and education. It presents a range of approaches that are being implemented worldwide to take advantage of this body of research in an attempt to provide alternatives to those who are facing the challenge of teaching and learning in environments where more than one language is present.

Mary Joy Pigozzi, PhD
Director EAC
Indigenous Language and Education

A paper written for Educate A Child, Doha, Qatar
Elaine Furniss, Consultant

Abstract

Most efforts to support universal primary education are linked to national education goals which usually take scant notice of the knowledge, culture and language of indigenous peoples. Often national language and education policies have actually contributed to the demise of indigenous languages. National education policies can also downplay the role that indigenous and other minority families and culture can play in the development of their children. As well we are reminded: “the universalizing goals of providing basic education have yet to address the problem of how to effectively incorporate local knowledge for the sake of serving Indigenous community priorities.” (Huaman 2013,15) Any group seeking to engage and involve indigenous peoples in the realistic achievement of universal primary education must take this into account. However given that language is acquired socially and in the context of culture, policymakers are often far distant geographically and politically from indigenous and other minority societal contexts when national decisions are made about which language to use and why in education. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is useful in helping to unravel why this can be a stumbling block.

During the past few decades new norms and declarations have brought to the fore the issues facing indigenous peoples throughout the world including how indigenous languages are often disregarded. The nature of language policy and planning can be a big influence in this regard.

Language revitalisation efforts are discussed and a framework for thinking about language revitalisation provided by Lo Bianco is described. A review of models of language use in education is provided. Attention is paid to some pedagogies that have been successful in communities and schools. Issues of language assessment are often the place where governments’ real agendas are demonstrated and indigenous children are often not able to demonstrate the language proficiencies they bring to school as their indigenous language use may not be assessed.

From a broader sociological perspective the paper notes that schools and those who work in them are often expected to change possibilities and trajectories of indigenous children in relation to dominant culture and this is not possible for all students. Schools can’t by themselves change society. They also can’t be solely responsible for the task of language revitalisation. Education success depends not on successes in language proficiency but the ability to transform such proficiency into other exchangeable commodities such as salaried work and sustainable futures. It is inappropriate to speak of education without taking these fields into account.
(Bourdieu 1976). Education programmes need to be developed in concert with other social programmes in health and protection for example and coordinated within communities, with an eye to sustainable economic futures. This is not just about what happens in school, although ensuring realistic goals for mother tongue language use goes a long way to supporting success and sustainability if not cut short.

The paper goes on to present what is known about bilingual language acquisition. Researchers suggest that children need at least 5-6 years of schooling in indigenous or minority language and literacy before transferring to education in the national or official language with well-trained teachers of the official language as a second language. So doing provides such children with a legacy not only of indigenous language and literacy learning, but also a key understanding of how language works which can be used for comparing and contrasting in learning a new (official) language. L1 language learning (indigenous, minority or immigrant)¹ does not interfere with learning an official language when teachers and resources are in place. ESL (English as a Second Language, or whatever is the official language in question, Arabic, French, Swahili, etc) teachers and methodologies are important as indigenous children transition from mother tongue to national or official languages. We also need to note that the increasing academic demands on learners as they continue through the grades in terms of text types and abstract concepts are made even greater with the introduction of a new language. Recommendations are made for successful involvement of indigenous and other minority languages in education for the realistic achievement of universal primary education.

¹ See Glossary
Introduction: some issues

Children in indigenous and other minority communities bring to school a linguistic resource which can be either valued or discarded. Those who make decisions about which languages will be used in education do so using a framework of common sense ideals, often linked to their own disposition for education based on past experiences and values: their habitus for education (Bourdieu, 1976 in Luke 2008), which in their minds is unquestionably reasonable. However, their lived experience can be far from the indigenous contexts for which they make language policies. When indigenous and other minority children are kept from learning their mother tongue, they are denied a basic human right. (UNDRIP, 2007). When they fail to learn an official language they may lack the means for a long-term sustainable lifestyle, adult employment and access to the multi-literacies of our globalised world. (Cazden et al,1996)

Language is not only a means of communication but also a medium of power through which individuals (and nations) pursue their interests and display their practical competence. Thus, for indigenous and other minority peoples who mostly have less power than those of the dominant culture, the push to establish legitimacy of L1 language use in education can be very difficult, even if it has been established as a human right. Current world views which value economics, business and globalisation mostly show little support for indigenous, minority or immigrant languages and culture. However, the importance of indigenous, minority or immigrant languages for those who use it is central. “Those who teach mainstream, monolingual language education continue ‘to routinely categorise the multilingual (indigenous) subject as ‘other’, as afterthought, exception, anomaly, and ‘lack’.”(Luke 2003,135)  Huaman 2013, in writing about the purposes of education in Peru, reminds us that even as national education can increase social and economic opportunities for indigenous children, as linked to the discourses of EFA and MDGs, it can also downplay the role that indigenous families and culture can play in the education and development of their children and in inculcation into traditions and ceremonies. “The universalizing goals of providing basic education have yet to address the problem of how to effectively incorporate local knowledge for the sake of serving Indigenous community priorities.” (Huaman, 2013, 15) Any group seeking to engage and involve indigenous, minority or immigrant peoples in the realistic achievement of universal primary education should note this.

National or official languages are often viewed as neutral and value-free because they are used by the dominant or more powerful language users in a country. Indigenous, minority or immigrant peoples may see learning a national language as a means for accessing pathways to life beyond the community. However indigenous and other minority languages can be the key to culture and community-based power including local knowledge about biodiversity and skills for working in the informal employment sector. Maintaining a home language, culture and cultural identity can influence health, resilience and well-being and may lead to more effective uses of second or other languages. (Benson 2005, Heugh 2011). Bruthiaux 2000 suggests, using three examples from micro-lending and the work of the Grammeen Bank in Bangladesh, unenforceable property rights in Egypt and the work of Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical in a number of Latin American countries to teach farmers how to solve agricultural problems, that understanding indigenous languages is germane to gaining an better life for many poorer people around the world who operate in informal economies.
Histories of official (often colonial) language prescription for education of indigenous and other minority children have contributed to the disappearance of mother tongue language use often to the point of language extinction, alongside failure of education outcomes for indigenous and other minority children educated in official/national languages if teaching is poor. Some indigenous groups have introduced language policies that privilege first language and literacy development and for some, “education has now come to be seen as a key arena in which indigenous and other minority peoples can reclaim and revalue their languages and cultures and, in so doing, improve the educational success of indigenous students.” (May, 2013, 38)
Status of Indigenous peoples

People who identify as indigenous, numbering more than 370 million in some 90 countries, comprise about 5 percent of the world’s population yet are 15 percent of the world’s poor. (May 2013, UNPFII 2006\(^2\), UN 2009) Indigenous peoples:

- are the descendants of the original populations inhabiting their lands at the time of conquest and identify as such
- speak (or spoke) a distinct and native language, and typically aspire to remain distinct culturally, geographically and institutionally rather than assimilate
- have an affinity with and attachment to the land; and
- tend to maintain distinct social, economic and political institutions within their territories (Cobo 1986, ILO Convention 169, 1989\(^3\), Patrinos and Skoufias, 2007)

Others suggest that definitions of indigenous are not so clear cut and that indigenous groups can more usually be defined by being heterogeneous and polythetic. (Levi and Maybury-Lewis 2010).

Indigenous peoples face huge disparities in terms of access to and quality of education and health. Champagne, 2009 quotes King & Schielmann, 2004: It is too common that “…educational programs fail to offer indigenous peoples the possibility of participating in decision-making, the design of curricula, the selection of teachers and teaching methods and the definition of standards.” The result is an education gap - indigenous students have lower enrolment rates, higher dropout rates and poorer educational outcomes than non-indigenous people in the same countries\(^4\). In Guatemala, for example, 53.5 per cent of indigenous young people aged 15-19 have not completed primary education, as compared to 32.2 per cent of non-indigenous youth. Any measures of indigenous peoples’ social and economic development however must necessarily start from indigenous peoples’ own definitions and indicators of poverty and well-being. (UN 2009,15). More detailed discussion of education disparities between indigenous students and non-indigenous students in particular countries can be found in The State of the World’s Indigenous Peoples (UN, 2009).

\(^2\) http://undesadspd.org/IndigenousPeoples/UNPFIISessions.aspx
The status of indigenous languages

Languages of the world are in decline and disappearing fast. Of the 7000 plus languages of the world, 5000 are identified as indigenous languages. Globally, the internet site Ethnologue suggests the following status of world languages. Languages are assessed by their vitality using the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS). Institutional languages are used and sustained by institutions beyond the home and community. Developing languages are those which are in the initial stages of development (graphization, standardization, modernization). Literature in a standardized form is being used but not in a sustainable way. Other status levels are self-explanatory.

WORLD
Population 6,716,664,407
Living Languages 7,105

Institutional: 682,
Developing: 1,534
Vigorous: 2,502
In Trouble: 1,481.
Dying: 906

---

5 Ethnologue Accessed April 1, 2014 https://www.ethnologue.com/world/***EDITION*** See this site for further explanation
6 See https://www.ethnologue.com/about/language-status
There are a number of reports which outline the nature of indigenous languages. In fact there are very few parts of the world where indigenous languages are not spoken, and with the fluidity of migration and resettlement it is probable that indigenous language speakers are in every country. For example, in parts of South America (Peru, Ecuador, Northern Argentina, Southern Colombia, and Bolivia) Quechua is the lingua franca spoken by more than 12 million people, Aymara by 1 million. In Mexico and Guatemala Maya is spoken by over one million and in Paraguay, more than 3 million people speak Guarani. Africa is home to about one third of the world’s living languages, with between 1200 and 2000 languages on the continent. Of these, Wolff 2011 tells us, only 72 indigenous African languages have more than 1 million speakers (and only 16 of these have more than 5 million, counting mutually-intelligible Zulu and Xhosa as different languages and including Malagasy and Afrikaans)...The vast majority of African languages have less than 100,000 speakers, probably even less than 50,000. Therefore, only considering “big” languages for educational purposes would amount to neglecting about 96 per cent of Africa’s mother-tongue speakers. Many of Africa’s languages are readily spoken across borders as the following table explains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Living Languages</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Vigorous</th>
<th>In Trouble</th>
<th>Dying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>938,190,060</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>900,743,578</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4,115,950,000</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>728,096,620</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>33,684,149</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table developed from Ethnologue data, Sixteenth Edition. 2010

---

7 Wolff, E 2011 Background and history – language politics and planning in Africa In Ouane, A & Glanz,C. 2011 Optimising Learning, Education and Publishing in Africa  p64
8 Ibid 6 p72
Some of Africa's shared (cross border) languages, adapted from Obanya (1999a:95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Countries covered</th>
<th>Speakers (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>Burundi, D.R.Congo, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>Benin, Cameroun, Chad, Ghana, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfulde</td>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroun, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauretanian, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingala</td>
<td>Congo (Brazzaville), D.R.Congo</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Angola, Congo (Brazzaville), D.R.Congo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>Mozambique, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewe</td>
<td>Ghana, Togo</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolof</td>
<td>Gambia, Mauretanian, Senegal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandinka</td>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Senegal, Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songhay</td>
<td>Benin, Mali, Nigeria</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyula</td>
<td>Burkina, Cote d’ Ivoire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanuri</td>
<td>Cameroun, Chad, Niger, Nigeria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crioulo</td>
<td>Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>Cameroun, Congo (Brazzaville), Equatorial Guinea, Gabon</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Languages 34 countries 140 million
It may be that cross border cooperation could be a rewarding field of work for NGOs and other international organisations supporting indigenous language education as it offers opportunities for cross border publishing and economies of scale for materials development. There were at least 250 indigenous languages spoken in Australia at the time of non-Aboriginal settlement of the country, many with multiple separate dialects. Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001, provide a detailed description of the status and prospects for Australian indigenous languages. The 2008 Australian census showed that only 11.42% of Australia’s total Indigenous population of 455,028 speaks an Indigenous language at home, while 81.75% speak only English. (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2008 in McKay, 2011). The following table, although a little dated, shows the ratios of populations globally with access to education in their mother tongue (UNDP, 2004, 34 quoted in Kosonen, K. 2009, 4.)

**Estimated populations with access to education in their first language** (Source: UNDP 2004, 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income QFCD</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the situation is very difficult for children in Sub-Saharan Africa. In Asian countries, as well as East Asia and the Pacific, and South Asia. However it also demonstrates that in every country access to education in mother tongue is an issue.
Normative status of indigenous languages and education in international law

A number of activities have increased global understanding of and positive responses to the issues facing indigenous peoples. These include the establishment of the UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations (1985), the adoption of the ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (1989), the proclamation of the International Year of the World’s Indigenous People (1993) and, subsequently, the proclamation of two separate International Decades of the World’s Indigenous People (1995-2004 and 2005-2014). The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) was adopted in September 2007. Articles 14 & 15 of this Declaration are of specific importance to this paper:

**Article 14**

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.

3. States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language.

**Article 15**

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations, which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information.

2. States shall take effective measures, in consultation and cooperation with the indigenous peoples concerned, to combat prejudice and eliminate discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among indigenous peoples and all other segments of society.

These Articles emphasise the centrality of the rights of indigenous peoples to develop and control education in their own languages. Huaman (2013) notes that a leader of the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN), Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley ‘consistently challenged us to “teach through the culture” and to consider the significance of this process against what he referred to as the “psychosocial maladies” brought on by colonisation.’ He argued that ‘the richest and most relevant lessons for Indigenous children came from valuing local knowledge and Indigenous languages as the basis of educational practice.’ (p 13) The State of the World’s Indigenous Peoples (UN 2009) is a useful compendium of information regarding indigenous peoples with discussions about poverty and well-being, culture, environment, education, health, human rights and emerging indigenous issues of conflict, displacement, conservation, globalisation, urban migration and isolation. Language is a key discussion point at all stages in this publication as it lies at the core of most indigenous issues, including education.
Language planning and indigenous languages

Since the 1960’s sociolinguists have been analysing language policy and planning (LPP) and their functions. The implementation of language policy is usually referred to as language planning or language management. Language planning is understood to include at least three elements:

i. Status planning – which involves decisions about which languages are to be used for high status functions like legislation (Acts of Parliament); national, regional and local government; in formal education etc.

ii. Corpus planning - which involves the development of written language (orthography, dictionaries, terminology development, standardization of the spoken forms in written form).

iii. Acquisition planning - which involves the development of language learning programmes, learning materials, and translation. (Heugh, Benson, Bogale & Yohannes, 2007)

These writers also add that for successful implementation to occur, what is also needed is

- Civil society participation in decision-making.
- Advocacy or awareness raising about the approaches which are likely to offer educational success in which contexts
- Realistic timeframe to respond to local circumstances.
- A budget which has taken into account the cost-benefits of different approaches to education and the returns on investment which these are able to deliver.
- Monitoring and evaluation of policy and implementation in order to respond promptly to necessary modification, changes, and up- or down-scaling (p19-20)

“For language planners in multilingual contexts, then, the question is not so much how to develop languages as which languages to develop for what purposes, and in particular, how and for what purposes to develop local, threatened languages in relation to global and spreading ones.” (Hornberger 2005, 27-28) Those involved in language policy and planning are usually at the level of central government and it is there that the value of indigenous language learning must be understood for indigenous languages to be utilised in education and be useful for successful early literacy learning and cultural development for children of indigenous and other minority families. Hornberger notes that local languages will thrive when they are viewed as a resource rather than a threat. Indigenous communities' language policies for first language and literacy development focus on revitalisation strategies that succeed at least in the short run, when they are home grown. Efforts from the outside by “well-intentioned others” to implement revitalisation and literacy programs have often been ineffective, but grassroots programs offer some hope of success. (Kartunnen, 2000)
Indigenous languages are often endangered by governments insisting on use of national languages other than mother tongue, especially in countries where colonisation has taken place (e.g. French and English colonisation in African states, English colonisation in the Americas, Australia and New Zealand), or where one language has been developed for the express purpose of national communication (e.g. Swahili in Kenya or Tanzania, Bahasa in Indonesia).

National Language Planning and Education Policies

Indigenous language learning in education needs national language policies which validate the use of indigenous languages in education. The experience of Norway in providing greater autonomy for the indigenous Sami population led to the passing of the Sami Language Act in 1992, for use of the indigenous language in areas of government, law and education. (May, 2013). A similar process in Canada has led to autonomy for the Inuit in the new Arctic province of Nunavut. The indigenous language, Inuktitut, holds official status along with French and English. Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia have established national bilingual policies. (See d’Emilio (1996) for a detailed discussion of intercultural bilingual education (IBE) in Bolivia.) However, even when national indigenous languages policies exist, they may not result in positive outcomes for indigenous languages development. Australia’s history of public policy development in relation to indigenous languages dates from the Commonwealth’s introduction of bilingual education in the Northern Territory (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001) and has been defined by a lot of chopping and changing according to change of government. An increasing emphasis on English literacy, and the dismemberment of public funding for bilingual education in the Northern Territory is the current state of play.

“The dominant rationalisation for language policy by the (Australian) Commonwealth has been progressively changed from one concerned with efforts to bolster multilingualism in community contexts and in the public sphere, to one where economic and trade (and general ‘efficiency’ criteria) dominate. Such rationalisations, while they avoid the overt language and nomenclature of assimilation may often lead to the same effect.” (Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001, 416)

The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992) provides opportunities for the use of minority languages for member states of the Council of Europe 9. Article 7 – Objectives and principles

1. In respect of regional or minority languages, within the territories in which such languages are used and according to the situation of each language, the Parties shall base their policies, legislation and practice on the following objectives and principles:
   • the recognition of the regional or minority languages as an expression of cultural wealth;
   • the respect of the geographical area of each regional or minority language in order to ensure that existing or new administrative divisions do not constitute an obstacle to the promotion of the regional or minority language in question;

• the need for resolute action to promote regional or minority languages in order to safeguard them;
• the facilitation and/or encouragement of the use of regional or minority languages, in speech and writing, in public and private life;
• the maintenance and development of links, in the fields covered by this Charter, between groups using a regional or minority language and other groups in the State employing a language used in identical or similar form, as well as the establishment of cultural relations with other groups in the State using different languages;
• the provision of appropriate forms and means for the teaching and study of regional or minority languages at all appropriate stages;
• the provision of facilities enabling non-speakers of a regional or minority language living in the area where it is used to learn it if they so desire;
• the promotion of study and research on regional or minority languages at universities or equivalent institutions;
• the promotion of appropriate types of transnational exchanges, in the fields covered by this Charter, for regional or minority languages used in identical or similar form in two or more States.

In Africa the lack of acceptance of indigenous languages for education has had a long history of promulgation of the languages of the colonisers: English, French and Portuguese, as official languages, alongside varying degrees of use of indigenous languages. Benson reports on the uses of Bantu in Mozambique. There are about 20 languages in Mozambique (depending on the definition of language); Sena, Changana and Shona are three of them. The official language and language of instruction is Portuguese. Mother tongue languages have been taught in pilot schools from grades 1 to grade 3. However as Benson 2005 discusses, Mozambique suffers from an inability to bridge the gap between pilot experimentation and a language policy that would enable all children to access education through their mother tongue. There have been some developments 10, but they have been modest.

In South Africa, a country with 11 official languages, the Ministry of Education moved in 1997 to ensure that all students by Grade 9 would have learned another African language apart from English or Afrikaans. This was supported in 2012 by the promulgation of an Official Languages Act which encourages the further use of South Africa’s official languages. Heugh 2014 suggests that: “Despite promising language policy in 1997, South African expertise and progressive initiatives, however, have stalled across the system over the last two decades Various reasons given include:

• “It’s too difficult to implement
• Classrooms (especially in Gauteng) are so multilingual, how can teachers use the home language?
• Parents don’t want it
• Children don’t have a mother tongue!”11

10 http://sciencenordic.com/teaching-children-their-mother-tongue-mozambique
11 Heugh, K. 2014 Implementation of local languages in primary schools in Northern Uganda: a case-study of language planning from below p3
In Ethiopia, by 2006, 23 languages were developed for use as mediums of instruction for 8 years of primary education. By 2009, along with expansion of university provision to each region, and local expertise, development in another 13 languages for similar use were in the pipeline. This was accompanied by a decentralisation of educational planning, provision and responsibility which led to a variety of local approaches to bilingual and multilingual education being developed. However, pressure for English within the Ministry of Education, has resulted in a series of actions which have undermined many of the local and regional achievements of the first ten to fifteen years of a multilingual policy (Heugh, K., 2010).

Uganda and Zambia have early-exit models (whereby mother tongue is taught only for several years before being overtaken by instruction in the official language). However both Uganda and Zambia are dominated by English in terms of textbook production and use of English as the language of instruction in teacher training colleges. Niger seems to be like Mozambique with a large number of pilot programmes without a language policy to move to national indigenous language programmes.

**Language revitalisation**

Language revitalisation is a response to language loss in indigenous communities and is often linked to cultural and civil rights of indigenous peoples. Language revitalisation success says Lo Bianco (2010) depends on “a coordinated approach of action on three fronts simultaneously.” (p46). These three fronts are:

i. Capacity: increasing linguistic proficiency through formal teaching and informal settings where the language is used.

ii. Opportunity Creation: developing access to domains where the language is natural, welcome and expected. (Lo Bianco & Peyton, 2013)

iii. Desire Enhancement: stimulating individual and collective investment in learning the language because doing so brings certain rewards. (Note: The writer sees this aspect of language revitalisation as more difficult than the first two types as it shifts attention beyond curriculum and teaching, and contexts for use, to the motivations that language learners might have for taking on the task of learning a language.)

In some contexts, the primary emphasis is on increasing capacity, especially in schools, without finding a role for language use in the wider community or creating a space where language users can idealise an intrinsic motivation to keep on learning and using the language. If this is the case, these efforts to maintain indigenous language may fail.
The decision to revitalise a language lies with the language community itself and not with those who study them as outsiders. (Hinton 2001) For those who do decide to work on bringing an indigenous language back to life, much work has been done. Two successful programmes are as follows: The Breath of Life programme involves documentation of written, imaged and digital resources to allow for their practical use in language revitalization. Breath of Life links to the Master Apprentice Programme. The Master Apprentice Programme (MAP) was developed around 1992 by US language activists at the Advocates for Indigenous California Languages Survival (AICLS). MAP is an informal immersion-based language program often developed without a formal teacher. MAP pairs a “master” (a fluent speaker of a language) with an “apprentice” (a committed learner with little or no fluency in the language). The Master-Apprentice team spends a significant amount of time together every week with all activities conducted in the target language. The programme is well known and used in the Americas and Europe and has had some use in Australia. In Canada the programme has been renamed Mentor Apprentice Program. There are a number of practical principles in using MAP. They include the following:

**Principles of MAP**

- **Leave English behind:** communicate through gesture, images (nonverbally). Focus on oral learning not reading and writing (An early immersion exercise is to use wordless books using the indigenous language in question)
- **Be a proactive learner or ‘language hunter’** going after language without waiting to be taught (Learning function phrases such as What do I do? What is she doing? or What is this? are used for learning the language in question).
- **Learn through activities** One activity, for example, might be making finger puppets (and using the experience to learn the language)
- **Learn language you can use, through using the language of daily life** (e.g. making a finger puppet; explaining what do you do when you get up in the morning)
- **Teach others as you learn** (by having conversations with others, using a conversation card if needed)
- **In all of the MAP sessions participants are free to make errors. The focus is on communication rather than perfection. Assessment tasks are related to different kinds of proficiencies that have been developed.**

---

12 Two models of language revitalisation from California http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OcHrIBmxEW 'YouTube Notes: Published 8 Mar 2012 This presentation focuses on two models that have been developed in California for revitalisation of moribund languages -- the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program, and the Breath of Life Workshops for languages without speakers. Both these programs were developed by a Native-run organisation, the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival. In the Master-Apprentice Program, the elderly speakers team up with younger learners, and the teams are taught how to transmit the language from elder to younger through immersion while living their daily lives together. For Breath of Life workshops, Native participants explore the massive language archives at the University of California and learn the fundamentals of linguistics with the goal of utilising the materials they find for purposes of language teaching, learning and revitalisation. Both these programs have spread both nationally and internationally and been found to be highly effective in communities that put them to use.


14 See http://www.fpcc.ca/language/Programs/

15 A more detailed version of these principles can be found at http://www.aicls.org/pages/10steps.html
In Hawaii and New Zealand, where only one indigenous language exists, language revitalisation has taken place through the use of language nests where the language is learned through immersion in education settings. In countries where many languages exist, fewer revitalisation programmes tend to emerge. Where there are many languages it may not be possible to train teachers for languages with a small number of speakers. Small languages groups cope with this through home schooling, language summer camps, and early childhood immersion schools. For such groups MAP is extremely important.
Policies into practice
Models of language use in Education

Heugh, 2011, describes the types of language use in education programmes that can be found in schools around the world. They are:

Subtractive education model: The objective of this model is to move learners out of mother tongue and into the official language as the medium of instruction as early as possible, and as early as the first year of schooling. This is common in Francophone and Lusophone countries in Africa.

Early-exit transitional model: The objective of this model is the same as the subtractive model above in that it aims for single target fluency in the official language by the end of schooling. Learners begin in mother tongue as the medium of instruction but if the transition to the official language takes place within four years it is called an early-exit/transition model.

Late-exit transition model: This model delays transition to the official language to year five or six. If it maintains mother tongue as a subject beyond year five or six this can lead to additive bilingualism, where effective first and second language pedagogy is used along with adequate content area literacy instruction.

Additive (bilingual) education models: Here the objective is to use mother tongue as medium for instruction throughout school years with the official language taught as a subject, or the use of mother tongue plus official language as dual media of instruction to the end of school. In the additive education model the mother tongue is never removed as the medium of instruction and never used for less than 50% of the time. Thus the aim is for a high level of proficiency is both languages. The arrangement could be:

- Mother tongue as the medium of instruction with official language taught as a subject
- Dual medium with mother tongue to at least years four and five and official language used for no more than 50% of the time to the end of schooling
- Where three languages are used: mother tongue, regional language and official language mother tongue may be reduced to accommodate the additive multilingual model.16

She argues passionately that the education decisions that have led to early-exit models of using indigenous languages for only two or three years before transitioning to learning the official language in school just don’t work. Subtractive and early-exit transitional models are not based on sound theory or research:

---

16 See Heugh’s, 2011, extensive discussion on models of language use in education programmes in Africa pp113-120
“Successful education requires mother tongue medium education throughout, but an absolute minimum of six to eight years of mother tongue (or language closest to the mother tongue) medium of instruction. It can also include the teaching and learning of a second language for use as a second complementary medium, for up to but no more than 50% of the day from the seventh year of school. Successful education everywhere requires mother-tongue-based systems. In Africa, this means African language-based systems. The end target of school cannot be the former colonial/official language only. The target must be a high level of proficiency in at least two languages—that is, academic bi- or trilingualism which include the mother tongue (or at least a language closest to this) plus an international language of wider communication (French, Portuguese, Spanish or English).17

Successful pedagogical practices

One issue for using indigenous languages in education includes the fact that students may come from a range of language backgrounds. Some students may be in programmes aimed at those who come to school speaking an indigenous language as an L118, while others join classes to learn an indigenous language as L2 learners, while in some classes both types of students are present. Given the poor economic circumstances that indigenous peoples endure, such schools may at the same time be sites where other minority and immigrant children with a variety of L1s attend. May presents Garcia’s (2007) notion of an emergent bilingual to capture positively the range of languages competence that students may bring to a language class. Whereas students coming to school with indigenous, minority or immigrant language knowledge and use are often labelled by their limitations in language use in the institutional or national language (Limited English proficient students, or English as a Second Language students, Garcia’s term focuses on the language knowledge and uses that these students bring to school (and maybe suggesting that schools value students in this way as well!) As Benson and Kosonen, 2013, remind us ‘Learners are not seen for what they already know and can do, which would be consistent with constructivist theory and learner-centred approaches (e.g. Vygotsky, 1978); instead they are identified by what they are missing.’ p2.

McCarty 2003 describes a number of pedagogical practices that have been successful including the following:

**Navajo:** McCarty described the Rough Rock Navajo programme which began in the 1970’s and had four main outcomes for four main groups:

- the Navajo school board gained increasing credibility with parents, staff, and students
- the Navajo staff’s vision and competence were recognised by outside observers as well as community members
- The Navajo parents, who played active roles in their children's schooling for the first time


18 These terms are described in the Glossary at the end of the paper.
• The Navajo students, who ‘came to value their Navajo-ness and to see themselves as capable of succeeding because of, not despite that Navajo-ness (p151)

At Rock Point school McCarty’s research demonstrated that monolingual, Navajo-speaking children (still at that time the majority in the school) who developed initial literacy in Navajo and were involved in the K-6 Rough Rock English-Navajo Language Arts Programme (RRENLAP) outperformed comparable Navajo students in English-only programmes. She writes about the reasons for such success:

“Our analysis revealed several conditions underlying these outcomes. First and foremost was the presence of a stable core of bilingual educators with shared values and aspirations for their students. Second, teachers received long-term support from the building principal and from outside experts, including educators from the Hawai’i-based Kamehameha Early Education Programme (KEEP). Third, the project received consistent funding over several years, a rare occurrence in American Indian schools, which are the most poorly funded in the USA. These conditions promoted a school culture that valued local expertise and encouraged teachers to reflect critically on their teaching, take risks in enacting instructional reform, and act as agents of positive change. As these conditions became normalised within the elementary school, Native teachers were able to create parallel conditions in their classrooms whereby students could act as critical agents and inquirers in Navajo and English” (p152-153)

At the Navajo immersion program in the reservation border town of Fort Defiance where fewer than 10% of 5 year old students were competent Navajo speakers the programme involved initial reading in Navajo and English and Mathematics in both Navajo and English. All communication was in Navajo in the early grades but by 2nd and 3rd grades it was half day each of Navajo and English. In fourth grade children received an hour a day in Navajo instruction. At all lessons an adult Navajo speaking carer or relative was in attendance at home to spend time after school in talking Navajo. Navajo-immersion students continue to outperform their peers in English-only classrooms. However the influence of English only state-wide testing saw Navajo immersion students performing poorly in lower grades. What was needed was an equivalent test in Navajo for these students. (May 2013, 45-47)

Cherokee: The Cherokee language immersion programme involved the strategy of recruiting and retaining bilingual and biliterate teachers, providing professional development in immersion education, involving parents and community in reinforcing the home–school language links and, crucially, developing appropriate Cherokee language assessments for early childhood. May outlines the development and use of the Cherokee language assessment programme called Cherokee Preschool Immersion Language Assessment (C-PILA). From using the assessment teachers realised they had not provided enough opportunities for two way conversations with students and recognised the need for further professional development, particularly in “effective communicative language instruction and immersion-specific teaching techniques; they also needed more language- and age-appropriate storybooks, visual aids and other supplementary materials to enhance communication in the classroom” (May 2013, 49)
**Hawaiian:** In 1978 Hawaiian was made an official language of Hawai‘i alongside English, and Hawaiian language, culture and history was to be taught in schools. ‘Aha Pūnana Leo (“Language Nest gathering”) Hawaiian-medium preschools were introduced in 1983, modelled on Te Kōhanga Reo Māori medium preschools established in 1982. By 2009, this had grown to 11 full-day immersion preschools and 22 elementary immersion programs, serving approximately 2000 students of both Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian ancestry. The majority of these programs provide full Hawaiian immersion until fifth grade, before the introduction of English language arts. A third language is then learned by children in these programs in intermediate and high school. (McCarty, 2008b) However this does not involve all children and the programme usually runs as a strand within mainstream English language school programmes. (May, 2013, 50) Institutions for teacher training in the Hawaiian language have also been established. (McCarty, 2003)

**Māori** - Māori became an official language of New Zealand in 1987. Māori language immersion programmes began in 1982 with the establishment of Te Kōhanga Reo which are full immersion Māori language preschool programs, initially run independently by parents. By 2009 about 25% of all Māori pre-schoolers attended Māori language nests, guided by several organising principles Kōhanga Reo.

- total immersion in Māori language
- imparting of Māori cultural and spiritual values and concepts to the children
- teaching and involvement of students in Māori customs
- complete administration of each centre by extended families use of traditional techniques of child care and knowledge acquisition (May, 2013, 53-54)

Full immersion Māori primary schools started in the 1980’s and Māori language high schools have also commenced. The success of the Kōhanga Reo preschool programmes helped increase the demand for primary school programmes which in turn developed the need for high school programmes. May 2013 quotes data from Rau (2004) which lists some reasons related to continuous adequate resourcing that are attributable to the programme’s success:

- development of a Māori language framework for assessing levels of language difficulty in junior reading texts which helps teachers make good matches between reading material and learner need/ability
- increased quantity and improved quality of Māori language reading material
- increased recognition and development of knowledge and teaching practice for Māori-medium contexts
- increased provision of Māori-medium-specific professional development for literacy
- ongoing commitment and dedication of Māori-medium teachers who work hard to raise Māori student achievement in the face of extreme demands and limited resources (May, 2013, 58)
H'mong, J'rai and Khmer in VietNam - The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) in Viet Nam in partnership with UNICEF is developing a flexible bilingual programme using H'mong, J'rai and Khmer languages. The Mother Tongue Based Bilingual Education project (MTBBE Action Research) was established in three provinces - Lao Cai, Gia Lai and Tra Vinh, in 2008 when the first pilot bilingual kindergarten classes opened their books and played games using mother tongue. One child said, ‘I enjoy speaking H’mong with my teacher and friends and find it much more fun going to school.’ Grade 1 classes followed in 2009. Research has continued in 13 kindergarten and 13 grade 1 classes (in three provinces) with materials and teacher training developed up to grade 5. This research has contributed to new policies and practices. Most importantly it demonstrates success in Education of which parents approve: As parents of one J’rai student stated: J’rai is the language we speak in our family and in the village. My husband and I cannot read or write. We are so proud that H.Nga is able to study in her own language. I do not believe H’Nga would have continued in going to school if the lessons had been in Vietnamese, it would have been difficult.

Further evaluation of this developing programme emphasises the importance of strong and visionary leadership at provincial level alongside the need to get strong ‘buy in’ from other officials as well as parents. The director of Education at provincial level said in 2014: “When ethnic minority students turn in poor learning performances, we should realize that it is due to the weakness of education processes.”

Uganda - The Mother Tongue Education project in Uganda is a very successful NGO-led project which has been conducted in 240 schools in six districts (40 schools in each of Arua, Kakwa, Yumbe, Adjumani, Gulu and Amuru districts) located in the North Western and Northern regions of Uganda between 2009 and 2013. Key achievements of the project between 2009 and 2013 include:

i. Improved learner achievement in literacy and numeracy at east for the first three years of the project along with sharp increases in enrolment, especially for girls.

ii. Increased community and parental awareness of the value of local languages in education which is indicated by involved parents (grandparents) and communities in school learning, through joint parent-child classes each week and through adult literacy classes. As well community and village saving schemes have been established emanating from adult literacy. Most importantly, 551 home learning centres (HLCs) attached to the 240 schools have been established which provide conveniently located spaces for adult learners, after school hours learning spaces of primary children and in some places, pre-school/kindergarten early childcare classes.

iii. The LABE MTE project has contributed to the formation of language boards which oversee capacity development, orthographic development, and materials development training of five language boards, for Aringa, Kakwa, Madi, Lugbara and Acholi languages identified as the local languages in the six districts.

---

19 See also http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/24/vietnam-experiments-with-bilingual-education/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0


21 Nguyen, Nga and Nguyen, Huong 2014 Leadership is Key in Expansion of MTBBE in Lao Cai Province Unpublished paper Hanoi: UNICEF Vietnam
iv. The production of sample reading materials and children’s magazines

v. Ongoing support of teacher education and professional development and contributing to the National Curriculum Development Centre’s Pedagogy Handbook for Teaching in Local Language

vi. The dissemination of experiences to policy makers through collaborative approaches with district and national level of government.

The report makes the point that a small NGO can provide a successful model for government but in the end the government must ensure that schools are fully resourced. It makes a number of recommendations for further development. (Heugh and Mulumba, 2014)

Making the links

In all of these examples there are several important factors to consider. First is the link between policies that legitimise indigenous languages at the national level, and the provision of resources for personnel, training and materials development at local levels. Second is the central importance of developing and keeping a strong cadre of bilingual teachers that continues across generations. In the case of Hawaii and New Zealand, Lo Bianco’s second and third criteria for language revitalisation are also checked as there are definitely contexts for language use as well as positive and real motivation for language use. Third are the positive outcomes for indigenous communities, a number of which are reiterated by Grimes 2009. In the case of VietNam the lesson to be learned is the careful documentation of research over a number of years, even in the light of further weakening of language policy with regard to indigenous languages use in education, (see Kosonen, 2013). In the case of Uganda the central contributions made to community members of all ages demonstrated the value of the project to all, while underlining the fact that governments have to be able to provide needed resources. The detail in planning and practicality of the Ugandan example is laudatory.

---

Broken links

It is at this juncture that there is sometimes slippage between what is planned and what happens in practice. May (2013) describes several programmes where the gap between policy and practice led to failure because the adopted practices were not effective for acquisition of bilingualism and biliteracy or were not sustained over time (p40). The first of these two programmes, an Ecuadorean indigenous bilingual programme failed because the practice of language learning was reduced to learning greetings and teacher instruction rather than using the language (Quechua) as a medium of instruction. This would be Purdie et al’s description of a language awareness programme. The second, a Navajo language programme failed when US national testing systems in English forced a shift away from good immersion practices and teachers teaching for the test (and not in the indigenous language). Other reasons for programme failure include lack of funding and a lack of qualified bilingual teachers, especially those who are used to code switching between languages, and a lack of resources. The lack of suitably qualified teaching personnel is a stumbling block in other countries as well and can cause dramatic shifts in language policy.23

McCarty (2007) also noted the importance of a stable core of bilingual teachers with shared values and goals for their students24. Heugh and Mulumba, 2014 noted that the Ugandan project had no control when teachers trained were transferred or when schools lacked even the most basic of resources.

Even when policies supporting indigenous language use in schools are in place, the push to use national and official languages is great. A study by Piper and Miksic (2011) comparing actual language use in Kenyan and Ugandan schools found that in Kenya, the ratio of mother-tongue instruction to instruction in English gradually and consistently declined between grades 1 and 7. In Uganda, by contrast, mother-tongue to English use was consistently above 70: 30 in grades 1–3. Mother tongue was highest in grade 3, at 76.8 percent, followed by a 63.6 percentage-point drop in mother tongue usage between grades 3 and 4. (p162). May, 2013 describes a similar study in Mexico where it was found that most teachers started to teach Spanish from Grade One instead of the indigenous language. (p41). Benson 2005 also outlines the types of language slippage that occur for example in Mozambique, where despite many NGO-based successful projects, preparation of materials in 16 indigenous languages and widespread voluntary support, the government has failed to make a country-wide commitment to bilingual education. And in Bolivia, for example, “the top-down nature of this reform has met with some resistance from communities and even teachers, and a combination of logistical constraints and decision-making difficulties have meant that mother tongue schooling is not yet reaching those who are most marginalised, and that the intercultural and indigenous language study components have not yet been operationalised after nearly 10 years.” (Benson, 2005, 252)

---

23 This was evident in the Northern Territory, Australia in 2008 when the then Minister for Education and Training, Marion Scrymgour, announced that all schooling in Northern Territory schools was to be conducted only in English for the first four hours of every school day (Memorandum 2008/2527). http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/special_eds/20090914/language/chronology.html

This policy has since been reviewed and dismissed but may be re-adopted in an alternate form after the 2013 Wilson review. http://www.education.nt.gov.au/parents-community/students-learning/indigenous-education-review-1

24 Also in Peru http://www.perusupportgroup.org.uk/news-article-670.html
It depends often on one’s own language history as to how one thinks access to language and literacy should occur. Understandings about pathways to success suggest better economic and social outcomes result from official language instruction in education. This is why teachers may not last the distance in terms of what is needed for successful indigenous, minority or immigrant language instruction over time. It also results in political and parental decisions for English first and English only (or French or Spanish as the case may be) as people buy into national language only discourses. Or it may result in shorter implementation, say one or two years of indigenous language use in schools, even though research would say at least six years is needed. Educational policies, systems, and practices, for the alteration and improvement of life pathways to and from educational institutions into other social and economic fields depend only in part on the contingent educational provision of literacy, whether conceived as print or digital, behaviour or practice. (Benson, 2005, Luke, 2003)

Problems of testing in indigenous language programmes

Today commentators shudder at the poorer education outcomes of indigenous or minority children when often the methods used to assess such outcomes are in a language which is not the students’ own or is one which they are early in the effort of acquiring. One of the difficulties continually faced by schools that teach in the indigenous language medium is the fact that the schooling system is often only equipped with language and literacy assessment tools in the national or dominant language. This leads to biased reporting of literacy proficiencies and lack of reporting of indigenous language proficiency all together. (Meiers et al 2013, Wigglesworth et al 2011). Wigglesworth et al also noted that the nature of test items in the national assessment tests did not necessarily test cultural aspects known to indigenous Kriol-speaking children in remote parts of the country (Australia).

Darrell Kipp’s (2009) description of lessons learned in developing language proficiency in the Blackfoot language provides a number of important principles. Chief among these is the importance of language immersion programmes in schools which do not grade children according to language proficiency. Kipp maintains: ‘what you need for language revitalisation is a room and some adults speaking the language to some kids.’ He goes on to explain how ingrained the intergenerational conditioning for not speaking indigenous languages continues to be:

“The history of tribal language oppression is well documented, but what is not given enough credence is the effectiveness of the eradication processes used. In our tribe, the negative conditioning was so successfully ingrained that the taboo against speaking our language remained fresh in the minds of even second and third generation non-speakers of the Blackfoot language. An important facet of language revitalisation is to de-program this ingrained conditioning for no other reason than to eliminate one more reason for hating ourselves for being Indian.” (Kipp 2009, 9)
The following quote from Speas 2009 outlines what actually happens for many bilingual children in American schools and is probably also relevant for indigenous children globally. For English substitute a country’s dominant language and for Spanish, an indigenous, minority or immigrant language as the case may be.

“Maybe there would be in a world where speakers of minority languages were not socially stigmatised and school systems waited until fifth grade to give children language tests. In the real world, bilingual parents in America know that school systems care only about English skills and minority languages are not widely valued. Their children will be tested in kindergarten or first grade, and their knowledge of the home language will be generally ignored. A six year old who knows 8,000 words of English and 8,000 words of Spanish will be treated as “behind” a monolingual child who knows 10,000 words of English. The child will be given special English language instruction and will be expected to be behind in other subjects. It is well-known that teachers’ expectations have a significant effect on performance. Children’s attitudes toward their own abilities and teachers’ attitudes toward the children are formed well before fifth grade. A child could be treated as “deficient” based on her first grade scores, and this could have an irreversible effect. Parents are not deluded to worry about the effects of bringing their child up bilingual. It takes a very strong parent with ample time to advocate for her children to counteract these effects. (Speas 2009. 29)

Much of the research on indigenous or minority languages and education fails to take into account the nature of indigenous students’ individual identities, the ways they position themselves Vis a Vis first and second languages and the ability to be adaptable:

“There’s that authenticity...it’s a real asset to have. ‘Cause...there’s certain places, you know, the ceremonies you go to and there’s a certain way to act and, you know, on the street...there’s a survival thing that sort of kicks in...that adaptability is really important. Just being authentic in those situations...being yourself or being your professional self or being your student self or being...your cultural self.” (Tremblay et al, 2013, 11)
Pedagogic approaches in communities

The key to language maintenance, Fishman (1996, 2007) insists, is intergenerational language transmission—the natural communicative processes in the home, family, and community through which succeeding generations replenish their speakers. Such processes are difficult for outside institutions such as schools and university programs to create. One such programme documented by Green 2013 is the language revitalisation efforts of the Kawaiisu in southern California which involves the following principles:

- a focus on the interrelatedness of language and culture for the community
- a push to get the language spoken in the home and used by the youngest members of the community in daily life
- attentiveness to the success of the neighbouring language communities’ revitalisation efforts
- the integrated use of technology as a tool to assist the revitalisation effort and to bridge the geographical barriers separating speakers from potential language learners.

Activities include the Master Apprentice model as well as a program called Language Revitalisation at Home, in which fluent speakers teach their family members how to do normal family activities using only the language. Language topics are determined by the family based on what is important to them with an emphasis on creating an interesting and fun environment for language learning, for all age groups. (Green, 2013, p283).

In British Columbia Schools (Canada) use is made of a language template for children aged 5-12 in order to plan and utilise indigenous languages and other international languages as courses of study.

In the Northern Territory (Australia) the importance of Indigenous community engagement was noted in a recent government review. The Chief Executive, Greg Barnes, Department of Education and Training, Northern Territory, noted

“...you have to have the community coming with and along side of you. ... the school needs to work with the community and not the other way around. The community should be driving the show. When you get them on board and owning things, places like Gunbalanya, Galiwinku and some of the communities on Groote now are getting enormous rollups of the community in the three-to-nine program. We have the community engaged in learning. If the community engages in learning then the modelling for the kids is amazing.” (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012, 81)

---

25 See also http://kawaiisu.org
26 http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/template_developed.php provides a copy of the template and a list of languages currently taught in BC schools.
What we know about bilingual language acquisition

Children need at least 5-6 years of schooling in indigenous or minority language and literacy before transferring to education in the national or official language with well-trained teachers of the official language as a second language. So doing provides such children with a legacy not only of indigenous language and literacy learning, but also a key understanding of how language works which can be used for comparing and contrasting in learning a new (official) language. L1 language learning (indigenous, minority or immigrant) does not interfere with learning an official language when teachers and resources are in place.

Some researchers in Africa (Heugh in particular) suggest that the time frame which is seen as optimum in indigenous communities in western societies may just be too short when even the most basic of resources is not in place. She recommends even longer use of mother tongue as the medium of instruction and underlines the fact that we underestimate the complexities of academic learning for those who are transitioning from one language medium to another and as they learn in even higher grades. As learners move through the grades the types of texts and the degree of text difficulty increases. Texts in more abstract subjects use more technical language. This, coupled with the transition to a new language is a difficult academic load.

Bilingualism: a cause for celebration

Little attention is paid to the ways in which success in indigenous language learning is supportive of indigenous children. Benson 2005 cites Bruthiaux 2002 who lists the values of bilingualism for indigenous children:

- becoming literate in a familiar language
- gaining access to communication and literacy skills in L2
- having a language and culture that are valued by formal institutions like the school
- feeling good about the school and the teacher
- being able and even encouraged to demonstrate what one knows
- participating in one’s own learning
- having the courage to ask questions in class (students) or ask the teacher what is being done (parents)
- attending school and having an improved chance of succeeding
- not being taken advantage of (Bruthiaux 2002. 286).

Often the supposed inherent worth of European languages and the lack of status of indigenous languages can stigmatise indigenous languages and their speakers as being somehow not up to standard. Other myths that persist contrary to research findings are that a new language is learned/used to the detriment of the first, or that bi- or multilingualism causes cognitive confusion. (Benson, 2005)
From the viewpoint of the dominant language, children with an indigenous language are often viewed as lacking in proficiency when they start school and have not yet acquired the dominant language. (Benson & Kosonen, 2013) However this is not the case.

- Non-standard dialects are systematic and have their own implicit grammar rules, which are just as logical as the rules of standard dialects.
- Bilingual children are superior to monolinguals in many cognitive tasks, and by about age 9 are completely equivalent to monolingual children in their skills in the school language (Speas, 2009)

Benefits of bilingualism (see Purdie et al, 2008)

- Well-designed bilingual programmes are academically effective and do not hold back students' acquisition of English (Francis and Reyhner, 2002; Guevremont and Kohen, 2012; Lewthwaite and McMillan, 2010).
- If literacy is established in a child's first language, it is easier to switch to another language (however programmes fail because the duration of mother tongue as medium of instruction is cut short).
- Childhood bilingualism enhances cognitive ability by promoting classification skills, concept formation, analogical reasoning, visual-spatial skills, and creativity gains.
- Bilingual education helps to provide a sense of identity to speakers of Indigenous languages and their descendants, by connection to their heritage via language programmes. Positive effects such as increased motivation and self-esteem, and participation in school have also been reported (Benson, 2005).
- Noori, 2009 comments: ‘the act of moving between languages is one of moving between cultures. How much more fun is it to say “baabaababiinchiged” than “waited and waited?” Our words are an epistemology; our grammar is a map. Our stories are our history. Learning is infinite and communal. Diversity is the ability to benefit from multiple perspectives.’ (p 21)

Leon White’s (2014) response to the Wilson Report (2013) also notes the importance of learning their indigenous language for indigenous children with Otitis Media and subsequent Conductive Hearing Loss. In other words they may see and understand the worlds of the community despite their hearing loss, long before they see and understand a newly-introduced language. This is also noted by Ball, 2008 who talks about the need to develop culturally appropriate screening and diagnostic assessment practices and valid, reliable screening and diagnostic assessment tools in relevant languages. (p5)

Teachers’ beliefs and actions

A New Zealand study by Bishop et al, 2003 emphasised the fact that a major influence on Māori students’ educational achievement was in the minds and actions of their teachers. The narratives in the study clearly identified that teachers who explain Māori students’ educational achievement in terms of the students’ deficiencies (or deficiencies of the structure of the school) were unable to offer appropriate solutions to such problems and couldn’t help improving the achievement levels of Māori students. This results in low teacher expectations of Māori students, creates self-fulfilling prophesies of failure, and leaves teachers further bewildered as to how to make a difference for Māori students. Changing this is a necessary condition for improving Māori student educational engagement and achievement. (Bishop et al,2003,198, Lewthwaite & McMillan, 2010)

Residential boarding schools

Noori 2009 notes the place of boarding schools in eliminating indigenous language as a form of cultural genocide (2009, 13). The assimilationist role of boarding schools is also acknowledged in the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission findings of 2009 (Walker 2009) even though some government reports still try to implement them for assimilationist purposes and to downplay indigenous language use. (Wilson 2013)

‘At residential schools, students were prohibited from speaking Aboriginal languages or practising their cultures, both in and out of the classroom setting. Students were often physically punished or humiliated if they were found to be speaking their native language or to be practising their traditional faiths. These measures led to a drastic decline of Aboriginal languages in Canada, and many of those that remain are not expected to survive much longer as the only fluent speakers in some communities are elders.’ (Walker 2009, 17)

Indigenous language learning and school attendance

Studies carried out in Queensland and NSW (Australia) indicated that the inclusion of Indigenous language learning at school led to an increase in school attendance. In Queensland between 2008 and 2010 overall Indigenous children’s kindergarten participation increased by 6 percent to 35 percent. In NSW, using and learning Aboriginal languages has been associated with increased school attendance rates among Aboriginal students, improved academic performance, particularly in levels of literacy, and a heightened sense of self-worth. For Aboriginal students, learning an Aboriginal language can strongly motivate students, promoting a sense of pride and direction. (Purdie et al, 2008)
Indigenous languages and well-being

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) released research highlighting the benefits of maintaining Indigenous languages to enhance young peoples’ wellbeing. The research found that young people who spoke an Indigenous language - almost half of all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in remote areas between the ages of 15 to 24 - were less likely to participate in high-risk drinking and drug abuse than those young people who did not speak a traditional language.28

Indigenous languages and local knowledge: biodiversity and linguistic diversity

The range of indigenous languages and cultures sustain detailed knowledge about the complexities of biodiversity and how to manage local ecosystems sustainably. If we lose indigenous languages we also lose knowledge about biodiversity. If global linguistic diversity is not to suffer even more loss major changes are needed in national and educational language policy. (Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010, 79) The website Terralingua explains the weaving of biodiversity and the range of languages and cultures that have named it and claimed it.29 For example much knowledge about local sources of biodiversity and their use are encapsulated in local languages. Terralingua explores the links between language, traditional knowledge, and the environment which are broken when local languages are neglected. This web resource emphasizes the value of indigenous and regional languages as ends in themselves and not only as a bridge to a national or international language.

28 Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning, Submission 70, p. 3. In Our Land Our Languages
29 http://www.terralingua.org
Recommendations for achievement of universal primary education

We know that effective learning in the mother tongue is a clear pathway for cultural transmission and understanding, as well as to success in the official or national language of a country, as long as it is taught for at least the first five to six years of schooling and is adequately supported by well-trained teachers and significant learning materials. The following are some recommendations for beginning to address the provision of indigenous languages in the achievement of universal primary education. One outcome that is not wanted is the children who fall between both languages who fail to learn either language well and who drop out of school altogether. Some of these recommendations are discussed in Purdie et al, 2008 and in Oane & Glanz (Eds) 2011.

Recommendations

1. Ensure the indigenous community’s control in indigenous language development and intellectual property rights

The decision to learn an indigenous language should be made by the community which has understood the benefits of learning using mother tongue as the medium for instruction. Communities may need some support in making such a decision. Uganda’s Quality Educators’ Initiative Team and Steering Committee (LABE, FAWEU and UNATU) has developed a useful strategy for helping communities understand the benefits of a local language programme.30

The planning of indigenous education should take place in the context of community development so that links between education, health and employment are always made and clear links are also made with history and culture.

The best place to start indigenous language development is in the home and in early childhood settings where community members support as teachers and where they also get opportunities to learn themselves.

2. Effect coherent language policies and planning

In order to progress towards meeting UPE, governments must design and implement national language policies based on the available evidence regarding indigenous languages as medium for instruction. Such programmes must be managed and resourced effectively.

Governments need to develop an advocacy strategy that both informs and engages communities about access to indigenous and other minority languages as well as official languages for the successful development of literacy and support to education for national development.

Evaluators of literacy and language education programmes should track student performance for at least the first six years of schooling and should identify the kind of programme (subtractive bilingual, early-exit transition, late-exit transition or additive bilingual.)

Assessors should have adequate expertise in bi-literacy and bilingual development.

Heugh 2011, in her chapter Cost implications of the provision of mother-tongue and strong bilingual models of education in Africa, provides a 10 step activity plan for using African languages in education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cost: same or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language education policy</td>
<td>Small consultative informed team: use experts from within Africa</td>
<td>Small consultative informed team: use experts from within Africa</td>
<td>Same as for any education policy/language policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Smaller informed team</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Same as for any policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Support Education</td>
<td>Education officials and experts via public media; formal &amp; informal channels of communication</td>
<td>Start immediately; keep public up to date with the debates; engage public participation in debates</td>
<td>Public media should carry this without cost to the state; state expenditure where possible. Same costs as for any government policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Language technology terminology</td>
<td>Small team of experts to engage in capacity development</td>
<td>Speeds up timeframe for delivery</td>
<td>New costs but inexpensive, replicable, electronically accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Translation technology</td>
<td>University departments of African languages to re-skill where necessary</td>
<td>Fast - can reduce translation time by 50%; can be used for textbooks and electronic resources - download assessments, worksheets etc</td>
<td>Inexpensive software investment. Time reduction = cost reduction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 See http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002126/212602e.pdf p286 (used with the author’s permission)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language development units</th>
<th>African universities - prepare students for orthographic, lexicographic, terminology and translation development expertise</th>
<th>Start training 2007</th>
<th>State invest in re-skilling university trainers and establishment of language development units; develop business plan - should be self-funding in 5-10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dictionaries (multilingual)</td>
<td>Identify institutional affiliation (e.g. university/ies; government department; non-profit independent structure)</td>
<td>On-going – long-term project</td>
<td>State investment/annual allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Multilingual materials</td>
<td>a. Publishers – domestic; b. Specialist teachers can also produce these electronically.</td>
<td>a. Publishing timeframes require careful scheduling. b. Use of electronic education bank for storing teacher generated materials is faster and can be used almost immediately</td>
<td>a. Publishing: Cross-border collaboration reduces outlay costs and speeds up return on investment. Usually not much more. b. Electronic bank of materials – minimal costs. Publishing houses can recover costs and grow business in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>Re-tooling/skilling of teacher trainers; share available African expertise</td>
<td>Fast-track capacity development, thereafter timeframes same as for regular provision</td>
<td>Minimal costs for initial design of new programmes, soon becomes normal recurrent costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Total Investment - additional expenditure on education budget for 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%-5% recoverable and reduces overall expenditure over medium term (5 years). Medium to long term prognosis - economic benefits to each country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Support language revitalisation and development.

If using indigenous languages is agreed upon, individual communities should design a plan for language revitalisation which builds on existing global resources. It is also important to consider contexts for language use and ways in which language learners can see a reason for language acquisition. (Lo Bianco, 2010)

4. Provide teacher education and professional development

Indigenous teacher training is at the heart of indigenous language and literacy development in schools and this should be central to any planning and long-term funding. Indigenous teachers know not only the language but the contexts and functions for use. Local teachers education courses should also teach the local languages which are used in local schools.

Scholarships and tuition support for developing and maintaining indigenous teachers in programmes may be needed Indigenous languages teachers may need special training courses and alternate career pathways if they have not yet achieved formal qualifications in a national education system. Years of effective experience should also count towards a nationally recognised qualification.

In addition teachers of indigenous children will need qualifications in accessing the official language as a second language. Professional development in ESL, FSL etc or its equivalent will be a requirement.

For all teachers develop multilingual and multicultural teacher education programmes. Ensure teachers know how to teach literacy in both L1 and L2 effectively and to assess progress and achievement of students in both L1 and L2.

5. Ensure resources for programmes which use indigenous languages as a medium for instruction as well as learning about language and culture

Indigenous teachers and interested and committed community members available to work in classrooms are the main resources for programmes. Promote programmes that provide mother tongue instruction for adults and children simultaneously though the use of joint parent/child classes, adult literacy and home learning centres

Promote culturally sensitive curricula that reflect the culture and heritage of the children being taught. Textual and digital resources will be needed for indigenous languages education. There are a number of examples of such resources available digitally. Ensure the of electronic education banks for storing teacher generated materials for sharing across languages and even countries.

Ensure that examination questions are culturally considerate of children and in languages that they know and can use to respond well.
6. Coordinate with and learn from other indigenous language programmes

There are numerous examples of indigenous language programmes Education systems need to keep up to date by linking with successful and ongoing programmes and to read and access existing resources.

7. Engage in research, Reporting and Funding

Any new language in education programme should be accompanied by a clear research design that explains the process and outcomes attained by students during the programme. Research-based reporting on programmes should be in place from the beginning and may lead to changes in funding and policy development.

Promote qualitative and quantitative studies of teaching in both L1 and L2 languages in classrooms.

8. Emphasize coordination across government departments such as health, environment, heritage and culture, housing and community services

Any new indigenous languages programmes in education should also be adopted in other government departments. Starting with bilingual signage and telephone information is a useful place to begin. Providing indigenous support staff in all areas of government at local levels and planning programmes together in education, health and child protection, as well as environment, heritage and culture, housing and community services, may ensure more positive adoption and continuation of programmes.
Conclusion

If we are to support indigenous children to achieve primary education completion it is important to provide the best pathways for them to do that while ensuring clear validation of their life and culture. The research is clear on more than a thousand reputable and replicated studies: language learning in L1 is valid. Language learning in L2 which follows is improved. Children achieve equal or better on academic content by accessing bilingual education and overall it’s better for literacy. (Lo Bianco, 2009). Immersion programmes should start in early childhood and continue into school settings for at least 6 years if not more in countries where resources are minimal.

Taking short cuts by reducing the number of years spent in L1 immersion will not lead to success and teachers need to be well versed in language and cultural contexts of language use, so indigenous teachers or teachers who have learned the language in question are usually better. When it comes time to transition to learning a second language teachers need to be trained as second language teachers and to use such strategies in classrooms.

Testing children in a dominant language that they do not speak or use in the early years of school makes little sense. More work is needed in most countries on the development of practical culturally appropriate assessment schedules, whether for language assessments or for health assessments.

Finding real contexts for language use and a personal motivation to learn an indigenous language are as important as quality education in an indigenous language.

There are no short cuts. Indigenous language education is imperative but it must also provide links to regional and national languages as well as sustainable livelihoods.
**Indigenous language**: one spoken in a relatively restricted geographical area, and one not commonly learned as a second language by people outside the community (Benson & Kosonen, 2013).

**L1 or Mother Tongue** The term first language or L1 refers to a language a person speaks as a mother tongue, vernacular, native language, or home language. Bi- or multilingual people may consider several languages their home or first languages. L1 mother tongue is the language that one (a) has learnt first; (b) identifies with; (c) knows best; and/or (d) uses most (Skutnabb-Kangas (2000), UNESCO, 2003). (Benson & Kosonen, 2012, add (e) speaks and understands competently enough to learn academic content at the appropriate age level).

**LWC** A language of wider communication is a language that speakers of different local languages use to communicate with each other (Kosonen, 2005), and which is spoken more widely than a local or home language; examples are creoles/Kriol or widely spoken regional languages like Wolof in Senegal or Quichua in a number of South American countries.

**L2 or second language**: the language that is not the learner’s first language, but one that she or he is required to study or use. It may be an LWC, spoken in the immediate environment of the learner, or it may be a foreign language, i.e. not heard in the learner’s environment (Kosonen, 2005). For indigenous speakers the L2 is often a dominant language usually a national or official language, used in formal contexts such education, health and government. The main problem with the concept of L2 in education is that the pedagogical strategies should be different depending on whether the L2 is an LWC or a foreign language. (Benson 2013)

**Social Capital** the ‘networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within or among groups’ (OECD 2001: 41). In his most recent book on social capital in Australia, *Disconnected*, Andrew Leigh (2010: 3) uses a simpler definition—‘networks of trust and reciprocity that link multiple individuals together’. (Biddle,2011)
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A short annotated bibliography


This document includes case studies of indigenous language programmes in Australia from Cable Beach Primary School, WA, Ceduna Area School, SA, Moorditj Noongar Community College, WA, Shepherdson College, community of Galiwin’ku on Elcho Island in North East Arnhem Land, NT, St Mary’s Primary School (Bowraville), NSW, and Willowra Primary School, NT. Several of the case studies outline the Master-Apprentice model of language teaching whereby a (for example at Cable Beach Primary School) Yawuru speaking Elder works with a younger Yawuru person who is learning the language. The master, Mrs Edgar, works only with the teachers, not the students in the classroom. It is an informal arrangement whereby she spends one day a week in the classroom observing and talking with the LOTE teachers during break times, providing an opportunity for them to practice speaking the language and learn new words; correcting their pronunciation; chatting about Yawuru history and cultural issues. The model is informally applied in other schools in Australia where an Elder who speaks the target language works with a younger member of the community who teaches in a school classroom setting.

Specific objectives

The language programme is embedded in the total school programme; there is whole-school planning to develop an integrated approach to teaching the target language.

- Students are actively engaged through the use of trained staff who use sound pedagogical approaches in the classroom.
- Teachers have access to a wide range of resources that have been specifically developed to support teaching and learning in the target language.
- Teamwork is promoted and there is a shared commitment to the language programme; teachers and assistant teachers are equal partners, and there is two way mentoring and learning.
- The critical importance of induction into the culture of the school and involvement in relevant professional learning opportunities for non-qualified teachers is recognised and acted on.
- The critical importance of understanding the cultural backgrounds of Indigenous students and the links between language, culture and self-identity is recognised and acted on.
- Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives are valued by the school community.
• Teachers draw on the insights, knowledge, and experience of community members.
• Literacy skills in the target language are transferred to English language learning.
• A Master-Apprentice type model is promoted whereby first language speakers of the target language work with younger novice speakers to develop their language skills.
• There is strong systemic support for the language programme in terms of syllabus documentation, curriculum planning, provision of resources, ongoing training workshops for teachers and teaching assistants, and the facilitation of networking.
• Good use is made of multi-media language resources.
• The school principal provides strong leadership in building the language programme and ongoing support for its maintenance.
• Members of the language team – including teachers, linguists, teaching assistants, community advisors – have a passion to build a strong and sustainable programme in the school.

**Difficulties in implementation**

In NSW, where attempts have been made to apply a form of the Master Apprentice model, its application is hindered by distance (between Master and Apprentice), the lack of identified funding to support implementation of the model, and the small numbers of proficient speakers of an Indigenous language who can act as Masters.

**Outcomes**

Purdie et al suggest that One possible way of strengthening the Master-Apprentice programme in Australia is for Endeavour Language Teachers Fellowships to be made available for Indigenous languages teachers. These Fellowships are offered to practising language teachers in Australian schools, and trainee (pre-service) language teachers in Australian universities to improve their language and cultural skills through intensive short-term study programs. Currently, however, the Fellowships are only available to teachers of Asian, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern languages. Language Centres have the potential to apply this model as part of their language revival and maintenance work, in conjunction with schools, where appropriate.

**2. Aligning Language Education Policies to International Human Rights Standards**

*Jon Reyhner and Navin Singh*  Northern Arizona University 2010

This document provides a useful overview of normative standards related to indigenous languages use.

These guidelines, developed by native educators from throughout Alaska, USA, contributed to the development of these guidelines through a series of workshops and meetings associated with the Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative. The guidance offered in the document is intended to provide assistance to the local language advisory committees created under US Senate Bill 103 that are responsible for making recommendations regarding the future of the heritage language in their community. The underlying theme is, to keep a language going, it must be used in daily activities at home and in the community so that it is transmitted and acquired naturally. Schools are seen to serve a supportive role by providing appropriate language immersion programs that strengthen the language used in the community. It is hoped that these guidelines will promote the daily use of indigenous languages throughout Alaska and that educational institutions will support in perpetuating languages. Guidelines are provided for Native Elders, Parents, Aspiring Language Learners, Native Communities and organisations, Professional educators, Schools, Education Agencies, Linguists, Media Producers, as well as Resources for strengthening Indigenous languages. It has recommendations that are simply written and could be useful for other indigenous groups as a starting point for work in the area of indigenous language use and development.


From the paper... This paper presents background information on Ganöhesge:kha: Hë:nödeyë:stha, or the Faithkeeper’s School, a small Onön:dowaga: (Seneca) language and cultural school in New York State, and analyses its type of curriculum and teaching methodologies. It reviews the importance of data collection and student/teacher assessments and the particular implications of assessments for a specific type of school such as the Faithkeepers. After describing the commonly-used FLOSEM and New York State assessment tools, this paper explains the need for adapting and modifying such tools for the unique needs of the Faithkeepers School. At the end of the paper, the process taken to develop the new rubrics for this school is explained, and the new tools are displayed in the appendices.

The Foreign Language Oral Skills Evaluation Matrix (FLOSEM) and the Ögwehöwe:ka: NativeLanguages for Communication: New York State Syllabus are used as models for the development of contextually relevant language assessment tools. These may be useful for those directly involved in the assessment of indigenous language development. Examples of rubrics developed are included in the appendices of the chapter.
5. MLE Advocacy Kit for Promoting Multilingual Education: Including the Excluded 
doi http://www.unescobkk.org/education/multilingualeducation/resources/mle-
advocacy-kit/?utm_campaign=

The MLE Advocacy Kit was prepared for all of those who want to ensure that “Education for All” does, indeed, include everyone! The kit will be especially valuable for policy makers, education practitioners and specialists who want to improve access to and quality of education for those excluded by language. It will also be helpful for speakers of ethnic minority languages who want to improve the education situation in their own communities.

This kit is designed to raise awareness on the importance of mother tongue-based multilingual education (MLE). It presents key arguments and facts about MLE and provides important insights about the value and benefits of providing education in learners’ mother tongue.

This kit contains three main booklets. Each booklet has a designated audience: 1) policy makers, 2) education programme planers and practitioners and 3) community members. Please remember that developing MLE requires contributions from everyone at all levels. For that reason, we encourage you to use all three booklets along with other available resources as you work together to plan, implement and sustain your MLE programmes.

This kit can be used in many different ways. For those who are already involved in MLE programmes, you might use these ideas to help you to promote mother tongue instruction and strengthen your programme. Those who are not familiar with multilingual education but want to improve educational access for minority language students might use these booklets to identify specific points that they can investigate and discuss in their own contexts.


Part 1 - Introduction, Part 2 - Psycholinguistic Principles, Part 3 - Pedagogy for Empowerment ‘You Tube videos of Professor Jim Cummins’ plenary talk during the 4th international conference on language and education: multilingual education for all -- policies, processes, and practices on 6-8 November 2013 in Bangkok Thailand. Related Link: http://www.lc.mahidol.ac.th/mleconf20...


A quote from the blog on which this list of apps is provided......

You’ll see that many of these apps fall into one of several categories: interactive dictionaries, phrase books, didactic games, and “digital museums” of culture and language. Regardless of the format of these apps, I think it is important not to view technology as a closed system, but instead a tool both effected by and affecting networks of people, places, and social norms. Mobile apps alone will not “save” endangered languages, as headlines often assert; cultural restoring work cannot depend on a string of code. They can serve as a tool, although arguably not the most powerful, in a portfolio of language conservation efforts. Communities have to be
excited about language-learning before they are excited about language-learning apps.

For starters, developers and communities must think about targeted users: if the goal is to instruct non-indigenous peoples about indigenous language, are users provided with relevant and culturally appropriate vocabulary? If the goal is to revive language within communities, do local people have access to necessary mobile technologies and the Internet? Have they been informed about the app, its purpose, and its functions? Better yet – did they help design it? Does the app take into account the possibility of illiterate users? How will the app continue to be relevant in the future of rapidly developing mobile technologies? Could it be incorporated into existing community programs in schools or other institutions? The list goes on


This article reports on the initial observation phase of a larger, longitudinal project that explores complex language encounters in grades R (Reception) to 3 classrooms in South Africa. Complex language encounters refer to teacher-learner exchanges that take place when neither teachers nor learners are first language speakers of the language of instruction, in this case English. Observations during teaching practice visits to linguistically and culturally diverse South African urban classrooms yielded several vignettes that illustrate the need for teachers to be provided with strategies to lessen the confusion of some language encounters. Although preliminary, our findings underline how critical it is for teachers to possess full proficiency in the language of instruction as well as cross-cultural competence. That is, in order to attend adequately to diverse learners’ sense-making efforts, teachers need to know how to relate to learners by ‘border crossing’ linguistically, culturally and conceptually. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.


This is a very readable pamphlet with some useful tips for teachers of indigenous students.


A long but very practical book which would be very useful for agencies about to embark on mother tongue and bilingual education projects. I found the sections which explain language acquisition and learning achievement in different types of education models to be most useful.

This resource is a very good description of how a mother tongue/ bilingual education project has been developed and managed. Access to the Labe website http://labeuganda.org

A programme of education above all