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1.0 What is Home-Based Language Revitalization and Why Does it Matter?

This thesis is intended to benefit Indigenous people undertaking language revitalization. Already, there is an international community of Indigenous people and their allies committed to speaking and strengthening their languages (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 1; Endangered Languages Fund 2013; Hinton and Hale 2001, 20, 34-5; Stabilizing Indigenous Language 2013; NILI 2013). From all across the globe, people have banded together to help one another as they speak and cherish their languages (Hinton and Hale 2001). I have received a level of support from these people that I cannot express in words. It is truly a blessing to know individuals so committed, resourceful and determined. I hope that this thesis can contribute to their work by helping to provide insight into the process of language revitalization. This thesis will draw on my participation in a community of language revitalizers in Eugene, Oregon to provide insight into the follow questions: What motivates language revitalization in my community? What insights do these motivations provide about the importance of language learning to ourselves and our communities, and what broader understanding does this provide about the significance of Native languages? What home-based language learning methods have promise for our community and other critically endangered language communities? How can existing home-based language revitalization theory and practice be applied to our situation? How can multilingual collaboration benefit language revitalization? I hope to gain a better understanding of the worldviews of Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed languages, as well as the theories that exist today to encourage language use in the home in order to refine understanding of learning in the home and promote further home-based language revitalization efforts.

There is an emerging body of literature on language revitalization. However, a notable gap exists in addressing how critically endangered languages can be revitalized (Leanne Hinton’s work being an important exception). For those of us speaking critically
endangered languages, this is alarming. This thesis hopes to contribute to language
revitalization as a whole. However, it is aimed specifically at those communities with little-
to-no outside funding or support, fragmented or non-existent speaking communities and
other identifying marks of critically endangered languages. Even if only by a small
contribution, this thesis aims to move us further towards realizing a future in which
Native people once again speak not just our own languages, but also the many languages
of our neighbors, families and friends. It is my hope that by exploring and delving into the
experiences of one group of people working to revitalize their ancestral languages, I can
help others who are seeking to do the same.

A second purpose of this thesis is to provide perspective for those just learning
what language revitalization is. Monolingualism is the norm in many places throughout
the colonized world (Hinton 2001, 3; Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Nichols 2008). Given the
multi-lingual past of most of humanity, this is a sad, and one could argue, unnatural affair.
Languages reflect a rich heritage which connects us to one another, give us strength and
insight, and remind us of who we are, who our friends are, and who came before us. With
that in mind, this thesis attempts to provide a better understanding of Indigenous
language revitalization efforts for readers who are new to this information. By exploring
the importance of our languages to our community in Eugene, I also hope to encourage
others to learn multiple languages. Given the immense cultural loss, oppression and
violence that accompanied movements toward monolingualism, I believe that those of us
who are linguistically impoverished would do a service to ourselves and our communities
to learn and use the many languages that exist in our cultures and environments. Our
heritage as human beings is one of linguistic diversity and language sharing, and moving
forward I hope that we can once again form and maintain communities that are
linguistically diverse.
1.1 A Brief History and Introduction to Language Revitalization

Below, I will give a brief history and explanation of how language revitalization came to be and what it looks like today. I will focus on the history of the United States, and specifically the Northwest United States, in light of the fact that the communities I am part of and working with all traditionally reside in Washington, Oregon and California. The following section is intended to give the reader a better understanding of language revitalization as a movement, to explore language revitalization theory, to introduce the community of language revitalizers with whom I work and to explain my connection to and experience as a learner of Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’.

1.1.1 Colonial Impacts on Indigenous Languages

Colonization of the Western United States took many forms. In the Pacific Northwest, outright genocide (Bommelyn 2006, vi-xv; Schwartz 1997) was followed by the creation of reservations and forced removals of our peoples’ from their rightful, ancestral homes (Schwartz 1997; Berg 2007). Our ancestors endured horrendous treatment on reservations (Schwartz 1997). Forced assimilation became the policy of the United States, and took many forms. For Native language use in the Northwest, boarding schools were part of this legacy of genocide against Native people. Native children were coerced or kidnapped and taken to boarding schools where they were routinely beaten, sexually abused, isolated and berated for speaking their Native languages (M. King 2008; Adams 1995; Hinton 1994; Pyuwa Bommelyn pers. comm., November 30, 2013). As a result of this oppression, a generation of speakers by-and-large did not speak their languages. In Native communities across the United States, boarding schools led to the loss of Native language use (Hinton 1994, 173-8; Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2010). Statements such as Richard Pratt’s (founder of Carlisle Indian School) infamous “Kill the Indian, save the man” exemplify a viewpoint that was pervasive throughout the United States, and was
effective in destroying Native language use (Reyhner et al. 2009, 13). Accompanying this forced assimilation was a targeted effort at dismantling reservations which peaked with the termination of many tribes in the mid-twentieth century (Berg 2007). Tribes were coerced into surrendering their sovereign status as a way to force their people to become “productive” members of American society. The loss of generations of speakers, coupled with the damage to community cohesion that resulted from forced relocation, the creation of reservations and subsequent termination of tribes conspired to diminish Native language use dramatically across the United States. For example, Hinton notes that as of the mid-nineties, there were no children in the entire state of California who were raised primarily or bilingually in their Native language (Hinton 1994, 21). This situation is reversing, however slowly¹.

1.1.2 A Global Movement towards Language Revitalization

Language revitalization is the movement initiated by Native people to begin speaking and using their languages once again. Worldwide, 6000 languages are estimated to be spoken in about 250 countries (Hinton and Hale 2001, 3). A world of increasingly globalized and nationalized economies, which use linguistic homogeneity to encourage national unity and economic ease of transaction, leaves the majority of the world’s languages in danger of being lost (Hinton and Hale 2001, 19-20). The language revitalization movement is certainly international, and is loosely organized. While many communities collaborate across tribal, state and national borders, it is most accurate to describe the movement as diffuse, and not resulting from the creation of one organization or group.

¹ For cases of Native children in California and elsewhere being raised primarily or bilingually in their Native language, see Hinton 2013.
In the Pacific Northwest, the continued struggle of Native people to speak their languages is becoming more widely acknowledged. Through the determination of many elder speakers and inspired younger generations, many language programs and revitalization efforts have emerged. Several organizations and programs have formed to support language revitalization—including the Northwest Indian Language Institute (NILI) and Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival (AICLS)—and their collaboration both nationally and internationally with communities is well established (Dr. Pila Wilson pers. comm., October 25, 2012; Yamamoto and Yamamoto 2004; SILS 2013; AICLS 2013; NILI 2013). Given the critically endangered status of the Native languages of California, Washington and Oregon (Hinton 1994; NILI 2013; Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 25, 2013), it is imperative that speakers take action now to revitalize Native languages in this region, or risk losing a valuable aspect of their cultural heritage and identities (Hinton 1994, 191). Below, I will discuss existing models of language revitalization, describe the benefits of home-based learning revitalization, and provide an overview of how one community of speakers in Eugene, Oregon built off existing language revitalization models to inform our own home-based learning.

At the foundation of home-based language revitalization is the acknowledgement that Native people need to develop and implement effective methods to combat language loss caused by boarding schools and colonization (Fishman 1991; Hinton and Hale 2001). This process is called reversing language shift (RLS) by Fishman (1991). The need for effective methods is especially pressing for the many critically endangered languages that have few or no living speakers, little to no funding being invested in developing speakers, and whose communities are geographically scattered. These languages come from communities who are marginalized and who face the greatest pressure to assimilate into dominant culture (Hinton and Hale 2001, 3-4). In order to explain why at-home learning is
an effective tool for these language communities, I would like to explore existing models of language revitalization, and some of the ideas guiding our work in Eugene, Oregon.

1.2 The Importance of the Home in Theories of Language Revitalization

Fishman (1991), Hinton and Hale (2001) and others have proposed that language revitalization starts with documentation, progresses to language use in the home and school, and peaks with the common use of language in the public sphere. ʔəswəli, Lushootseed speaker, language teacher, proponent of at-home learning, and instrumental figure in language revitalization efforts in Eugene, Oregon has observed a similar pattern. He notes that language teaching in the classroom emphasizes accumulating knowledge about a language, while home-based language learning focuses on use of the language, and finally that a community of speakers is necessary for language transmission to occur (ʔəswəli, 2013). ʔəswəli’s observation demonstrates that accumulating knowledge about a language and gaining proficiency in it does not necessarily ensure language use. Likewise, practicing use of a language does not guarantee a speech community, or transmission of meaningful information in the language. Given that the aim of language revitalization is restoration of languages to use in daily life, I argue that focusing on gaining the capacity to transmit meaningful information in the language, and exercising this capacity, is critical for any language revitalization effort. Therefore, finding a setting that encourages both the use of a language and transmission of information of that language is desirable in any language revitalization project. As the language nests of the Māori have demonstrated, the home is uniquely situated to encourage language use, and act as a seed from which to create a community of speakers (Hinton and Hale 2001, 119).

Re-imagining the home plays an important part in understanding why home-based learning is a desirable revitalization method in the Native community. ʔəswəli also offers valuable insight into what exactly a home can represent. He states that:
Our homes are sacred. That’s where the heart of our lives are. Our homes, the way they [elders and first language speakers] said it in English is that it has a spirit...This is very important because it shapes our attitudes and our attitudes shape how we think. It shapes our understanding. And our understanding shapes how we think. And thinking shapes how we speak. And speaking shapes what we do. And what we do shapes how we live. It all works together...So your home is where you eat, where you sleep, where raise your children. Your home is where you think. It has your thoughts, your mind. Your home is where you prepare your mind before you go out in the world.

Viewing our homes this way contributes a more nuanced understanding of the importance of home-based learning methods. Language revitalization is fundamentally an act of cultural revitalization. Homes facilitate this process because they form the basis of our daily lives. Homes are an effective place to create change in one’s life because homes are the seat of our habits, comforts and routines. Our homes are where we live and feel at-ease. In other words, homes are where we can be ourselves.

ʔəswəli and I also discussed the mobility of the concept of home. Home is where the heart is—as an old cliché tells us. ʔəswəli applies a somewhat similar logic in explaining how the traditional mobility and seasonality of Native peoples led to a different understanding of home, one that is more rooted in one’s connections to others and to one’s homeland than it is to a specific dwelling:

[O]ur people were mobile people. And so, up in Washington...we had winter homes. This time of year in spring we took off, and traveled and started gathering and fishing and visiting and this and that now that the winter was over. And, but, we never lost the concept of this is the cooking fire, that’s the other fire...the home never stopped. The home was in the canoe. There was a chief, where he sat, and there were the workers, where they sat. There were the visionaries that sat up front, and so on. And so, you never lost this concept of home.

ʔəswəli’s description of home extends beyond a physical space. Home becomes synonymous with a prepared order and routine found throughout one’s life. In other words, home is both where you take comfort, and where you prepare yourself to live a good life (ʔəswəli, 2013). Drawing from this philosophy, the act of home-based language learning becomes much more than committing to speak a language within a set of walls.
Instead, it is the re-ordering of one’s life. Home-based language learning provides us with a chance to re-examine what it means to have a home, what it means to treat that home well, and what it means to live purposefully and with good hearts. Home-based language revitalization is then both a reclaiming of the home for the language, and also the recreation of the Native home.

1.3 Cultivating Strong Language Communities through Multilingual Collaboration

For languages programs with funding, vitality and community support, the model of programs such as the Hawaiian immersion preschools are highly effective (Dr. Pila Wilson pers. comm., October 26, 2012; Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 94; Hinton and Hale 2001, 147-165). This is because the Hawaiian immersion preschool model moves beyond accumulating knowledge of the language, and focuses instead on using the language and bringing a community together. For those of us speaking critically endangered languages in the Pacific Northwest, it is exponentially more complicated: we have no community of speakers to bring together. This leaves us with a seemingly unsolvable riddle: even if we are able to move from accumulating knowledge about a language to using the language in our homes, how can we create a community of speakers?

One answer has been the Master Apprentice (MA) Method (Hinton 1994; Hinton and Hale 2001; Grenoble and Whaley 2006). MA method places adult speakers with elders/first language speakers to intensively study under an elder speaker. The successes of the MA Method have been attributed to the intense focus of the method on home and daily-life based learning. This method focuses on creating a small number of highly proficient speakers to carry on the language.

---

Grenoble and Whaley (2006) define language vitality as a function of intergenerational language transmission. That is, children must be learning and speaking a language for it to be considered vital.
Others programs—such as the Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Symposia (SILS)—have brought together speakers from different language groups to support each other. These programs focus on pooling resources and ideas to increase the capacity of all the languages represented, while providing community support for endangered language speakers. AICLS and SILS are excellent examples of how cross-lingual support can create meaningful improvements in multiple speaking communities.

In Eugene, we have begun to combine the spirit of both of these approaches. We have formed a network of speakers across languages who meet regularly in our homes to support each others’ learning. A benefit of this support that we did not anticipate is that we are learning and using each others’ languages. I am proposing in this thesis that the intentional banding together of critically endangered language learners may be what is necessary to nurture revitalization efforts in these languages. This argument springs from the work of organizations such as AICLS and NILI, and applies principles of existing language revitalization theory and practice to languages that face challenges because of their extremely limited speaking populations.

Working together has several benefits. First, there is the benefit of having a larger voice. AICLS is proof that many endangered languages banded together can achieve notable things (AICLS 2013). Second, there is the benefit of embodying an ancestral value: multilingualism. Before colonization of the Northwest and our peoples, many people in any given community were multilingual (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 25, 2013, Loren Bommelyn pers. comm., July 15, 2013). Grenoble and Whaley (2006) also note that linguistically diverse regions of the world—such as the Pacific Northwest—tend to have much higher rates of multilingualism (36–7). Colonization changed this by violently forbidding multilingualism. It follows that if we are to revive our cultural traditions, we should do so by returning to a multilingual existence. Third, collaborating closely across
languages allows speakers to expand the habitat in which their languages thrive. If I speak my ancestral language Dee-ni’ in my home, it is as if the rest of the world is a desert where the language cannot survive. By working together with Lushootseed speakers, I can create a home-environment for my language through my speech, and an intermediate environment in those Lushootseed speakers’ homes where my language can expand. Having a periphery around my language core (i.e. home) will strengthen my language, and protect the life of the language. Essentially, by learning pieces of each others’ languages, we are able to buffer our languages against a monolingual environment. Working alongside each other expands our realm of what is possible.

The last logical thing when struggling to revitalize one’s language is to undertake learning another Native language—it seems too overwhelming—but this step might be just what we need. It is well documented that languages with more dominant positions in society hedge out minority languages (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Nichols 2008; Hinton and Hale 2001, 3). I argue that the same is not true when working with other critically endangered languages; the less time Native language learners spend in English, the more they benefit.

1.4 Why Might This Project Be Valuable?

Language revitalization has been shown to have powerful benefits on communities (King; Hinton and Hale 2011; Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar 2010; Reyhner et al. 1999). Language loss is strongly associated with the decline of community autonomy and the worldview of a given community (Hinton and Hale 2001, 4). Therefore, the vitality of our Native languages is directly related to our health and autonomy as Native people. Given the benefits that Indigenous people derive from our cultures, religions, ancestors, worldviews and traditions, and the importance of language to Indigenous peoples’ identity (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 91), language revitalization is an act that strengthens
community. Given the immense social, economic, and political pressure on Indigenous people to effectively vanish through assimilation, any effort to promote our cultures should not be taken lightly. Language revitalization is an opportunity for Native people to strengthen our communities by cultivating an aspect of ourselves—our languages—that are central to maintaining a connection with our ancestors, ourselves and our progeny.

1.4.1 Contributions to Language Revitalization Literature

In the field of language revitalization, literature discussing large-scale language revitalization efforts is most readily available (Grenoble and Whaley 2006). There is a shortage in the literature concerning the efforts of Northwest Native people revitalizing their languages (Hinton, 1994, 2001 and 2013 being notable exceptions). Many people are working on this issue (AICLS; Jensen et al. 2013; Bommelyn 2011; Atkins 2012), but few are publishing about it. The intent of this thesis is to benefit language revitalizers and scholars who are seeking to advance their field by making the insights and challenges of our struggles more accessible to others.

I identified a lack of information that explores in-depth how to practice language revitalization in critically-endangered language communities. These points are not meant to disparage the work of any other scholars who have chosen to focus on larger-scale revitalization projects. Rather, I am pointing out that the people (i.e. me and others) who are working with critically endangered languages would do well to show our contributions to the field of language revitalization. These contributions can be major. For example, Native California language speakers are credited with starting the Master-Apprentice method of language teaching that is now internationally recognized (Hinton and Hale 2001, 218; Grenoble and Whaley 2006).

While it is a factual statement that not all critically endangered languages will survive, it is still important to discuss how to revitalize the world’s most endangered
languages. Focusing on the most endangered languages provides unique benefits such as a more nuanced understanding of the multiplicity of ethnicities and peoples working to preserve their culture, and as a reminder that small voices cannot be discounted or ignored. Those of us working with critically endangered languages need specific resources to use and discuss. For example, a book about how to start and fund a tribal language program might not benefit a community that is not federally recognized the same way it would a federally recognized community. Tailoring resources for critically endangered languages may help to revitalize those languages.

1.4.2 Telling Native Experiences with Native Voices

Finally, this thesis may contribute to a better understanding of the history of colonization and survival of Native American peoples. Monolingualism is at the heart of American colonial philosophy and policy toward Native peoples and others (Hinton 1994, 181-3; Nichols 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2010; Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 30). Proposing an alternative view based in Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed and other Native peoples’ philosophies gives a different understanding of multilingualism that may help to advance our understanding of what it means to live in a multicultural and multilingual world. In this way, language revitalization is also a human-rights issue (Hinton and Hale 2001, 4-5; UNDRIP 2007; UNECSO 2003, 1). Indigenous peoples are struggling to maintain the existence of our cultures, worldviews and identity as peoples. Whether or not one agrees with the importance of a particular language, it must be recognized that people have a right to exist and perpetuate themselves (UNDRIP 2007). Therefore, language revitalization is also an issue of the rights of Indigenous people to exist. All people and cultures have a right to survive; during the era of colonization, Indigenous rights to survive were infringed upon in egregious and unspeakable ways. Language revitalization is one way that Indigenous people are mending this wound.
1.5 Eugene, Oregon—Language Revitalization Hotspot?

The University of Oregon is home to the Northwest Indian Language Institute (NILI), a valuable resource center for Native language teachers. NILI “provides Native language teachers and community members with training in language teaching, materials and curriculum development, benchmarks creation, and linguistics. With tribal partners, NILI supports and strengthens language preservation efforts by establishing collaborative, on-going projects which meet the specific needs and desires of each language community” (NILI 2013). Many Native language learners have been drawn to the University of Oregon because of the work NILI is doing—myself amongst them.

Home-based language learning has become a focus for the Native language community affiliated with NILI. The idea of revitalizing language in the home is not new: language nesting is an at-home learning method developed by the Māori people of Aotearoa (Hinton and Hale 2001, 119-120). Language nests originally occurred in geographically concentrated, tight-knit and highly culturally active groups. Several Native language speakers in Eugene, Oregon have come together to pursue home-centered language learning. Although we are speakers of different languages, we hope that by developing a sense of community in our mutual undertaking, we can support the revitalization of each of our languages by drawing on existing home-based models of learning such as the Māori model.

There are several languages being studied, spoken and revitalized through NILI or in affiliation with NILI, including but not limited to Ichishkíin (Sahaptin), Chinuk Wawa, Taa-laa-wa Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed (NILI 2013). Of these, our community is made up of peoples descended from and/or taught by descendants of Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ and Lushootseed. Below I will provide a brief history and description of each, followed by an introduction to the families and individuals who make up our small community.
1.5.1 Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’

Prior to genocidal acts and forced relocations by the United States government and private citizens, Tututni, Tolowa and Chetco Indians lived alongside one another in Southern Oregon and Northern California (Bommelyn 1997, 1-5). From a Northern boundary of the Sixes River to a southern boundary of Wilson Creek, California, these peoples formed an over-arching ethnic group of people Identified by linguists as a group who speak Coastal Athabaskan. There is considerable disagreement amongst both the Native and academic community about the closeness of Tolowa-Chetco dialects and Tututni (Bommelyn 2006; Bommelyn 1997; Dr. Underriner pers. comm., September 23 2013; Bright 1964, 101; Pyuwa Bommelyn pers. comm., September 20 2013).

Two tribes whose members descend from Coastal Athabaskan people, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians and the Smith River Rancheria, have both relied on Tolowa linguistic materials in their language programs. However, there are other efforts at Tututni language teaching which rely exclusively on Tututni material, including the work of the late Gilbert Towner, the Confederated Tribes of the Lower Rogue, and the Hall family. There has been little collaboration between Coastal Athabaskan language revitalization efforts because of differences in opinion about the extent of dialectical differences, and for myriad of personal, community and inter-tribal-governmental reasons. Given the critically endangered status of Tolowa, which (to this author’s knowledge) has only one living heritage³ speaker, and Tututni, which (to this author’s knowledge) has no living heritage speakers, I find this debate self-destructive for our peoples. Hinton and others point out that arguments over dialect and variety of language

³ For the purposes of this paper, I am using the term heritage speakers to denote speakers who grew up gaining proficiency in their language due to exposure to from first language speakers. This awkward definition is a result of my struggles to explain the complicated situation surrounding the state of Dee-ni’ language speakers today.
use have the potential to fragment and damage revitalization efforts (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 29-41; Yamamoto and Yamamoto 2004, 15-17; Hinton and Hale 2001, 17). Bearing that in mind, our community in Eugene is made up of both Tolowa and Tututni peoples, who are working together to revitalize Dee ni’ Wee-ya’—Dee ni’ language. I would like to acknowledge that the vast majority of the dialect and language we are learning is Tolowa, and is possible only because of the unprecedented efforts of Loren Me’-lash-ne Bommelyn and many others—both past and present—at Smith River and Siletz.

For the purposes of this thesis I will refer to our language interchangeably as Dee ni’ and Dee ni’ Wee-ya’. I will do so in order to avoid a constant rehashing of the disagreements over our dialects, to recognize the importance of Tolowa people in revitalizing our ethnic groups’ culture, and in order to promote a sense of collaboration and cultural unity that I believe is critical in revitalizing Dee ni’ peoples’ culture on the Southern Oregon and Northern California coast. One of my most sincere hopes for this thesis is that it can serve to promote a sense of cultural unity and solidarity amongst neighbors, cousins and bands of people who were forcibly separated and alienated from one another by citizens and the government of the United States of America.

1.5.2 Lushootseed

Lushootseed is a Coast Salish language spoken within the Puget Sound region. Zalmai Zahir, who a highly proficient speaker of Lushootseed and is highly respected in the community for his cultural and historical knowledge, elaborates:

The Puget Salish language is located within the Puget Sound region and includes all of its river tributaries; the east side of Kitsap Peninsula; Whidbey Island; and Skagit Valley. Other names the Puget Salish language is known by are Lushootseed, dxʷləšucid, txʷəlšucid, and xʷəlš ucid. The names vary because tribes within the Puget Sound region say it a little different, but all of the names mean language of the Puget Sound region…[ʔaswali] refer[s] to the language as Puget Salish to be inclusive of everyone. Within Puget Salish, there are two conventional dialects: they are Northern Puget Salish (NPS) and Southern Puget Salish (SPS)...The border between the two dialects happens to be about on the King...
County and Snohomish County boarder, north of Seattle. The differences between the two dialects are namely the accent, the sounds oo and o, and some word differences. (Zalmai Zahir, pers. comm., September 25 2013.)

Based on ongoing research (Zalmai Zahir, forthcoming), observations of the quality of recorded speakers’ speech and a consideration of history in the region, the Puget Salish language began to decline heavily between the 1930’s and 1940’s. In the 1950’s, documentation of the language commenced. It is important to note that the language had been in decline for two decades before extensive documentation began. Due to the substantial efforts to document the language in the 1950s, Lushootseed revitalization efforts today are easier (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 23, 2013). Zalmai estimates that today approximately ten to fifteen people can carry on conversation in Lushootseed at a beginning conversational level, with two speakers (Ɂəswəli and Tupəl) proficient enough to function in their daily lives with only occasional use of English to explain foreign concepts (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 23, 2013).

1.6 The Structure of This Thesis—Exploring Motivation, Materials and Methods

Jon Reyhner writes in the introduction to Revitalizing Indigenous Languages that “language activists need to concentrate on the methods, materials and motivation they will use to achieve their goals. [bold in original]” He refers to these points as the “three ‘M’s’ of language revitalization” (Reyhner et al. 1999, xvii). Others have researched extensively effective methods for language revitalization (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Hinton and Hale 2001), have identified the importance of developing materials (Hinton and Hale 2001, 10-12), and have noted the critical component that motivation plays in language revitalization (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Hinton and Hale 2001, 4).

Drawing from this framework, this thesis is an exploration of interviews with language speakers and revitalizers in Eugene, Oregon. Investigating speakers’ motivations, methods and materials for at-home language learning both provide insight for others who
may be seeking to revitalize their own languages, expose challenges within home-based language revitalization practice, and provide a lens through which to view larger issues of language revitalization such as cultural continuation, identity and the role of family in language revitalization.

These interviews were conducted within a community of speakers working primarily with the languages of Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ and Lushootseed; additionally, learners and speakers of Chinuk Wawa and Ichishkín form a valuable part of this community. Multilingualism in this community forms another potential area for these voices to contribute to the collective understanding of language revitalization. Working together across critically endangered languages provides valuable benefits for all participants. Increasing awareness of this model for language revitalization may help others to collaborate in the future.

This thesis is intended to demonstrate some effective methods for home-based language revitalization, provide insight into the importance of motivation and struggles in maintaining motivation while using language in the home, and act as a tool to advocate for increased collaboration between critically endangered language communities. Without working together effectively and resourcefully, speakers of critically endangered languages face a bleak struggle. Together, we have a much greater capacity to lift each other up, and continue our work as speakers of unique and precious languages.

1.6.1 Thesis Interview Methods

In order to understand the role(s) motivation plays in home-based language revitalization efforts, I conducted two-part interviews with a community of language learners of Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed in Eugene, Oregon, as well as with one family in Palo Alto, California (who have since returned to Eugene) during the spring and summer of 2013. Interviews were conducted in speakers’ homes in an effort to facilitate discussion of
methods and materials used to help at-home learning. The first part of the interview explored motivations for learning and using Native language in the home, while the second part of the paper recorded data on language use, access to materials, and methods currently in use at each participants’ home. By bringing together data on both motivation and methods of language revitalization, it is my hope that I can provide guidance for others doing language revitalization while also creating an opportunity for reflection within the community at NILI. Furthermore, I hope to supply insight into the positive potential of language revitalization as an act of self-improvement and community building for Indigenous peoples. The following questions were developed both through my experience learning Dee-ni’ and after an examination of language revitalization literature, and with the insights provided by my mentors and peers at NILI. These questions guided my interviews:

1. What motivates language revitalization in my community?
2. What insights do these motivations provide about the importance of language learning to ourselves and our communities, and what broader understanding does this provide about the significance of Native languages?
3. What home-based language learning methods have promise for our community and other critically endangered language communities?
4. How can existing home-based language revitalization theory and practice be applied to our situation, and similar situations?
5. What role can multilingualism play in language revitalization? How can multilingual collaboration strengthen language revitalization efforts?

In order to explore both the motivations behind language revitalization and the act of learning language in the home, these interviews were broken into two parts. The first part of these interviews relied primarily on an interview method borrowed from feminist
scholar Barbara Sutton (Sutton 2011). This method features the use of note-cards with single words written on them. These cards provide conversation prompts for the interviewee. I developed the terms for my interview cards based on my research into language revitalization literature, and on my experiences as a language learner. Additionally, blank cards and a writing utensil were provided to interviewees, to encourage them to talk about themes not found on the cards. A list of the interview-card words can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this thesis.

The second part of these interviews drew from a question list I developed. These questions can be found in Appendix 2. These questions sought to collect information regarding what methods speakers are using and consider effective, and about what materials speakers feel would benefit them. This part of the interview was intended to 1) explore the advantages and disadvantages of methods used in our community to increase language use in the home, and 2) offer a chance for reflection and improvement within our community and other similar communities.

One consideration in undertaking this project was my close personal involvement with the community I was interviewing and working with. I would like to acknowledge both my close connection to the people interviewed for this thesis, all of whom are dear friends or family. Emerson et al. (1995) note that the methods an ethnographer chooses, and the ethnographer as a person, cannot be discounted from the data they collect (9-15). In this case, I feel that my position as a Native person using and learning Dee-ni’ provides a valuable perspective for this research. Given that the purposes of this project are to benefit communities undertaking language revitalization, advocate for Indigenous languages and offer an Indigenous perspective on language use in the home, my identity, education within the Native community, and my close personal connection to language revitalizers in Eugene, Oregon offer me the numerous benefits that may allow me to better
explore at-home language revitalization. Below, I have briefly described each interviewee, both to give a better understanding of how we are related to one another, and to demonstrate how even a small community of speakers can be linguistically and culturally diverse.

1.6.2 Community Members

For the purposes of this thesis, I will be relying heavily on interviews of nine community members who are working closely together to revitalize their languages in the home and in some instances for their children. Please note that due to IRB and UO Human Subjects research restrictions designed to protect the anonymity of participants, the names of interviewees have been changed.

These people are:

Ch’ee-see-ne: Tututni person. His wife Tr’aa-ne and he have 5 children: myself, Tay-lvlh, Shlha’-e, Shchee-le and Lee-na. Tay-lvlh and Lee-na have become involved in language revitalization activities more recently and were therefore not interviewed for this thesis. Tr’aa-ne: Not descended from Dee-ni’ people, Tr’aa-ne has undertaken language revitalization with her family.

Shchee-le: Tututni person and son of Tr’a-a-ne and Ch’ee-see-ne. Married to Shghee-tr’e, his children are Chee-lee-xvrs and Dee. Shchee-le began learning Dee-ni’ in 2006, and I became involved that year in home-based learning with him. At the time of the interviews, Shchee-le and Shghee-tr’e lived in Palo Alto, California and were heavily involved with our community through long-distance communication and regular visits to Eugene. Since then, they have moved back to Eugene and are continuing to work on language.

---

4 Please note that names below were adapted from Dee-ni’ words, or are Lushootseed names. However, in some cases I intentionally misspelled Dee-ni’ words so that glottal stops [’] would not be awkwardly paired with English possessives (e.g. [’s]).
Shghee-tr'e: Not a person of Dee-ni’ descent, Shghee-tr’e has undertaken language revitalization in order to support her children’s cultural competency and her husband’s work.

Shlha’-e: Tututni person and son of Tr’aa-ne and Ch’ee-see-ne. Shlha’-e and I currently live together.

Ch’vs-ne: Tolowa person, Ch’vs-ne is currently pursuing a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Oregon. Ch’vs-ne, his wife Tr’aa~-xe and their family are the most advanced home of Dee-ni’ speakers in Eugene.

Tr’aa~-xe: Native person not of Dee-ni’ descent who has undertaken Dee-ni’ language revitalization with her family.

ʔəswəli: ʔəswəli is widely regarded as a highly proficient speaker of Puget Salish, and is a language teacher, in addition to his work in revitalizing the language in his home. ʔəswəli is also pursuing a PhD in Linguistics at the UO. He currently lives with his language apprentice Tupəl in Eugene.

Tupəl: Suquamish person currently pursuing a Master’s degree from the University of Oregon. Tupəl lives with ʔəswəli; their home is the most advanced nest of language use the community interviewed for this thesis.

Our community is diverse; we have been drawn together by a passion to work on our languages, by our association with NILI, and because of our past friendships and family relationships. Because of our diverse community, I will argue that we provide a new way to think about language revitalization for critically endangered languages: we can collaborate across language groups to form multi-lingual support and speaking communities.
1.6.3 A Note on Terminology

At this point, we are calling our efforts “language nesting,” although they are not identical to language nesting efforts of Māori and Hawaiian people, which focus on a preschool immersion supported by extensive at home speech (Dr. Pila Wilson pers. comm., Oct 26 2012). For lack of a better term, this prospectus will refer to our efforts as “language nesting,” “at-home learning,” “home-based learning” and “language revitalization in the home,” amongst other things. I do not want directly equate our work to the Māori or Hawaiian language nests. Although we are deeply indebted to their work and methods, it would be disingenuous and highly disrespectful to claim that we are practicing an identical method. Bearing that in mind, I have decided to take the lead of others in the community who are using “language nest” in a colloquial sense for the purposes of clarity and ease of reading.
2.0 Motivations and Challenges in Home-based Language Revitalization

Exploring what motivates Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed speakers in Eugene, Oregon to undertake language revitalization has several benefits. Practically, it is a chance to reflect as language revitalizers on how to maintain our motivation to pursue language learning. Motivation is also a powerful lens which exposes underlying philosophies and beliefs behind our efforts to revitalize our languages. This lens has a great positive potential to supply us with insight about why language revitalization is valuable to Indigenous people, and how home-based language learning can be a path for cultivating health and nourishing our peoples’ worldviews and existence. In this section, I draw heavily from interviews and language revitalization literature to explore motivations and challenges learners face. In doing so, I hope to better understand how we can build our motivation as learners, and explore what motivation can tell us about the process and significance of language revitalization for Native communities. 

Motivation has been identified as a critical component of language revitalization efforts. Even instances where endangered language communities are relatively well supported, complete dedication of several individuals is required for successful language revitalization to occur (Hinton and Hale 2001, 4). Given the importance of motivation to learning and the purpose of this thesis to aid others attempting to revitalize Native languages, we can gain a better understanding of what motivations may be useful and effective and what problems may await speakers within their motivations. We can use motivation as a lens for understanding larger issues within language revitalization, such as the existence of worldviews within endangered languages, the role of the family in learning, and the importance of community support in deterring or enabling successful language revitalization efforts. The following section draws on interviews conducted with
community-members in Eugene, Oregon discussing their motivations and challenges to their motivation in revitalizing languages in their homes.

I have chosen to discuss particularly significant motivations and challenges by giving each a section in the paper. However, these two categories have overlap. For example, community-at-large is discussed separately from the family, although in many small communities there is significant overlap between one’s family and community. Furthermore, some motivations can also pose challenges when viewed in a different context. So, while stress as a de-motivator has its own section, it is also mentioned in other places. I chose to organize the discussion of motivations for speaking in the home in this manner because it illuminates the wide range of motivations that individuals have, and the common threads between motivations and challenges that individuals experience. While creating these categories is somewhat arbitrary, it allows for an in-depth exploration of motivation that I hope provides new insight into the process of speaking an endangered language at home.

2.1 Community, Ancestors and Family—Relationships that Motivate Language Learners

Community as a motivator can be understood in three parts with regards to at-home learning. First, I will discuss physical communities (i.e. current reservations and tribal community at-large) in the “Caring for and Creating Community” section. Second, I have included our ancestors and our community as an ethnic identity within the section entitled “Carrying Forward Our Ancestors’ Worldviews and Cultures.” Finally, I will discuss our families as motivators within the “Strengthening Our Families” section. In dividing my discussion this way, I hope to show how community is made up of many different layers which affect our motivations for learning language differently. Each of these three parts of Native community overlap often. Instead of viewing these sections as separate or unrelated categories, I encourage the reader to view them as components of a
larger concept of Native community. Dividing these categories into three sections is partly a result of my interpretation of the interview data, and partly an effort to demonstrate the varied types of community that Native people live in and consider when making decisions.

2.1.1 Caring for and Creating Community

Ch’vs-ne and Tupal identified a feeling of responsibility toward their community as a motivation for learning the language. For Ch’vs-ne, a big part of this was the benefits that language can have in helping to create a strong community (for a more in-depth discussion of this, please see the section titled “Promoting Healing, Health and Stability,” p. 40). Community can act both as a support for motivated learners, and as a motivator itself. Language revitalization has also been a way to make new community. This is a strong motivator for Shchee-le, who describes how forming community has motivated him to keep speaking and using Dee-ni’:

I think what also makes it fun is you’re connecting to a community of speakers that are all interested in similar things. You build community...and friends, hang out with people and talking about it, but also the same thing with your family, you’re kind of building this unique fun thing that you all do together. Also [on a] cultural level I imagine it’s just connecting me to my ancestors in a similar way. [It also] intellectually it really connects you with people who are interested in learning language all sorts of different languages too, you have something in common you can talk to them about.

Shchee-le describes how learning the language is a way to bring together people who are similar to him. This process has helped him to draw closer to his family, but also draw friends closer to him and his family—it is an act of creating a community. This is a critical point: learning your language can bring you closer to other people who also care about speaking endangered languages.

Shchee-le explains that he is maintaining a connection with his ancestors, which is building another type of community. In addition to the relationship between ancestor and descendant, Shchee-le implies another relationship: between descendants of speakers of
the language. To identify a connection with your ancestors invites you to connect with others who share your ancestry. In this way, studying the language creates a broader idea of what community Shchee-le belongs to: Dee-ni’ speaking coastal people. Language revitalization acts as a tool to maintain strong ties to one’s cultural community.

In addition to being a motivation within itself, community support was identified by multiple people as being an effective way to maintain and grow motivation; community is also a way to stay motivated and cope with challenges. From this, we can see that language has a role to play in both helping to maintain strong, autonomous and healthy Indigenous communities (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2010), and that language can play a major part in bringing together new communities of speakers. Furthermore, community plays a role in keeping people motivated by offering support. In the methods and tools section, we will discuss in more detail some of the ways that we worked together to strengthen our community of speakers. Tr’aa~xe described how AICLS has supported her and Ch’vs-ne’s efforts:

We’ve been working with AICLS for several years. It’s Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival. They’re…motivating because they’re all struggling through the same things everyone else is struggling through. Or they were language learners and now are fluent speakers or…they’re still working…what you’re going through is also what they’ve already experienced, so there’s a lot of support there for struggles and for being able to talk about the difficulties of learning language.

Having people to share struggles with and relate to is important in any endeavor. AICLS reaches across critically endangered language groups to bring together committed and supportive individuals. This is something we have been trying to replicate less formally in Eugene. Shghee-tr’e describes what that community support has meant for her: “When there’s other people around seeing that and acknowledging that [language use] and encourage [it], [then there’s] more motivation. So it’s easier to do. It’s easier to take the time to care about when there’s that…support system.” Shghee-tr’e, who at the time
lived in Palo Alto, California related that at times learning away from her family and
friends in Eugene made speaking the language much more difficult for her and her family
(Shghee-tr’e, 2013). Similarly, a series of handbooks released by the Indigenous Language
Institute (ILI) identify finding collaborators and supporters as a vital component of
beginning any language revitalization program (Yamamoto and Yamamoto, 4). The
importance of our community for Shghee-tr’e and Shchee-le is that it provides them with a
sense of encouragement and eases some of their burden of revitalizing language in the
home. Similarly, for Tr’aa~ -xe having people to empathize and collaborate with makes her
learning much less difficult.

For the interviewees above, community protects their sense of motivation to learn
the language—it keeps those embers from going out. At the same time, forming and
maintaining a community provides additional resources that take some of the burden off
of the learner. Community support is therefore important to motivation because it serves
as a buffer or protective layer between demotivators and the learner. More formal
communities, such as AICLS, can even provide support financially for learners, while less
formal groups such as ours fill the role of offering like-minded peers, love and emotional
support, and people to speak our languages with.

2.1.2 Carrying Forward Our Ancestors’ Worldviews and Cultures

Languages represent the continuation of our cultures’, our ancestors’ legacies and
our autonomy as Indian people. The stories, proverbs and expressions within our Native
tongues are lessons in how our cultures view the world. Even to someone who sees no
special value in our languages, it must be acknowledged that our languages provide a
worldview that is unique and one-of-a-kind (Hinton and Hale 2001, 4-5; Grenoble and
Whaley 2006, 19-20). A responsibility to continue our ancestors’ culture has motivated
many of us. Ch’vs-ne states:
[Your language is] connected to who you are as Indian people and how the world is seen through the language. So it’s very important in identifying as Tolowa Dee-ni’, as Nili-chun-dvn-dee-ni’ or Tututni...Tuu-tuu-dee-ni’. Just the knowledge in our language, too. Cultural knowledge...is lost if the language is lost.

For Tupal, this recognition was a major factor in motivating her to learn her language. She relates how responsibility can stand in stark contrast to assimilation and apparent apathy in the Native community:

There was definitely the whole sense of responsibility after realizing that there is a language, and I didn’t know about this language, and nobody’s speaking it and nobody is talking about it like it’s a problem, nobody seems to be missing it.

Tupal identifies a central issue at the heart of language loss: that no one seems to be missing our languages, and what they represent. From this perspective, language revitalization is a necessary component of cultural survival. Part of the troubling trend of cultural loss in Native communities is that as our communities lose our language, they replace the worldview of our ancestors with a globalized worldview (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 23-7). Without the worldview housed within our languages, we lose our capacity to view the world through our ancestors’ eyes. For ?aswali, the joy of accessing this knowledge is enough of a motivation to keep him going. However, he also elaborates why the knowledge within our languages is important:

I think that language is the access to how our ancestors viewed the world and that view is important to me...The fact that [it] is different is worthy of keeping that idea, that view, that thought alive. Because when we lose those multiple perspectives on life, then our way of interacting with the world becomes only one way and we lose the beauty of life. We lose something there that is very wonderful. Again, it comes back to a different way of understanding. A different way of viewing. The acquisition of knowledge. We lose that ability to acquire knowledge in that way. It doesn't mean we can't acquire knowledge, but it won't be the same knowledge.

Knowledge is a treasure. ?aswali draws attention to the fact that our languages are our inheritance. The knowledge housed within our languages is precious. This is a motivation to continue our ancestors’ worldview, because it is a unique and valuable thing...
to us. Ch’vs-ne elaborates on why that knowledge is so precious. Part of the reason is that it represents our ancestors’ legacy as survivors. Our cultures have persevered through genocide and countless atrocities (Schwartz 1997; Berg 2007; Hinton 1994). Part of continuing our peoples’ worldviews is recognizing that these worldviews have survived through so much adversity. Ch’vs-ne talks about both the murderous genocide and cultural genocide of Tolowa people:

A lot of it is that there’s a big reason why we have language loss...we can’t control the reasons why we lost the language...We had no control over the atrocities that happened towards us. The genocidal acts...[Back then] you didn’t use your language. They beat you if you used it in boarding schools. You went [forcibly] to these huge metropolitan areas where they didn’t speak your language. As language loss occurs, the identity of who we are as Indian people dies with it. The knowledge that it has dies with it. That’s why I think genocide is still occurring...So reclaiming our languages is wonderful.

Ch’vs-ne derives motivation to continuing reclaiming his language from the the legacy of Dee-ni’ (people) who have survived so much trauma. Like Ṭəswəli and Tupsəł, Ch’vs-ne recognizes the value of the knowledge within his language. He brings to light the fact that his ancestors endured through many struggles, and that as a result of their struggles this knowledge has continued to exist. By comparing Ṭəswəli and Ch’vs-ne’s statements, we can appreciate that both the knowledge itself and the legacy of our people to retain that knowledge can act as powerful motivators. Ch’ee-see-ne brings these two points together in describing how learning ancestral stories has been a motivation for him:

[One motivation is to] find greater connection and show respect towards ancestral stories, ancestral words, and to carry those through the generations...and then show respect to older generations by learning ancestral languages and ancestral stories...There's something about the survival of stories. The stories have survived and who knows how they've done that...they've existed in English and I felt really blessed to be able to find [more complete] field notes that [existed] ahead of the publication of the stories. And then I'm really happy to be thinking about the transferring those stories into Dee-ni', shifting them back. It seems like it’s a...I can’t say a destiny, but it seems like it’s good work...
Within Ch‘ee-see-ne’s work of taking Ts’aa-maa-dee-ne’ (Joshua) stories which were recorded in English and translating them back into Dee-ni’ wee-ya’ we find the elements of all issues discussed above. He discusses learning these stories as a way of nourishing information that has survived in a battered state. Reclaiming stories from English to Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ is much like the experience of learning to appreciate our languages’ worldviews as Native English language speakers. Language revitalization is at once about continuing and cherishing our worldviews, about moving forward as people who have experienced cultural loss, and about acknowledging the link that our language and culture provide between our ancestors, ourselves and our progeny.

2.1.3 Strengthening Our Families

Family and children form an important part of motivation for many of the participants I interviewed. With critically endangered languages, the group of people committed to speaking is often small, and in many instances are also family (Yamamoto and Yamamoto 2004, 12-15; Hinton 2013; Hinton 1994), and children play a major part in the hopes of any language revitalization effort (Hinton 1994; Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 1; Nicholas 2004, 2). Furthermore, for critically endangered language learners, using family as a source of motivation addresses some concerns for critically endangered speaking communities articulated by Hinton and others. While some revitalization efforts—including those going on in Eugene—require that speakers teach adults before having the capacity to teach children, the goal of teaching adults is so that children can again speak the language (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 3-6). Families certainly make up an important part of community. I have chosen to separate this section from the community section because of the particular importance of the family for the interviewees, and because I believe this is evidence that leaning on one’s own family or close friends’ family networks can be an effective way to build a speaking community. This has implications
outside our group, as families can be an excellent place to recruit new speakers, get support from those close to you, maintain a tight-knit and positive group, and find like-minded people.

However, working with your family has its own struggles. Below, I will discuss these issues by first discussing how using family can act to motivate people to use their target languages. From there, I will speak about how supporting one’s family and providing cultural and spiritual enrichment for them through speaking, learning and sharing the language can be a motivator. Finally, I will explore some of the struggles that working with family can present.

For many of the participants, family was an especially important motivator. Speakers especially identified children within their families as powerful motivators for them to learn the language. Families appear to play some very important roles in enabling or damaging language revitalization efforts in the home. This is not surprising, given that many people live with their families, or depend upon them for support and inspiration in other areas of their lives. Conversely, family problems logically interfere with home-based language learning; family conflicts do not cease to exist simply because people within the family have decided that language revitalization is an important undertaking. Lastly, learning language in the home can change family dynamics (Reyhner et al. 2009, 114-115).

For example, the experiences of Māori language nesters have demonstrated that parent-child dynamics experience unique benefits and challenges from language nesting. Investigating and taking notes of these challenges is an opportunity to both strengthen our resolve to learn our languages, and to anticipate potential conflicts that may occur in our personal lives as we commit our time to speaking our languages.

For Ch’ee-see-ne and Tr’aa-ne, family provided the spark of motivation that they needed to start studying the language more seriously. They are a good example of how
family can provide positive momentum to encourage learning. For Tr’aa-ne, taking part in language was a way to stay involved with her husband and children. She describes the benefits to her family life by noting that “belonging comes to mind. As people in my family became interested in learning the language, then I wanted to take part in it as a family event or a family activity…” (2013) Her husband Ch’ee-see-ne echoes this sentiment:

It was a family project that got me launched into learning Dee-ni’, and that’s part of what is important for language learning for me is to do my part, be part of an ongoing family project of learning language, transferring language, working with cultural materials, ancestral materials.

One struggle when revitalizing a language is to create an environment, however small, in which there is positive pressure to learn the language (Reyhner et al. 2009, 4, 18, 119; Reyhner et al. 2003, 27). Language revitalization can be a lonely and stressful experience, as we will discuss later, and activities that present learning the language as normal, desirable and expected are invaluable because they combat feelings of loneliness, stress and being overwhelmed. Using family to create a strong but small community set of expectations can be one way to overcome some of those negative feelings. Tr’aa-ne’s initial interest in the language shows how important it is to find some community when you are learning. Tr’aa-ne also shows how our feelings towards our family can help us to take action:

[B]ecom[ing] fluent in another language [has] always been just a long term goal in my life... when the opportunity came up for my family, you guys [her children] and Dad [Ch’ee-see-ne] and everybody got excited about studying Dee-ni’, then I thought that that would be a better language than any other language to put effort into learning because there aren’t very many speakers, and because it has a cultural meaning and connection to our family. I think there’s a huge connection between language and culture, and I have a hope that I can help play a role in our family keeping that connection going.

While learning another language has been one of Tr’aa-ne’s goals for a long time, it was only after her family began working on their ancestral language in the home that Tr’aa-ne decided to give fluency in Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ her attention. Her decision gives an
important clue about how to motivate people to learn language in the home. By aligning her personal motivation to become bilingual with a need that she perceived for her family, Tr’aa-ne has been able to motivate herself to begin learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ in the home. By connecting personal motivations with family wellbeing, motivation to learn language becomes tied to existing familial relationships. In turn, we may have success in motivating more people. One reason that this might be true is that working to revitalize a language for one’s community can be dauntingly abstract; bringing it back to family helps make the work more concrete.

Another important motivational role that family can play is that learning the language helps to create links between one’s culture, ancestral ways, and family, which in turn act to strengthen the family (Hinton 2013, 38-9). Above, both Tr’aa-ne and Ch’ee-see-ne alluded to this. Implicit in their decision to learn Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ was a recognition that participating in “family activities” or “family undertakings” is a good way to strengthen your family. This is also another example of how personal motivations initially unrelated to language, such as the desire to have a strong and healthy family, can be realized by undertaking language revitalization efforts. By giving the family a task to work on together, it is possible to draw on learners’ motivation to create a healthy family in order to revitalize their target language. In this way, one ties their motivations for language learning together with their motivation to have a closer family.

Tr’aa~xe explains a very different way that at-home language use can strengthen the family. She states that “we wanted to be able to have the kids know who they are, because without the language, the culture really changes. And in order to understand who they are as Dee-ni’ people, language will need to survive” (2013). While Ch’ee-see-ne and Tr’aa-ne saw the act of the learning the language together as beneficial for their family, Tr’aa~xe notes that the values and identity kept within Dee-ni’ can also provide benefit to
a family. Dee-ni’ language offers a way for children to know find their identity, and have handed down to them a value system that is precious to Dee-ni’ people. Similarly, Shghee-tr’e states “the main reason I want to learn it [Dee-ni’] is to be a part of their culture and make sure that they have as much access to it as possible; being their mom and learning it too is the way to make that happen” (2013). Being involved in this family undertaking is a way to ensure that her children receive a meaningful and healthy upbringing.

Shghee-tr’e spoke about how supporting her spouse in learning the language is a way that she can become closer to her family; she also discussed some of the difficulties around learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ as someone married into a Native family. She relates:

I like that we’re learning Dee-ni’ and I really feel excited about being a part of that and I feel really honored to be a part of that, not being a Native person...feeling so welcome into being a part of that, that feels really...I don’t know, it makes me feel like a part of the family. Then in some ways, that makes me feel a little bit guilty, like I’m kind of attaching on to this culture, and maybe leaving mine behind just a tiny bit in doing so...

Shghee-tr’e’s insights into integrating into her in-laws culture and family demonstrate once again how family and family dynamics can play a powerful role in motivating us to learn language in the home. While the language has been a bonding point for Shghee-tr’e and the rest of the family, it has also presented Shghee-tr’e with difficult choices. Raising her family in an environment so focused on Dee-ni’ cultural revitalization has left little time for her Salvadorian heritage to be passed down to her children. Shghee-tr’e expresses mixed feelings about this; amongst these is the possibility that she is “attaching herself” to a culture to which she doesn’t belong.

Family is a large part of what Shghee-tr’e shared with me as a motivator for her. Supporting Shchee-le’s interest in language revitalization has given Shghee-tr’e a new closeness with her family (specifically her in-laws). For others working to revitalize their language with people from outside their community or neighboring communities, it is
valuable to recognize and confront the feeling that you do not belong. From a practical standpoint, feeling alienated from the language you are working on can be a powerful demotivator. One strategy to address these feelings can be found in Bringing our Languages Home (Hinton 2013). Several contributors within the book articulate a view that languages are a bounty to be shared and cherished within one's family. Making explicit that this is true even when some members of your family may have married into the community provides motivation to empower your family. Nourishing the bounty of your language can help your family move forward together, regardless of each family members' connection to the language.

Family dynamics can also pose obstacles to staying motivated (Reyhner et al. 2009, 114-115). For example, Shchee-le and I started learning together in the home in 2006. At that time, we all spent a lot of time at my parents' together; it became a home environment where Shchee-le and I felt comfortable exploring and using the language in everyday life. Shlha'-e, however, had a different experience:

It started with you and [Shchee-le]...at home [in 2006-7] and that wasn't something that I was doing. I mean there's family relationship dynamics that weren't working, obviously then...I mean personally I was dealing with things that kind of just caused me to push all that away when you guys were doing it.

Just as family can act to tie together everyone's motivations into a “project,” pain around family can impede at-home learning. While Shchee-le and I were able to work together, we were not able to include Shlha'-e. His then-rocky relationship learning language from family members exposes an important point to consider when bringing language learning into your home and life: language learning is not exempt from existing difficulties in your relationships with your family. Bringing language into your life means that the painful or unresolved parts of your life will also interact with the language.
Ch’vs-ne describes how organizations such as AICLS can provide a potential solution to the personal nature of learning with one’s family by creating structure that helps form productive family/language learner relationships:

Being around other people [who are also doing Master Apprentice and] who are learning language, [you get to] see what’s working for them. You know, understanding like...how this relationship needs to work. You have to go beyond, you know father-son, or mother-son or mother or grandma, or grandparent. Usually it is family members who want to do a Master Apprentice, [so AICLS provides a good model].

While at-home learning has unique challenges because of family dynamics, it also provides an opportunity for collaboration within families. In this way, language learning can be a vehicle for families to grow strong together. This isn’t to say that Master Apprentice or other methods will instantly eliminate family conflict, but instead to note that there are models of learning that take into account existing family relationships.

One’s home, and by extension one’s family, form a fundamental and critical aspect of revitalizing language (Reyhner et al 2009, vi). With regards to one’s family, this means that there have opportunities to grow, move past old scars and grudges, and rise upwards together by growing closer through mutual commitment to language use. However, it also means that language-in-the-home efforts may force one to confront painful parts of relationships within families; these issues do not disappear when one brings their ancestral language into their home. Instead of looking at this as a daunting or negative thing, I suggest that we view language learning as an opportunity for familial, as well as personal, growth. The above testimony demonstrates how family can be a powerful motivator for learning language. Moreover, it shows us that language learning can help us to draw closer to our family by undertaking cultural and language revitalization projects together.
2.2 Enrichment and Healing as Motivations for Learning Language

In addition to the motivations that different types of community play in motivating language learners, more personal motivations also play a strong role. Below, I will describe two ways that personal benefits of language learning impacted interviewees’ motivation. First, I will discuss the opportunities that language learning provides for personal and cultural enrichment, and fun. Second, I will describe how language learners are motivated by the ability of their languages to cultivate health and promote stability in their lives.

2.2.1 Opportunities for Cultural and Personal Enrichment

Literature seeking to popularize the plight of endangered languages often emphasizes the danger that these cultures face in a globalized world (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Reyhner et al. 2009, 192; Hinton and Hale 2001, 3-4). While these dangers are real and weigh heavily on language revitalization, it is also an undertaking that can be full of fun and unique enjoyment. A key motivation that many interviewees shared was an enjoyment for the work of learning and speaking their languages.

Ch’vs-ne describes how Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ is a way for him to cut loose with friends, for Ch’vs-ne speaking is “actually fun, too, for me being in public and being able to gossip about people in the language if I wanted to and I know no one knows what I’m saying” (2013). Ch’vs-ne is able to connect with me and others through Dee-ni’; he and have a lot of jokes this way. The unique character of our language and the relationship we have built together through working on the language gives these jokes and moments a special significance. In Indigenous Language Revitalization, Margaret Noori relates a similar anecdote about her kids being able to joke in public using the Anishnaabemowin. She describes this benefit for her daughters as “see[ing] the language as a way to laugh with one another when the world isn’t listening” (Reyhner et al. 2009, 18). Her statement
captures the significance of being able to communicate in Dee-ni’ in the public sphere: it
gives us a space to be ourselves, despite living in a world that can’t “hear” us. This
statement is literal in one sense—no one else is likely to understand us—but is also
profound because it points out that the world of monolingual, American existence does not
listen to us. That is to say, it pretends that we don’t exist.

On a lighter note, overlooking the simple good times that Dee-ni’ has given us
would be shortchanging an important part of speaking the language: having fun. More
fundamentally, it is a unique enrichment of our relationship that exists specifically within
the context of Dee-ni’. The jokes and experiences we share in our language may not be able
to occur in another language. At the very least, they would be altered in connotation and
significance. Here I am reminded of a phrase passed from my grandmother to my
generation by her grandmother. I often heard that my great-great-grandma Rachel, to my
knowledge the last Tututni speaker in my family, would tell my granny “everything is
funnier in Indian.” Captured within this statement is the recognition that not all
knowledge is conveyed equally by every language. Enjoying good times in Native
languages can be a special motivation because it connects speakers to their community in
a unique and fun way.

For others, the act of learning and teaching a language is itself a fun activity. Tupol,
who started learning Puget Salish at age eleven, describes how she got involved as a
language teacher while still in high school. Growing up, Tupol relates how “We didn’t have
any teachers, so I was the one who kind of took it on. [I] was just teaching what I did know.
And I did that mostly just because I enjoyed it and it was fun” (2013). While Tupol also
describes feeling concerned about the condition of her language at the time later in the
interview, it was the enjoyment of teaching that originally drew her to become committed
to learning, using and teaching Lushootseed. Hinton and Hale (2001) emphasize the
importance of a dedicated and hardworking core of people in any language revitalization
effort (3). I would add that the people involved should also enjoy speaking, learning and
教学 their language, because language revitalization relies heavily on one’s ability to
work independently and assume responsibility for one’s own progress in using and/or
teaching language (Nicholas 2004, 14), and to do this work without enjoying it would be
unbelievably tedious. Tupal’s success with Lushootseed is a great model for others who
really enjoy their languages as they are learning them; she is an encouragement to others
who think they want to take a next step in language revitalization. Her case is also a
reminder that finding motivation for learning Native languages is much easier if you are
someone who is interested in speaking the language for enjoyment’s sake. If you are one of
these people—or know one of them—please encourage yourself or anyone you know who
fits that profile to speak their Native language! Shchee-le also finds the process of language
learning to be enjoyable in its own right. He relates that:

One big thing is I think it’s really fun to learn language and I find it really interesting.
That’s one reason why I like to study languages. It’s challenging and interesting, but it’s
also just really fun to figure things out and remember words and to be like discovering
how to say things. That’s one big motivation is [that learning Dee-ni’ is] intellectually
rewarding but it’s also fun.

Shchee-le identifies two major parts that lead him to enjoy learning Dee-ni’. The
first stems from his interest in learning other languages, and the challenge of acquiring
new vocabulary and using it. The second point of interest for him is in the thrill of
discovering how to express ideas in the language. For at-home language revitalization, this
is an endless experience. Searching through archived materials and picking the brains of
any advanced speakers that we may have access to are the only way that our Dee-ni’
community in Eugene has to answer questions about the grammar of the language.
Shchee-le relates how exciting it is to dig and have those questions answered, then put
that knowledge back into use. There is a certain kind of exhilaration to being unable to
express an idea, then dwelling on it and finding a grammatically clumsy way around your lack of knowledge, only to discover later a much more elegant way of expressing what you mean. For some of us, this search and its rewards provide a powerful motivation to keep learning the language.

2.2.2 Promoting Health, Healing and Stability

The relationship between language and health was something that several interviewees spoke about. Learning the language was associated with benefits to health, and for Ch’ee-see-ne and Ch’vs-ne in particular, the language is a way to heal and stabilize one’s emotional, mental and spiritual life. Ch’ee-see-ne states that a major part of his motivation to learn the language stems from its health benefits for him:

I think a lot of it [what motivates him to learn stories and speak Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’] is just stability. It’s like psychological, mental defense. A lot of my work that I do, entertainment that I expose myself to, words that I read in newspapers or words that I listen to on the radio, I don’t really have a sense that it’s stabilizing or supporting or healing or [is] healthy. I don’t think a lot of the words I’m exposed to are...helping me make community or connect with people, but I never have a doubt with the words, the work that I do with stories. I never have a doubt that that’s really a support for healing and stability in my life. So I have that confidence that it’s a healing thing to do.

Learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ gives Ch’ee-see-ne emotional and mental health. Memorizing stories and practicing speaking in Dee-ni’ are themselves exercises that makes the mind more limber; there is an abundance of second-language acquisition literature that shows that learning another language is good for the mind (Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2009, 26). However, Ch’ee-see-ne also notes the benefits of the language in providing a stable and coherent influence on his mind. Ch’ee-see-ne contrasts this to news and entertainment media in the US, which he describes as generally not healthy for him. One possible explanation is that learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ gives Ch’ee-see-ne the ability to see and appreciate the world in a way that enriches him and emphasizes different
priorities than those found within modern, globalized English. Ch’ee-see-ne’s observation is significant as an example of how learning an endangered language can be an act of self-improvement. Bearing this in mind, Ch’ee-see-ne’s motivation for his own mental health can be channeled through learning the language; Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ gives learners a chance to improve their mental stability and health.

Ch’ee-see-ne also relates how he uses the language to promote his spiritual health. He states that “I’ve also used them [the stories] in sweating. In places where we’re sweating as a family, having a sweat ceremony and having to stay in a sweatlodge for a prolonged period. It helps with that, I’ve found that it’s helped with that” (2013). Others have also connected language and spiritual health. For example Mary Fox—an Ojibwe elder—is quoted in Reyhner et al. (2009) as stating “Without the language, we are warm bodies without a spirit” (42). Fox’s statement reveals how essential the connection between language and spiritual health is for Native communities. Similarly, reciting the stories during ceremony enhances Ch’ee-see-ne’s ability to care for his spiritual health. It promotes his continuation of cultural traditions that have been passed down to Indian people to help us stay healthy. Learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ supports these prayerful activities, which can provide a powerful motivation to anyone seeking spiritual health. Ch’vs-ne also relates how he sees the language as important to spiritual health, and how this motivates him:

I think it goes back to identity just with the language loss and our history and whatnot. There are many things that go into the identity of an Indian person. It’s defined legally by blood quantum sometimes. It’s defined by cultural knowledge, which includes language. So I see it as Indian people are this shell, in a sense what’s in that shell defines them. I think that when as an Indian person you don’t know the language or you don’t know cultural practices, there’s a hole in that shell. And you know it’s there. And you might not know what exactly it needs to be filled

---

5 For more on the role of Native languages in providing valuable alternative ways of thought, see Hinton (1994).
with, but you know somewhere why it's there... there’s knowledge, that you want to know. Because of your ancestry, of who you are. But when it’s not there, it eats at you. So you’re not as healthy of a person.

Knowing that something is absent in your life, but not knowing how to fill that space is a particular and frustrating kind of pain (Hinton 2013, 81-2). Ch’vs-ne notes that not knowing your language, and at the same time realizing that you are missing an aspect of who you consider yourself and your people to be, is something that "eats at you;" it hurts you. He describes how Indian people can be thought of as fragments of a shell; the more pieces of the shell are brought together, the more whole and healthy that person becomes. From Ch’vs-ne’s perspective, learning the language promotes the spiritual health of an Indian person by replacing emptiness in them with cultural and self knowledge, and a strengthened identity. The potential of language to build spiritual and mental health in Indian people is a motivation for Ch’vs-ne, who sees language revitalization as a avenue for community revitalization:

It’s healing. [When you learn your language] there’s not that sore anymore. I think...it heals individuals and when you heal individuals, it heals the community they’re in. And it can grow. I mean, Indian country's [messed] up. I mean, it really is. So, I see this as a way...to make it better. It will lead towards healing, because I think a lot of people are ashamed, they don’t know...they don't know about their culture...

Describing not knowing one’s ancestral language as a sore is a useful metaphor in understanding why community members become motivated to learn and teach their languages. Seeing one’s neighbors, family and even one’s self afflicted by sores begs some sort of treatment. Furthermore, Ch’vs-ne's description goes a long way in explaining a certain kind of motivation: there is a certain kind of urgency to wanting to heal a sore—one frets and pokes at a wound, not knowing what to do at the foreign mass staring back up at them. These private wounds that people bear—envision infections that stink and are hidden under bandages and long-sleeved shirts—can also carry shame with them. Ch’vs-
ne expands on this idea by noting that learning one’s language is a way to overcome one’s shame about being an uncultured person. In doing so, he exposes another way in which viewing language loss as a physical sore expands our understanding. Sores can also stigmatize; people with visible skin conditions are often ostracized. Likewise, when a Native person loses their language and access to the cultural information within it, others’ may perceive them as a less “authentic” Indian; within the Native community one may also be perceived as ignorant or otherwise backwards. Both these judgments are a burden. More important than others’ perception is the fact that the sore of language loss lowers the quality of a person’s life. Carrying a sore reduces one’s capacity to move, work and enjoy one’s self.

Ch’vs-ne relates injuries to loss of language and in doing so points out that learning one’s language will provide numerous benefits, and increase quality of life. Just as someone who has suffered from an open wound on their body must adjust their daily behavior to accommodate for their wound, go through shame and effort to hide their wound, and deal with the actual pain of the wound, so is it with communities experiencing language loss. They have to adjust their cultural practices by inviting English into spaces previously reserved for their Native languages, they have to confront shame about being unsuccessful in perpetuating their cultural heritage, they are impoverished by a lack of access to language-specific information, and they have to deal with the emotional pain of language loss as if it were a wound. Ch’vs-ne’s metaphor shows us how language learning can be a way to heal some of these ills in Native communities. Native language has the potential to nourish and heal by acting as a cultural cornerstone (Hinton 2013, 118). While Ch’ee-see-ne gave us a better understanding of how Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ can heal and nourish a person, Ch’vs-ne applies a similar line of thought at a community level. However, both
men use the healing potential of language as a motivation to learn and revitalize Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’.

By exploring Ch’vs-ne and Ch’ee-see-ne’s motivation to create a healthier life for themselves and their community by learning Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’, we have also come to a larger understanding: that language revitalization is also about health. This truth extends beyond motivation, and into challenges with learning. Ch’vs-ne describes how thinking of language loss as a sore also helps explain some peoples’ reluctance to learn their language:

It is super sensitive, when you try to heal it. It’s like if you had a huge sore on your chest, and you went to someone and said “Oh, can you help? I need to know this,” or something, and they just started poking at it. “Well let’s see what it is…,” Instead of just working around it, or asking about it. I don’t know, it’s hard, I think.

People are often guarded about their wounds. Something that I constantly remind myself is that language revitalization is inherently a very personal undertaking: everyone is personally invested in the work (Hinton 2013, 16). However, people are personally invested in different ways. Using the metaphor of a wound helps to form a mental image about how to be careful and nurturing with people as they begin to work on their languages. However, I also believe this metaphor carries some problems with it. Namely, it can lead to a focus on negative aspects of the process of language revitalization. Instead of focusing on the positive aspects of learning the language, such as cultural enrichment, it focuses on the negative aspects, on the wound itself. While this may seem like an obtuse point, it is an important distinction. If we are going to think of language loss as a wound, and language revitalization as healing, it is very important that we do so in a way that emphasizes our capacity to heal, instead of emphasizing the severity of the wound. This way, people will enjoy their health as it increases, and be able to face the task of healing with grace.
In addition to spiritual and mental health, physical health can be a challenge, as well. Shlha’-’e describes how when he is living an unhealthy lifestyle, it is demotivating to him:

Then the other thing is, I mean like...exercise, diet, you know, sleep. I haven’t always been at my healthiest. I don’t learn as much when I’m not as mentally sharp. So friends are part of it, too. Definitely have to cut back hanging out with some people just because of the lifestyle they lead.

Like committing to any long-term undertaking (e.g. school), it becomes important to take care of one’s body and mind so that one can perform the tasks in front of them. This is another example of how language revitalization can change people. It is hard to do, and requires that people re-evaluate how they’re spending your time. Shlha’-’e relates how a less healthy lifestyle made it harder for him to do language revitalization work. Conversely, for ?əswəli health problems present a challenge. He says about his health “when I don’t feel well, when I’m low on energy [I don’t speak Lushootseed]. And that seems to be a constant, when people are sick, they’re going to have a hard time focusing on reclaiming domains and keeping things going” (2013). As far as solutions for this problem, ?əswəli and I discussed that health must come before language (?əswəli, 2013). In other words, it is not productive to destroy yourself trying to revitalize a language. ?əswəli explains how he slows down and focuses on his health when he is feeling down:

Now, I keep my language nest going for myself in the kitchen. But oftentimes I will revert to English for other things that I would normally do in Lushootseed. So it’s just something that I’ve accepted. That’s one of the things that happens and I’ll try to keep going as long as I can, but I’m only human, you know? Doing the best I can.

Looking at language and its relation to health provides several valuable realizations. As ?əswəli alluded to, knowing when to give one’s self a break is a valuable skill to have while doing language revitalization. At the same time, Ch’ee-see-ne and Ch’vs-ne demonstrated how actively using one’s language can be healing to our psyches and spirits. So, while taking breaks forms an important part of maintaining a consistent effort,
language can also be a remedy for what ails us. In other words, health impacts language learning, and language impacts health.
3.0 Challenges to Motivation in At-Home Language Learning

In addition to the motivations discussed above, learners face several types of challenges as they attempt to revitalize language use in their daily lives. While the above sections include descriptions of how motivators can at times backfire (e.g. family dynamics), the following section is dedicated to discussing obstacles to motivation that interviewees experienced and struggled with.

3.1 The Potential for Commitment to Language Revitalization to Overwhelm

Because Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed are critically endangered languages and little support exists for learners, it is easy to feel overwhelmed while undertaking at-home learning. Dealing with feelings that learning is a lifelong commitment can be extremely overwhelming given that perpetuating Native cultures is something of personal, community and spiritual importance to language learners (Hinton 2013, 4; King). Gaining a better understanding of why people may feel overwhelmed, and exploring some strategies people are using to get through these feelings is essential to maintaining a sound mind while working on one’s language. One challenge for learners is the work commitment that at-home language learning requires. Ch’vs-ne told me about growing up while his father was doing extensive work on Tolowa Dee-ni’, and what he thought it would be like to learn the language:

But actually putting [in] the time...I guess I didn’t really know what that meant back then, either. I thought “Oh I can just talk to my dad and then I’ll kind of learn it.” And that doesn’t work. Just with that mentality, it’s a lot more intense, everything needs more planning than that.

Ch’vs-ne’s comment highlights a truth about speaking and learning an endangered language—it is a substantial commitment. One reason for this is that there is little-to-no outside support for people seeking to use their languages on a daily basis. While language programs provide information about the language, there are precious few organized
resources for those seeking to promote and use their language in their daily life. While earlier sections have detailed how the commitment of learning one's language can also be an act of self-improvement and act to increase one's health, it must also be noted that this commitment can be very draining.

Shlha’-e describes feeling unprepared for the commitment that language revitalization poses. It is certainly overwhelming to study language and realize just how much work there is to be done for a language to even be documented adequately, let alone spoken in homes again. As a young man beginning to learn his ancestral language in adulthood, Shlha’-e finds the stark truth that a language’s fate lies in the hands of a few people to be frightening:

I think fear is...a big emotion for me with all of that. I know I should be something, but there’s the fear of responsibility for one, of what does it mean when you are being involved with this work? What does that mean about how, the commitments you’re willing to make and are having to make? And there’s guilt around that, for not knowing if I’m...if I was ready and still not knowing if I’m ready, able, capable... if I work hard enough.

The feeling Shlha’-e is articulating is one I have heard from many involved in language revitalization. There is a huge weight associated with recognizing the value of an ancestral language. The root of this weight lies in part in the fact that no one is speaking it. In effect, one realizes how precious something is only to immediately notice that it is falling out of the world.

Ch’vs-ne and Tr’aa-~xe expressed the weight of responsibility that accompanies committing to work on Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’. For Tr’aa-~xe, the choice to work on the language was a moral imperative; to not do so was in effect to become complicit to the loss of Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ from the world. She describes how the choice for her and Ch’vs-ne as being a choice to “do it, or make a conscious decision to let the language die, which we weren’t ready to [do].” Tr’aa-~xe’s statement exposes a complication of working on Native
languages. To commit oneself to speaking an endangered language means to recognize the value of these languages to our communities. Moreover, it implies an acceptance of responsibility for the health of the language.

One strategy that many speakers and allies have identified to help them stay positive while accepting this responsibility is to apply the idea of the language as a living entity (ʔəswəli, 2013; King; Reyhner et al. 2009, 6-7, 19-20; Hinton 2013, 20). Instead of viewing the language as on a path to extinction, it can be helpful to remember that the language and culture are a part of a legacy, an entity in themselves that can visit and inspire us. While some might dismiss this point as being only a coping mechanism, I would argue that it represents part of an alternative learning strategy, and an Indigenous philosophical view. By viewing ourselves as part of a continuum between our ancestors, present community and future generations, we gain a better perspective on what our roles may be, as well as an understanding that this effort did not start with us, and will not end with us. Striking a balance between responsibility and humility requires simultaneously acknowledging our ability to positively influence the status of our ancestral languages, while also recognizing that we are not exceptional saviors of our languages. To do otherwise carries the risk feeling so overwhelmed that one can become paralyzed. Additionally, the ego associated with thinking of oneself as an exceptional language learner can engender strife within the community, and prevent one from collaborating effectively with others (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., October 13, 2013). Therefore, adopting the mentality discussed above may be in the interest of speakers’ philosophical, mental and spiritual health, in addition to being a practical decision to promote language use.

One way that interviewees described to cope with the commitment of speaking their languages is to couch their language use within activities that benefit them. This way, their commitment to language use becomes a commitment to self-improvement and
positive change. For Ch’ee-see-ne, this means attaching his language use to learning ancestral stories, a favorite activity of his:

The stories for me are the primary, the language has come second. The primary vehicle has been the stories. I’ve been really committed to the stories, and now I’m committed to the stories in a different form and I can see that it’s an improved form and I’m committed to that. And I’m happy to be doing that.

From Ch’ee-see-ne’s perspective, learning ancestral stories is his primary commitment. Translating these stories back into Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ becomes an improvement to an activity that he feels happy to undertake. Forming these positive associations between language use, other commitments, and feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment is another strategy to address feeling overwhelmed by commitment. The idea of improvement is critical here. Instead of seeing language as a terminal situation, the perspective articulated by Ch’ee-see-ne sees the language as something growing. The fundamental difference in perspective between seeing someone as ill, and seeing someone as recovering or rehabilitating lends an entirely different perspective to making commitments towards the continued health of that person. Language revitalization is often described in terms of illness and death. For example, languages are described as moribund, deceased, or extinct (Grenoble Whaley 2006; Hinton and Hale 2001, 13). I argue that this viewpoint can be taken further. Instead of viewing our situation as analogous to organ failure, we can view our situation as that of someone re-learning how to walk after a major surgery. The difference is subtle, but major. By rehabilitating our languages, we focus on our growth and improving mobility and use of our languages, and not on the specter of language loss hanging over us.

3.2 Dealing with Stress from Language Learning and from Elsewhere

Seven of the participants identified stress as a major obstacle to learning their target language in the home. There are several types of stress that blocked peoples’
learning, from feeling overwhelmed about managing language revitalization with other 
priorities in life to frustration about not being able to easily communicate in the language. 
However, whatever the stressful situation was, participants were emphatic that stress was 
a main obstacle in using language in their everyday lives.

Ch'ee-see-ne spoke about priorities, and how making language more of a priority 
over his work could make learning easier in some ways, and more difficult in others:

Work actually is a prompt for me, probably if I stopped working it'd be more of an 
obstacle, because when I'm working I go out on a walk and when I go on a walk I 
recite at least one of the stories I've been memorizing...If I wasn't working so 
much, [there would be] ways to get around the lack of reliable word sources...I 
feel one of them is to call people and ask them. I think one of the reasons I don't do 
that is that I feel stressed, I feel like I don't have enough time.

Ch'ee-see-ne also identified what's at the root of this stress. Ch'ee-see-ne describes 
how "I have this concept that people have priorities and language isn't...isn't that 
important for other people and myself. I could have a different attitude about that, I could 
change my attitude. So, my attitude is an obstacle." Ch'ee-see-ne's answer reveals a lot 
about how stress and other challenges interfere with language learning. Stress can be 
thought of as worrying excessively or chronically about a problem. Important to language 
revitalization is a seemingly unrelated fact about stress: to be stressed about something 
means that one has to find it important in one way or another. Language revitalizers have 
identified working with language as very important to them, and they are now balancing 
this priority with other factors of their lives they consider important. So, while Ch'ee-see- 
ne has identified Dee-ni' Wee-ya' as an important aspect of his life (i.e. one worth stressing 
over), his bosses have not to the extent that they haven't agreed to pay Ch'ee-see-ne to 
learn his language at home instead of teaching. Likewise, there is not sufficient support 
through tribal programs for families who want to dedicate their lives to learning in the 
home.
For learners stress can come from several places, including the stress of undertaking such a culturally important, emotionally charged and difficult task, the stress that comes from carving out space in one’s life—a struggle Ch’ee-see-ne faced—for another thing one finds important, or stress from dealing with a lack of support or infrastructure as one attempts to revitalize their language in the home. Tr’aa~xe spoke at length about how stress can discourage her from speaking:

If something’s going on, maybe it’s stressful or something, then we don’t speak as much, which I think is interesting. Because it’s harder to deal with the stress and deal with translating what you want to say. It becomes just another stressor, so rather than deal with that, you knock off the one you don’t have to do, so you can deal with what you actually have to work on.

Juggling language revitalization with already existing obligations and priorities in one’s life is a difficult task. For Tr’aa~xe, part of this stress has to do with her lack of ability to communicate as easily over whatever is distressing her. In other words, Tr’aa~xe cannot always express herself quickly in a stressful situation, which makes using the language more difficult. To commit to using a language during stressful situations means that one is in effect sacrificing some of one’s ability to deal with these situations effectively, at least in the short term (Hinton 2013, 90-1). Many strategies to address stressful situations are likely to depend on the use of the dominant language (e.g. call a friend to express one’s frustrations, cussing, talking it over, praying, etc.), leaving one hamstrung to deal with them while staying in one’s target language. However, the language provides unique opportunities for dealing with stressful situations, as well. Below, Tr’aa~xe also describes how the Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’e can be used to diffuse stressful situations:

One thing...the kids have really helped me with is that during that [stressful situations] lots of our endearment [is] in the language...that breaks the pattern of stress. So I don’t know how to [overcome stress], cause you can’t get rid of stress and you can’t get rid of obstacles that come up or random people that you run into. But learning to handle it in a better way could probably help lower the stress, so
help you stay in the language more...It’s actually really kind of powerful. They [her kids] can tell when you’re stressed and they feel your energy. [The kids] break that [when they use the language]...and anything when you’re stressed to break the pattern of being stressed helps relieve the stress. Anything that helps relieve [stress] is beneficial.

One hopeful aspect of Tr’aa~-xe’s strategy for dealing with stress is the role that Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ and her children played in breaking patterns of stress. While the emotional stakes of learning the language can add to a stressful situation—e.g. not only am I stressed, but am now also failing to use my target language—these same emotional stakes can also bolster us against stress. Tr’aa~-xe described the overwhelming positive feelings that come from her children expressing their love in the language. This positivity “breaks the pattern” of stress that Tr’aa~-xe faces. It is especially important that people revitalizing languages who also have limited resources take careful stock of what capacity they have (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 48). Inventorying ways that we can use the language to reduce stress and increase our mental health is one way that we can make something out of nothing—to borrow a common expression. In other words, this is a resource our languages provide that does not require outside investment. Because of our precarious situation, we have to be especially resourceful; using Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ as a solution to stress not only removes a demotivator to using the language, but does so in a way that further promotes language use.

The ability of Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ to break patterns of stress is a promising one. One major benefit to learning the language that Shlha’-’e and ?əswəl have identified is that it “changes you” (2013). One way that the language can change you is by pushing you to adopt new patterns in your life. Idioms in the language are an example of this. A Taa-laa-wa proverb which states that we shouldn’t waste food has caused me to look at my eating habits with more care (Bommelyn 2006, 93). Ultimately, it has caused me to try to waste less food. Similarly, by acting as a tool to break stressful situations, maybe our languages
can help us to permanently break patterns of stress. Certain stresses are inherent within a lifestyle. For example, stress over missing work is influenced by the eight-to-five work day. By changing ourselves through the language, we can give ourselves new tools to deal with stress. At the same time, we alter the patterns of our lives. In my experience, making this transition between priorities of modern life, and priorities of language and cultural revitalization can itself be stressful. However, Tr’aa—a-xe’s experience shows that while we may be in a state of flux between stresses, priorities and lifestyles, our languages can help us to break patterns of stress.

Learning a language in the home means inviting the mind of that language into one’s everyday life; it is a personal rather than academic undertaking. Recognizing the benefits that this can have on one’s ability to deal with personal stress is one way to appreciate the value of the language. Tupal describes how taking a more accepting view of stress helps her to deal with stressful situations:

Even though it [learning language] does sometimes [turn into a stressful thing], just accept it, that you get stressed out over anything. And just, realize that what you’re doing is important work and it needs to be done with the right mind—you can’t mess with it. Unless you want to...and it won’t be good.

Tupal’s description of keeping a good mind is a good reminder that stress begets stress, and that sometimes the best way to deal with stress is to acknowledge it and move on. Tupal is expressing an important value I have heard expressed by both Lushootseed and Dee-ni’ people (Bommelyn 2006; Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 25, 2013): one must focus one’s mind in a positive way to achieve a positive outcome. From this perspective, stress is an obstacle only because it keeps people from maintaining a good mind. When viewed this way, removing stress is a practical goal to achieving one’s goals as much as it is about one’s health.
In their home, roommates ʔəswəl and Tupał spend the majority of their time in Lushootseed. They are the people in our community closest to speaking only in their target language. However, stress continues to be a major obstacle for their speaking. ʔəswəl offers no solution for being stressed, stating that it is a problem he is still trying to understand and overcome. This is a reminder that stress appears to be an obstacle that will face language revitalizers even as they meet success. ʔəswəl describes how “One [demotivator] is if I’m upset or something stressful is going on, I resort to English. That’s the biggest challenge. It’s interesting that I find that when I tell people that [they say] ‘Oh wow! The same thing happened to me’” (2013). The pervasiveness of stress as a demotivator is a good indicator that learners would do well to plan for how to deal with stress as they move forward revitalizing Native languages. Tr’aa~xe and Tupał have offered us potential solutions based on using the language and its values to reduce stress. An additional strategy that ʔəswəl is exploring involves reclaiming the domains (please see later section on reclaiming domains for a more in-depth discussion of this method) of stress:

I’m trying different things... In my class I teach online, we’re doing a unit on how to express yourself. And it’s starting with, “I enjoy visiting with relatives,” “I enjoy going to see a movie and this and that”...to “I get bored when so-and-so tells me about this over and over again.” “That really irritates me, when the cat eats from the butter dish or whatever they want to say,” to “I’m really getting pissed off, back off,” to “I told you to stop doing that.” [Let’s] do a formalized unit on it, let’s reclaim these domains. Because it’s going to give it conscious energy...Because part of it may be, it’s our Native language and it’s sacred...It’s our heart, it’s the home, it’s how we start our day. Do we have kind of psychological aversion to say, you know, “Bug off. This is none of your business.” And not wanting to say harsh things. But we say harsh things...So that’s part of it, just exploring...consciously reclaiming that domain. Rather than just saying “I’m going try to speak Lushootseed all day,” Saying,“ and when I get upset, I’m going try to keep that thinking in Lushootseed.”

ʔəswəl’s ongoing experiment with reclaiming domains that involve stress, irritation and other negative emotions highlights the issues above. While at-home
language learning is an opportunity to embody positive lifestyles and philosophy embedded within Native languages—as Tupal alluded to—we must also recognize that in order to truly immerse our homes in our Native languages, we have to find ways to speak during our lows as well as our highs.

Reclaiming these types of domains also exposes another dilemma within language nesting: creating organic language use through deliberate action. I believe part of what makes it difficult to use our target language in stressful situations is that so much of our target language use occurs through deliberate and practiced methods. Stressful situations invite unrehearsed or instinctive responses; stressful situations represent a level of language use that we are trying to achieve. However, in a world where English is so pervasive—even in our own minds—it is difficult to train ourselves to spontaneously reach out and use our target languages. One unanswered question that stress and language use brings up is: how can learners invite Native languages into novel and emotionally-intense parts of their lives? Does it require that learners plan ahead and reclaim these domains, as ?aswol? is proposing? Or should learners simply wait for their proficiency to increase, and for the language to naturally reach into these places? More fundamentally, can methodically reclaiming such emotionally-charged domains lead to spontaneous language production? As reclaiming domains has succeeded in creating spontaneous language use elsewhere in our lives, I am hopeful that it will also succeed in stressful or otherwise emotionally intense situations; however this issue is still unexplored.

3.3 Conflicts—Complicating Language Revitalization

Save your energy for the good work of language revitalization, and let the rest be. Never beg on behalf of your language for anything from anyone. Explain what is needed, speak from the heart and reasonable people will assist you. Do not denigrate your language with argument or allow even the mildest form of violence around it. The many forms of discord witnessed in a community are especially
dangerous when allowed in a language revitalization setting. It is Gramma’s house; treat it with the utmost respect.

—Darrell Kipp (in Reyhner et al. 2009)

Interpersonal and intra-community conflict pose a major challenge to language revitalization (Yamamoto and Yamamoto 2004, 16; Hinton and Hale 2001, 17). For those learning their languages in the home, language is inherently a personal process. Therefore, conflicts in one’s personal and community life translate into conflicts in learning one’s language. As Darrell Kipp, cofounder of The Piegan Institute—a successful Blackfoot language immersion school—notes, community strife can cause serious damage to language revitalization. Preparing strategies for remaining positive is a vital aspect of dealing with conflict, given the destructive potential that violence and discord can have on language revitalization efforts. For critically endangered languages, the pool of potential collaborators on a given language is extremely limited, meaning that inter-personal conflicts can have even more serious ramifications for speakers. ?aswali sees this as a major obstacle facing speaking communities, stating “if our communities are going to revitalize a language and become a speaking community a big part of that seems to be how long can they get along with each other. Getting along with each other seems to be a real problem” (2013). Given that conflict is such an obstacle, examining how conflict poses a challenge to language revitalization 1) illuminates some aspects of grassroots, home-based language revitalization that are unique to these efforts and 2) helps prepare language learners for obstacles that are likely to face them in the future. Because of the small size of existing speaking communities, and the small number of people involved with, interested in or with the capacity to make decisions affecting the health of Dee-ni’ and Puget Salish, conflict plays an especially important role in determining the future use of these
languages. When there are only a handful of speakers in the world, negotiating conflict between individuals becomes a necessary skill for learners to master. Ch'vs-ne states that:

Because you're dealing more with individuals in the sense that if you don't have a relationship with that individual, you don't have a relationship with the language, maybe. So friendship is more important in that sense. And it has to do with respect, too. A mutual respect is important, as a teacher or as a learner. Respect of the knowledge, where it comes from.

Ch'vs-ne notes that in order to work in an endangered language community, making a deliberate effort to make friends and be respectful is critical. Recognizing that the relationships with other speakers are in many ways irreplaceable gives one a different perspective on what conflicts may be important, and what conflicts are best left alone. A seemingly-natural conflict resolution strategy that I have encountered while working through conflict in my language community involves the idea of swallowing my pride in order to get along. However, there is potential in language revitalization for a more significant shift in mind frame. Ɂəswəli describes this well:

People want respect. They don't just want it, they expect it. “I'm older than you, or I'm an elder,” “You're supposed to say this to me,” “How dare you! I'll never talk to you again because...” And so there's a lot of that, and it doesn't even have to be an elder, or I'm not referring to just elders. I'm talking about the group as a whole, there are young people who say I know this, and you don't. You should respect me...I think the illusion is, number one: I'm important, therefore I must be treated as important. I think that's one illusion. I think the other is that what I know is important, therefore I am important, therefore I should be treated as important. Instead of saying no, what I know is unique, but the idea of saying important implies that something else is not important. And the fact that people know many different things, [for] example it's a good thing a heart surgeon knows how to operate on a heart, or else people would die...if we can kind of get back to that simplistic idea that, no what I'm doing may be an anomaly right now but in two weeks, it's going be expected. It's going be the reality of how I talk. Then maybe we get away from some of this ego stuff that gets us in trouble as a community...it's self-defeating. You're [trying to] revitalize a language and yet these two people won't talk to each other because of something someone said fifty years ago. That's not productive...

Ɂəswəli is articulating a significant perspective in managing conflict. Earlier, we discussed the challenges of feeling overwhelmed by commitments to learning the
language (See section titled “The Potential for Commitment to Language Revitalization to Overwhelm,” p. 47). As part of that discussion, I described how feeling exceptional can form part of feeling overwhelmed by commitment. Within ?əswəlî’s thoughts, we find another example of how thinking of one’s work as exceptional or important can backfire on an endangered language learner. Given that the work is intensely personal, and time-consuming, there exists potential that the value each learner attaches to their work will also be transferred onto their ideas of themselves and their community. I have experienced this inflated ego, just as ?əswəlî has noted it. While the thinking is not always explicitly selfish or self-important, it can result in a self-centered perspective that has the potential to create conflict. For example, if I think Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ is important, and I think that my family’s work on the language is important, then I may go on to think my family is important. From there, it is easy to perceive a slight against my family as meaning that someone else thinks my family is not important, and by extension the language is not important.

If instead we follow ?əswəlî’s understanding of the language as unique, we arrive to a conclusion that the work we’re doing is valuable to us, and that it is our languages unique character and relationship to us that make it valuable. Instead of an absolute statement about importance, we arrive at an understanding that our languages are unique, and that what makes them unique is of value, which is something personal. While importance relies on other people subscribing to one’s view—one are not important if no one else thinks you are (well, maybe self-important)—uniqueness is a statement of fact. If this idea of uniqueness is transferred from our conceptions of the language to our conceptions of ourselves (as I hypothesized above for importance), we arrive at a much more benign conclusion that we are unique, and that we value ourselves. Part of the logic behind ?əswəlî’s statement is a recognition of what it means to be part of a endangered
language’s cultural group. It means that it is unlikely that many people will ever know you exist. This is a humbling realization, but one that everyone can apply to their lives in one way or another. Forming a perspective that recognizes the value of uniqueness while also recognizing that importance and value are subjective has the potential to diffuse conflict because it subverts the development of self-importance.

One reason discussing ego is useful is that the field of language revitalization presuppose that speaking Native languages is very important to Native language learners (Hinton and Hale 2001, 3-6). Despite the importance of language revitalization to people within the cause, people are often unable to move beyond inter-personal conflicts resulting from working with others on the language, or existing conflict from within the community. In other words, problems between people exist even when those people think that the language is incredibly important. Recognizing this dissonance may help to adopt strategies to mitigate conflict in endangered language speaking communities.

3.4 Working with a Lack of Resources

One major obstacle that endangered language learners face is a lack of resources (Hinton and Hale 2001 p 6). Resources of all types—reference materials such as dictionaries, media like books and entertainment recordings, linguistic material such as elicitations, human resources and support such as available teachers or mentors—are often in short supply. As a result, many people are forced to when learning also simultaneously develop their own materials. While this is true for many language revitalization efforts, it is especially true for at-home learning, which focuses on language use as opposed to curriculum development. For Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ and Lushootseed, there is a fair amount of material. Lushootseed is exceptionally well documented (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 24, 2013). Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’, while not as well documented, does have several dictionaries, and many hours of first language speakers answering
elicitations and telling stories; there are even a few instances of recorded conversations. These resources have in many ways enabled the at-home efforts that we are undertaking. However, both teaching and learning resources are lacking. This is a major obstacle for both Puget Salish and Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’, and can be a demotivator.

While each language has several reference materials, both the Dee-ni’ and Lushootseed speakers in our Eugene community have expressed how frustration in not having a reliable source from which to gain answers. People are proactive in response to this dilemma, and have taken it upon themselves to research and develop the materials they need, however. Ch’vs-ne states about his linguistic work on the language as well as his work with the Smith River Rancheria:

Eventually when we [Smith River Rancheria] get this database printed out and put it all on the website or...that’s going to be a resource that I’ve worked on. When I get my grammar done that’s going to be a resource, it’s going to be documented. It’ll be something people can look at. It will be a resource that wasn’t there before. Essentially, Ch’vs-ne creating vitally needed resources for the language. This is significant for other speakers who will appreciate these resources. More pertinent to a discussion of obstacles to language use, it is significant because it shows how language revitalization can require some people to take on seemingly impossible amounts of work. Ch’vs-ne is pursuing a PhD, and additionally is putting effort into speaking in his home, but without the benefit of resources (specifically, the one’s he is working on but don’t yet exist). In effect, he is in a position where he must learn, but also develop materials that would help him learn more effectively. ?əswəl, also a PhD student, has had similar obstacles:

I don’t know all of the structure of how to say things. And so, I do research and I can find most of them in the stories, but there are things like I was going to go to the store, but then I went to the gas station instead. I’m not quite sure how to say that. I can express it, but very simple in English, it’s something that appears to have never been asked, you know? It may have been, but I don’t know where it is so, still researching it. So there are things like that that are challenging, there are
low frequency words that when they come up are important, but they don't come up a lot. These are words that I don't use all the time, but when they come up, they're important.

For ?əswəli, researching linguistic materials is the only way to address grammar knowledge that is lacking for Lushootseed. Similar to Ch'vs-ne, ?əswəli must invest his time in answering grammatical questions to enable himself to advance his language use. This places an extra burden on both men as they attempt to use the language in their daily lives. This is why the methods discussed in the next section of the paper are so vital to home-based learning efforts: they alleviate the conflict between work expectations of using a language and having other obligations in life, whether those obligations are related to research of the language, or work commitments. While it is impossible to dispel each instance in which language revitalization poses special challenges or stresses, by developing alternative methods of using our languages that blend more effectively with our existing life obligations, we can more effectively pick how to learn and use our languages. By using effective methods, we can compensate for some of the resources we lack.

For others, a lack of resources can be a demotivator because it is frustrating. While ?əswəli and Ch'vs-ne are equipped—as linguists-in-training and advanced speakers—to answer their own questions about their languages, many other people in our community are not. For these people, a lack of resources can mean essentially a dead-end for their learning. Shchee-le describes this frustration:

I mean I feel the most frustration in like...with the dictionary situation. Especially like with colloquialisms or like knowing where postpositions, what postpositions go with what verb, just kind of like the more advanced things that dictionaries do. Yeah, that's where I feel...like I was looking, I took Spanish in high school, looking at the Spanish dictionary...it's...It would be great if there was something like that with Tolowa[Dee-ni'] where it's like here's the verb, here's the preposition that goes with it, these are the five different definitions of it. Or the five different ways it's used, are all listed together, under the word. And it's, you can look it up in
English, or you can look up here's...here...by Dee-ni'. You heard this word, you can look it up in Dee-ni', here's what it means in English.

The two most recent dictionaries of Dee-ni’ are both based on the same source material, and have essentially the same content and format (Athabaskan Language Dictionary: Nuu-wee-ya'; Bommelyn Tolowa Dictionary). What has frustrated Shchee-le is that existing dictionary formats do not provide an easy avenue for intermediate-to-advanced speakers. The grammar information around the language is at present only available through word of mouth, or by doing independent research. Unfortunately for learners such as Shchee-le, this makes them dependent on the free time of other learners and speakers such as Ch’vs-ne and his family. While this has positive potential to bring community together by creating a network of de facto masters and apprentices, it is also a stressful situation for Shchee-le, who has little control over this aspect of his own learning, and for Ch’vs-ne and his family, who have an added responsibility as Eugene’s authorities on all things Dee-ni’. For Ch’ee-see-ne, a similar frustration over lack of materials exists. Ch’ee-see-ne's commitment to learning and restoring Ts’aama-dee-ne stories into Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ is made exponentially more difficult by the lack of advanced grammar resources available to learners:

[An] expanded dictionary would be a help. [I]f there were...translations of stories, that would be a big help for me. If I had access to other stories...I think that would help, to see how other phrases got translated. That'd be a good thing for me to look at.

Ch’ee-see-ne is running into two problems at once. The first is that there is a lack of examples of advanced syntax for Dee-ni’ readily available to learners. This means that in order to find answers about how to express complex concepts—not only with intelligible grammar, but also with fluency or cultural appropriateness—one is essentially forced to either research recordings of first language speakers, or secure time with the only highly advanced speaker of the language. The second problem Ch’ee-see-ne is facing is that
stories in Native Northwest languages often have unique grammar rules and conventions (Hinton 1994; Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., September 24, 2013). This means that having access to stories forms a vital part of Ch’ee-see-ne’s effort to revitalize the stories he is learning and caring for. Ch’ee-see-ne’s frustration exemplifies a wide range of challenges found in documenting, creating and utilizing Native language resources. These include 1) the lack of resources available to critically endangered language learners, 2) the unique challenges facing Native languages (e.g. cultural considerations such as differences between story grammar and every-day grammar, source materials that may be inaccessible or esoteric) and 3) the ways that intersecting challenges accumulate and increase the work required for endangered language learners to be successful.

While lacking resources brings with it particular frustrations and poses roadblocks to learning, it is the reality of most language revitalization efforts. In fact, both Lushootseed and Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ are fairly well documented in comparison to some other Native Northwest languages such as Alsea or Takelma. The struggles facing our learners are therefore not exceptional compared to challenges faced by other endangered language learners.

Frustration over resources can act as a demotivator in two ways. First, it can drain learners’ energy, as they are forced to invest their time sorting through linguistic materials and doing research to find answers to questions about vocabulary and/or grammar. Second, a lack of resources can be demotivating because it creates a dead-end for learners such as Ch’ee-see-ne who are not linguists (trained or lay) and have a limited capacity to find answers to the questions they have. This creates a dependence on other learners, who may or may not be available to help. Additionally, the constant dependence of many beginning learners on a few advanced learners places a burden on advanced speakers of the language, creating another demotivator. In effect, a lack of resources creates a chain of
added work for everyone. This can demotivate learners who want to have questions answered as they think of them; learning without adequate resources can be very stop-and-go. Finding alternative methods for at-home learning of endangered languages must therefore take into account the limited resources available to us. In the next section, we will discuss language use methods that allow us to maximize the vocabulary we have access to, and ensure that we spend as much time as possible speaking our languages, instead of only focusing on documenting or accumulating information about our languages.

3.5 Challenges Unique to Children Learning at Home

For the children of the families involved, there are some unique and substantial challenges associated with their parents’ choice to learn Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ in the home (none of the Lushootseed participants are currently raising children). Since children are not necessarily given a choice about taking part in at-home language learning, while at the same time so much of a family’s hopes for language use lay with their children’s proficiency and learning (Hinton 1994; Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 4-6, 54-5; Nicholas 2004, 2), it seems practical to discuss the challenges that may face children as their families teach them their target language.

For Shchee-le, a constant concern is about how to keep up with his children’s learning. Shchee-le’s children gained proficiency in Dee-ní’ faster than Shchee-le was able to continue learning new grammar and vocabulary:

I feel like before they really start expressing a lot of words, they’re kind of comprehension is so simple that it...matches up with my own level of speaking. The challenge for me with kids is keeping with it after they exceed my own ability in the language, and that’s like the most challenging part of that.

In one way, this is very encouraging, because it means that Shchee-le was able to effectively transmit the language knowledge that he has to his children. Shchee-le and
Shghee-tr’e must be effectively using the language with the children if the result is that their children surpass or challenge their own language proficiency. On the other hand, this challenge is in some ways a puzzle without a solution. Because of the lack of resources and commitment required, learning Dee-ni’ takes time. Unfortunately, the transition from learning one’s language to trying to raise one’s children in the language is rarely a perfect one.

This is in large part because of how much work and time it takes to use the language, let along prepare one’s self to use it with one’s child. Ch’vs-ne relates that “These past four or five years have gone by really quick. I mean, it’s vital that you get language use with your kids early on...everything’s time sensitive. But what’s difficult about it is that it takes a long time to learn the language” (2013). For both Ch’vs-ne and Tr’aa~-xe and Shchee-le and Shghee-tr’e, recognizing this fact meant moving forward with speaking Dee-ni’ to their children before they as parents had achieved fluency in the language. In many ways, the less-than-ideal nature of raising their children in Dee-ni’ while also teaching themselves to use Dee-ni’ reflects the struggle of at-home language use as a whole. It is an issue that always includes hurdles that are challenging to one’s personal life. Additionally, at-home language learning often occurs during less-than-ideal times or circumstances, out of necessity. The opportunity for people to speak critically endangered languages can be short-lived, so seizing the opportunity when it presents itself means beginning to use and learn the language even if it does not seem like an ideal time to do so. Similarly, committing to raising one’s children—partially or fully—in a critically endangered language is often a process that is undertaken before one feels ready or completely prepared.

Shchee-le describes how speaking with his first child was valuable in part because it helped him to prepare for his second child. At the same time, this experience meant that
Shchee-le may have made more mistakes with Chee-lee-xvsr than his younger child. Shchee-le states that “I think with [Chee-lee-xvsr], I’m a lot better at it with Dee [Dee]...because I had to practice with [Chee-lee-xvsr]. I didn’t really know how it was [to raise a child bilingually in English and Dee-ni’].” Recognizing this learning curve for both parent and child provides a greater degree of understanding about the process of raising a family in one’s Native language. It is also an opportunity to adjust expectations about language use in the home. Grenoble and Whaley (2006) identify having realistic expectations as a critical component of language revitalization programs (48-9). Similarly, having realistic yet ambitious short-term expectations for raising one’s first child may help to alleviate surprise or concern when the first child is not as proficient as subsequent children. Anticipating this possibility may be an important step in remedying it as the family moves forward with the language use.

One unintended consequence of raising one’s children as you learn is that it can create frustration for the first child in the family exposed to the language, because they are often the child that will be the least exposed to the language. As the parents gain proficiency and encourage language use throughout their family, younger children will be exposed to more language while they grow up than their older siblings were. Additionally, younger children will have more peers (i.e. their older siblings) with whom to speak the language. In a sense, this places a burden on the first child to be raised in the language, as they will get the brunt of the mistakes that the family makes, while getting the least amount of support (as the family is still establishing their norms and habits for language use while the eldest child is learning the language).

Tr’aa-ne, Chee-lee-xvsr’s grandmother, explains how she sees this dilemma unfolding in our family:
As [Dee] has picked up Dee-ni’...and I think the project started after [Chee-lee-xvsr] was pretty established English speaker, so he’s had a little resentment around it, or something. A little resistance to it...Last time he was here, so that was interesting. I just really openly told him that I don’t know Dee-ni’ but I want to know some words, too. Or not, you know? I didn’t want to pressure him. But I think that kind of helped him to hear me say that. That I’m just learning, too. I think he was feeling a little left out or something. I’m not sure.

While Dee has not expressed or shown any hesitation to communicate using Dee-ni’, Chee-lee-xvsr has begun to withdraw from the language in some circumstances. In *Bringing Our Languages Home: Language Revitalization for Families* (2013), the Peters family, who raised their third child entirely in the Kanien’kéha language, share a similar experience. Their middle child, who first learned English, then was exposed to a Kanien’kéha language immersion environment, underwent a time where she was very reluctant to learn Kanien’kéha, and was vocal in her opposition to using the language. Eventually, their daughter took to the language. Taking stock of these differences between our children’s learning experiences allows families to address them so that they can move forward with speaking in the home. It also allows families to make sure that language learning is not interfering with the health of their children. Based on the evidence of Māori and Hawaiian communities, effective implementation of at-home learning can be very beneficial for children by providing greater academic achievement, increased physical health because of associated cultural activities (e.g. traditional diet), sense of belonging and/or greater understanding of ancestry and identity, greater participation in traditional ceremonies and integration of our peoples’ philosophies into our perspective (Zalmai Zahir pers. comm., March 15 2013; King; Hinton and Hale 2001; Hinton 2013, 13-4; Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar 2010; Reyhner et al. 1999). These potential benefits do not however mean that we should be careless in raising our children in our languages. I am very cautious about making this point because of the history of the education system in discouraging multilingualism for Native people. However, I have chosen to bring up this
issue because as we work to grow the use of our languages in our homes, there is a very real interaction between the language, our families and our mental and spiritual health. This interaction extends to our children, and ensuring that this interaction is positive for them will help to increase language use, and most importantly protect the wellbeing of our children. Language revitalization has immense positive potential for children, and ensuring that families undertake their efforts in positive and well-prepared manner will help to realize those benefits for their children.
4.0 Methods and Tools for At-Home Learning

This section is intended to provide an overview of the methods and tools that our community is currently using and experimenting with to facilitate at-home learning. By examining the methods we currently use, our community and others can come to a better understanding of how to improve our strategies for speaking in our homes. Additionally, the testimony of participants adds to the growing voices advocating for home-based learning methods that emphasize language use and meaningful transmission of information in one's target language.

4.1 Considerations

Before discussing some tools and methods that friends, family and myself—as well as many others who have written about or contributed to language revitalization—have identified as useful, I would like to discuss two considerations for anyone beginning to speak in their home, or anyone seeking to understand what that process is like.

4.1.1 Teaching Yourself to Use Your Language

If your ancestral language is critically endangered, you will have to take initiative in your learning. Finding ways to learn the language on your own will help empower you. Community is vital, but if your community is small, others’ personal lives and struggles will sometimes necessitate that you carry on speaking alone. Similarly, you may have to begin thinking of yourself as a teacher and researcher for yourself (Atkins 2012). This means that that designing methods to help yourself learn and speak, keeping a tab on what is working well for you, learning some basic linguistic theory, familiarizing yourself with whatever has been written about your language, and getting a sense of how to find and access the recorded material of your language will become important parts of your learning.
For Shlha'-'e, self-teaching has been a sometimes difficult process. He described to me how beginning to learn Dee-ni’ later than many of the other speakers in our community has left him at a loss for how to move forward (Shlha’-’e, interview). For Shghee-tr’e, learning the language to teach to her kids has meant assuming the role of teacher much earlier than she anticipated, or feels prepared for (interview). Shghee-tr’e and Shlha’-’e’s experience is echoed by many of the families who contributed to Bringing Our Languages Home (Hinton 2013), who describe how taking control of one’s own speaking and learning can be at-once rewarding, challenging and intimidating.

4.1.2 Holding yourself Accountable

Being able to hold yourself accountable is important, because you won’t always have support (Nicholas 2004, 14). In a classroom, a good teacher will make sure their students are responsible for their work. In a home with a committed first-language speaker, an apprentice learner can depend on someone else to speak and use the language. However, when you are the person initiating language use in your own life, you must be able to hold yourself accountable. Tr’aa-ne talks about developing strategies to help her use and learn the language throughout her day:

One technique I have not just with language learning but... [also with] other things that I want to do but I’m not very good at making myself do [is]that I’ll say like "I can’t get on and check my email until I’ve done this." So I’ve been applying that to this language learning a little bit. Or like, I’m not going to read the paper until I’ve gone over this one page of language lesson or gone over the vocabulary I have [double check for accuracy].

Developing strategies that effectively force you to use your target language is one aspect of holding yourself accountable. Tr’aa-ne has been able to apply the ways that she holds herself accountable in other parts of her life to her language learning and language use. Borrowing from other parts of your life helps ensure that your strategies are effective for you. Tupal describes another aspect of holding yourself accountable excellently:
[It helps me to] accept the fact that there’s going to be days that I am not going to do as much as I probably should have or could have, but if I would’ve done something different, I might have like done too much and just wore myself out, and not giving it, you know, the attention it needs. And you need to have the attention, that it's not like you have to do it, but you want to and you’re ready for it. And so I think you can’t be like that every day.

Since you have more responsibility for your own language’s use in your home, it follows that you would benefit from being extra positive and careful with yourself. While it can be tempting to think “If I do not speak, no one will,” it is equally—if not more—important to remember “If I burn out, there will not be any language use in my house at all.” As Tupal points out, working when you are worried or feeling overwhelmed can be counterproductive. It is easy to be too hard on yourself while learning your language in the home, because it feels important. Replacing fears and concerns about the language with a pragmatic focus on increasing use in the home can help us to hold ourselves accountable, and enable us to use our languages at home with a good mind and a happy heart. I believe this is critically important because if we allow language revitalization to become a negative or a weight on our lives, we have lost the purpose and the beauty of remembering and speaking our ancestral languages. Not only is carrying forward with a heavy heart more difficult, but it may be self-defeating.

4.2 Tools that Facilitate Language Use in the Home

Below is a table offering summaries of several language-learning tools currently in use in Eugene. Following this table, each of these methods is discussed in more detail. Our
community of speakers is experimenting with these methods in our homes in an effort to find effective ways to speak and use our languages throughout our lives. These methods and tools draw on existing language revitalization methods and literature, as well as on innovations within our community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool and Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Suggestions and Concerns</th>
<th>For Additional Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reclaiming Domains: creation of dedicated spaces or times in which only the target language(s) will be used (e.g. greetings)</td>
<td>Increase daily language use; Give language space to live; Work towards immersion setting in home; Normalize language in daily life; Create opportunities for social interaction and knowledge transmission in target language</td>
<td>Commitment to daily language use; Access to dictionary, recordings or other source of vocabulary; Strategy to hold self accountable; Consistency is more important than pace</td>
<td>Contact Northwest Indian Language Institute (see bibliography); Also see formulaic method in Grenoble and Whaley (2006) pp. 55-56; Hinton and Hale (2001) pp 217-226—Master and Apprentice method can be thought of as reclaiming a domain of language use with a particular person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Nesting: creating a physical space in which the speaker commits to using only their target language(s).</td>
<td>Work toward immersion setting in the home; Create permanent physical space for the language; Create physical space for other learners to dependably have access and positive pressure to speak the language; Create immersion environment for children</td>
<td>Commitment to creating an exclusive physical space for language use; Extensive labels of common actions in language to support learner when they forget terms or lose motivation; Signage in target language alerting others that English will not be used in the nest; It can be difficult to ask non-learners to respect boundaries of language nest</td>
<td>See Grenoble and Whaley (2006) pp. 52-55; Hinton and Hale (2001) pg. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels: labeling vocabulary terms, processes (e.g. doing the dishes) etc. to facilitate language learning in the home.</td>
<td>Encourage language use, normalize language in home, making and placing labels is a learning activity, encourage visitors to inquire about and use language</td>
<td>Re-labeling regularly is key; Labels can be easy to ignore—develop strategies to avoid overlooking labels; labels are less useful if not personally tailored to one's desired vocabulary; Access to a source of vocabulary</td>
<td>Contact Northwest Indian Language Institute (see bibliography); For another example of at-home labeling, see Hinton (2013) pp. 3-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phrase Lists:
learner translates commonly used phrases applicable to their life and physically carries a list of these phrases.

| Create targeted reference material for self; create expectation of language use in specific situations; Promote regular use of language throughout the day | Can be cumbersome or awkward to carry a long list; Takes deliberate effort to reference paper when speaking conversationally; May be more effective when working with kids or alone |

### Technology:
discusses the various ways that technology can or could be used by language learners to increase target language use in daily life

| Support language use; Link together speakers; Provide new media for speakers; Reclaim common domains in U.S. society | Technology often includes bias towards English (e.g. software is in English); May be difficult to maintain the spirit or worldview of the language through certain mediums (e.g. texting); Technological products are not useful if they are not used—be sure to create media that is needed and useful |

### Multilingual Support Network:
collaboration across language groups, and efforts to learn each others’ languages in order to create larger, more viable speaking communities.

| Broaden speaking base for critically endangered languages; Provide emotional support; Increase amount of learners; Increase capacity of all languages to advocate for and effect change; Maintain cultural tradition of multilingualism; Philosophical and intellectual enrichment | Requires planning often without outside support; Less time in dominant language often means more time in all target languages; |

---

#### 4.2.1 Giving Languages Space to Live—Reclaiming Domains and Language Nests

Reclaiming domains is a tool for language revitalization which envisions the world as broken up into different places and activities. For example, greetings can be a domain, while the kitchen can also be a domain. There can also be domains within domains. For example, cooking potatoes is a domain that occurs within the larger kitchen domain. To
reclaim a domain means to take any activity or physical place and reclaim it for the
language. In other words, one commits to use only their target language in this space. This
can be a multi-step process. For example, I have recently started reclaiming the domain of
frying potatoes (something I do most mornings) with one of my brother Tay-lvlh. To make
learning this domain accessible for him, we started with only nouns and two verbs. From
here, we will gradually increase the amount of vocabulary we have committed to using
until we cook potatoes only in the language.

The eventual goal of reclaiming domains is to create a space similar to the Māori
language nest model (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 52). By accumulating enough domains
in one physical space, such as the kitchen, one is eventually able to commit to only using
one’s target language in that space. ?əswəli and Tupal have created a nest for the language
in their kitchen. In this space, they use only Lushootseed, and permit only the use of non-
English languages. Reclaiming domains is one way to approach the goal of immersive
environments. Below, I detail the experiences of interviewees in reclaiming domains, in
hopes that their experiences can motivate others to take back areas of their lives for their
ancestral languages (or support friends and family who are!).

For our community in Eugene, the choice to focus on reclaiming domains was
influenced in large part by ?əswəli. In addition to being exposed to literature which
emphasizes the importance of exclusive spaces for your language (Reyhner et al. 2009, 15;
Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 52; Hinton and Hale 2001 119-120, 149-50), I heard about
benefits of reclaiming domains through ?əswəli, who decided to experiment with the
method while teaching an online Lushootseed class. ?əswəli saw first-hand the benefits
that this method had on him and his students:

In the fall of 2011, we started teaching Lushootseed online and we started with the
idea of let’s reclaim domains. So that what I teach you, by the end of the week
you’re using every day in your life, if not the next day. And we make a commitment
to reclaim these domains. And so, we picked the theme of the kitchen and cooking as domains to pick—the main domain. And it didn’t work for everyone, because not everyone cooks. Or not everyone has dynamics where reclaiming domains in the kitchen works. That’s important. But for a number of people it did work. And then by...it only took one term of that, by winter of 2012, we as a group decided to experiment with the idea of language nesting in the kitchen and the reason why we pushed towards a language nest is that by the research we know of the last forty years, fifty...about forty years...the only way that we know to revitalize a language that is no longer spoken every day in daily life is by language nesting. And language nesting means that you create a nest for the language where it can live, and you do your best not to contaminate the language with English so that your language can live. [My experience with a language nest was that] anywhere else in my apartment we could speak English, but in the kitchen they heard Lushootseed. And so it was very minimal, but there was some language transmission occurring. So, being very excited about that, that’s why I’ve maintained that “Yes, this is the way to language revitalization.” Because even though internal motivation is very important, it is a little bit fragile. When you create physical locations where it is expected that you speak the target language, it becomes more stable.

Integral to what ?əswəli discusses is reclaiming domains relies on giving space for the language to breathe and grow. Reclaiming domains scaffolds language learning, and the language benefits from this. Because the goal is to create a healthy environment for one’s language to live, it is important when reclaiming domains that people commit to reclaiming the domain for the long term. Imagine living in an environment that was sunny and pleasant for three days out of the week, but then brutally hot and dry the other four days of the week. To most people, that would seem a lot less hospitable than living in a place that was less sunny and nice on the good days, but still alright to live in when at its worst. Reclaiming domains supposes the same thing for the language: consistency is more important than having an ideal situation. ?əswəli describes this benefit of reclaiming domains as providing stability. Since we are trying to build habits of language use in our daily lives, it benefits us to create habits which enable stable use and improvement. Slow progress may even be preferable when reclaiming domains because it helps to normalize the language as we learn it.
Each new domain that one learns should remain a space for the language, and never return to English (or whatever the dominant language may be). While mistakes will happen, and everyone slips up, it is important to draw the distinction between trying to use some Native language in an area, and slowly committing to replacing English with one's target language for the rest of one's life. ?aswali sees reclaiming domains as a way to approach a language nest, a larger area in which one only speaks one's target language. For example, by reclaiming domains in the kitchen, one can eventually convert their entire kitchen into a nest for one's target language.

Reclaiming domains is a flexible activity, however. For example, Tr’aa-ne describes how she exchanges greetings in the morning with her husband using Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ (Tr’aa-ne, interview). She does not exchange greetings with everyone she meets in the language. Her domain is “greetings with my husband.” So, while reclaiming domains is a major commitment, it is one that is always tailored to the learner. Tupal elaborates on this flexibility:

...if you don’t want to reclaim just like a process...reclaim some sort of interaction with somebody. You know, team up with somebody and say” Ok, every day we’re going to go through this.” You know, “how are you? What are you doing?” Even if it’s the same stuff, just go through it every day, just to get it down. And then add something else to make it more complicated.

Revitalizing a language spoken by few people can be very lonely. Tupal notes that reclaiming domains gives one flexibility about deciding whether to work alone or with others; domains can also be a tool to work alone, or a way to involve other people in using and learning language. Tupal also points out that reclaiming domains allows people to focus on learning what they want to learn, not something they feel that they have to learn. Lastly, she reiterates ?aswali’s point above, that a slow-building commitment is the key to success with reclaiming domains.
Similarly, Shghee-tr’e notes that reclaiming domains helps her to focus on using the language in ways that are comfortable for her (Shghee-tr’e, interview). Normalizing language use is another advantage of reclaiming domains. Often, speaking a critically endangered language can lead one to feel ostracized both from the general public, and from one’s community (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 2-8). Normal is not often a word associated with language revitalization. Finding ways to make language use normal requires using language regularly, and comfortably. Given that our goal is to speak our languages throughout our lives, normalization then becomes very important. Shghee-tr’e speaks about how reclaiming domains in areas that feel comfortable helps her:

That’s one way that I try to incorporate it, is in those domains, in those phrases that I’m comfortable with. The ones that I’m comfortable with and know I use them. And then there’s ones that I’m not as confident in saying, but I understand them so...I don’t know. I guess that...just in those...the most familiar day-to-day things [I have the most success].

For Ɂəswəli, normalization of language use highlights the benefits of reclaiming domains, and in doing so addresses what is at the core of language revitalization. After a time, “[Language use] becomes...it doesn’t become a big deal. And that seems really important, [for] that shift occur. That this anomaly suddenly becomes normal. And that’s very interesting...I didn’t realize that when I was doing it. And then after doing it for a while, I go “yeah! It’s not a big deal, it’s how I talk. It’s how I communicate.” Ɂəswəli’s distinction that speaking eventually becomes so commonplace to him that he forgets that to others it may appear exceptional provides critical insight into at-home learning.

There is a contradiction within regarding language revitalization as “normal,” when in fact very few people within our communities are trying to revitalize our languages. However, when we create a standard that treats language use as anything less than normal, it inherently lowers our expectations. That is, if those of us who are Dee-ni’ learners think that we are special every time that we say *gaa-si* instead of ‘plate,’ then we
are stopping short of our goal of making our daily communication in the language. In this way, normalization becomes a critical part of both reclaiming domains and of language revitalization in general. While our languages may not be common, that does not mean they cannot be typical, or normal, in our own lives. In fact, I would argue that they must become normal in order for Native language learners to regard any revitalization as successful. Beginning to think of our language use as normal—non-extraordinary, plain and expected—encourages us to use our language. While this may seem counter-intuitive given the lack of support that language learners often encounter, ?aswali and Shghee-tr’e’s comments echo my experience. Diffusing these complex feelings of guilt, responsibility and stress and replacing them with normalization makes the task less intimidating.

Another implication of Shghee-tr’e’s comment is that speaking in the home can be intimidating; it’s easy to be uncomfortable using the language. One way to address making domains feel normal is by picking areas where one already has some knowledge of or background in the language, and then focusing on using that knowledge. In that way, learners are making the most of what they have. Additionally, growing into a new domain may not be as intimidating if one already have some exposure to the language. Tr’aa~xe notes yet another benefit of using the reclaiming domain method: it breaks down what can otherwise be a daunting process. She states that:

I think that’s why people learning in the home get discouraged, because it seems like this vast thing, rather than making it like couch time or computer time, or washing the dishes time. Or maybe not even like a domain, like a "Do..." like even smaller than that [laughs]. Cause what if you’re saying something like, like we have those cubbies. So if I was putting grocery bags away, that could be a domain. Even though it’s teeny-tiny, you know fold the bag, put the bag in the cubby, push the cubby back. I mean, that could be someone’s domain.

In Section 2, we discussed how feeling overwhelmed can damage motivation and pose an obstacle to learning. Tr’aa~xe has identified reclaiming domains as a possible solution for this. She gives excellent examples of how one can break learning into smaller
chunks. This helps learners to stay focused on the positive progress they are making, instead of viewing the work they are doing as inadequate. Tr’aa-~-xe also elaborates on the flexibility of domains, noting how one can find miniature domains within any given domain. As a method, reclaiming domains recognizes how massive of an undertaking language revitalization can be; this method helps us to move past that by replacing feelings of being overwhelmed with feelings of constantly being successful. Even if these successes are small, they represent an increasing and stable increase in our language use throughout our daily lives.

Another benefit of reclaiming domains is that it creates what ?əswəli describes as external expectations (2013). By committing to using only one’s target language, one creates an expectation that the language will be used. That means even when one’s motivation fails, one will still have some sort of positive pressure to encourage them to speak. Given the lack of support that often faces critically endangered language learners, a back-up plan to keep forward progress even when one’s motivation fails can be a major asset. ?əswəli elaborates, stating “…even though internal motivation is very important, it is a little bit fragile. When you create physical locations where it is expected that you speak the target language, it becomes more stable” (2013). Given the success that ?əswəli has had in reclaiming his entire kitchen as a language nest, and the existing literature that focuses on the importance of keeping learners motivated (Reyhner et al. 2003, xvii; Hinton and Hale 2001, 16), it seems prudent to acknowledge the potential of external expectations as a positive tool in reclaiming domains. While an external expectation is created by the speaker, it abstracts the motivation and helps to create a sense that when one is tired, overwhelmed or stress that there is still some sort of external structure urging them on. Given the struggles of our communities to deal with stress, developing external expectations for language use may be a powerful tool to move forward.
Shghee-tr’e provided feedback about how to improve the process of reclaiming domains. Her idea, which Shchee-le independently echoed (Shghee-tr’e, interview), was to coordinate the domains with other learners so that others in your community are building similar language use patterns and vocabulary alongside each other. Shghee-tr’e articulated her vision as “[A] communal idea of how to do it...I’m not a linguist, I don’t know about teaching language, but to me it makes the most sense, right? So, it’s like if we’re all learning this, we’re all learning kitchen stuff, we’re all learning living room stuff [at the same time].” Shghee-tr’e advances the idea of external expectations by noting that reclaiming domains may be improved by emphasizing the community aspect of the activity. While one advantage of reclaiming domains is that it only takes one person to reclaim domains in their life, it is also a flexible method that has potential application for groups of people. ?aswali, for example, has utilized reclaiming domains as a teacher, and has his students reclaim domains of their choice, but all within the kitchen. By working with others on the same domain, one creates an environment in which one answers to not only their own expectations of how the domain is going, but also other learners’.

Shghee-tr’e also makes another point that is not directly related to reclaiming domains, but is well worth noting. In admitting that she isn’t a linguist, Shghee-tr’e is both humbling herself and making an important point about the nature of language revitalization. While we are lucky that several members of our community are studying linguistics at the UO, this is not a pre-requisite for learning and speaking our languages. Shghee-tr’e’s idea about reclaiming domains is insightful and valuable, and may improve the tool of reclaiming domains. While remaining humble should be a priority, especially given the potential for speakers of an endangered language to be exploited, misrepresented as fluent speakers or mislabeled as “experts,” we must also take control of our own learning confidently.
For Tr’aa~xe, one advantage of at-home learning is the value and weight that one's language take on the home. She states:

[I]t becomes valuable to use in your home. There's value on it, because it's something you do every day, it's something you see all the time. So there becomes a...almost like a weight, every time you see it, you think the same thing, and wanting to use the same words.

Tr’aa~xe’s comment provides an understanding of how creating external expectations, coupled with making language use normal in one’s home, leads to a positive pressure and increased language use. The apparent contradiction that making language use normal simultaneously makes it more typical and also adds more weight to the language is hard to grasp. In some ways, it is similar to anecdotes about becoming married; it is the routine of being with the other person that becomes meaningful and valuable. At the same time, this “weight” that Tr’aa~xe describes does not act to hold her back. Instead it anchors her so that she can continue to remain in a place where she is motivated to use her language, and sees the value in doing so. Reclaiming domains is a method with many advantages. Perhaps the greatest amongst them is that it develops habits of language use that create positive expectation for further use. Reclaiming domains helps us to become acclimated to using our languages every day, until not using language becomes abnormal.

4.2.2 Labels in the Home and Daily Life

Labels provide several benefits for our speaking community in Eugene, Oregon; other language revitalizers have also noted the benefits of labels (Hinton 2013, 16). Labels provide easy access to vocabulary, serve as reminders to speak the language, invite others who come into your home to learn and speak by making the language visible (i.e. they normalize speaking the language), while the act of making and remaking labels also reinforces vocabulary. All the households in our community use labels to some extent.
However, different people have described different levels of success learning from labels; for some, labels have helped to promote language use around their home, while for others labels have not stuck as an effective method. When I asked what advice Tr’aa~xe would have for someone trying to start learning language in the home, she described the benefits she sees to using labels:

I would have them label their house. I think that’s the most helpful. I labeled my groceries. That helped me learn foods. Every time I’d go grocery shopping, because I was the one that did the grocery shopping, so then when I’d bring it back, I’d just re-label everything and then I’d just open the fridge at that point of the cupboard. Then I’m looking at all the Dee-ni’ words rather than the English words, which was helpful.

Tr’aa~xe’s description of labeling offers several hints about how to successfully label the home. First, Tr’aa~xe notes that she chose to label things in her life that she used often. For her, this meant buying and putting away groceries. For Tr’aa~xe, labels that can easily be ignored or tucked away in a seldom-used part of the house is less useful than having labels in the most active area of her life. Second, Tr’aa~xe notes that relabeling was a part of her success. The labels she placed on food items had to be constantly replaced as her family ate the food. Not only was Tr’aa~xe getting exposed to the words each time she looked at the food in the fridge, she was also learning as she remade labels. Tr’aa~xe also picked labels for words that she was likely to use. This is the most critical point. Food vocabulary is something useful to Tr’aa~xe, which gives her motivation and reason to use it. The point of labeling one’s house, like with all the methods for at-home learning, is to use language. Tr’aa~xe utilizes labels to help her remember vocabulary in areas of her life where she can easily use the language. Shchee-le also talks about how labeling helps him to use the vocabulary that he is learning:

Say we’re cooking pancakes and I want to say now we’re going to flip it and I’m like...I can’t remember how to say that. Before labels I would have to remember to write it down then later that night I’d be super tired, I’d have to talk myself into looking it up, then I’d have to write that on a flashcard, then if I forgot to study it, I
wouldn’t remember so I’d just have these like lists of words I wanted to say piling up. But this other way, I just glance up [and] see the word I’m looking for.

For Shchee-le, labels offer a way to make learning easier. Instead of having to spend time memorizing words off of flashcards, Shchee-le is able to integrate his learning into his daily routine. Labels offer a way to combine one’s learning with one’s everyday life. In doing so, they take some of the pressure off of learners to set aside time for studying. Instead, effective use of labels requires that learners integrate language use into daily activities.

Shchee-le also describes how moving away from flashcards and towards labels in his home has made learning language a more social process. Learning with one’s family becomes more important if one’s emphasis is on using the language, and not simply learning it. For Shchee-le, labels are a way to invite others to speak:

Another big change I’ve been going through with my speaking lately is, I’ve been trying to think of it less as something I do on my own and more as something I do with other people. My own language acquisition, and so...that’s the big reason I moved away from flashcards, is...they’re an individualizing experience, whereas using labels to learn is much more inclusive.

Shchee-le’s changing emphasis is also reflective of my experience and others’ within our community. What initially started as an individual activity has shifted focus toward a communal activity. In response, we need to adopt methods that facilitate using the language with other people, instead of simply amassing as much information as possible. Labels inherently invite social learning. Most people that have seen or encountered the labels in my house have wondered aloud about the labels. After explaining the labels to them, acquaintances often ask how to pronounce words. At the very least, the labels let others know that I am learning the language. The same is true in Shchee-le’ situation. Labels also include his family in the process. While before Shchee-le
may have spent time alone flipping through cards, he can now work together with his wife and kids to learn vocabulary together—and most importantly—to use it.

However, there are also problems to using labels. For Ch’ee-see-ne, labeling has been slow going. He states that labels have “fallen by the wayside” in his home (2013). Part of why Ch’ee-see-ne hasn’t begun labeling the house is that his wife Tr’aa-ne and he haven’t found time to do it together. Ch’ee-see-ne also described to me that he was unclear about what I wanted him to do with the labels. This touches on an important point to consider with labels. Since I gave the labels to my parents, it could be that they do not feel like the vocabulary is valuable to their lives. From our experience, I would argue that labels are most effective when they are made and put up by the person or people who will be seeing them and using them on a daily basis.

Another problem with labels is that they can become easy to ignore. Tupol uses labels extensively in her home, both to label nouns and to give step-by-step instructions for processes. While she suggests labels as a great way to learn in the home, she also acknowledges that they are not a perfect solution. Her advice is to “write and label it [what you want to learn].” However, Tupol also notes that “The only problem with labels is that you can label it, then you get used to it being there and you don’t look at it, and so…but if you do it and you actually make a point to say ’Ok, I’m going to focus on one of these things today’” (2013). In other words, putting up labels, then allowing them to blend into one’s décor is not effective.

Labels are not a silver bullet solution to learning in the home. It takes a lot of discipline to read and respond to the labels one puts up, especially when one feels like going through their daily routine in English instead. The experiences of learners interviewed above present several lessons about how to make labels effective learning tools in the home. These include creating labels with vocabulary that are interesting, being
disciplined about reading the labels that are put up, and maintaining the labels in the house as they get old, worn down, or too familiar. Given the strong preference for labels with many of the learners I interviewed, it seems natural to recommend this method to anyone trying to revitalize a language in their home.

4.2.3 Phrase Lists—Creating Targeted Vocabulary

Tr’aa~ xe used one method to greatly accelerate her speech. By creating a list of commonly used phrases, Tr’aa~ xe was able to target her most frequent language use, and start replacing English with Dee-ni’. She describes below:

I made a phrase list, I wrote down everything I said for an entire day and translated it. There were things on there I wish I hadn’t said, but I said them, so...they’re translated. And then I just packed it around, it was this big, long list...It was really kind of complicated at first, but it was really neat, because I had everything I wanted to say. Almost everything I say every day to the kids or around the house is the same. Sweep the floor, do the dishes, open and close the door. You know, whatever it is. Get on the computer, it’s all basically the same.

Making a phrase list had several advantages for Tr’aa~ xe. It allowed her to see what language she used most often throughout her day, and target these phrases as places to start using Dee-ni’ Wee-ya’ in her life. In doing so, it facilitated immediate language use. Additionally, making a phrase list ensures that everything that one chooses to learn is applicable to the learner. This method does have some limitations, however. Tr’aa~ xe described how this method worked well for her in part because she was alone with her young children for most of the day, and was not engaging in a lot of open-ended conversation. Making a phrase list for conversations between adults seems less plausible; this method probably won’t help build advanced conversation skills. Another limitation is that carrying around a big list can be bulky or awkward. Tr’aa~ xe makes light of this fact, but does acknowledge that it was complicated (2013). Phrase lists such as Tr’aa~ xe’s provide valuable insight into the words that one uses throughout the day, and give learners the ability to immediately switch often-used phrases into their target language.
However, these phrase lists do not help with the finer points of communicating. Since much of language revitalization starts as one or two committed people working together (Hinton 1994), I think it is important to include methods such as these which encourage the growth and use of language in one person at a time. Critically endangered language communities need to build a base of speakers who are capable of carrying the language forward, but must do so one speaker at a time (Grenoble and Whaley 2006; Hinton 1994). Because phrase lists focus on individual progress, they are well-suited to this goal.

4.2.4 The Potential for Technology to Bring together Speakers

Technology has varied roles in language revitalization efforts. For some, entire language programs initially depended on the use of a piece of technology (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, 80-1), while for other communities, face-to-face interactions are the only or primary way that language is used. While our work is happening on a much smaller scale than many established language revitalization programs, technology has a large set of roles in our efforts, as well.

For Shchee-le and Shghee-tr’e, who at the time of their interviews lived in Palo Alto, California and were not near any Tolowa or Tututni speaking people, technology offered a link to other speakers. Using instructional videos developed by the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians and Smith River Rancheria as a learning tool have helped to supplement daily language use in their home (Shchee-le 2013; Nuu-wee-ya’ Videos). A single piece of technology can be very useful. Shchee-le and I depended on these videos when we were beginning to learn Dee-ni’ in 2006.

Phones conversations are one major domain that people have had success using the language. For Shlha’-’e, phone conversations have been the most frequent and reliable domain for him to use the language. Below he describes how phone conversations have helped his learning and language use:
...On the phone with you [and Tr’aa-ne and Ch’ee-see-ne] is probably the most frequent use of the language. Asking where you’re at, you asking me where I am. That’s actually been the majority of my learning...I’ve kind of started taking stabs in the dark, to see if I’m understanding [what you’re saying], too. Yeah, I’ve been learning things that way. [It’s] very context heavy...

The phone has given Shlha’-’e a place to experiment with the language. It has also been a regular place for him to exchange the language he does know with other learners. Given the routine of phone conversations, they also present Shlha’-’e with an opportunity to have consistent, predictable conversations. This allows him to draw on the regularity of small talk and the context it provides to experiment in small doses with his comprehension and speaking.

The role of phones in enabling people to use the language in their daily lives should be acknowledged and encouraged. Phone calls are a domain with a regular set of conventions (hellos, goodbyes, etc) that make switching these parts of your conversation into the language easy. Additionally, they are controlled social interactions between only two people (usually). This makes it easier to explore one’s language, if the person on the other end of the line is someone the learner is comfortable with, that is.

Texting offers another opportunity for language use. Texting with Ch’vs-ne, Tr’aa-xe and Shchee-le has increased the amount of language I use dramatically. Likewise, Shchee-le relies on texting Ch’vs-ne or me to get answers to questions about grammar (Shchee-le, 2013). Some people would argue a written and short-hand method of communication like texting is a somehow diminished form of language use. However, I would argue that if someone texts regularly in their life, then it is a valid and important part of their life to reclaim for the language. There is no authentic use of the language if there is no language use at all. In other words, if Dee-ni’ or Lushootseed people text today, then let them at least do it in the language! This viewpoint is echoed by the recent influx in language learning and use apps that have begun to proliferate (Dadigan 2013;
Weingartner 2013). Adapting to our technological lifestyle presents unique challenges beyond the scope of this paper, but also provides us with opportunities to add language use to another part of our daily lives.

Ch’ee-see-ne has used phones, and specifically cell phone apps, to another effect. Ch’ee-see-ne and I communicate using Zello, a walkie-talkie app which allows you to leave convenient voice messages for each other throughout the day. It is like a voicemail and a text combined; you receive a voice message, but without the caller having to go through an inbox, or wait for the phone to ring. Walkie-talkie apps such as Zello have allowed Ch’ee-see-ne and I to exchange information in a quick, efficient manner that includes a voice recording; we are essentially having a very slow conversation. Exchanges over Zello have supported Ch’ee-see-ne’s efforts to translate stories into Dee-ni’ (Ch’ee-see-ne, interview). Methods such as these may be a way to help more advanced learners to efficiently spend their time answering questions for others. Given the short-handedness of many language revitalization efforts, finding shortcuts like these is tremendously important.

4.2.5 Multilingual Support Network—Collaborating and Fostering Speaking Communities

One aspect of our work together in Eugene has been regular meetings and collaboration. Given the importance of collaborating and creating a support network in other critically endangered language revitalization projects (AICLS 2013, Dr. Pila Wilson pers. comm., Oct 26, 2012; Yamamoto and Yamamoto 2004, 14-5), this tool is worth discussing as an important part of our work. In earlier sections, we discussed the role of family in supporting and maintaining motivation to speak one’s target language. To clarify, this section is about how to create and maintain new networks that are designed specifically to enable Native language users to share methods, laughs (stress relief is important!), experiences and develop a sense of unity across language and/or community
There are several existing organizations that are intentionally creating a group of people to work together on languages; AICLS is one that is very close to our situation both because several of our participants are also active in AICLS, and also because AICLS has brought together languages with few to no Native speakers who are children (Hinton 1994). One major avenue that our collaboration took was hosting regular (bi-weekly to monthly) language meetings and activities where we came together to discuss what challenges we were facing in speaking in the home and what successes we had. These dinners were also a major opportunity to teach each other our languages and speak to other speakers of our languages. ʔəswəli describes how that opportunity is both exciting and new:

And in doing so [conducting meetings in our languages], can we transmit more language to other people around us, not just the people we live with, so that we're creating a Lushootseed [community] for ourselves, a Tolowa [Dee-ni'] community, and an Ichishkii community? And I think that can be multi-lingual...I don’t know of anyone that’s created that model before...

It is very important to temper ʔəswəli’s statements by recognizing that we are just beginning to experiment with this kind of multi-lingual, language-use-based support network. Our meetings have been mostly informal, and centered around meals, cultural activities, or our shared work through NILI. The meetings we have conducted already have excited others in Eugene, Oregon as well. They represent a great opportunity to adopt a new method into language revitalization. Multi-lingual, intentionally created language speaking communities may help us to revitalize our languages. For Ch’v’s-ne, being supported by and being able to give support to other language revitalizers is important. He admits that “[I rely on support from] other language learners of their own language, like ʔəswəli, who’s awesome and people I meet through AICLS, and through NILI. We’re all really supportive of each other in all our endeavors. That’s invaluable as well” (2013).

There is something unique about our situation in Eugene, Oregon. In addition to having so
many critically endangered languages brought to the UO, there is also an ability to escape
some of the problems within one’s own community, and instead work with people solely
committed to language revitalization. Tupal elaborates:

[I]t definitely helps having people that help not only with Lushootseed, but doing
the same stuff with [their] languages...There’s a lot more support for that kind of
learning, you know? But back home, there’s not so much support for that kind of
learning. There’s a lot of support for Lushootseed, people wanting to learn it and
stuff, but there’s not that same support. Like when we have those meetings [our
monthly meetings]? There was good stuff that came out of the meeting [she first
attended]. Like, you just kind of came out feeling like re-motivated about stuff. And
so I think that’s something that in Eugene, I don’t think I could get that in
Washington right now.

The motivation and support that our community in Eugene offers Tupal is not
always present in Washington. While there is support for the idea of speaking the
language, there may not be adequate support within a community for individuals who
want to commit themselves to language revitalization. This is one notable reason that
forming our own communities amongst committed individuals may be critical to our
success. Until language revitalization becomes more widely appreciated, finding places for
support is vital for mental wellbeing and to enable us to innovate and collaborate.

Unfortunately, our meeting schedule has been erratic. During my interviews, we
had reached a lull in our meetings. Several participants expressed frustration with this,
and noted the positive potential that the meetings had carried with them. Shlha’-’e states:

...We haven’t been meeting anymore, and we had talked about doing lessons in our
languages to each other and all that. That’s kind of fallen apart, unfortunately. And
a lot of that, I think, is people being super busy with, you know graduate school
and college. [It] would be good... to be more supportive of each other as a group...

While our struggles to keep up the group are worrisome, the fact that they were
missed by group members is a promising sign that they are valuable for everyone. Ch’vs-
ze states “the idea of meeting every Friday, cause that..gives you motivation to get
something done, cause you’re responsible not just to yourself but to other people”(2013).
He describes how regular meetings help to create a sense of accountability. The scheduling troubles around these meetings also help to serve as a reminder of the importance of being flexible while working on your language.

Difficulties in maintaining regular meetings also point to a need for further support. Tr’aa¬¬-xe, who is also active in AICLS, noted that a more structured, funded organization could possibly serve the function of providing that support better than our informal group:

I think an AICLS-type organization up here would be really helpful for people, because it is really hard to learn language and doing it on your own is even harder...I think something like that that’s not language specific but more specific to encouraging people to work on language is needed.

While we have been successful in supporting one another, dedicating resources and time to making an organization that exists specifically to support people could bring people closer together, and attract more learners and supporters to the cause of revitalizing our languages. Tr’aa¬¬-xe’s observation is based on the potential of our meetings to provide much-needed support for learners; encouragement and support are major aspects of any successful revitalization effort (Reyhner et al. 2009, 4; Reyhner et al. 2003, 3-4). She articulates how our meetings served a valuable function of providing encouragement without judgment:

Those meetings we were having once a month there for a while were really helpful. And encouraging cause it was a place where, same kind of thing were other people were struggling to learn their language and were sometimes successful and other times weren’t successful. But there was no judgment about being successful or not being successful because at some point we’ve all not been successful, you know? So I think that would be helpful having something like that.

Moving forward, it appears that creating more structure to help keep meetings organized and scheduled will help people. What is most important to note, however, is that speakers meeting across language groups to support each other and to speak each others’ languages have been an important part of our efforts in Eugene, Oregon. These
meetings created a situation in which we would translate between two or three Native languages to communicate across the room; by doing so, we could hold conversations while also keeping English out of the meetings. While discussions about challenges and struggles were often in English (as discussed in the stress section, many people have a difficult time communicating in their language when dealing with particularly emotional topics—something to take note of and work on), also having non-English speaking time built our capacity and commitment to using our languages.

Holding a conversation this way has several lessons to offer for speakers who wish to support and collaborate with other Native language speakers. First, it is a reminder that it is especially important to bring our languages into meeting spaces about language. Overcoming a tendency to speak about language revitalization in English is very difficult to do. However, the ability to communicate and transmit ideas about what revitalization means through our language will signal a major step in our ability to express ourselves and our priorities as people. It is worth noting here that I would have rather written this thesis in Dee-ni’ and I consider this work severely limited because it represents a massive effort undertaken in English, instead of in Dee-ni’. Taking steps such as conversing about intellectual and emotional ideas in our languages builds our capacity to do meaningful work in our languages. Second, making the effort to respect and enjoy others’ languages is a great way to bring people together. A common anecdote about travelers is that the people who are willing to step outside their comfort zone and speak new languages are often the people who make the most friends. In my experience, this lesson also applies to language revitalization! Third, bringing together motivated people across languages moves us toward a critical mass. The sum is greater than its parts is definitely a true

---

6 For an example of academic material written entirely in an Indigenous North American language, see the work of Fred Metallic, also included in the bibliography under: Mik’maq Archives (2013).
statement when it comes to motivation and Native language learning. For example, after a little over a year of meetings and discussions with both Dee-ni’, Lushootseed, Ichishkiin and Chinuk Wawa (two other languages spoken and taught in Eugene, which currently are beginning to focus on at-home learning), I have found that one of my closest collaborators is ?əswali. He will always take part in Dee-ni’ immersion activities, and his commitment to language revitalization has greatly boosted my motivation, stabilized my mood, and brought more language into my home for both my brother Shlha’-e and me. Without putting together these meetings, we may have missed the opportunity to collaborate as closely with ?əswali, and in turn would have lost the chance to make a friend and mentor who has been a positive influence on Native language speaking in our homes.
5.0 Language Revitalization, Multilingualism and our Futures

In the future, it is my hope that multilingualism becomes the norm in the United States. While I hope this statement becomes true for everyone living in what is today known as the United States, it is my most sincere hope that Native languages once again become commonly used and exchanged throughout Native communities. This has implications for my generation of young Native people. Many languages are currently spoken only by a few elders in the community. This is a precarious situation, and young people must act urgently to help improve the conditions of their peoples’ languages. Bringing our languages into the home is a powerful way to do this work. Home-based learning demands not only that one gain knowledge of the language, but also that they apply this knowledge to one’s lifestyle. In doing so, home-based learning gives us an opportunity to reclaim our lives for our languages.

Language revitalization today is gravitating more and more towards home-based learning methods such as language nests, family-centered learning, and Master Apprentice method (Hinton 2013; Grenoble and Whaley 2006). One potential avenue to further encourage the use of Native languages in our homes is to collaborate with other language speakers to create environments that invite multiple languages into our homes. This is especially true for critically endangered language learners who may have one or very few speakers to speak with. Working with other Native language learners can create a very powerful community of like-minded people dedicated to supporting each other by learning each others’ experiences. Our community of speakers in Eugene, Oregon is an example of one such community. Our struggles and successes in learning, using and communicating in our languages offer valuable insight to other language revitalizers. Little has been written about the experiences of critically endangered language learners—
especially those using home-based methods—although we are in desperate need of more resources and collaboration.

Without working together, minority language speakers have little chance of protecting and using their languages. Community plays a pivotal role in both motivating learners, and in facilitating effective language learning methods. Therefore, finding a way to manufacture a tight-knit and reliable community is a critical aspect of language revitalization. Bearing that in mind, critically endangered languages are in a unique position to collaborate. While this collaboration is in one sense out of necessity, it is also the continuation of a rich tradition of multilingualism in the Americas. By reasserting our multilingualism, Native people have an opportunity to enrich our minds and spirits, while also lifting up our neighbors as they do the same.

Languages are precious because they offer us connections. Language allows us to connect to our ancestors. Language allows us to connect to our neighbors. Language allows us to connect to our families. Language allows us to connect to our homes. Language allows us to connect to the world in unique and beautiful ways. Shlha'-e stated that “Language changes us” (ʔaswali, 2013). Yes, language does change us. It changes us by enriching our capacity to exist in this world. Revitalizing languages is about re-establishing connections with the world that we live in. But it is also about changing the way that we exist in the world. Bringing our languages into our homes is a rare opportunity to live our own lives in a good way while carrying on the work of our ancestors. This is why we say daa-naa-~yash, this is why we say ḥədiw̓ to the language as it knocks on our door. We are welcoming the language, all those who have spoken it, and all those who will speak it, into our lives.
Appendices

Appendix 1—Interview Card Keywords

Responsibility
Fun
Love
Continuation
Hope
Future
Belonging
Ancestors
Culture
Family
Change
Alienation
Loss
Guilt
Community
Hard work
Survival
Children
Friendship

[Blank]—two cards left intentionally blank for any additional words the interviewees had in mind
Appendix 2—Interview Questions

How often do you use your target language at home?

Where do you use your target language most?

What ways do you use the language?

What activities do you use to practice the language? / What different activities, settings, times, methods etc do you use?

How often do you ________ (for each activity described above)?

Do you have any particularly useful activities you would want to tell others? / What would you describe as the most effective ways that you practice and the most successful times and circumstances that you speak?

Why (for each)?

If you are limited, what limits you from practicing this way, or speaking in this way more often?

How did you discover these activities?

What tools do you have to practice and use the language? / What materials do you have access to? From where?

What additional materials would benefit you? Do they exist?

What support or help in speaking do you have?

What additional support do you feel you would benefit most from?

What challenges do you have speaking/using the language?

How do you overcome or cope with these challenges?

If not, what have you tried? Why do you think that this continues to be a challenge?

Are there any activities that you’ve stopped or found difficult? Why or how?
Bibliography


Ch’ee-see-ne. Interview by author. Digital recording. April 20, 2013.


Shghee-tr’e. Interview by author. Digital recording. April 7, 2013.


