<A>THE POSITION PAPER

<B>*Pathways Forward for Indigenous Language Reclamation: Engaging Indigenous Epistemology and Learning by Observing and Pitching in to Family and Community Endeavors*

RICHARD HENNE–OCHOA

Indiana University, Bloomington

EMMA ELLIOTT–GROVES

University of Washington, Seattle

BARBRA A. MEEK

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

BARBARA ROGOFF

University of California, Santa Cruz

Over the last 40 years or so, especially in the last two decades, the world's Indigenous peoples and their allies have responded in earnest to threats to the vitality of their Indigenous languages. Our main purpose in this article is to offer a reconsideration of language revitalization by examining foundational ideologies and related practices. We believe that doing so will inform scholars and practitioners of language work and, ultimately, serve Indigenous communities who want to better align their language revitalization efforts with Indigenous concepts and practices.

Similar to mainstream discourse related to climate change, mainstream discourse about heritage language frames the issue as a crisis that can result in the extinction of not only people,

plants, and animals but also Indigenous language and cultural practices (Baldwin, Noodin, & Perley, 2018). Furthermore, the discourses of crisis or death are a function of the settler colonial ideology of Indigenous erasure (Wolfe, 2006), whereby participation in such discourses perpetuates a sense of loss of life. In this context, responses to Indigenous heritage have been varied.

The responses have been labelled most commonly as "language retention" (Bauman, 1980), "language renewal" (Brandt, 1988; St. Clair & Leap, 1982), "reversing language shift" (Fishman, 1991), "language revitalization" (Davis, 2018; Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Hinton & Hale, 2001; Hinton, Huss, & Roche, 2018; Jacob, 2013; Meek, 2010), and "language reclamation" (De Korne & Leonard, 2017; Leonard, 2012, 2017, 2019; Perley, 2011). These terms, especially language revitalization, are ubiquitous today in discourse about responses to language endangerment. The meanings of these terms are usually taken for granted as mutually understood across bodies of interdisciplinary scholarship.

Yet, just what exactly are these terms taken to mean in Indigenous communities? As Leonard (2017) recently pointed out, those who engage in language work, that is, "language documentation, description, teaching, advocacy, and resource development" (p. 16)—as well as learning—do not necessarily share the same meanings in common. Complicating matters, definitions of learning itself vary across contexts. We draw on Gutiérrez and Rogoff's (2003) understanding that "learning is conceived of as a process occurring within ongoing activity, and not divided into separate characteristics of individuals and contexts" (p. 20). That is, learning is situated deeply in local family and community contexts, and observation and evaluation of learning takes place across generations. For example, while Elliott–Groves (second author) was conducting research in her home community—Cowichan Tribes on Vancouver Island, British Columbia—she was asked to participate in the end-of-life ceremony for a community member (Elliott–Groves & Meixi, 2020). Given that Elliott–Groves was born and raised in the community, Elders and other community members have observed and evaluated her performance in relation to cultural and community

commitments across her lifetime. Each opportunity provided her the opportunity to learn new skills and acquire new knowledge, while providing a chance for the community to evaluate her learning (Elliott–Groves & Meixi, 2020).

Differences in conceptions of what language is or what learning constitutes will inevitably result in differing notions of what language revitalization is and how it should be done. In particular, we note how Leonard (2017) pointed out that non-Indigenous linguists working as allies to Indigenous communities in their language work tend to conceive of language as an object, owing in large part to their education and training in Euro-Western schools and universities. Emphasizing structural properties, language is framed by such allies as a 'thing' that can be captured through linguistic elicitation from speakers and the recording of narratives—in the Boasian tradition—and turned into documents such as dictionaries, grammars, and texts (Leonard, 2017; see also Darnell & Valentine, 1999). In this sense, a language may be understood as a code that is separable from context.

While this language-as-code ideology is a useful way of conceiving of language for certain intents and purposes, such framing exists "at the expense of social practices" (Leonard, 2017, p. 18; see also Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974). It masks an understanding of language as social interaction, situated within and in dynamic and dialogic relationship with multiple layers of context, including historical, sociocultural, political economic, developmental, and psychological. We suggest that rendering language as a code is an attempt to remove Indigenous concepts of language from the social and cultural context, resulting in Indigenous erasure. Indigenous understandings of language are intertwined with Indigenous concepts of land, identity, and thought, and as such, cannot be successfully compartmentalized and transmitted.

Importantly, the conception of language as an object fails to acknowledge the social work and cultural meanings of language, including its importance for understanding cultural concepts of identity and the associated relational and moral fabric of the community. Efforts at language

revitalization need to design their efforts around ethical commitments to the community (Grenoble, 2009; Kroskrity & Meek, 2017; Meek, 2017). And because language revitalization is most often a collaborative endeavor, differences in conceptions of what language is may be consequential to coordinating language work:

> However it is conceptualised, 'language' provides the basic framework through which people plan, execute, and assess language work. When speaker–consultants participate in language documentation, for instance, it is their understanding of 'language' that informs their motivations in doing such work. When they negotiate ethical and other concerns, it is with this as a backdrop. When community members engage with language documentation or with pedagogical materials based on documentation, it is with their understanding of 'language' that they use these products and assess their value. (Leonard, 2017, p. 19)

Engagement with Indigenous language revitalization activities is preconditioned by ideologies of what language is and what constitutes learning a language, which is reflected in the approach to language revitalization. This, of course, is true whether or not those engaged in this type of language work state their ideologies of language and learning explicitly or are even cognizant of them (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Kroskrity, 2009, 2018). Further, we recognize that language practices reinforce certain ideologies of language in a dialogic relationship (Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998).

It seems reasonable to wonder, then, what ideologies of language and learning exist in language work, as well as how they are manifested in social practices. That is, what are the most basic conceptual foundations undergirding language revitalization and how are they tied to language revitalization efforts? To be sure, there is a substantial body of work concerning ideologies of language (e.g., Joseph & Taylor, 1990; Kroskrity, 2000; Schieffelin et al., 1998; Silverstein, 1979). Scholarly attention has been given specifically to Indigenous language ideologies or "beliefs and feelings about language and discourse" (Field & Kroskrity, 2009, p. 4) held by Indigenous community

members (e.g., Davis, 2018; Hill & Hill, 1986; Jacob, 2013; Kroskrity & Field, 2009; Kulick, 1997; Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007; Morgan, 2009). Yet there is a need for attention focused on Indigenous conceptions of language itself and of what language revitalization means, and how such conceptions shape and are shaped by language revitalization initiatives that occur within and across various contexts.

To this end, we focus on three areas: (a) Indigenous ideologies of language and language revitalization, (b) Euro-Western ideologies of language and how they are (intentionally or unintentionally) built into many current indigenous language revitalization initiatives and programmatic actions, and (c) a family- and community-based response to language endangerment founded on a broader enterprise than language revitalization—language reclamation—that foregrounds Indigenous ideologies of language while also supporting a way of learning, prevalent in, but not exclusive to, Indigenous communities, called "learning by observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors" (LOPI; Rogoff, 2014).

In this way, we hope to contribute to the decolonization and Indigenization of language revitalization taken up by others (e.g., Hermes, 2005; Hermes & Haskins, 2018; Leonard, 2017). We consider a perspective on decolonization and Indigenization informed by Wilson and Yellow Bird (2005), who stated that decolonization is "the intelligent, calculated, and active resistance to the forces of colonization that perpetuate the subjugation and/or exploitation of our minds, bodies, and lands, and (. . .) is engaged for the ultimate purpose of *overturning the colonial structures and realizing Indigenous liberation* [emphasis added]" (p. 5). To this end, we theorize Indigenous language revitalization using an analytical framework including Indigenous conceptions of land, language, thought, and identity. Drawing on Tuck and Yang's (2012) discussion of decolonization, we hope to offer suggestions for the repatriation of Indigenous languages that emerge from Indigenous ways of knowing.

By complicating the very notion of language itself, we push back against Euro-Western

ideologies of language that privilege structure and code. Instead, we advance Indigenous ideologies of language, which we suggest are, in many instances, language-as-social-interaction ideologies (Duranti, 1997), language-as-performance ideologies (Bauman, 1977, 1986, 2011; Bauman & Briggs, 1990), and, more broadly, language-as-social-action in the ethnography-of-speaking tradition (Bauman & Scherzer, 1975, 1989; Hymes, 1962, 1972, 1974). We do this to recenter Indigenous conceptions of language itself, particularly, by promoting a language-as-a-process-of-sustaining-relationality ideology.

We also seek to contribute to the deconstruction of common Euro-Western-based ideologies of language revitalization and language instruction tied to those ideologies. We call attention to how such ideologies and practices obscure Indigenous conceptions of language and Indigenous language reclamation. Our interest in problematizing 'language revitalization' stems from how ubiquitous and seemingly dominant conceptions of it mask the role of settler-colonialism in Indigenous language endangerment. Instead, we consider how language reclamation (see, for example, De Korne & Leonard, 2017; Leonard, 2012, 2017, 2019), a concept which derives from a decolonized/decolonizing and Indigenized/Indigenizing paradigm, is a more apt, productive, and dynamic concept to facilitate pedagogical transformation. We further respond to the need to offer critical perspectives on language revitalization practices that center language learning in Indigenous social, cultural, relational, and spiritual contexts.

<B>*Indigenous Ideologies of Language and Language Reclamation, and Related Practices*

We begin by suggesting that language reclamation should be consistent with Indigenous perspectives and goals. That is, we support a language-as-a-process-of-sustaining-relationality ideology. This is not to suggest that Indigenous and Euro-Western ideologies of language do not mutually influence one another or that there are 'pure' Indigenous ideologies of language. In fact, we recognize the existence of "conceptual convergence" or "what could be called ideological syncretism" (Meek, 2009, p. 165) as it relates to ideologies of language. Rather, we mean to examine

areas where the different cultural meanings of language are apparent and consequential, even if interconnected and sometimes challenging to distinguish.

A conception of language as social interaction frames language as a process or verb, not an object or noun, and foregrounds relationships through interaction. Important to this conception is the centrality of relational reciprocity in Indigenous notions of language; ethical relationships with people and the natural world are integral to the how and why languages are learned in context across generations. We are, in other words, suggesting that an appropriate conceptual framework for understanding Indigenous ideologies of language is an Indigenous relational epistemology.

It is important to first reframe language 'revitalization' within a language reclamation paradigm to foreground Indigenous and decolonizing ideologies and practices. This encompasses conceptions of language as relationality, as well as language practices that honor Indigenous ways of speaking (Henne, 2009; Henne–Ochoa, 2018). It also includes Indigenous pedagogies that reclaim Indigenous languages by sustaining and reclaiming Indigenous cultures (McCarty & Lee, 2014). For us, to reclaim a language refers to the active recovery of language processes and practices that have been impacted by colonization and, in this way, allows us to acknowledge that Indigenous languages were never forfeited. These Indigenous conceptions of language, language practices, and pedagogies have existed for millennia, but in many cases they have been weakened and are still under threat by settler-colonialism. Thus, rightfully, many Indigenous people seek to reclaim them.

We are suggesting that *language reclamation* is a more apt term than *language revitalization*, given the expressed language goals of Indigenous communities. It is so because it calls out settler-colonial impacts while also charting a process of decolonizing Indigenous language ideologies and practices by reconfiguring them within self-determined Indigenous social structures in which family and community interaction is (re)embedded.

<B>*Indigenous Notions of Language in Relationship With Land, Language, Thought, and Identity*

Iñupiaq scholar MacLean (2010) shared her expertise on the intimate relationship between land, language, and thought from Alaska. Language is used to organize everyday life by communicating local meaning (MacLean, 2010). For Iñupiaq, whose way of life and livelihood is contingent upon respectful relations with land and sea, language is used to direct attention quickly to the accurate location of an object, with respect to visibility, proximity, and safety (MacLean, 2010). Iñupiaq language was developed in relation to the land, and as such, their number of demonstrative pronouns to describe objects in relation to the environment is higher than in the English language. In English, demonstrative pronouns include *this* and *that* in the singular form, whereas, the Iñupiaq language has at least 22 stems used to create demonstrative pronouns. The mere quantitative differences across the two languages illustrate the process-oriented nature of Iñupiaq language, while MacLean's description of language in relation to life, livelihood, and safety illustrates a vastly different perspective and function of language itself.

For most, if not all, Indigenous peoples, being Indigenous means "to live in relationship with the place where one is born," (Jaimes Guerrero, 2003, p. 66). Therefore, Indigenous conceptions of self, including what it means to be a person, are strongly rooted to the land. Among Cowichan, for example, many believe that the land holds the bones of their ancestors, and therefore, their relationship to the land constitutes their individual and collective identities across generations (Elliott–Groves, 2019).

To honor their commitment to respecting plant, animal, and natural world relations, some communities have members who have been trained by Elders to speak up on behalf of the land and water during every community decision. Indigenous language has evolved from Indigenous relationship to land, and in this way, can be understood as emergent from the land (Tuck, McKenzie, & McCoy, 2014). Without heritage language, many Indigenous people believe that their communication with the land and spirit world could be adversely impacted, thus shifting concepts of Indigenous identity. Many communities have stories embedded in particular landscapes that

demonstrate a collective identity associated with generations of responsible relations with a particular place (Cajete, 1994). Indigenous notions of self, then, are also deeply intertwined with Indigenous understandings of language, thought, identity, and relationship to land.

<B>*Euro-Western Ideologies of Language and Language Revitalization, and Related Practices*

How do Euro-Western notions of language as a neutral, representational, and autonomous code align with dominant language revitalization ideologies and practices? To revitalize Indigenous languages, many Indigenous communities whose Indigenous language is severely endangered or dormant have, out of necessity, relied primarily on formal educational institutions and Indigenous-language-as-a-second-language (ILSL) programs (Coronel-Molina & McCarty, 2016). In ILSL programs in schools, language instruction is commonly, though not always, based on Western pedagogy, involving what Rogoff (2014) has called assembly-line instruction (ALI), with efforts to transmit isolated bits of knowledge separate from the contexts of their use.

Moreover, ILSL programs have typically been educational institution-sited approaches that are not supported outside of the formal learning environment by family- and community-based Indigenous language programs. Gómez de García, Axelrod, and Lachler (2009) described it this way:

Problems related to language loss and shift in Indigenous communities seem to be not only that Indigenous languages are no longer spoken by the younger generation and that the contexts for speaking the language within the community are diminishing but also that dominant-culture ways of addressing these challenges are being adopted. Responsibility for revitalizing languages is most commonly situated within the institutions that are constructed to mirror dominant culture values: the schools and the tribal bureaucracy. (p. 118)

The result, often, is that while Indigenous children and youth may develop some knowledge of their Indigenous language in school, they do not develop enough communicative competence to speak it outside of their Indigenous language lessons for more than a narrowly restricted range of domains

and purposes. Instead, they ordinarily speak the language-of-wider-communication (such as English or Spanish) elsewhere in and around the school and in family and community domains. In the long term, they do not ordinarily develop Indigenous language communicative competence to the point that they are well prepared, when they become parents, to immerse their own children in the language at home within everyday activities.

Pointing to the effectiveness of language nests, particularly in connection with the Māori (see, for example, King, 2001) and Hawaiian (see, for example, Wilson & Kamanā, 2001) languages, Indigenous communities have increasingly turned to Indigenous language immersion (ILI) programs. However, unlike the total immersion programs for the Māori and Hawaiian languages, many of these other ILI programs situate immersion solely in formal daycare facilities and schools (Coronel–Molina & McCarty, 2016). We have observed that many of these daycare- and school-based Indigenous language immersion programs do not have learners using the language to accomplish culturally relevant endeavors. Instead, they carry out typical Euro-Western schooling activities. For example, among the Oglala Lakota, a Native American group whose current homeland is the Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota, and in other Lakota communities on the Northern Plains of North America, Henne–Ochoa (2020) has observed that ILI programs have been operating for about the past two decades, serving a small number of children and youth. Lakota language immersion is occurring in some daycare facilities. In a few schools, there are Lakota immersion programs in early elementary grades. But as with the ILSL programs, based on what Henne–Ochoa (2020) has observed and what Pine Ridge Reservation residents have said to him, immersion in daycare facilities and schools involves doing activities prescribed by Euro-Western school curricula. Further, children who participate in Lakota immersion programs rarely use Lakota outside of those contexts, in family and community life.

Our study of the nature of ILSL revitalization programs reveals several characteristics common to ALI, "which aims to control the learners' attention, motivation, and behavior in settings

isolated from productive contributions to the community" (Rogoff, 2014, p. 75). Rogoff's (2014) seven facets of ALI are useful for organizing the description of many ILSL revitalization programs built on that model and tied to Euro-Western language-as-code ideologies. We draw on the seven-facet ALI prism here in order to unearth the ideologies inherent in many ILSL programs and also to problematize and rethink ILI programs that are designed according to conventional Euro-Western philosophies of schooling and pedagogy.

<C>*Facet 1 – What Is the Community's Social Organization?* In daycare- and school-based Indigenous language revitalization (including both ILSL and many ILI programs), language learning takes place in formal educational institutions, which are segregated from family and community endeavors. The learning community is bureaucratically controlled such that one learns the language according to the normative procedures and rules of the institution, a 'language regime' of sorts.

<C>*Facet 2 – What Motivates a Person's Involvement?* As in all ALI, motivation to learn an Indigenous language through ILSL programs stems from the learner seeking extrinsic rewards and avoiding threats (Rogoff, 2014). Grades, for instance, serve as prods in ILSL programs to get learners to apply themselves to language learning exercises so as to show 'proof' of competence to others and not to be deemed incompetent by them. At the same time, teachers' involvement is motivated by the bureaucratic system to deliver the curriculum to students, and to attempt to control student involvement and to rank students' language knowledge and skill via points and grades.

However, extrinsic motivation to learn, rather than intrinsic motivation, does not always result in a sustained commitment to learning. In fact, "if there isn't a considerable amount of interest and commitment on the part of the learner, learning doesn't occur at all" (Simpson, 2014, p. 15). For example, among the Lakota of Pine Ridge Reservation, children and youth are often unmotivated to learn Lakota through ALI in school. As they and their Lakota language teachers have reported to Henne–Ochoa (April 28, 2019), and as he has observed in Pine Ridge Reservation classrooms, extrinsic rewards and direct assessment of their linguistic competence stifles, rather

than kindles, their participation, even though they otherwise express support for the goal of revitalizing Lakota and hold it in very high regard.

<C>*Facet 3 – How Is Group Interaction Organized?* In ILSL programs, social organization is arranged for direct instruction that follows a typical teacher–student participation structure in order to learn language in didactic fashion. There is a clear division of labor between the teacher and students, a unilateral arrangement (Philips, 1992). Teachers control students' attention toward and motivation for engaging in activities designed to foster language learning. There are predetermined learning activities that are regimented by prepared teacher–student scripts that prompt asymmetrical participation. In ILI programs, although the aims are consistent with producing new speakers, it is usually carried out in a school and in a form of immersion that is far from being immersed in culturally relevant contexts.

<C>*Facet 4 – What IS Learning?* What is the goal of learning an Indigenous language in ILSL and ILI programs? While, according to many local adults and Elders, the ultimate goal may be to restore intergenerational Indigenous language learning and sustain and revitalize Indigenous culture, ILSL programs, in effect, transmit from teacher to students isolated knowledge of, and very limited skills for, using the Indigenous language. They do so by reducing the language learning to knowing rules of grammar, memorizing word lists and stock phrases, and creating sentences, questions, and commands by following linguistic patterns found in prefabricated examples. Teachers and parents may implicitly expect children and youth to use their rudimentary Indigenous language competence in other settings where the language is spoken, as prerequisite linguistic knowledge and skill for inclusion in society at large.

<C>*Facet 5 – How Does Learning Occur?* Daycare- and school-based ILSL programs tend to promote language learning by means of lessons and exercises. For example, the language teacher will say a word or phrase in the Indigenous language and the students are expected to repeat what they hear, either collectively or in individual turns. Often, literacy activities are a major focus of

instruction, cutting into opportunities for developing aural and oral competence in the Indigenous language. This entails silent individual seatwork, typically translation exercises from the Indigenous language to the world-majority language, and vice versa.

ILI programs embed language learning within the activities of the institution, which typically conform to ALI. This means communication occurs in the immersion language, but it is situated within organizational structures of formal learning. Specifically, communication is regimented according to step-by-step instruction in the subjects of the curriculum. True, there is some communication that is organized less formally, such as that occurring in gaps between formal lessons. But the bulk of communication involves teacher-directed discourse designed to lead students in a pre-scripted sequence that is often expressed through known-answer questions, followed by student answers, followed by the teacher's verbal assessment of those answers. These scripts occur orally and through written interaction in order to lead students to knowledge and insights about each school subject, framed in terms of the Indigenous language.

<C>*Facet 6 – How Do People Communicate?* Communication in ILSL programs is limited to formats that do not usually approximate those found in ordinary social interaction. In ILI programs, communication is based on the life of the daycare or school, and not always or usually on life outside of those spaces. For example, in ILSL programs communication tends toward didactic interaction. And in ILI programs, communication is typically organized around a curriculum that does not include a broad range of family and community interests and activities.

<C>*Facet 7 – Why Evaluate? And How?* When students are assessed for Indigenous linguistic knowledge and skill in ALI-based daycare and school programs, especially in middle school and high school programs, it is done to sort learners according to proficiency standards set forth in the language curriculum. Language assessment procedures and language learning are separate activities. Teachers provide students with feedback that essentially tells them how they rank relative to their peers and what degree of competence they must display in order to receive rewards, such as

pleasing the teacher and getting good grades, and avoid threats, such as embarrassment in front of their teacher and classmates for not knowing how to say something properly or not comprehending and responding appropriately to verbal messages directed at them.

Thus, the very heart of the life of the Indigenous language—intergenerational language learning by infants and children from caregivers, through engagement in informal, everyday interaction—often receives little direct nourishment from school-based language revitalization programs—particularly ILSL programs, which are built largely on an ideology of language as bounded knowledge separate from social interaction. Instead, in many communities, school-based language revitalization programs are socializing children and youth into their Indigenous language such that they come to view the language as a school subject, restricted to school use only. It may be said that language socialization of this sort is effectively a colonizing practice because it removes the Indigenous language from its relations with multiple Indigenous lifeways.

Some Indigenous communities have challenged this intergenerational Indigenous language interaction rift and paired Indigenous language speakers (usually Elders) with individual family or community members (usually from among the younger generations) who learn the language outside of formal educational institutions. These master–apprentice pairings have resulted in considerable language learning (Hinton, 2013). Other communities have established home- and community-based language instruction involving small groups of learners.

For example, Grant and Turner (2013) described the Kawaiisu Language at Home program in northern California. While the master–apprentice model involves pairing a fluent adult speaker with another person seeking to learn the language—who together use the language for communication in everyday activities—the Kawaiisu Language at Home program extends the model to include whole families engaged in "immersion sets." Adults and children take part in scripted interaction activities prepared by a development team and led by at least one fluent speaker. Families are trained monthly through communication exercises, and assessed for communicative competence through

built-in comprehension checks and review of videotaped sessions.

While making some progress toward restoring intergenerational language learning, home- and community-based language instruction such as that found in the Kawaiisu language program often involves planned language lessons or otherwise scripted instruction. The relatively few people who are able to devote themselves to language learning this way do so during time away from normal, day-to-day family and community endeavors. And yet, the very design of these programs limits opportunities for participants to become conversant in the Indigenous language through immersion in culturally relevant endeavors.

If an Indigenous language revitalization program is designed according to an ideology of language as grammatical code and vocabulary, those who participate in it are socialized to the Indigenous language in a way that alienates them from seeing it as synonymous with social interaction.

<B>*Indigenous Language Reclamation*

"Perhaps all language teachers need pedagogies for learning and teaching that account for living in and through our languages. Ways of teaching that we can feel in our whole bodies, not just our minds." (Hermes, 2016, p. 574)

As we have articulated in the previous section, when Indigenous languages are taught using ALI, students are socialized away from the idea that their Indigenous language is about relationality. Another way in which such institutional approaches alienate students from their Indigenous languages is by creating expectations based on the structure of schooling that are not (and often cannot be) met by the Indigenous language curriculum. Students expect reading and writing to be a significant part of the curriculum (by third or fourth grade), they expect the lessons to advance their knowledge as they advance through primary and secondary education, and they expect some form of evaluation or assessment and feedback. When these expectations are not met, students often are

incapable of using or choose to avoid using the Indigenous language, resulting in a form of alienation from the language. For example, this type of alienation arose when Kaska students chose to take French rather than Kaska, further distancing them from their own Indigenous language practices (Meek, 2009, p. 170; see also Meek, 2010).

We turn now to providing a sketch of an approach to language revitalization that situates Indigenous language learning within everyday Indigenous life. We think of it as but one of many ways Indigenous peoples can learn their Indigenous language through interaction in family and community endeavors. By offering this approach, we do not mean to suggest that formal educational institutions have no role to play in language revitalization efforts; to the contrary, we recognize that schools have played, and will continue to play, a crucial role in Indigenous language revitalization around the world, particularly in communities that have few or no Indigenous language speakers (see, e.g., McCarty & Lee, 2015; Moquino & Blum Martinez, 2017). Rather, we mean to expand attention and resources to informal Indigenous language learning in ordinary family and community endeavors, a way that socializes language learners into and through an ideology of language as relationality.

<B>*Learning by Observing and Pitching In to Family and Community Endeavors*

In keeping with a language reclamation paradigm, we offer a strategy for language learning that involves participation in family and community endeavors. The strategy entails a form of learning that, while not exclusive to Indigenous families and communities, is especially prevalent in them, at least insofar as it has been documented in South, Central, and North America. It is LOPI, which Barbara Rogoff and colleagues have abundantly described (Alcalá et al., 2014; Coppens et al., 2014; Correa–Chávez, Mejía–Arauz, & Rogoff, 2015; López et al., 2012; Mejía–Arauz et al., 2018; Paradise & Rogoff, 2009; Paradise et al., 2014; Rogoff, 2014; Rogoff et al., 2003; Rogoff, Najafi, & Mejía–Arauz 2014; Rogoff, Mejía–Arauz, & Correa-Chávez, 2015; Urrieta, 2015).

Learning an Indigenous language through observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors is certainly not the only way Indigenous languages may be learned outside of formal educational institutions. Its promise has, however, already been suggested by Meyer (2017) based on her research in Oaxaca, Mexico. Following Meyer, we present LOPI as an example of a language reclamation strategy that aligns well with Indigenous ideologies of language and Indigenous pedagogy, while at the same time supporting decolonization and Indigenization.

As with our treatment of ALI, we present a LOPI-based approach to language reclamation by organizing it according to seven facets, each framed by a question. The questions labeling each facet of the LOPI prism, and those of the ALI prism discussed earlier, come from come from Rogoff's unpublished 2019 revision of the prism, and resemble the labels used in the 2014 prisms (Rogoff, 2014).

<C>*Facet 1 – What Is the Community's Social Organization?* Participants in LOPI-based language reclamation develop communicative competence in the Indigenous language through participating in family and community endeavors. Indigenous language use occurs through intra- and intergenerational interaction in everyday activities. Language learning through a LOPI-based way of learning socializes learners into and through the language such that it is inseparable from daily life.

In order for language revitalization efforts to be effective, those engaged in language reclamation efforts need to recognize and understand community-based knowledge, including relational dynamics, and how these understandings facilitate Indigenous language learning and education more broadly. For Kaska children, this socialization process involves learning about respect, both in relation to how to behave toward older family members and Elders and in relation to understanding what it means to be Kaska (Meek, 2007). Discourses of respect teach everyone about the social structure of their community and their place in that community. LOPI promotes such socialization.

<C>*Facet 2 – What Motivates a Person's Involvement?* Learner motivation in LOPI-based language reclamation is not dependent on a desire to learn the language exclusively but is tied to participants' desire to be involved in and contribute and belong to family and community life (Rogoff, 2014). In other words, language learning occurs as a by-product, of sorts, of getting things done. For example, a tradition of stick gambling exists in the Yukon Territory, along with an annual stick gambling competition. People are motivated to participate in stick gambling not specifically or not only to practice using their Indigenous language but instead to contribute their share to the gambling. The Kaska language camps that have been run by the Kaska First Nations and by the Liard Aboriginal Women's Society (LAWS) have necessarily involved everyday activities such as berry-picking, moosehide preparing, storytelling, food preparation and cooking, and other ordinary tasks (e.g., wood-chopping; Moore, 2003; Meek, 2010). More choreographed events such as plays (of traditional narratives or translated children's books) have also motivated child and adult participation in language revitalization activities (Carr & Meek, 2013). This same source of motivation—a desire to belong and get things done—would drive participation in endeavors in a LOPI-based approach to revitalization.

<C>*Facet 3 – How Is Group Interaction Organized?* Interaction in LOPI-based Indigenous language learning involves groupings of participants who collaborate in a way that is similar to musical ensembles in which coordinated performances emerge organically (Rogoff, 2014; Mejía–Arauz et al., 2018).

This approach has been a mainstay of Aboriginal Head Start programming for Kaska children in Yukon Territory, where Elders are invited to share childhood stories, traditional tales, and some basic skills (such as sewing moccasins) with children. The interactions are organized around the visiting Elder who addresses the children, teaching them about their Indigenous culture and demonstrating basic techniques in the language *Dene k'éh* ('in a Dene way'). The teachers direct students' attention toward the Elder, elaborating when necessary. The Elders would typically try to

involve the children by either having them participate in the skill being demonstrated or by posing questions that encouraged the children to relate to the narrative through their own experiences and responsibilities (such as watching younger siblings or cousins). Embedded in such activities is mutual respect among the adults and children as they work together.

<C>*Facet 4 – What IS Learning? and Facet 5 – How Does Learning Occur?* As discussed earlier, Indigenous ways of learning, including LOPI, take learning as "a process occurring within ongoing activity, and not divided into separate characteristics of individuals and contexts" (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 20). Understood in this way, it becomes obvious that learning occurs everywhere, all the time; it is not relegated to only specific sites and instances, like schools and formal learning exercises. Learning, as an ongoing process situated within ordinary—as well as extraordinary— activity, is, thus, a ubiquitous aspect of all social life. From this perspective, a LOPI-based approach to language reclamation occurs as the cumulative outcome of family and community members communicating with one another in order to accomplish everyday endeavors. Learning the Indigenous language happens through verbal and nonverbal communication that is inextricably bound with collaborative pursuits.

It is important to note, however, that communication among participants in the endeavor is not limited to only what is directly related to it. There is also communication that occurs concomitant to the collaborative purpose, including: the sharing of narratives, especially stories; showing consideration and respect toward others; joking; honoring culturally-patterned norms of participation; and other communication that may seem 'peripheral' to non-Indigenous outsiders but is, nonetheless, an important aspect of accomplishing shared goals.

For example, consider an event for Kaska language learning involving harvesting birchbark for making baskets, soapberries for making 'Indian ice cream,' and fishing. Kaska language learning occurred directly, as part of the instructions and explanations, and indirectly as part of the ambient conversation among more fluent Kaska users.

<C>*Facet 6 – How Do People Communicate?* LOPI is based in the shared activity itself. The participants coordinate through nonverbal and verbal means, where these serve the activity at hand. In other words, participants provide or ask for information that is needed in the activity, and because it is based in what they all can see and hear in the ongoing shared context, it can be economical. Explanations do not need to be lengthy when the context is shared, and questions ask for needed information, unlike the quizzing questions common in schooling. Narratives or ribbing may indirectly provide a lesson to correct someone's misbehavior. Stories may provide analysis of related situations that may help to figure out how to handle a challenging situation. Communication unfolds organically throughout the endeavor, as people engage with all modalities in accomplishing the endeavor at hand. The way people communicate in LOPI, therefore, is embedded in ordinary social life and emerges in ways that are consonant with the rhythms of everyday practices and consistent with Indigenous ways of being.

<C>*Facet 7 – Why Evaluate? And How?* LOPI-based language reclamation includes mostly subtle assessment and evaluation of individuals' contributions to collaborative endeavors. While those with more experience and expertise may occasionally give novices overt signs of approval or disapproval during and following an activity, most often they avoid calling the group's attention to the quality of an individual's contribution. Instead, for example, an Elder will respect all contributions regardless of their quality and timeliness, giving only positive feedback to individuals by subdued gesturing or otherwise softly and quietly signaling approval with a smile, a kind and reassuring glance, loving words, or delicate touch. But it should be noted that such assessment and evaluation is not really intended to judge contributions per se; rather, it is to recognize others' commitment to the family and community and to show appreciation for their responsible behavior. In addition to assessing individuals' contributions, LOPI involves assessing the supports that are provided. For example, in talking with a 2-year-old, if a directive fails to have its effect, an adult evaluates what can be done to better support the child's understanding. For example, the adult

might point to the desired object, when the child looks confused after being told *hand me that*.

In terms of verbal interaction, which is paramount to novices' learning the Indigenous language, LOPI-based learning affords opportunities to engage with and use language in situ and under guidance. Speakers can and do provide feedback on learners' productive and receptive competence by repeating acceptable versions of what they are trying to say, for direct comparison, and providing opportunities for them to rehearse without receiving a more explicit, and, thus, a less overtly judgmental, kind of teaching. It is this mild 'correction' of efforts at verbal communication that promotes continued efforts.

A LOPI-based approach to reclaiming Indigenous languages would be based in intergenerational interaction in which children are included as contributors to an event with some value to the family or community. It would be structured in a collaborative fashion encouraging the initiative and coordination of everyone involved, and supporting the group's learning and innovation. Learners' inclusion as contributors would provide them with purpose to observe and listen, and to speak as they pitch in to the activity at hand, and more experienced participants would subtly guide their contributions.

The LOPI strategy thus offers the possibility of recentering Indigenous ideologies of language, that is, language-as-a-process-of-sustaining-relationality ideologies, and privileges Indigenous pedagogies coupled with a commitment to Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and axiologies.

<B>*Conclusion*

We hope that we have contributed important groundwork toward a new framework of language reclamation. As we reconsider and work toward the transformation of current approaches that center on Euro-Western ideologies and ALI, our aim is to reclaim Indigenous ideologies of language and pedagogies. We think a LOPI-based approach to language reclamation is one effective

strategy for creating new Indigenous language speakers who have linguistic knowledge plus communicative competence in various domains and situations.

A LOPI-based strategy for language reclamation is consistent with a number of important Indigenous concepts (which are at odds ALI). A LOPI-based language reclamation approach employs a relational epistemology, in the inclusion of learners and more experienced people in shared endeavors of importance in the community. We would add that this would include recognition of the role of place and land as a key basis within shared endeavors of importance in the community. A LOPI-based approach also places central importance on the interdependence of people across generations in both a particular collective endeavor and in the long-term collective good. Further, LOPI recognizes and is built on decades of Indigenous scholarship describing Indigenous ways of learning (see also Rosado May et al., 2020). Finally, recent scholarship regarding LOPI increasingly specifies the role of local moral or axiological understandings (see e.g., Bang et al., 2015).

To be sure, we recognize the need for schools to play a role in Indigenous language learning, too. However, reclaiming Indigenous languages by recentering them in family and community life more directly targets informal, inter- and intragenerational language learning—the heart of language vitality. As it fosters social interaction within everyday out-of-school endeavors, so too does it contribute to the rebuilding and proliferation of Indigenous pedagogies, as well as cultures.

Of course, reclaiming Indigenous languages demands more than just a LOPI-based strategy combined with school-based programs. A more robust vision of Indigenous language reclamation would include ongoing and future work to decolonize and Indigenize various other social institutions, such as community centers, by reestablishing Indigenous ideologies of language and Indigenous pedagogies and language practices within those institutions. This would require us to rethink language revitalization from its ideological foundations and corresponding practices, and move into a paradigm of language reclamation. Such language work would be holistic in scope, integrated into life across the lifespan, and carried out as one aspect of overall Indigenous community healing and

wellness.

<B>*References*

Alcalá, L., Rogoff, B., Mejía–Arauz, R., Coppens, A. D., & Dexter, A. L. (2014). Children's initiative in contributions to family work in Indigenous-heritage and cosmopolitan communities in Mexico. *Human Development, 57*, 96–115.

Baldwin, D., Noodin, M., & Perley, B. (2018). Surviving the sixth extinction: American Indian strategies for life in the New World. In R. Grusin (Ed.), *After extinction* (pp. 201-234). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bang, M., Marin, A., Medin, D., & Washinawatok, K. (2015). Learning by observing, pitching in, and being in relations in the natural world. In R. Mejia–Arauz, B. Rogoff, & M. Correa–Chavez (Eds.), *Children learn by observing and contributing to family and community endeavors: A cultural paradigm,* (pp. 303-313). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

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

Bauman, R. (1977). *Verbal art as performance*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, performance, and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, R., (2011). Commentary: Foundations in performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics 15*, 707-720.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology 19*, 59-88.

Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (1975). The ethnography of speaking. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 4*,

95–119.

Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (Eds.). (1989). *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brandt, E. A. (1988). Applied linguistic anthropology and American Indian language renewal. *Human Organization*, *47*, 322-329.

Cajete, G. (1994). Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education. Durango, CO: Kivakí Press.

Carr, G. L., & Meek, B. A. (2013). The poetics of language revitalization: Text, performance, and change. *Journal of Folklore Research: An International Journal of Folklore and Ethnomusicology*, *50*, 191–216.

Coppens, A. D., Alcalá, L., Mejía–Arauz, R., & Rogoff, B. (2014). Children's initiative in family household work in Mexico. *Human Development, 57,* 116–130.

Coronel–Molina, S. & McCarty, T. L. (Eds.) (2016). *Indigenous language revitalization in the Americas*. New York: Routledge.

Correa–Chávez, M., Mejía–Arauz, R., & Rogoff, B. (Eds.). (2015). Children learn by observing and contributing to family and community endeavors: A cultural paradigm. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Darnell, R., & Valentine, L. P. (Eds.). (1999). *Theorizing the Americanist tradition* (Vol. 13). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dauenhauer, N. M., & Dauenhauer, R. (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, (pp. 57–98). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, J. L. (2018). *Talking Indian: Identity and language revitalization in the Chickasaw renaissance*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

De Korne, H., & Leonard, W. Y. (2017). Reclaiming languages: Contesting and decolonising 'language endangerment' from the ground up. *Language Documentation and Description, 14*, 5–14.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Elliott–Groves, E. (2019) A culturally grounded biopsychosocial assessment utilizing Indigenous ways of knowing with the Cowichan Tribes. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 28*, 115-133.

Elliott–Groves, E. & Bang, M. (2020). *Disrupting collective capacities: Understanding suicide in the context of settler colonialism*. Unpublished manuscript.

Elliott–Groves, E. & Meixi, I. (2020). *Why and how communities learn by observing and pitching in: Indigenous axiologies and ethical attunements in LOPI*. Unpublished manuscript.

Field, M., & Kroskrity, P. (2009). Introduction: Revealing Native American language ideologies. In P. Kroskrity & M. Field (Eds.), *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian Country* (pp. 3–28). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages* (Vol. 76). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gómez de García, J., Axelrod, M., & Lachler, J. (2009). English is the dead language: Native perspectives on bilingualism. In P. Kroskrity & M. Field (Eds.), *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices, and struggles in Indian country* (pp. 99–122). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Grant, L., & Turner, J. (2013). The Kawaiisu language at home program. In L. Hinton (Ed.), *Bringing*

our languages home (pp.189–208). Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.

Grenoble, L. A. (2009). Linguistic cages and the limits of linguists. In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned* (pp. 61–69). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Grenoble, L. A., & Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher, 32*, 19–25.

Henne, R. (2009). Verbal artistry: A case for education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 40*, 331–349.

Henne–Ochoa, R. (2018). Sustaining and revitalizing traditional Indigenous ways of speaking: An ethnography-of-speaking approach. *Language & Communication, 62*, 66–82.

Henne–Ochoa, R. (2020). Indigenous language revitalization through observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors: A rationale and description. *Infancia y Aprendizaje: Journal for the Study of Education and Development*.

Hermes, M. (2005). "Ma'iingan is just a misspelling of the word wolf": A case for teaching culture through language. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 36*, 43–56.

Hermes, M. (2016). A response to Ennser–Kananen's "A pedagogy of pain." *Modern Language Journal, 100*, 573–575.

Hermes, M., & Haskins, M. (2018). Unbecoming standards through Ojibwe immersion: The wolf meets ma'iingan. In G. Wigglesworth, J. Simpson, & J. Vaughn (Eds.), *Language practices of indigenous children and youth: The transition from home to school.* (pp. 99–116). London:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill, J. H., & Hill, K. C. (1986). *Speaking Mexicano*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Hinton, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Bringing our languages home.* Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.

Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (Eds.). (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. Leiden, The
Netherlands: Brill Publishers.

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

Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.),
Anthropology and human behavior (pp. 13–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of
Washington.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes
(Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). New
York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia:
University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacob, M. M. (2013). *Yakama rising: Indigenous cultural revitalization, activism, and healing*. Tucson,
AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Jaimes Guerrero, M. (2003). "Patriarchal colonialism" and Indigenism: Implications for Native
feminist spirituality and Native womanism. *Hypatia, 18*, 58–69.

Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. J. (Eds.) (1990). *Ideologies of language*. New York: Routledge.

King, J. (2001). Te Kōhanga Reo: Māori language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The
green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 119–131). Leiden, The Netherlands:

Brill Publishers.

Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.). (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM:

School of American Research Press.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2009) Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle: The need for

"ideological clarification." In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous language*

revitalization: Encouragement, guidance & lessons learned (pp. 71–83). Flagstaff, AZ:

Northern Arizona University.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2018) On recognizing persistence in the Indigenous language ideologies of

multilingualism in two Native American communities. *Language & Communication, 62*, 133–

144.

Kroskrity P. V., & Field, M. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices*

and struggles in Indian country. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Kroskrity, P. V., & Meek, B. A. (Eds.) (2017). *Engaging Native American publics: Linguistic*

Anthropology in a new key. New York and London: Routledge.

Kulick, D. (1997). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self and syncretism in a*

Papua New Guinean village. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leonard, W. Y. (2012). Framing language reclamation programmes for everybody's empowerment.

Gender and Language, 6, 339–367.

Leonard, W. Y. (2017). Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language.' *Language*

Documentation and Description, 14, 15–36.

Leonard, W. Y. (2019, September 19). Indigenous languages through a reclamation

lens. *Anthropology News*. Accessed 30 October 2019 at https://www.anthropology-

news.org/index.php/2019/09/19/indigenous-languages-through-a-reclamation-lens/

López, A., Najafi, B., Rogoff, B., & Mejía–Arauz, R. (2012). Collaboration and helping as cultural

practices. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 869–884).

Chicago: Oxford University Press.

MacLean, E. A. (2010). Culture and change for Inupiat and Yup'ik people of Alaska. In R. Barnhardt &

O. K. Angayuqaq (Eds.), *Alaska Native education: Views from within* (pp. 41–58). Fairbanks,

AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Makihara, M., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and

sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies*. Chicago: Oxford University Press.

McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous

education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*, 101–124.

McCarty, T. L., & Lee, T. S. (2015). The role of schools in Native American language and culture

revitalization: A vision of linguistic and educational sovereignty. In W. J. Jacob, S. Y. Cheng, &

M. K. Porter (Eds.), *Indigenous education: Language, culture and identity* (pp. 341–360). New

York: Springer.

Meek, B. A. (2007). Respecting the language of Elders: Ideological shift and linguistic discontinuity in

a northern Athapascan community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 17*, 23–43.

Meek, B. A. (2009). Language ideology and Aboriginal language revitalization in Yukon, Canada. In P.

Kroskrity & M. C. Field (Eds.), *Native American language ideologies: Beliefs, practices and

struggles in Indian country* (pp. 151–171). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Meek, B. A. (2010). *We are our language: An ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern

Athabaskan community*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Meek, B. A. (2017). Native American languages and linguistic anthropology: From the legacy of

    salvage anthropology to the promise of linguistic self-determination. In P. V. Kroskrity & B. A.

    Meek (Eds.), *Engaging Native American publics: Linguistic Anthropology in a new key* (pp. 3–

    24). New York: Routledge.

Mejía–Arauz, R., Rogoff, B., Dayton, A., & Henne–Ochoa, R. (2018). Collaboration or negotiation:

    Two ways of interacting suggest how shared thinking develops. *Current Opinion in*

    Psychology, 23, 117–123.

Meyer, L. M. (2017). Resisting Westernization and school reforms: Two sides to the struggle to

    communalize developmentally appropriate initial education in Indigenous Oaxaca, Mexico.

    Global Education Review, 4, 88–107.

Mihas, E., Perley, B., Rei–Doval, G., & Wheatley, K. (Eds.). (2013). Responses to language

    endangerment: In honor of Mickey Noonan. *New directions in language documentation and*

    language revitalization. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Moore, P. J. (2003). Lessons on the land: The role of Kaska Elders in a university language course.

    Canadian Journal of Native Education 27, 127-139.

Moquino, T., & Blum Martinez, R. (2017). Keres Children's Learning Center: The search for a

    linguistically and culturally appropriate education. In T. B. Peele–Eady (Ed.), *Integrating*

    home and heritage languages in schools: Pedagogy and promise. New York: Routledge.

Morgan, M. J. (2009). *Bearer of this letter: Language ideologies, literacy practices, and the Fort*

    Belknap Indian community. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Paradise, R., Mejía–Arauz, R., Silva, K., Dexter, A., & Rogoff, B. (2014). One, two, three, eyes on me!:

    Adults attempting control versus guiding in support of initiative. *Human Development, 57,*

131–149.

Paradise, R., & Rogoff, B. (2009). Side by side. *Ethos, 37,* 102–138.

Perley, B. C. (2011). *Defying Maliseet language death: Emergent vitalities of language, culture & identity in Eastern Canada.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Philips, S. U. (1992). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Rogoff, B. (2014). Learning by observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors: An orientation. *Human Development, 57,* 69–81.

Rogoff, B., Callanan, M., Gutiérrez, K., & Erickson, F. (2016). The organization of informal learning. *Review of Research in Education, 40,* 356–401.

Rogoff, B., Mejía–Arauz, R., & Correa–Chávez, M. (2015). A cultural paradigm: Learning by observing and pitching in. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 49,* 1–22.

Rogoff, B., Najafi, B., & Mejía–Arauz, R. (2014). Constellations of cultural practices across generations: Indigenous American heritage and learning by observing and pitching in. *Human Development, 57,* 82–95.

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Mejía–Arauz, R., Correa–Chávez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54,* 175–203.

Rosado–May, F. J., Urrieta, L., Jr., Dayton, A., & Rogoff, B. (2020). Innovation as a key feature of Indigenous ways of learning: Individuals and communities generating knowledge. In N. S. Nasir, C. D. Lee, & R. Pea (Eds.), *Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning*. New York: Routledge.

Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., &. Kroskrity, P. V. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and*

theory. New York: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Simpson, L. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society, 3*, 1–25.

St. Clair, R., & Leap, W. (1982). *Language renewal among American Indian tribes: Issues, problems, and prospects*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.

Tsunoda, T. (2013). *Language endangerment and language revitalization: An introduction* . Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Tuck, E., McKenzie, M., & McCoy, K. (2014). Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research. *Environmental Education Research, 20*, 1–23.

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

Urrieta, L., Jr. (2015). Learning by observing and pitching in and the connections to native and Indigenous knowledge systems. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior,* 49, 357–380.

Wilson, W. A., & Yellow Bird, M. (2005). *For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2001). "Mai Loko Mai 0 Ka'in'ini: Proceeding from a dream": The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 147–176). Leiden, The Netherlands:

Brill Publishers.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*, 387–409.