CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indigenous Language Revitalization and Applied Linguistics: Parallel Histories, Shared Futures?

Onowa McIvor*

University of Victoria
*Corresponding author; E-mail: omcivor@uvic.ca

Abstract

Damages done to Indigenous languages occurred due to colonial forces, some of which continue to this day, and many believe efforts to revive them should involve more than Indigenous peoples alone. Therefore, the need for learning Indigenous languages as "additional" languages is a relatively new societal phenomenon and Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) an emerging academic field of study. As the ILR body of literature has developed, it has become clear that this work does not fit neatly into any single academic discipline. While there have been substantial contributions from linguistics and education, the study and recovery of Indigenous languages are necessarily self-determined and self-governing. Also, due to the unique set of circumstances, contexts, and, therefore, solutions needed, it is argued that this discipline is separate from, yet connected to, others. Applied linguists hold specific knowledge and skills that could be extended to ILR toward great gains. This paper explores current foci within ILR, especially concepts, theories, and areas of study that connect applied linguistics and Indigenous language learning. The intention of this paper is to consider commonalities, differences, current and future interests for shared consideration of the potential of collaborations, and partnerships between applied linguistics and ILR scholars.

Introduction

If one measures time in millennia, it has been a relatively short time since Indigenous languages flourished across the Americas and continued quite naturally through intergenerational transmission. Therefore, the need for learning Indigenous languages as "additional" languages (that is, not acquired from birth) is a relatively new societal phenomenon and Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) an emerging academic field of study. As the ILR body of literature has developed, most notably since the 1990s, it has become clear that this work does not fit neatly into or alongside any single academic discipline. While there have been substantial contributions from linguistics and education to ILR, the study and recovery of Indigenous languages are necessarily self-determined and self-governing. Also, due to the unique set of circumstances, contexts, and, therefore, solutions needed (explored later in this paper), it is argued that this discipline is separate from, yet connected to, others.

The study and recovery of Indigenous languages is necessarily interdisciplinary; it borrows from, leans on, and contributes to various fields of study. One foundational

orientation for the field of ILR is that of decolonization theory defined by its overt acknowledgment of historic injustices, followed by support for the resurgence of Indigenous knowledge and ways of being (Battiste, 2013; Gaudry, 2015; Simpson, 2011). Decolonization theory is grounded in remembering and deconstructing precontact and postcontact history, and, in regard to SLA, remembering when Indigenous languages flourished in these lands followed by the circumstances and factors leading to their rapid decline. "Decolonization brings about the repatriation of Indigenous land and life; it is not a metaphor for other things we want to do to improve…" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 1). A decolonization approach, then, brings a social justice aim to one's academic and personal work, and, in relation to ILR, it contributes to the revival of Indigenous languages as part of a larger movement restoring the value that all citizens can see in Indigenous ways of knowing. Taking a decolonization approach also means to turn a system around so that it is no longer oppressive and insists on an empowerment approach that is self-determined and self-governed. All are welcome and encouraged to take a decolonization approach. tawâw - there is room for you here. "The First Peoples of this land have been burdened with the responsibility of ensuring that Indigenous languages do not die, but partners and allies need to do more to also ensure this outcome" (McIvor & Anisman, 2018, p. 102).

In addition to linguistics and education, the most productive alliances to pursue, it seems, are the subdisciplines within applied linguistics[1] that focus on how languages are learned. While recognizing that there is complexity and variety within the field, for the sake of simplicity, I will refer to the subdiscipline(s) within applied linguistics mentioned above, using the common label of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), while recognizing that others could be used that emphasize the "additional" and "learning" dimensions of the enterprise in question (see Block, 2003; Mitchell & Myles, 2004).

This paper explores some of the current foci within ILR, especially those that connect with concepts, theories, and areas of study within applied linguistics and Indigenous language learning. The intention of this paper is to consider commonalities, differences, current and future interests for shared consideration of expanding, deepening collaborations, and considering additional partnerships between applied linguists and ILR scholars.

Dr. Onowa McIvor (author) is nehinaw (Swampy Cree) and Scottish-Canadian. Her nehinaw family is from kinoseo sipi (Norway House Cree Nation) and Pimicikamak Cree Nation in northern Manitoba. She is a life-long learner and high-beginner to low-intermediate speaker of her ancestral language. Onowa has been a scholarly and educational member of the Indigenous language revitalization community since the early 2000s and has a passion for exploring the space between ILR, applied linguistics, and SLA. There was a time during Onowa's scholarly development that she wondered if ILR should be a subfield within SLA. However, she came to understand that ILR is necessarily autonomous, and, rather than being subsumed by another field, the languages and communities involved are better served by the creation of interdisciplinary space for collaboration and partnership from independent places of strength.

Background

To provide context, a short history of the field of SLA will be paralleled with some historical context of Indigenous language loss and subsequent revitalization efforts in Canada and the United States in order to situate a point of contact for this paper.

Background to the Field of SLA

Several authors have summarized the history of the field of SLA. Of these, Mitchell and Myles (2004) are established authorities in introducing the field through their widely accepted and utilized texts. Mitchell and Myles (2004) discuss the early field as "the development of theorizing about SLA from an adjunct to language pedagogy, to an autonomous field of research" (p. 29), although they also acknowledge that the field was still very much linked to the "practical business of language teaching" (p. 30). Generally, the late 1960s seems to be widely accepted as the time when the field of SLA began to be seen as an autonomous discipline independent from its roots in linguistics and psychology (Block, 2003; Mitchell & Myles, 2004). Some date the origins of the field to Stephen Krashen putting forth "the first broad scope theory of SLA" in the 1970s (Block, 2003, p. 19), solidifying the field as a stand-alone discipline. The plethora of important contributors to the development of the field of SLA is too numerous to list here, and a review of the decades of research agenda is beyond the scope of this paper; the intention, rather, is to highlight the origins to establish a point of connection to Indigenous language revitalization.

As the academic field of SLA developed, it has focused mainly on second language acquisition, yet it has remained largely apart from the reality of Indigenous language loss and the efforts being made to revive them. Rather, the field of applied linguistics, and particularly, subfields within SLA, developed almost entirely focused on immigrant populations and heritage and foreign language learners, a view shared by prominent applied linguist Stephen May (2019). While SLA researchers focused on the learning of additional languages, the Indigenous language revitalization movement in Canada and the United States at first emerged seemingly disjointed from the field of SLA research. Perhaps this is, in part, due to the fact that in the 1950s, when the foundations of the field of SLA were being laid, Indigenous languages were not generally recognized as being in danger (explained in greater detail, in the next section).[2] I argue then that neither SLA nor ILR have, in general, benefitted from each other's knowledge nor reaped the rewards of each field's respective research and practices in any central way.

Both King and Hermes (2014) and May (2019) have offered convincing accounts of lost opportunities and signalled potential outcomes for richer collaborations between these two fields of study. King and Hermes's study (2014) concludes with the overall finding that, in various Ojibwe learning environments, it was consistently meaningful interaction that made a difference rather than passive learning opportunities. While this may seem a potentially simplistic or even common-sense outcome, it is a glaring example of the "cost" to ILR communities who have not had wide-spread access to SLA research of this kind. Assistance in adaptation from a first language learning model (where passive listening and observation as a child might be fine) to a second language learning context, which requires different learning and speaking opportunities to be successful, could make a tangible difference that ultimately determines the continuation of a language or not.

Indigenous Languages History

Since time immemorial, Indigenous languages[3] were passed on naturally by parents and grandparents to infants and young children, who learned it as a first language or perhaps grew up bilingual (if also exposed concurrently to English or other languages). While overall Indigenous populations (and therefore some languages) declined during

early contact, mainly due to war and disease, Indigenous oral history imparts that Indigenous languages (and multilingualism) remained strong in to the 20th century in many parts of Canada and the US. It was only during the latter half of the 20th century that Indigenous languages in North America began their most drastic demise in earnest. A major factor in this demise was the residential school era, where children had been forcibly removed from their homes and forbidden to speak their languages for many generations (Churchill, 2004; Milloy, 1999).

Beginning in the 1940s and more widely in the 1950s, the government of Canada and the three Christian churches that ran the schools began closing the first of them (Milloy, 1999). Nevertheless, the damage was done as natural intergenerational transmission was largely severed and the decline of Indigenous language transference accelerated. In addition, communities had already been suffering the wider effects of colonization for many decades. This suffering was compounded by the return of generations of children who were not as whole as when they left. These adolescents and young adults returned with many traumas to heal from, one of which was often their speaking abilities, and certainly another was their experiences with and relationship to their ancestral languages.

Early non-Indigenous language revitalization scholars identify the 1960s (particularly the Civil Rights movement and parallel American Indian Movement) as the time when demands for change started to be taken more seriously (McCarty, 2008). Hinton (2008, p.159) agrees that "from the 1960's on" Indigenous people in the United States began to organize around language revitalization, although references in the literature remained sparse in regard to a call for action and strategies for some time. Despite light references in the literature in the 1980s (Bauman, 1980; Cummins, 1980; Jamieson, 1988), very few North American authors addressed the need to revive Indigenous languages until the 1990s, and particularly not until the latter half (see Cantoni, 1996; Fettes, 1992; Fishman, 1991; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Hornberger, 1996; Ignace, 1998; Kirkness, 1998; Krauss, 1998; Maurais, 1996; Norris, 1998; Reyhner, 1995).

Despite this decades-long attention to the need for language revitalization efforts, a general lack of additional language learning knowledge in Indigenous communities remains. This is not to retract from the more recent examples that exist demonstrating tremendous knowledge, skill, and method having been created over time to great effect (e.g., Green & Maracle, 2018; Johnson, 2017; Stacey, 2016), but rather to speak to the majority of contexts rather than the exceptions. While it has been long since understood that there is no "one way" to effectively teach or learn a language (Kumaravadivelu, 2006), the fact is that many First Peoples[4] have not had the opportunity to learn how to teach their languages effectively due to a lack of exposure to relevant and accessible theoretical knowledge and practical skills of second language learning. Although both SLA and ILR are currently contributing to this research agenda, King and Hermes (2014) explain there remains a frequent "mismatch between the expectations and the realities of language teaching" (p. 269) for many communities focused on ILR. For example, many Indigenous communities in Canada and in the US teach languages as a subject or in a community classroom setting for a few hours a week with the expectation or hope of creating new speakers of the language (McIvor & Anisman, 2018). Another important factor within this set of realities is the lack of trained and qualified teachers. As stated by Hinton (2011), "Commonly, the only speakers are the elders nowadays, who are past their retirement age and are untrained in language teaching" (p. 312). This brief history of the early stages of ILR as a dedicated and scholarly field of study, together with considering select, current topics in the field, leads to the

following overview of differences between ILR learning contexts and those more commonly researched in SLA.

Differences

A few important differences exist between ILR and SLA. These examples are included to assist with situating a greater context for ILR work in relation to the current field of SLA. The first difference between the language learning environments studied from an SLA and applied linguistics perspective and that of ILR is that there are often very few speakers of the Indigenous (target) language, and sometimes no speakers at all (Hinton, 2011). This reality creates a very particular circumstance, in which teaching and strategy innovations have to be adjusted accordingly. In addition, very few Indigenous language learning communities have ready-made curriculum and learning resources, unlike those for majority language foci for immigrant populations or other world languages that are widely taught and spoken. This requires extra efforts for Indigenous language teachers, or they go without, and therefore, the learning suffers for lack of curriculum and language learning resources. "[P]edagogical books, reference dictionaries, culturally appropriate curricula and language teaching materials are few and far between unless the teachers themselves make them… [and] in fact, that is just what the teachers of endangered languages do" (Hinton, 2011, p. 312).

Another important difference, while recognizing foreign language teachers are often second language speakers too (see Martinez Agudo, 2017), is that almost all Indigenous language teachers are concurrent and early language learners with varying levels of language proficiency. Rorick (2019) discusses becoming a teacher early on in her language learning journey, and Johnson (2017) explains, "it is known that Indigenous language learners must stand up and become teachers" (p. 512). Both "Emma" (profiled in King & Hermes, 2014) and SX̱EDȽELISIYE (2014) discuss their experiences of teaching early on in their learning journey, but also the pedagogy and success of accelerating their learning through classroom teaching experiences.[5] "[W]e have created an immersion program with teachers who are not first language speakers or fully fluent. I am one of those teachers" (SX̱EDȽELISIYE, 2014, p. 80).

Related to the social theories within SLA, an emerging theme in both ILR practice and research is addressing trauma related to language learning. Indigenous language learners stand apart in that they are not just traumatized learners (as might be the case also for refugees, for instance), but rather they carry specific traumas (often intergenerational) related to language loss and the relearning processes. A study focused on Mentor-Apprentice language learning (Jenni et al., 2017) revealed participants discussing the negative impacts that language loss had on their well-being but also the healing and health-giving benefits a return to the language or opportunity to learn gave them. Very little research exists on this topic. However, there is a program called "Silent Speakers" run by the First Peoples' Cultural Council (fpcc.ca) that focuses on cognitive-behavioral therapy for those who have lost their language and would like help with reconnecting through or past the traumas they associate with speaking.

Lastly, despite the strong arguments for the need, the reality remains that very little systemic access to SLA theories or methods for communities reviving Indigenous languages exists. Hinton (2011) explains, "[f]oreign language teaching and majority language teaching are based on many decades of research, literature development on language teaching theory, and methods…. For endangered languages, there is much less support available for language teaching" (p. 312).

Rosborough and Rorick (2017) describe these differences in ILR while calling for greater understanding about effective language teaching:

> Revitalization of endangered Indigenous languages involves unique issues and challenges. Included in these challenges are few fluent speakers available to teach the languages, the passing of elder speakers who hold specialized cultural and grammatical knowledge, limited availability of language resources, and social-emotional barriers resulting from colonization and assimilation policies and practices. The urgency of the work is driving the need to know more about effective ways to teach and learn Indigenous languages. (p. 120)

Explaining these differences are important steps toward building a bridge across the two fields of study. While recognizing "a striking shortage of applied linguists in the field of endangered languages," Penfield and Tucker (2011, p. 292) believe applied linguistics can be part of a multidisciplinary approach to answering the practical problems presented to learners and speakers of Indigenous languages. McIvor & McCarty (2016) promisingly believe that this has already begun in stating, "[a]s Indigenous language reclamation has grown as both a grassroots movement and a scholarly discipline, greater attention is being paid to the reciprocal contributions of the field of second language acquisition" (p. 12).

The following section explores various concepts and terms within SLA, followed by case examples highlighting contemporary challenges that cross over and connect across the fields of SLA and ILR. The subsequent terms and concepts within second language learning highlight both differences and what is useful to converse across fields of study. In addition, these terms were created void of dialogue with ILR communities and yet they are now used and applied in ILR contexts and so this exploration is in part to unpack these terms for the ILR scholarly community.

Common Terms

Target Language

The first concept for consideration is "target language," used to describe the language in which learners are aspiring to develop proficiency. It is a useful term within ILR as it provides a neutral way to discuss the process of acquiring Indigenous languages without having to grapple with assumptions and pre-existing beliefs that accompany other terms such as heritage language, foreign language, and mother tongue.

Second Language Learners

In addition to meaning individuals who are learning a second language, the term "second language learners" is often used to describe people who are learning "the languages of the communities where they live" (Kinginger, 2004, p. 221). However, this common use of the phrase assumes that the second language is the dominant language of the area. This makes the application of this term problematic for Indigenous second language learners who, although living in their homeland and often in their community of origin, are not necessarily in a second language-dominant environment. Therefore, not all research focused on "second language learners" applies to Indigenous language learners. Another term that might be more accurate toward ILR experiences is "heritage language learner."

Heritage Language Learners

Weiyun He (2008) defines heritage language learners as students in an English-dominant country raised in a home of non-English target language use, who are to some degree bilingual. Although the motivations, such as maintaining culture, and perhaps the strategies for continuing the language may be similar, McCarty (2008), a long-serving scholar and activist for Indigenous language advancement, believes that the interests of Indigenous language speakers are not well served by the term "heritage language" due to its association with immigrant communities. However, of all the phenomena currently studied in SLA, the language learning situation and motivations of heritage language learning are likely closest to ILR in that these individuals, families, and communities are resisting complete assimilation into the dominant culture and language around them. Heritage language promoters are trying to keep the language and culture of their "homelands" alive and continue them in their "new" country for generations to come.

This latter point is where the concept of heritage language veers away from ILR. The land, atmosphere, and context has shifted around Indigenous people; they did not travel somewhere to a new environment. By definition, Indigenous people are *in* their homelands yet have to reclaim "space" for their languages and cultures to survive. Another difference for most Indigenous people is that there is no "other" place in the world where they can practice and enhance their language skills in an immersion environment. As McCarty (2008) points out, "there is no external pool of speakers to help secure the future of Indigenous [languages]" (p. 211).

Lastly, heritage language literature points to first language speakers in the home whether it is parents, grandparents, and/or extended family as the transmitters of the language (He, 2008), a situation that is increasingly unlikely in Indigenous contexts. Despite these differences, there is much similarity in the experience of learning either a heritage language or an Indigenous language as a second or subsequent language in an environment dominated by another language.

Foreign Language Learning

It is ironic to equate the phenomena of Indigenous language learning with foreign language learning; however, similarities do exist. Like heritage language learning, the parallel between Indigenous language learning and foreign language learning is that of learning a language in an environment and social context where the target language is not the main language in use. As articulated by Block (2007b), "the FL context is… to learn a language that is not the typical language of communication outside the classroom" (p. 112). This statement identifies another similarity, which is the classroom as a common site for learning.

One important difference though between foreign language and Indigenous language learning is that there are no other places in the world where one can go to experience immersion in the target Indigenous language as one could in a foreign language (such as French, Spanish, or Mandarin). The motivations for learning may also be different as many foreign language learners are driven by the potential economic benefits of promotion within their industry (military, corporate, or governmental) and access to work overseas, which is not the case for Indigenous language learners. In addition, Kinginger (2004) conveys that in the US (and presumably Canada) "[FLL] is normally construed as an academic pursuit which is optional at best" (p. 221).

Mother Tongue

McCarty (2008, p. 202) characterizes the term "mother tongue" as one that is "typically thought of as the language one learns first and knows best," a definition that often does not apply to Indigenous language learners. Despite this, it is a term that is often heard in Indigenous communities when discussing Indigenous languages. It may relate to McCarty's (2008) observation that the term mother tongue "denotes a deep, abiding, even cord-like connection between language and identity" (p. 202). Many Indigenous people have a spiritual connection to their language that not only has to do with their ancestors but also with the ground beneath them, often referred to in Indigenous communities as Mother Earth. The challenge with this term is that, in most instances, the "mother tongue" is not the Indigenous learners' first language the way the word is used typically in SLA literature, and so the studies and theory that pertains could be misleading. Below is just one example of how the term can be confusing if transferred directly from SLA to ILR:

> [mother-tongue] education is directed toward enabling children to have a 'best' chance in school by conducting programs in their first language… [However], in most parts of Canada, except Nunavut in the far north…the vast majority of Indigenous children [are] not speaking or hearing the Indigenous language at home. Therefore, policy, advocacy, and implementation are focused on revitalization approaches, including language immersion programs in which the 'mother-tongue' language used in the program is actually a *new* language for the children. (McIvor & Ball, 2019, p. 14)

Ancestral Language

The term "ancestral language" is the most useful and suitable to date, although it is sparsely used in the literature. It is useful in part due to its inherent acknowledgment of the ancestors in the phrase, which is important to Indigenous people, but also because it avoids some of the issues identified with the above terms. According to Basham and Fathman (2008, p. 577), the term "ancestral language" provides a distinction between languages that are Indigenous to an area and those which are widely spoken in a homeland elsewhere, as is the case with heritage and foreign languages. Interestingly, though, Basham and Fathman (2008) choose to use the term "heritage language" in their paper on Indigenous languages as they identify heritage language as gaining favor in scholarly literature pertaining to Indigenous languages (see Campbell & Christian, 2003; Cummins, 2005; Fishman, 2001). Nevertheless, as stated, this term is currently the most useful for Indigenous communities to position and identify within the SLA and ILR research and scholarship.

Current Topics/Crossing Over

"There are obvious similarities between the community revitalization needs and the domain of applied linguistics" (Penfield & Tucker, 2011, p. 297). Linguist and Indigenous language revitalization specialist Leanne Hinton (2011, p. 308) explains, "second language learning and teaching are key components in all… kinds of language revitalization programs." The following includes various case examples within ILR that stem from or cross over to areas of study within SLA. They are organized into the

following concepts: learning conditions, learning strategies, learner attributes and differences, and dimensions of learning.

Learning Conditions

Rorick (2019) offers a holistic view of a learner-teacher-scholar-activist within ILR whose work relates directly to many sectors of applied linguistics. Rorick explains that she was exposed to her ancestral language in elementary school through a subject-based curriculum of 30 minutes a day, while no children in her community were being taught or spoken to in the language at home. Later in life, her early adulthood, she turned toward her own journey of learning her language through the Master-Apprentice method (see Hinton et al., 2018a). During this time, she also helped to begin an early childhood immersion program (called a Language Nest), then later developed a four-day outdoor language immersion curriculum, followed by a three-month classroom-based curriculum based on what she was learning in her graduate studies focused on ILR.

Rorick's case example is of particular interest, both because it is quite varied and therefore crosses over many different learning environments and settings, and because, in some ways, her Indigenous language learning story is also somewhat typical. Many Indigenous people did not have exposure to their language at home or in their communities as a living language in childhood but may have been exposed through school programming, only to turn their energies toward language endeavors earnestly in their adult life. Varying conditions exist across these diverse learning contexts; however, it is known that there are certain necessary conditions for these programs to assist in leading to the creation of new speakers.

McIvor (2015) explains these elements are critical for successful learning to take place. These understandings are broken down into four domains: time, opportunity, accommodation, and content. Within the concept of time, through this research and others (Johnson, 2017), it is understood that learners need thousands of hours of exposure at a satisfactory quality together with adequate duration and intensity. Opportunity refers not only to hours of exposure but also the chance to both hear and practice producing the language. Accommodation involves understanding individual learners' needs within their history with language learning, areas of interest, past successes and failures with language learning, goals, desires, and motivations. And finally, age appropriate content is crucial as adults will quickly tire of singing nursery songs or doing child-focused games nor can young children necessarily enter additional language learning through a focus on astrophysics or any other highly specialized area.

Learning Strategies

In 2017, Johnson stated, "[t]here is little published about best practices in First Nations language-teaching methods; in fact, little is published about First Nations language-teaching methods at all" (p. 512). While a more recent volume highlighting various methods and strategies for language learning in Indigenous communities has since been published (see Hinton et al., 2018b), it remains true that empirical research and documentation of effective Indigenous language learning methods and strategies in North America remains underserved. Hinton (2011) explains:

[m]ost of the strategies and methods of language teaching and learning presented… are original, creative 'bootstrap' ways people have developed as a response to the goals of and obstacles to language revitalization…. communities, families and individuals [have to] create new and unique strategies all the time to bring their endangered languages back into use. (p. 317)

Johnson (2017) offers one example of a program methodology that is structured, sequenced, and modeled after one created at the Salish School of Spokane. The method is based on a laddered sequence of textbooks, images, and audio recordings, among others. It is understood to be classroom-based curriculum totaling 2000 hours over four years with the goal of creating new speakers. Conversely, Rorick (2019) explores her passion of creating land-based curriculum and programming that remains in the language (rather than teaching "about" the language in English). The *Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization* contains several examples of methods that are well known in our field but have not been yet written about much until now. Those include the Root Word Method (Green & Maracle, 2018), Language "Nesting at home" (Zahir, 2018), an overview of the "Where are your keys?" and, finally, the Master-Apprentice Language Learning Program (Hinton et al., 2018a). Each of these methods offers an explanation as to what the method looks like and the successes and challenges known to the method. What is common across these methods is that they hold a philosophy of immersive practice as well as adhering to the conditions for learning explained earlier in McIvor (2015) regarding time, intensity, duration, appropriate content, opportunity, and accommodation.

Learner Attributes and Differences

Some developments within the field of SLA that Block (2007a) and others have referred to as "the social turn" have created greater possibilities for connections by expanding and developing certain concepts and factors of critical importance to the field of ILR. Both Duff (2019) and May (2019), for example, articulate the many challenges that remain to be considered in the continuing and developing "social turn." Sociocultural, sociolinguistic, and sociocognitive theories of SLA consider factors that also play a key role in Indigenous language learning models and theory building.

It is an interesting paradox and contact point for ILR, given some critiques that more cognitively oriented SLA research is overly "individualistic and mechanistic" (Firth & Wagner, 2007, p. 757). This is also illustrated by Atkinson (2002, p. 535) who argues that "the learner in mainstream SLA is something like an automaton, interesting only in the sense that it houses a discrete language learning system." Pavlenko (2005) sheds further light by contending, "It is not surprising that this individualistic and cognitive view of the affective domain emerged in North America academia, where individuals are viewed as autonomous selves and monolingualism rules as the norm" (p. 34). What is intriguing is that perhaps just as with SLA itself, the necessary approach to ILR is simultaneously individualistic and collective in nature. Each learning journey begins with one person, who must be personally motivated and interested and have the necessary access to high-quality learning opportunities, based on proven practices, underpinned by what is known about additional language learning. Equally, there must be an understanding of the barriers and collective contextual factors at play and necessary supports in place to manage them.

Johnson (2017) states in her account of the Syilx Language House that "[t]eachers must also contend with higher levels of learner anxiety due to various factors resulting from colonization, including language decline, older teaching techniques … and tensions and oppositions in community" (p. 512). This experience is common and well known in Indigenous second language learning contexts; and, anxiety and motivation are also factors considered of importance within many social approaches to SLA.

Motivation

Motivation is an important concept for consideration across our fields of study. A number of SLA researchers, including Zuengler and Miller (2006), hold the view that motivation (particularly, integrative or intrinsic) is connected to access to participation in the target community. Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000), for example, highlight the fact that second language learning often occurs in order to "participate in the… lifeworld of another culture" (p. 155). Indigenous people on language learning journeys are not usually trying to gain access to another (foreign) culture but rather their own that has often been lost to them, their family, or their community.

Drawn from a survey conducted with Indigenous language learners, Basham and Fathman (2008) found learners' motivations to be: "the preservation of the language and culture, desire to teach children and desire to communicate with Elders" (p. 589). Daniels-Fiss (2008) expressed similar motivations in expressing that she wanted to "deepen [her] identity as a Cree woman and to pass the language on to [her] children" (p. 235).

Identity

Ricento, and others such as Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004), recognize language as a "prominent marker of group membership and social identity" (Ricento, 2005, p. 896). Spolsky (1999) further explains "language is fundamental in defining identity" (p. 181). He provides the example of the Zionist program for the resurrection of Hebrew for those of Jewish descent, noting the slogan of the time, "You're Hebrew, speak Hebrew" (Spolsky, p. 183). This case illustrates Zuengler and Miller's (2006) point that, for some language learners, there is "much more at stake than merely developing competence in an additional linguistic code" (p. 43).

However, much of the second language literature on identity focuses on adult immigrant and foreign language learning contexts (as explained in Darvin & Norton, 2015; Norton, 2000; Norton, 2019; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004) and, therefore, may not translate directly to the realities and context of Indigenous language learners. Bonny Norton is recognized by Swain and Deters (2007, p. 828) as having made a "significant contribution to the social turn in SLA research," and she continues to be an important contributor to the literature on language learning and identity. Although there is much to be learned from Norton's work for the realities of ILR, as with other work within SLA, there are also significant differences in terms of Indigenous second language learners from the immigrant populations Norton and other SLA researchers' study.

The main difference between Indigenous learners and the immigrant populations that Norton studies is that her participants are often striving for acceptance and access to mainstream society. Although there are times that immigrant language learners may simultaneously reject parts of mainstream society (language and/or culture) while also trying to integrate, Indigenous language learners are often in the process of attempting to detach from settler society rather than trying to be accepted or integrated within it.

Related to identity are common losses and fears that accompany SLA (for immigrant learners), such as fear of loss of connection to culture and fear of loss of ways of life. Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) discuss many second language learners' choice to become proficient in the target language only to a certain degree so as to avoid "the consequences of losing the old and adopting the new ways of being in the world" (p. 162). For Indigenous people, this loss is historical—it has already occurred. What lies ahead in terms of acquiring a second language (their own) is all about *gain* and becoming whole. In fact, to gain the target Indigenous language for Indigenous people is actually to regain, enhance, or revive the "old ways" and shed some of the "new." An apprentice in the McIvor et al. (2018) study states, "I have found a part of my soul that was missing. I just feel so grateful. I feel like it's one of the biggest, most meaningful things I've ever done in my life" (Gisele Maria Martin, Nuu-chah-nulth Apprentice, p. 21).

Dimensions of Learning

Pronunciation and assessment are standard topics within SLA and, perhaps not surprisingly, there are crossovers with ILR. This section will include a case example of each.

One of the unique features in regard to ILR pronunciation is the intergenerational lapse in learning the language, that is, many teachers of the language are additional language learners themselves and have very few speakers to draw upon. While it is largely understood that pronunciation, in particular, is an issue in ILR, very few researchers within our field have focused here. Bird and Kell (2017) have completed one of the only studies to survey a single language speaking community (the SENĆOŦEN speaking community of lower Vancouver Island in BC, Canada) about their attitudes and expectations around pronunciation. They confirm that while "[m]ost Indigenous language revitalization programs in Canada currently emphasize spoken language…. virtually no research has been done on the role of pronunciation in the context of language revitalization" (Bird & Kell, 2017, p. 538).

Bird and Kell acknowledge there is a "relatively large body of research in SLA" (p. 539) focused on pronunciation, and they state that adult learners will almost always have the accent of the language they knew first (or best). They go on to say that, "[i]n language revitalization contexts, the situation is particularly complex, since speakers and learners are often especially concerned with speaking in a way that is faithful to their Elders' speech" (p. 539). Like many other Indigenous language learning communities in Canada, Bird and Kell (2017) assert the importance of this topic due to the reality that the majority of teachers are L2 speakers. Further, they explain, "[p]ronunciation change in a speech community is also often perceived negatively, particularly among older generations… fluent-speaking Elders can be particularly uncomfortable with pronunciation that does not match their own…" (p. 542). Bird and Kell, as the first to study this topic, suggest how this might be solved, proposing that "speech communities must strike a balance between respecting and honouring Elders' ways of speaking and supporting language learners as they strive to become proficient" (p. 543). As first language speakers continue to pass away in many communities in Canada and the US, and more second language speakers begin and continue to teach with less and less access to and input from first language speakers, it is easy to see how this will become a topic of increased focus over the next short while and years to come.

The topic and development of adequate assessment tools is a part of any serious and successful language learning program aiming to create new speakers. The American Council of Foreign Teaching of Language (www.actfl.org) produces many assessment

tools commonly used in Indigenous communities, while some instead adhere to the Canadian Language Benchmarks (www.language.ca). Often, assessment tools that are created for other contexts do not work in Indigenous language learning environments (for example, proficiency indicators like being able to order in a restaurant or open a bank account, both of which are found in the Common European Framework). Some language groups and programs have created their own assessment tools, such as Kahakalau (2017) and the NEȾOLṈEW̱ project aimed specifically at adult learners who are driving their own process in learning in a one-on-one apprenticeship environment (see McIvor & Jacobs, 2018, and netolnew.ca/assessment). As one case example, the NEȾOLṈEW̱ Assessment tool was created in collaboration with community partners, co-investigators, apprentices, and research assistants. The NEȾOLṈEW̱ Assessment Tool is helping to fill a current gap in ILR assessment where adults can self-assess with a positive focus using Likert scaling. While assessment is a developing area within ILR, it too is gaining momentum, a trend likely to continue as community planners center their focus on the creation of new speakers.

Building Bridges

The previous section focused on Current Topics and Crossovers aimed to provide an overview of and insight into possible synergies between SLA and ILR through case examples. It is clear from the review that further research is needed into the application and overlap of concepts in SLA within Indigenous language learning contexts, as most are underexamined from an Indigenous point of view. In this section, I turn my attention to the importance of building bridges within and across SLA and ILR.

One of the main challenges for ILR scholars in terms of access to and understanding of SLA theory and research are the existing divisions, internal debates, and factions within. For example, with SLA being a relatively new field of study by academic standards, and with the emergence in the field of more socially-oriented theorizing, contextualizing, and adding to the cognitively oriented focus, it seems that the socially-oriented aspects are seen by some as existing on the margins of the mainstream (May, 2019). One, then, might conclude that this leaves ILR on the fringe of the margins.

One of the benefits to deeper and closer collaborations between the field of SLA and ILR would be to highlight and bring attention to the communities on whose lands we all reside, rather than focusing solely on foreign language and immigrant experiences. For ILR, a main benefit of collaboration would be not having to "reinvent the wheel," recognizing that many language learning processes are human in nature and are therefore transferable to different contexts. Individual difference constructs, such as anxiety and motivation, should be applicable to ILR. Additional partnerships and collaborations with ILR would offer an opportunity to SLA researchers to understand more about how Indigenous languages are being learned in SLA settings and, therefore, to learn how generalizable and universal the knowledge and insights created in the field really are. This sort of move away from using the same kind of (white, middle-class, college-aged) participants is now being recognized in the field (see Andringa & Godfroid, this volume; Mackey, 2020). ILR contexts are ideal sites for moving away from the use of the same types of participants mentioned above, and this move could be realized in partnership with ILR researchers.

Given that few Indigenous people are learning their ancestral language as a first language, this leaves a great number who are potential second/additional language learners. This means the common ground for meaningful collaborative research should be

plentiful and fertile for a long while. Until Indigenous languages thrive again, it is likely to be some time before the majority of Indigenous language learning becomes SLA in nature. Therefore, collaboration and shared understanding would be of great mutual benefit to ILR and SLA. Toward this end, applied linguist Mela Sarkar (2017) wisely adds:

> How can we work together without it turning into the old colonial story of white people from the outside trying to be helpful but winding up doing more harm than if they had never come? I know that in my discipline we all too easily assume that what we know about second language acquisition and pedagogy in the usual Western contexts (from classrooms to factory floors) will be true for all contexts. But this is an incorrect assumption. (p. 503)

The solution to this worry is to ensure that the partnerships and collaborations developed from this invitation are self-determined and self-governed. Rorick (2019, p. 232) articulates this as "employing a decolonizing practice" and privileging "Indigenous, rather than dominant colonizing knowledge bases" to guide the work. The NEȽOȽNEW̱ project (netolnew.ca) in Canada is one such project, conceived by an Indigenous-led research team, further developed with nine Indigenous partners, the research project and grant funds are self-governed by a rotating advisory council of partner members. The ethics protocol for the research grant, while all-encompassing at the university, privileges community processes and is trumped by a partner's formal ethics process when reviewing the research.

Ways Forward

> Absent from second language pedagogy for endangered languages, in many cases, are applied linguists who specialize in language-teaching theory and methodology. In general, outside experts who work with communities on language revitalization are documentary linguists, theoretical linguists, and linguistic anthropologists— most of whom do not have an educational background in language teaching and learning… [Therefore] the guidance of experts in language and teaching methods and models could be of great assistance in language revitalization. Research by applied linguists on the effectiveness of the new models and how they could be improved would be especially helpful. (Hinton, 2011, p. 317)

Penfield and Tucker (2011) concur that "language revitalization and documentation would benefit from more applied linguists turning their attention toward endangered language work" (p. 291), further stating, "[t]here is ample room to include them if they choose to bring their skills to the table and are willing to embrace the very different language context presented by endangered language communities" (p. 296). And finally, they simply state, "there are not enough applied linguists in the endangered language world" (p. 303).

Yet, ILR research has to be "by or with" not "on or for." There are several good examples and guides on how to enter into virtuous research and collaborative relationships with Indigenous communities (see Czaykowska-Higgins, 2009; Riddell et al., 2017; Sarkar, 2017). While theses authors and foci vary, and, for a full appreciation of these researchers' journeys one must access their work, there are some common lessons among them, such as: relationship and intention are always fore; and the research agenda must be driven by or be of great interest to the community and prove to benefit the people (and in this case the language) in some way. Czaykowska-Higgins (2009)

advocates that the more collaborative research that occurs between fields that do not normally work this way, or work together, the better understood Indigenous community-based collaborative research will be. She concludes with the belief that collaborations across disciplines inevitably bring exciting opportunities, new knowledge, and benefits both fields involved.

Solutions

We must build increased capacity in the form of new Indigenous scholars specializing in Indigenous language learning and have their work supported by interested additional language learning specialists to make the best use of the limited resources and limited time we have to turn the tides. Therefore, I call upon allies from within applied linguistics and SLA to respectfully join Indigenous communities in their efforts and offer expertise to assist in making the very best use of the time we have left with the most proficient speakers today.

Together, let us develop new empirical research projects (beyond description) focused on the most popular language revitalization programs and strategies (such as language nests, full-immersion schooling, accelerated learning methods, and the Mentor-Apprentice language learning program). In addition, we should systemically support the development of resources and share expertise to create and sustain immersion programs for parents of young children, infants, preschool-aged children, K-12 schools, and adults, all of which are critical to the revival and continuation of the first languages of this land. Attending to these research areas and future areas of knowledge creation could move applied linguistics, SLA, and ILR forward together in new and exciting ways.

Conclusion

The damages done to Indigenous languages occurred due to colonial forces, some of which continue to this day, and many believe efforts to revive them should involve more than Indigenous peoples alone. Those working in applied linguistics and SLA hold specific knowledge and skills that could be extended to ILR for great gains. ILR has much to benefit from the decades of fruitful research on the impacts of sociocultural contexts on language learning and maintenance, as well as optimal conditions for additional language learning from a cognitive perspective. Reciprocally, applied linguistics could be enriched by greater knowledge of Indigenous language learning contexts and the particular teaching and learning methods that have been developed therein, which often differ from those widely studied in the literature. More broadly, ILR brings a novel social justice opportunity to the field of applied linguistics and one to which some members may find themselves being called to contribute. Several applied linguists offer the upmost leads on this charge (May, 2019; Ortega, 2019; Sarkar, 2017; Weinberg & De Korne, 2016) with many calling for a more multilingual turn in SLA that is, of course, by nature also multicultural and complex (Douglas Fir Group, 2016; Duff, 2019; Ortega, 2019). These calls come from the cognitive side of SLA too (e.g., Andringa & Godfroid, this volume; Mackey, 2020).

This paper has explored the similarities and important departures as well as the tensions and possibilities for stronger connections and sharing of knowledge across these fields of study and argues for greater collective engagement in this work (McIvor, 2018). A greater connection between the two fields could bring exciting and useful outcomes

to both. Working across these two fields more purposefully would build capacity among both Indigenous language and applied linguistics scholars, and maximize the resources available to maintain, revitalize, and strengthen nationwide reconciliation and revitalization efforts of Indigenous languages. This capacity is essential to maximize the knowledge and resources available to maintain and strengthen revitalization efforts of the Indigenous languages around the world. This paper is a call for greater collaboration, an invitation to learn from one another, furthering the aims of Indigenous communities on whose languages all those working in the Canada-US contexts reside.

tawâw—we welcome you in, there is room for you here. It is time for those within applied linguistics with relevant knowledge, skills, and interest to begin working more closely with and across ILR for a stronger, better, and more just language environment in Canada and the US, where the original languages of these lands thrive *alongside* the others, not disappear because of them.

êkosi

Notes

1 The field of applied linguistics is varied and multiple, and so it is with caution that I refer to it within as one entity; however, for the purposes of pursuing potential relationship and collaboration, I refer to our field of Indigenous Language Revitalization (ILR) in the same ominous (and somewhat problematic) way.
2 I am sure many Indigenous parents, elders, and leaders were beginning to be concerned about the demise of their languages. However, it was not documented as a predominant issue in the activism and political activity of that time.
3 Defined as the languages of the people who occupied the lands now known as Canada and the US prior to European contact.
4 First Peoples is an encompassing term used to refer to the first peoples of the lands now known as North America. First Nations is a term used in Canada created to refer to the "first" Nations of that land. Native American is recognized as the most common term used in the US, and so First Peoples or Indigenous are used in this paper as overarching terms unless another term appears as part of an author's direct quote.
5 See Hinton (2003) for additional early account of this ILR phenomena.

References

Andringa, S., & Godfroid, A. (this volume). Sampling bias and the problem of generalizability in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40.

Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 525–45.

Basham, C., & Fathman, A. (2008). The latent speaker: Attaining adult fluency in an endangered language. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(5), 577–97.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Purich Publishing.

Bauman, J. J. (1980). *A guide to issues in Indian language retention.* Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bird, S., & Kell, S. (2017). The role of pronunciation in SENĆOŦEN language revitalization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 73(4), 538–69. doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.4060

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition.* Georgetown University Press.

Block, D. (2007a). The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 863–76.

Block, D. (2007b). *Second language identities.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Campbell, R., & Christian, D. (2003). Directions in research: Intergenerational transmission of heritage languages. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1(1), 109–44.

Cantoni, G. (Ed.). (1996). *Stabilizing Indigenous languages.* Northern Arizona University Center for Excellence in Education.

Churchill, W. (2004). *Kill the Indian, save the man: The genocidal impact of American Indian residential schools.* City Light Books.

Cummins, J. (1980). Ancestral-language maintenance: The roles of school and home. *Multiculturalism, 14*(2), 23.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a language resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 585–91.

Czaykowska-Higgins, E. (2009). Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation, 3*(1), 15–50. hdl.handle.net/10125/4423

Daniels-Fiss, B. (2008). Learning to be a nehiyaw (Cree) through language. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 2*(3), 233–45.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 36–56.

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(S1), 19–47.

Duff, P. A. (2019). Social dimensions and processes in second language acquisition: Multilingual socialization in transnational contexts. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*, 6–22.

Fettes, M. (1992). *A guide to language strategies for First Nations communities.* Assembly of First Nations: Language and Literacy Secretariat.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(5), 757–72.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages.* Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited: A 21st century perspective.* Multilingual Matters.

Gaudry, A. (2015). Researching the resurgence: Insurgent research and community engaged methodologies in 21st century academic inquiry. In S. Strega & L. A. Brown (Eds.), *Research as Resistance: Revisiting Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, (2nd ed., pp. 243–67). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Green, J. (Tehota'kerá:tonh) & Maracle, B. (Owennatékha). (2018). The Root-Word Method for building proficient second-language speakers of polysynthetic languages: Onkwawén:na Kentyókhwa adult Mohawk language immersion program. In L. Hinton, L. M. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (1st ed., pp. 146–55). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315561271

Grenoble, L. A., & Whaley, L. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response.* Cambridge University Press.

He, A. W. (2008). Heritage language learning and socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 201–13). Springer.

Hinton, L. (2003). How to teach when the teacher isn't fluent. In J. Reyhner, O. Trujillo, R. L. Carrasco, & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing Native Languages* (pp. 79–92). Northern Arizona University.

Hinton, L. (2008). Learning and teaching endangered Indigenous languages. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 157–67). Springer.

Hinton, L. (2011). Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education, 25*(4), 307–18. doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.577220

Hinton, L., Florey, M., Gessner, S. & Manatowa-Bailey, J. (2018a). The Master-Apprentice language learning program. In L. Hinton, L. M. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (1st ed., pp. 127–36). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315561271

Hinton, L., Huss, L., & Roche, G. (2018b). *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization.* Routledge.

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (1996). *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Ignace, M. B. (1998). *Handbook for Aboriginal language program planning in British Columbia.* First Nations Education Steering Committee: Aboriginal language subcommittee.

Jamieson, M. E. (1988). *National Aboriginal language policy study.* Assembly of First Nations.

Jenni, B., Anisman, A., McIvor, O., & Jacobs, P. (2017). An exploration of the effects of mentor-apprentice programs on mentors & apprentices' wellbeing. *International Journal of Indigenous Health, 12*(2), 25–42.

Johnson, S. M. K. (2017). Syilx language house: How and why we are delivering 2,000 decolonizing hours in Nsyilxcn. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 73*(4), 509–37.

Kahakalau, K. (2017). Developing an Indigenous proficiency scale. *Cogent Education*, *4*(1), 1–11. doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1377508

King, K. A., & Hermes, M. (2014). Why is this so hard? Ideologies of endangerment, passive language learning approaches, and Ojibwe in the United States. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *13*(4), 268–82. doi:10.1080/15348458.2014.939029

Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219–42). Multilingual Matters.

Kirkness, V. (1998). The critical state of Aboriginal languages in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *22*(1), 93–108.

Krauss, M. (1998). The condition of native North American languages: The need for realistic assessment and action. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *132*, 9–21.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to post-method*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mackey, A. (2020). *Interaction, feedback, and task research in second language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Martinez Agudo, J. D. D. (Ed.) (2017). *Native and non-native teachers in second language classrooms: Professional challenges and teacher education*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Maurais, J. (1996). The situation of Aboriginal languages in the Americas. In J. Maurais (Ed.), *Quebec's Aboriginal languages: History, planning and development* (pp. 1–42). Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, *103*(S1), 122–29. doi.org/10.1111/modl.12531

McCarty, T. (2008). Native American languages as heritage mother tongues. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *21*(3), 201–25.

McIvor, O. (2015). Adult Indigenous language learning in Western Canada: What is holding us back? In K. A. Michel, P. D. Walton, E. Bourassa, & J. Miller (Eds.), *Living our languages: Papers from the 19th Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Symposium* (pp. 37–49). Linus Learning.

McIvor, O. (2018). *Indigenous languages in Canada: What you need to know*. CCUNESCO. https://en.ccu-nesco.ca/-/media/Files/Unesco/Resources/2018/09/IndigenousLanguagesCCUNESCO.pdf

McIvor, O. & Anisman, A. (2018). Keeping our languages alive: Strategies for Indigenous language revitalization and maintenance. In Y. Watanabe (Ed.), *Handbook of Cultural Security*, (pp. 90–109). Edward Elgar Publishing.

McIvor, O., & Ball, J. (2019). Language-in-education policies and Indigenous language revitalization efforts in Canada: Considerations for non-dominant language education in the Global South. FIRE: Forum for international research in education. In K. M. Wong & C. Benson (Eds.), *Policy and practice in the use of non-dominant languages in comparative education* [Special issue], *5*(3), 12–28.

McIvor, O., & Jacobs, P. (2018). *Adult Indigenous contributions to reviving languages in British Columbia through mentor-apprentice style learning: Assessment tool*. University of Victoria. www.netolnew.ca/resources

McIvor, O., Jacobs, P., & Jenni, B. (2018). *Adult Indigenous contributions to reviving languages in British Columbia through mentor-apprentice style learning: Research report*. University of Victoria. www.netol-new.ca/resources

McIvor, O. & McCarty, T. (2016). Indigenous bilingual and revitalization-immersion education in Canada and the USA. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education, Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed., pp. 1–17). Springer International Publishing.

Milloy, J. S. (1999). *"A national crime": The Canadian government and the residential school system, 1879 to 1986*. University of Manitoba Press.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. Oxford University Press.

Norris, M. J. (1998). Canada's Aboriginal languages. *Canadian Social Trends* 51 (*Winter*), 51. Statistics Canada, Catalogue No. 11–008.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Pearson Education.

Norton, B. (2019). Identity and language learning: A 2019 retrospective account. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *75*(4), 299–307. doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2019-0287

Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *Modern Language Journal*, *103* (Supplement 2019), 23–38.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual context*s. Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learnin*g (pp. 155–77). Oxford University Press.

Penfield, S. D., & Tucker, B. V. (2011). From documenting to revitalizing an endangered language: Where do applied linguists fit? *Language and Education*, *25*(4), 291–305. doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.577219

Reyhner, J. A. (1995). Maintaining and renewing native languages. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *19*(2), 279–304.

Ricento, T. (2005). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learnin*g (pp. 895–910). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Riddell, J., Salamanca, A., Pepler, D., Cardinal, S. & McIvor, O. (2017). Laying the groundwork: A practical guide for ethical research with Indigenous communities. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, *8*(2), 1–20.

Rorick, C. L. (2019). wałyaʕasukʔi naananiqsakqin: At the home of our ancestors: Ancestral continuity in Indigenous land-based language immersion. In L. T. Smith, T. Tuck, & K. W. Yang (Eds.), *Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education: Mapping the long view* (pp. 224–37). Routledge.

Rosborough, T. Ł. Ł. P., & Rorick, Č. L. (2017). Following in the footsteps of the wolf: Connecting scholarly minds to ancestors in Indigenous language revitalization. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *13*(1), 11–17.

Sarkar, M. (2017). Ten years of Mi'gmaq language revitalization work: A non-Indigenous applied linguist reflects on building research relationships. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *73*(4), 488–508. doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.4082

Simpson, L. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence and a new emergence*. Arbeiter Ring Publishers.

Spolsky, B. (1999). Second-language learning. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identit*y (pp. 181–92). Oxford University Press.

Stacey, K. I. (2016). *Ientsitewate'nikonhraié:ra'te Tsi Nonkwá:ti Ne Á:se Tahatikonhsontóntie We will turn our minds there once again, to the faces yet to come: Second language speakers and language revitalization in Kahnawà:ke*. Master's thesis, University of Victoria, BC, Canada. UVicSpace.

Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(5), 820–36.

SX̱ED₮ELISIYE (Sampson, R.). (2014). W̱IÁLḴEN NE SḴÁL: SX̱ED₮ELISIYE's SENĆO₮EN auto-ethnography. Master's thesis, University of Victoria, BC, Canada. UVicSpace.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40.

Weinberg, M., & De Korne, H. (2016). Who can speak Lenape in Pennsylvania? Authentication and language learning in an endangered language community of practice. *Language & Communication*, *47*, 124–34.

Zahir, Z. (2018). Language nesting in the home. In L. Hinton, L. M. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (1st ed., pp. 156–65). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315561271

Zuengler, J., & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 35–58.