

Hawaiian

A Native American Language Official for a State

William H. Wilson

Introduction

Hawaiian, the language explored in this chapter, is the traditional language of the indigenous Polynesian people of Hawai'i—the "Hawaiians," also called "Native Hawaiians." It is also the official language of a state, the only state that has an official language in addition to English.

Hawaiian, like all Native American languages, is an endangered language that was suppressed in schools as part of the assertion of American control over Indigenous peoples. In 1896, the use of Hawaiian in schools was banned, and it remained illegal to conduct public schooling through the medium of Hawaiian for 90 years thereafter (Wilson & Kamanā, 2006). A language excluded as a medium of education is doomed to extinction in the contemporary world.

In recent years, a language revitalization movement has brought new life to Hawaiian. It is now possible to attend preschool, K–12 public education, and even graduate school totally through Hawaiian as the medium of instruction. As the most successful effort in language revitalization in the United States, Hawaiian is in a unique supportive position for Native American language revitalization as a whole (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006).

Origins and the Historical Base of Contemporary Hawai'i

Hawai'i is distinctive as a political entity in having boundaries coterminous with the traditional territory of an indigenous people. No other state is as strongly identified with a particular Native American people or culture. In Hawaiian tradition, the Hawaiian Islands and the Hawaiian people themselves are siblings, born of the same primordial parents, Wākea and Papa. Similar traditions are found in related Polynesian cultures located some 2,000 miles to the south on islands from which anthropologists believe ancestors of ancient Hawaiians navigated to Hawai'i on oceangoing canoes.

At first contact with the European world in 1778, control over the eight inhabited Hawaiian Islands shifted through warfare among ali'i, the chiefly lineages. By 1810, Kamehameha united the entire island chain under his rule. Ten years later, American missionaries arrived and introduced a Latin-based alphabet. Kamehameha's grandson then adopted the written word for operating his government. The establishment of uniform standards for spelling brought further unity to the islands yet also allowed continued distinctive dialectal pronunciations and vocabulary in the spoken language (Schütz, 1994).

In succeeding years, the Kingdom of Hawai'i evolved into an internationally recognized nation state. By the mid 1800s, it was a constitutional monarchy with a small college (the first west of the Mississippi), a centralized public education system (the first west of Massachusetts), a national judiciary, a parliament, and a robust media, all run predominantly through the indigenous language. Hawaiians had one of the highest rates of literacy in the world and recorded much of their traditional culture in writing during this period. They formed the core of the public sector including the schoolteachers and government clerks. Hawaiians were also found in traditional indigenous occupations in fishing and subsistence agriculture and in blue-collar work in shipping, cattle ranching, and commercial agriculture (Coffman 2003; Reinecke, 1969).

While initially quite large, the indigenous population decreased due to introduced diseases. The Kingdom actively sought immigrants of "kindred races" to add to the Hawaiian population. By the late 1800s, the noncitizen immigrant population equaled that of the Hawaiians. The largest groups of immigrants were recruited from China, Japan, and the Portuguese Atlantic islands as laborers by the burgeoning sugar industry. The immigrants were primarily single males. A considerable number intermarried with Hawaiians and/or became naturalized citizens. Hawaiian was widely used by these immigrants as a lingua franca, especially in a pidginized form known as 'Ōlelo Pa'i'ai. Many of the Hawai'i citizen children of immigrants were fully fluent in Hawaiian, which they learned on school playgrounds and in the community (Bickerton & Wilson, 1987).

The historic use of the Hawaiian language and its heritage in binding the multiracial population together is the source of the contemporary identity of Hawai'i. That identity includes use of the language for the vast majority of place and street names, for local flora and fauna, and for Hawai'i's motto and anthem. Hawaiian is also the language of the music and dance that represent Hawai'i to the world.

Nineteenth-century Hawai'i also included a small Anglo American group that began with missionary families. This group controlled the sugar plantation-based economy. Using their connections to the growing military power of the United States, the Anglo Americans gradually took political control of Hawai'i. In 1893, the United States Marines overthrew the monarchy, delivering power to the Anglo American minority. Five years later, Hawai'i was annexed by the United States by Congressional Resolution in spite of a written petition by a majority of the voting-age Native Hawaiian and other citizens of Hawai'i opposing annexation (Silva, 2004). Unresolved legal and political issues relating to the overthrow and annexation remain important today, especially relative to the indigenous sovereignty of Native Hawaiians.

Hawaiian in the Territorial and Early Statehood Periods

With the establishment of a territorial government, Hawaiians were accorded full citizenship and the vote similar to Christianized American Indian "citizen tribes." By far the largest voting block in the territory, they controlled the territorial legislature and Hawai'i's nonvoting representative to the U.S. Congress. In spite of the strength of Hawaiians at the ballot box, however, true political power rested in the hands of the Anglo-Caucasian sugar planter class, who advised on the choice of the all-powerful, presidentially appointed governor (Coffman, 2003).

A policy of changing the common language from Hawaiian to English was part of the colonizing strategy of asserting political control over Hawai'i. The territory of Hawai'i was required to run its legislature through English and maintain a ban on Hawaiian-medium schools. Hawaiian use in schools by teachers and students was severely punished (Wilson & Kamañā, 2006), resulting in language shift on public school playgrounds from Hawaiian to a new language—Hawai'i Creole English. Hawai'i Creole English descended from the earlier pidginized Hawaiian used with immigrants but relexified with much English vocabulary (Roberts, 1995). Children of new plantation immigrants, including the European Portuguese, assimilated and adapted to this new language, which is usually

Table 21.1 Major Hawai'i Ethnic Groups in 1900

Major Ethnic Group	Percentage of General Population	Percentage of School Population
Hawaiian	25%	49%
Japanese	39%	9%
Chinese	16%	8%
Portuguese	11%	25%
Anglo-Caucasian	6%	6%
Others	2%	3%

Created from information in Reinecke (1969, p. 42, 74–75).

called Pidgin. This immigrant child assimilation to the Pidgin of the dominant Native Hawaiian school population occurred in spite of home use of immigrant languages and after-school immigrant language schools. There was little opportunity for non-White and Portuguese children to learn standard English from the small population of Anglo-Caucasian children because the ruling oligarchy sent their children to exclusive private schools. Table 21.1 illustrates the population of Hawai'i in 1900 when the territorial government was first established (Reinecke, 1969).

The Native Hawaiian community sought to maintain its language through a variety of media and other outlets, including the indigenous press, through churches run by Hawaiian pastors, through Hawaiian political and cultural organizations, and through home language use. Realizing that these strategies were not preventing language shift and loss among children, in the 1920s the territorial legislature mandated the teaching of Hawaiian in second language courses for teacher preparation, in the high schools, in the University of Hawai'i, and also in elementary schools in heavily Hawaiian areas (Lucas, 2000). Though these actions had little effect in reversing language shift, they established a place for teaching Hawaiian in the educational system, albeit with the status of a "foreign language."

World War II was a defining moment in the history of Hawai'i, as it challenged the loyalties of the non-White population, especially the large population of Japanese ancestry. Hawai'i's locally born, Pidgin-speaking young people joined the U.S. military in impressive numbers. They returned home determined to remove barriers of race and class that had long been maintained by the Anglo-Caucasian oligarchy. This movement focused especially on seeking statehood, achieved in 1959, when Hawai'i became the first state ever with a non-White majority (Coffman, 2003).

The Hawaiian Renaissance

In the 1970s, Hawai'i experienced the "Hawaiian Renaissance." This period focused on long-standing Native Hawaiian political and cultural issues, including the survival of the indigenous Hawaiian language. Hawaiian was then normally spoken only by elders born before 1920 and by a tiny population of some 200 on the isolated island of Ni'ihau. In 1978, via popular vote by the majority non-Native Hawaiian population, Hawaiian was enshrined in the state constitution as an official language along with English (Wilson, 1999). At this point, there were fewer than 50 children under the age of 18 who were fluent in the language.

The recognition of Hawaiian may ultimately have been only symbolic as a result of its recognition as an official language if it had not been for a concerted effort by a small group of college students to revitalize Hawaiian among the population. Following the lead of New Zealand Māori, in 1983 we formed the nonprofit 'Aha Pūnana Leo to establish private total Hawaiian-medium language nests for children below the age of 5. Our small nucleus of families then moved into the public school system, establishing a full K–12 system of education through Hawaiian, referred to

by the Hawaiian term *Kaiapuni Hawai'i* (Hawaiian environment) and by the English term *Hawaiian language immersion*. There were many barriers to overcome in the establishment of these schools, including the 1896 law banning Hawaiian-medium education. However, the movement gained supporters in the legislature and state board of education in spite of opposition from those who warned that teaching totally through Hawaiian would have negative academic results (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001).

Our movement built from the work of previous generations in documenting the language, in reforming its writing system, and in teaching it as a foreign language in English-medium educational entities. In 1999, the first high school seniors to be totally educated through Hawaiian in more than 100 years graduated. As part of the process of developing a system of education for these students, we also developed a Hawaiian language college at the University of Hawai'i at Hilo. It provides Hawaiian-medium coursework through to the doctorate, including a total Hawaiian-medium teacher education program. The college also maintains a curriculum center and a lexicon committee that serves the entire state (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001; Wilson & Kawai'ae'a, 2007). Other Hawaiian university programs elsewhere in the state have also grown and currently serve the movement.

Closely related outcomes of the revitalization of Hawaiian have been growing use of Hawaiian in the media, including weekly radio programs on several islands; the Ōiwi TV Hawaiian-language television programming; *Nā Maka O Kana*, a statewide school newspaper in Hawaiian; the weekly *Kūkalahale* Hawaiian language column in the state's largest daily newspaper; and the bilingual *Ulukau* Hawaiian language and culture website. Local banks accept checks written in Hawaiian and include Hawaiian in ATMs. There have been commercials in Hawaiian on television and televised use of Hawaiian in various specials. Native Hawaiian politicians have used Hawaiian without translation in the legislature, and there have been resolutions passed with both Hawaiian and English versions.

Hawaiian Language Learning in Educational Institutions

Table 21.2 illustrates enrollment rates for students studying the Hawaiian language in postsecondary settings. These rates reflect the success of Hawaiian language use and instruction in systems of education over recent years (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2010). Postsecondary education enrollment rates of students studying Hawaiian are more than twice those in any other Native American language (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2010).

Growth in primary and secondary school study of Hawaiian has been somewhat hindered by continuing mistaken assumptions regarding the value of Hawaiian for acceptance into college and later employment. Such wariness is especially common with regard to schools in which Hawaiian

is the language of instruction. These schools have Native Hawaiian enrollment percentages in the high 90s, with a large portion of students coming from Hawaiian Homesteads (Kana'iaupuni, Brandon, & Jenson, 2010; Takayama, 2008).

Hawaiian Homesteads are somewhat similar to American Indian reservations, with a 50% Native Hawaiian blood quantum requirement for lessees. Hawaiian Homestead communities are often associated with heavy use of Pidgin, low economic status, and poor educational outcomes. Most have a nearby Pūnana Leo preschool and Kaiapuni Hawai'i program taught through Hawaiian. The majority of Hawaiian Homestead children, however, still attend English-medium schools, as do even higher percentages of the large population of Native Hawaiians who live outside Hawaiian Homestead communities (Kamehameha Schools, 2005).

Schools providing instruction through Hawaiian have combated negative stereotypes of the students they serve by focusing on college preparatory courses and by integrating courses in high-status "heritage languages" of immigrant ancestors as third languages in addition to English as a second language. As a result, a Hawaiian-medium school may have a stronger program in foreign languages such as Japanese and Chinese than mainstream English-medium schools. Kaiapuni Hawai'i schools also have a higher high school graduation rate and college attendance rate than mainstream English-medium public schools. The linguistic, cultural, and academic success of schools taught through Hawaiian has led to continued growth in their enrollment rates ('Aha Pūnana Leo, 2010, 2011; Hale Kuamo'o, 2010, 2011).

Hawaiian immersion has a much higher use of the non-English language in the classroom than immersion in other languages in the U.S. The typical "total Hawaiian" program uses only Hawaiian until Grade 5, when an English language course is introduced, which may be taught through either Hawaiian or English. A "heritage" (e.g., Japanese) language course may begin as early as first or second grade. "Total Hawaiian" intermediate and high school programs continue to restrict English to a yearly English language course, while "partial Hawaiian" programs typically teach only two or three courses per semester through Hawaiian and the rest through English (Wilson & Kamanā, 2011). A new model focusing on children speaking Hawaiian at home is called "Hawaiian-language-medium education" and involves total use of Hawaiian in all aspects of schooling, not just the classroom, as in immersion (Wilson & Kamanā, 2011). Table 21.3 illustrates 2011/2012 enrollment in schools providing instruction through Hawaiian, which includes both charter and noncharter programs. The 2011/2012 school year enrollment rates reflect a 3.7% growth over the previous year ('Aha Pūnana Leo, 2010, 2011; Hale Kuamo'o, 2010, 2011).

The successes of schools taught through Hawaiian have been the driving force in revitalizing the Hawaiian language. They have also played a major role in encouraging enrollments in Hawaiian in English-medium public high schools (5,348 students in 2009). Other educational settings for expanding Hawaiian language and culture are Hawaiian-focused charter schools taught in English. These often teach Hawaiian as a required formal second language and use Hawaiian terminology

Table 21.2 Fall 2009 Hawaiian Language Enrollment Rankings in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education

Setting	Number of Students Enrolled in Hawaiian Language Study	Ranking of Hawaiian Language Study Among All Languages
Community college	818	14th
Four-year college	1,188	21st
Graduate program	99	21st
TOTAL	2,006	20th of 232 languages

Created from data in Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin (2010).

Table 21.3 Hawaiian Program Enrollments for 2011–2012

Model	Number of Sites Offering	Number of Enrolled Students
Total Hawaiian Pūnana Leo preschools	11	230
Total Hawaiian elementary programs	15	1,617
Total Hawaiian intermediate/high programs	6	353
Partial Hawaiian intermediate/high programs	7	174
TOTAL	39	2,374

in other contexts. Enrollment in English-medium Hawaiian culture-based charter schools in the 2011/2012 school year was 1,235 and is also growing (Charter School Administrative Office, 2012).

Approximately 11% of the school population in Hawai'i attends private schools. Private schools have sought to strengthen their Hawaiian identity through Hawaiian language courses and through recruiting students from Kaiapuni Hawai'i sites. This is especially true of the private Kamehameha Schools for Native Hawaiians, established in 1887, on a model similar to that of American Indian boarding schools, including initially suppressing student practice of their indigenous language and culture (Eyre, 2004). Kamehameha has a large endowment, allowing it to reach a large population. In the 2011/2012 school year, the three K-12 Kamehameha School campuses enrolled 5,380 Native Hawaiian students, including boarders (Hawaii Council of Private Schools, 2012). All students at these schools had some exposure to Hawaiian through cultural education. Kamehameha began offering high school study of Hawaiian some 40 years after the public schools. It has been similarly slow and careful in considering introducing Hawaiian immersion or even requiring Hawaiian language study of its students. Its second language Hawaiian high school elective program, however, is today the most developed in the state, with students able to choose up to five levels of study. Kamehameha recently began special financial support for Pūnana Leo language nests. Kamehameha also runs approximately 30 English-medium preschools that teach some Hawaiian vocabulary as part of cultural enrichment to more than 1,500 preschool children (Kamehameha Schools, 2012).

Native Hawaiian Political Recognition and the Language

The continuing struggle for federal recognition of Native Hawaiian sovereignty and confirmation of the right to run Hawaiian-exclusive entities (e.g., Kamehameha and the Hawaiian Homelands) has also reinforced interest in Hawaiian language maintenance.

After Cherokees, Hawaiians are the second largest of all Native American peoples. Most Native Hawaiians live in Hawai'i, where they have a distinct legal status as indigenous. In 2010 they made up 21.3% of the state population, the largest proportion of any state population that is indigenous. There are also considerable numbers of Hawaiians living outside Hawai'i. The 2010 census identifies 45% of Hawaiians living in states other than Hawai'i. Most are along the West Coast, especially in California and Washington (Hixson, Hepler, & Kim, 2012; Norris, Vines, & Hoeffel, 2012).

Wherever they live, Hawaiians establish organizations to maintain cultural links. These organizations also provide a means for connecting people to resources for language maintenance such as Niulohiki of the 'Aha Pūnana Leo, an online program for language instruction. Distinctive to Native Hawaiians are the 56 Hawaiian Civic Clubs, part of a political and cultural movement that began in 1918 under the leadership of Hawai'i's territorial delegate to Washington and royal family member, Prince Kūhiō (Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs, 2012). Two of the newer Hawaiian Civic Clubs have been organized by youth focused on Hawaiian language revitalization and expanded use.

Part of the struggle for Hawaiian recognition includes a distinctive political status for genealogically inherited *kuleana* (responsibilities/rights/cultural and spiritual duties) of Native Hawaiians. Such *kuleana* are unique and specific to different Hawaiian lineages and are recognized in the state constitution. Native Hawaiians can share much Hawaiian culture, including the language, with others while maintaining distinct cultural and spiritual *kuleana* from Native Hawaiian ancestors that are highly guarded. The Hawaiian language is growing in importance as a vehicle for expressing various Hawaiian *kuleana* and is increasingly being recognized as important for use in the home as well. Those reporting use of Hawaiian in the home to the U.S. Census grew by 90% from 1990 to 2000. In the 2000 census, Hawaiian was counted as the second most widely spoken

language indigenous to the 50 states after Navajo (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000), and the American Community Survey (2006–2008) found that it is sixth in numbers of speakers among non-English languages spoken in Hawai'i (Ng-Osorio & Ledward, 2011).

Prospects for Hawaiian as a First Language

High reporting of Hawaiian as a language used in the home in the 2000 Census (27,160 nationally and 19,045 for the state) reflects overall growth in the use of Hawaiian. However, reports on home language use include both scenarios in which use may be limited to terms and phrases integrated in communication among nonfluent speakers as well as actual growth in fluent second language Hawaiian speakers, who we estimate to number around 10,000. True revitalization of Hawaiian involves use as the primary home language, including use as a first language by children. At the beginning of the Hawaiian Renaissance in the 1970s, there were no first language Hawaiian-speaking children anywhere in Hawai'i except in the tiny Ni'ihau community. The population on Ni'ihau has since declined to 70, yet an additional source of first language speakers has now emerged.

The new Hawaiian-speaking population had its origins in a tiny core of college-trained second language Hawaiian speakers, my wife and me among them. Besides us, there was one other family in which both parents were speakers and three other families in which only the mothers were fluent. A few other early families developed fluency and use with their children after enrollment in the Pūnana Leo. We were the core families of the two Pūnana Leo from which the larger movement grew (Kawai'ae'a et al., 2007; Wilson & Kamanā, 2013; Wong, 2011). There was a considerable gap in time before other second language speakers decided to raise their children speaking Hawaiian. When, in the early 2000s, evidence emerged of the academic success and high graduation rates among children raised speaking Hawaiian in the home who were also schooled entirely through Hawaiian, a new group of young adults decided to raise their children speaking Hawaiian from birth.

The growth in first language speakers of Hawaiian is especially noticeable in Hilo, a heavily Native Hawaiian area and the site of the state's Hawaiian-language college, which is pioneering the Hawaiian-language-medium model. A 2009 survey of those enrolling in the college's Hawaiian-medium P-12 laboratory school site, Nāwahōkalanī'ōpu'u, showed that 87 of 261 enrolled (33%), had spoken Hawaiian since birth with one or more of their parents (Wilson & Kamanā, 2011).

Speaking Hawaiian at home, combined with enrollment in a school taught through Hawaiian, are the two most important factors in determining the survival of Hawaiian among children. Historically, speaking Hawaiian at home did not maintain the language because children attending school through English came to identify with English rather than Hawaiian. The development of young Hawaiian-fluent, child-bearing-age adults committed to P-12 schooling through Hawaiian for their children is occurring through 4-year college programs and through Hawaiian-medium schooling itself.

The number of first language Hawaiian-speaking children is now around 200 to 300 and is still a minority in schools taught through Hawaiian. At present in such schools, Hawai'i Creole English is the typical "playground language," because it is the home language of the majority of enrolled students. This is similar to the situation in which Hawaiian was initially the playground language when English-medium schooling began in Hawai'i. It is therefore significant that at Hawaiian-medium Nāwahōkalanī'ōpu'u School, mentioned earlier as having many children speaking Hawaiian at home, the playground language is shifting to Hawaiian (Wilson & Kamanā, 2011).

As Hawaiian begins to establish a new population of first language speakers, it is certain to go through changes, similar to what happened when Modern Hebrew developed in Israel. An

advantage that Hawaiian revitalization has over Hebrew revitalization is access to tapes of elders and a larger corpus of written materials, which are used in schools and universities.

To be fully revitalized, Hawaiian needs to move beyond the home and the classroom. The nonprofit 'Aha Pūnana Leo, which has led the Hawaiian language revitalization movement, actively promotes the shift from English as the primary language to Hawaiian as the primary language through its Kumu Honua Mauli Ola philosophy ('Aha Pūnana Leo & Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani, 2009). This philosophy calls for the establishment of total Hawaiian language *honua*, entities or systems of human relationships that are maintained entirely through Hawaiian. The 'Aha Pūnana Leo head office in Hilo is one such Hawaiian medium *honua*; the offices of the Hawaiian language college are another. Under this philosophy, English and other languages are to be used only with non-Hawaiian speakers who are not part of the *honua*. The Hawaiian language college also actively promotes young adults adopting Hawaiian as their primary language in their personal relationships. With growth in the number of individuals fully fluent in Hawaiian and committed to using Hawaiian as their primary language, government services and private businesses through Hawaiian can be expanded.

The Larger Native American Language Revitalization Movement

Hawaiian language revitalization is the leading edge of a larger movement to revitalize Native American languages. Hawaiian was the first Native American language with language nest and total immersion programming. It is still the only one through which total Indigenous-language-medium education extends to Grade 12. More than half of all students enrolled in Native American language immersion programs are in Hawaiian programs. Hawaiian language revitalization leaders have close connections to American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native American Pacific Islander Language revitalization leaders, especially those involved in immersion schools. Many have visited the Hawaiian language college and its laboratory school (Pease-Pretty On Top, 2003). A national network spreads best practices and other support, including testing through Native American languages (Rawlins, Wilson, & Kawai'ae'a, 2011).

Local political support for the Hawaiian language has affected national policies as well. The wording of the seminal Native American Languages Act of 1990 (NALA) came in large part from a resolution passed by the 1987 Hawai'i state legislature (Arnold, 2001). Hawai'i's congressional delegation has been centrally involved in the development and passage of all Native American language legislation since then. A major national issue at present is the lack of compliance with NALA in federal educational legislation, especially in No Child Left Behind (NCLB). NCLB recognizes the right of Puerto Rico to use Spanish as an official language of education but does not recognize the right of states, territories, or Native American governments to declare Native American languages official and use them in education. This disparity has led to considerable problems in Hawai'i, including parent boycotts of testing (Wilson, 2012).

Other disparities exist relative to education through Hawaiian at the preschool through university levels—much of it tied to following national English-medium education trends rather than addressing what is best practice for education through Hawaiian. Education through Hawaiian needs to be treated as a totally separate category and not subsumed under the same provisions as English-medium education. While the state legislature passed a Hawaiian-language-medium education act in 2004, the state Department of Education has yet to implement it.

While much remains to be done, the overall direction in Hawai'i, the United States, and the world is for increased recognition and protection of the rights of Indigenous peoples to maintain their ancestral languages—in education and elsewhere. In 2010, the United States adopted the United Nations Resolution on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It is likely that the state of Hawai'i will move forward in implementing those provisions for its official language—Hawaiian.

However, the key to language survival remains with use of languages by children (Wong Fillmore, 2011). In the case of Hawai'i, it is young adults in the Native community itself who are leading the way. Increasingly they are learning Hawaiian, making it the first language of their homes, sending their children to schools taught through Hawaiian, and devising new *honua* in which Hawaiian can be used in the contemporary world. While much remains to be done, progress is certainly being made in assuring a future for Hawaiian as a living language for the 21st century.

References

- 'Aha Pūnana Leo. (2010). *Nā Kula Pūnana Leo 2010–2011*. (Data on enrollments). Hilo, HI: Author.
- 'Aha Pūnana Leo. (2011). *Nā Kula Pūnana Leo 2011–2012*. (Data on enrollments). Hilo, HI: Author.
- 'Aha Pūnana Leo & Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani. (2009). *Kumu Honua Mauli Ola. [A native Hawaiian educational philosophy statement]*. Hilo: University of Hawai'i-Hilo.
- Arnold, R. (2001). To help assure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 45–48). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs. (2012). Retrieved from <http://aohcc.org/>.
- Bickerton, D., & Wilson, W. (1987). Pidgin Hawaiian. In G. G. Gilbert (Ed.), *Pidgin and creole languages: Essays in memory of John E. Reinecke* (pp. 61–76). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Charter School Administrative Office, State of Hawai'i. (2012). Directory of charter schools of Hawai'i. Retrieved from <http://hesao.org/content/charter-school-directory>.
- Collinan, T. (2003). *The island edge of America: A political history of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Eyre, K. (2004). Suppression of Hawaiian culture at Kamehameha schools. Honolulu, HI: Kamehameha Schools. Retrieved from http://apps.ksbe.edu/kaiwakiloumoku/makalii/feature-stories/suppression_of_hawaiian_culture.
- Furman N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2009*. NY: Modern Language Association. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/2009_enrollmentsurvey.
- Grenoble, L., & Whaley, L. (2006). *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hale Kuamo'o. (2010). *Nā Kula Kaiāpuni Hawai'i 2010–2011*. (Data on enrollments). Hilo, HI: Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani.
- Hale Kuamo'o. (2011). *Nā Kula Kaiāpuni Hawai'i 2011–2012*. (Data on enrollments). Hilo, HI: Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani.
- Hawai'i Council of Private Schools. (2012). *Private school enrollment report, 2011–2012*. Retrieved from http://www.hais.org/uploads/file/about_stats_hcpsenrollrpt12.pdf.
- Hixson, L., Hepler, B. B., & Kim, M. O. (2012). *The Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander population: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-12.pdf>.
- Kamehameha Schools. (2005). *Ka Huaka'i: 2005 Native Hawaiian educational assessment*. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- Kamehameha Schools. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.ksbe.edu/>.
- Kana'iaupuni, S., Brandon, L., & Jenson, U. (2010). *Culture-based education and its relationship to student outcomes*. Kamehameha Schools Research & Evaluation Division. Retrieved from http://www.ksbe.edu/spi/PDFS/CBE_relationship_to_student_outcomes.pdf.
- Kawai'ae'a, K., Housman, A., Alencastre, M., Ka'awa, K., Māka'imoku, K., & Lauano, K. (2007). Pū'ā i ka 'ōlelo, Ola ka 'Ōhana: Three generations of Hawaiian language revitalization. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 4(1), 183–237.
- Lucas, P. (2000). E ola mau kākou i ka 'ōlelo makuahine: Hawaiian language policy and the courts. *Hawaiian Journal of History*, 34, 1–27.
- Ng-Osorio, J., & Ledward, B. C. (2011). *Aia ke ola i ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i: Revival of the Hawaiian language*. Honolulu, HI: Kamehameha Schools—Research & Evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.ksbe.edu/spi/PDFS/Lang_prevalence.pdf.
- Norris, T., Vines, P. L., & Hoefel, E. M. (2012). *The American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf>.
- Pease-Pretty On Top, J. (2003). *Native American language immersion: Innovative Native education for children and families*. Retrieved July 25, 2012, from <http://www.aihcc.org/resources>.

- Rawlins, N., Wilson, W., & Kawai'ae'a, K. (2011). Bill Demmert, Native American language revitalization, and his Hawai'i connection. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 50(1), 74–85.
- Reinecke, J. (1969). *Language and dialect in Hawai'i: A sociolinguistic history to 1935*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Roberts, J. M. (1995). Pidgin Hawaiian: A sociohistorical study. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 10, 1–56.
- Schütz, A. (1994). *Voices of Eden: A history of Hawaiian language studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Silva, N. (2004). *Aloha betrayed: Native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Takayama, B. (2008). Academic achievement across school types in Hawai'i: Outcomes for Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian students in conventional public schools, Western-focused charters, and Hawaiian language and culture-based schools. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 5, 245–283.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Language spoken at home for the United States, Census 2000*. Special Tabulation 224. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/language/data/census/>.
- Wilson, W., & Kamanā, K. (2001). Mai Loko Mai O Ka 'I'ini: Proceeding from a dream. The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 147–176). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilson, W. H. (1999). The sociopolitical context of establishing Hawaiian-medium education. In S. May (Ed.), *Indigenous community-based education* (pp. 95–108). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilson, W. H. (2012). USDE violations of NALA and the testing boycott at Nāwahīokalani'ōpu'u School. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(3), 30–45.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2006). For the interest of the Hawaiians themselves: Reclaiming the benefits of Hawaiian-medium education. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 3(1), 153–181.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2011). Insights from Indigenous language immersion in Hawai'i: The case of Nāwahī School. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. Williams (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 36–57). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2013). E Paepae Hou 'Ia Ka Pōhaku: Reset the stones of the Hawaiian house platform. In L. Hinton (Ed.), *Bringing our languages home*. (pp. 101–117). Berkeley, California: Heyday Books.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kawai'ae'a, K. (2007). I Kuinu; I Lāla: "Let there be sources; let there be branches": Teacher education in the College of Hawaiian Language. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 46(3), 37–53.
- Wong, K. L. (2011). Language, fruits, and vegetables. In M. E. Romero-Little, S. J. Ortiz, & T. L. McCarty (Eds.), *Indigenous languages across the generations—strengthening families and communities* (pp. 3–15). Tempe: Arizona State University Center for Indian Education.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (2011). An ecological perspective on intergenerational language transmission. In M. E. Romero-Little, S. J. Ortiz, & T. L. McCarty (Eds.), *Indigenous languages across the generations—strengthening families and communities* (pp. 19–48). Tempe: Arizona State University Center for Indian Education.

Handbook of Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages in the United States

Research, Policy, and Educational Practice

*Edited by Terrence G. Wiley,
Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donna Christian,
Sarah Catherine K. Moore, and Na Liu*

Co-published by Routledge and the Center for Applied Linguistics

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

CAL CENTER
FOR APPLIED
LINGUISTICS

First published 2014
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2014 Taylor & Francis

Co-published by the Center for Applied Linguistics
4646 40th Street NW, Washington DC 20016
www.cal.org

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States : research, policy, and educational practice / [edited by] Terry Wiley, Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donna Christian.
pages cm

- Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Indians of North America—Languages—Handbooks, manuals, etc.
 2. Language revival—United States—Handbooks, manuals, etc.
 3. Heritage language speakers—United States—Handbooks, manuals, etc.
 4. Education, Bilingual—United States—Handbooks, manuals, etc.
I. Wiley, Terrence
G. PM206.H36 2014
497—dc23
2013027361

ISBN: 978-0-415-52066-9 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-415-52067-6 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-12241-9 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC



Printed and bound in the United States of America by Sheridan Books, Inc. (a Sheridan Group Company).

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xii
SECTION I	
Foundations of Heritage, Community, and Native American Language Education	1
Introduction <i>Terrence G. Wiley, Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donna Christian, Sarah Catherine K. Moore, and Na Liu</i>	3
1 Demographic Realities, Challenges, and Opportunities <i>Molly Fee, Nancy C. Rhodes, and Terrence G. Wiley</i>	6
2 The Problem of Defining Heritage and Community Languages and Their Speakers: On the Utility and Limitations of Definitional Constructs <i>Terrence G. Wiley</i>	19
3 Heritage Language Students: Profiles and Possibilities <i>Guadalupe Valdés</i>	27
4 Three Hundred-Plus Years of Heritage Language Education in the United States <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	36
5 Policy Considerations for Promoting Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages <i>Terrence G. Wiley</i>	45
6 Documenting Language Loss and Endangerment: Research Tools and Approaches <i>Joseph Lo Bianco</i>	54

7 Professional Opportunities for Heritage Language Speakers <i>Maria Carreim</i>	66
8 Research on Heritage Language Issues <i>Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl</i>	76
SECTION II Commonly Taught Languages	85
Introduction <i>Ofelia Garcia</i>	87
9 Spanish in the United States <i>Kim Potowski</i>	90
10 French Heritage Language Communities in the United States <i>Jane F. Ross and Fabrice Jaumont</i>	101
11 German as a Heritage Language in the United States <i>Renate Ludanyi</i>	111
12 Italian and Italians in the United States <i>Anna De Fina</i>	123
13 Portuguese Heritage Bilingualism in the United States <i>Jason Rothman and Tiffany Judy</i>	132
SECTION III Critical and Less Commonly Taught Languages	143
Introduction <i>Scott McGinnis</i>	145
14 Arabic in the United States <i>Jeff Bale</i>	148
15 Being “Critical”: Implications for Chinese Heritage Language Schools <i>Shuhan C. Wang</i>	157
16 The Journey of Hindi in the United States <i>Surendra Gambhir and Vijay Gambhir</i>	167

17 Russian Heritage Language Learners: From Students’ Profiles to Project-Based Curriculum <i>Olya Kagan</i>	177
SECTION IV Native American Languages	187
Introduction <i>Teresa L. McCarty</i>	189
18 Navajo <i>Larisa Warhol and Jeston Morris</i>	192
19 Pueblo Languages of the Southwest <i>Christine Sims</i>	202
20 Oowaaha Myaamiaataweenki: Miami Is Spoken Here <i>Daryl Baldwin</i>	212
21 Hawaiian: A Native American Language Official for a State <i>William H. Wilson</i>	219
22 Warm Springs Languages <i>Valerie Switzler and Erin Flynn Haynes</i>	229
SECTION V Languages With Strong Community Connections	239
Introduction <i>Sarah J. Shin</i>	241
23 Japanese in the United States <i>Kimi Kondo-Brown</i>	244
24 Community Support for Korean as a Heritage Language in the United States <i>Jin Sook Lee</i>	253
25 Yiddish: A Jewish Language in the Diaspora <i>Netta Avineri</i>	263
26 American Sign Language as a Heritage Language <i>Sarah E. Compton</i>	272

Contents

27	Khmer <i>Wayne E. Wright</i>	284
28	Filipino in the United States: Heritage Language Perspectives <i>Joseph Axel</i>	297
SECTION VI		
Promotion of Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages		309
	Introduction <i>Wayne E. Wright</i>	311
29	Digital Stories in Heritage Language Education: Empowering Heritage Language Learners Through a Pedagogy of Multiliteracies <i>Polina Vinogradova</i>	314
30	Heritage Language Development and Identity Construction Throughout the Life Cycle <i>Agnes Weiyun He</i>	324
31	Stakeholder Views of Community-Based Heritage Language Programs: Chinese and Korean Cases <i>Na Liu and Byoung-Keun You</i>	333
32	Program Models for Heritage Language Education <i>Sarah Catherine K. Moore</i>	341
33	Assessment of Heritage Language Learners: Issues and Directions <i>Margaret E. Malone, Joy Kreeft Peyton, and Katie Kim</i>	349
34	Preparing Teachers to Work With Heritage Language Learners <i>Ana Marfa Schwartz Caballero</i>	359
35	Funding for Heritage Language Programs <i>Sarah Catherine K. Moore</i>	370
	Afterword: Heritage, Community, and Native American Language Education: Looking to the Future <i>Joy Kreeft Peyton and Donna Christian</i>	377
	Contributors	384
	Index	391

Preface

The inspiration for this volume can be traced to the publication of Joshua Fishman's foundational study of *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966). Since its release more than half a century ago, interest in the maintenance, development, and revitalization of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States has grown despite decades of debate over the merits of bilingual education for language minority populations (Wiley, 2013). Although many language communities have long devoted energy to educating their children and finding ways to maintain their rich linguistic and cultural traditions (e.g., Fishman, Chapter 4, this volume; see also the language-focused chapters in this volume), institutional recognition of and support for the promotion of heritage and community languages has for the most part been lacking. There have been major advances in the recognition and promotion of Native American languages such as Hawaiian (see Wilson, Chapter 21) through local and state efforts to promote the language, with federal recognition of Native American languages growing since the passage of the Native American Languages Preservation Act in 1990 (see Wiley, Chapter 5; McCarty, Introduction to Section IV; Sims, Chapter 19; Wilson, Chapter 21; Switzler & Haynes, Chapter 22). The contributors to this volume document the promising support of policy makers, educators, and community members in promoting the vitality of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States, but they also reveal the many challenges that remain.

In the late 1990s, considerable interest in heritage and community languages in the United States began to reemerge among scholars. In 1998, for example, Stephen Krashen, Lucy Tse, and Jeff McQuillan published *Heritage Language Development*. In the following year, 1999, the First National Heritage Language Conference was hosted by California State University, Long Beach, in collaboration with the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC); participants included James Alatis, Russell Campbell, Lily Wong Fillmore, Joshua Fishman, Ana Roca, and Guadalupe Valdés, among others. Several of the editors of this volume (Christian, Peyton, and Wiley) also participated. Among its concrete outcomes, the 1999 conference was instrumental in bringing together a working group focused on research under the leadership of Russell Campbell. The group gathered the following year at UCLA for a working symposium, leading to the production of a research agenda for the field (University of California, Los Angeles, 2001). Shortly thereafter, the Center for Applied Linguistics published *Heritage Languages in America: Preserving a National Resource* (Peyton, Ranard, & McGinnis, 2001), which featured contributions from many who had attended the 1999 conference in Long Beach. Other volumes appeared at about the same time (e.g., Webb & Miller, 2000; Wiley & Valdés, 2001), and beginning in 2003, the online *Heritage Language Research Journal* was launched, which has provided a major outlet for scholarship in the field.

A Second National Conference on Heritage Languages in America, again organized and sponsored by CAL and NFLC, was held in 2002 in Reston, Virginia. The participants agreed that an organization was needed to promote the sharing of information and efforts to promote heritage

language maintenance and development. From this discussion, the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages was created, with a mission "to promote the maintenance and development of heritage languages for the benefit of individuals, communities, and society" (<http://www.cal.org/heritage>). Under the direction of a Steering Committee representing multiple institutions committed to the effort, the Alliance's mission is carried out through regular communications with the field, publications, a directory of programs, and coordination of a discussion list. The research group met again in conjunction with the 2002 conference, focusing its discussion on "intergenerational transmission of heritage languages," with a summary published in the new *Heritage Language Journal* (Campbell & Christian, 2003).

There were also efforts to promote bi-/multinational collaboration on heritage and community language education issues. In 2001, during the period between the two major U.S. national conferences, for example, Russell Campbell organized a binational conference in collaboration with Helen Borland of the Victoria Institute of Technology in Melbourne, Australia, which stimulated comparative binational research (see Hornberger, 2005).

An indicator of the growing acceptance of heritage language education as a field can be seen in the 2006 addition of the National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC) at UCLA to the network of 15 federally funded language resource centers. Its mission is "to develop effective pedagogical approaches to teaching heritage language learners, both by creating a research base and by pursuing curriculum design, materials development, and teacher education" (<http://www.nhlrc.ucla.edu>). In 2010, the NHLRC organized the next major conference on the topic, expanding the scope to an International Conference on Heritage/Community Languages and attracting researchers and practitioners from around the world. Ongoing NHLRC activities include a variety of research projects, professional development workshops and institutes, publications, and production of the *Heritage Language Journal*.

The rate of publishing in the field has also accelerated. Subsequent volumes, such as Brinton, Kagan, and Bauckus (2008) have been published that focused on the field broadly, as well as language-specific collections, such as He and Xiao's (2008), which focused on Chinese as a heritage language, and Beaudrie and Fairclough's (2012), with a focus on Spanish, have made important contributions.

As attention to heritage, community, and Native American languages has grown, there has also been a significant increase in the emphasis on research in this area in many of the major professional language teaching organizations such as the American Association for Applied Linguistics, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the Modern Language Association, TESOL International, and the American Educational Research Association. In addition, over the past decade there has been a steady stream of dissertations, which are making significant contributions to the field (Seals, Liu, & Moore, 2012).

With this increased attention has come an expansion of our knowledge base about speakers of these languages as language users and learners as well as about policies and practices that promote (or deter) language development. This handbook brings together many of the scholars who are building the field(s) of heritage, community, and Native American language education research and practice to provide an overview of the current state of our knowledge and offer perspectives on how to move forward as a field.

Deciding on a single label for this volume was problematic because there is no firm consensus in the field on the appropriateness or elasticity of terms that can be applied across all language groups and their speakers (see Wiley, Chapter 3, on the problems of definition). The terms *heritage*, *community*, and *Native American* languages are used here because they are used among language advocates and educators to refer to speakers who have immigrant and Native American language ancestry or family and community connections to a language and culture. It is important to recognize that the languages they are speaking and learning are not *foreign languages* to them. The term

heritage language is also used in some chapters in this volume as an umbrella term for some or all of these groups. Similarly, the terms used as section headings and the languages grouped under some of those sections reflect choices that were not always easy to make. For example, the term *critical languages* is part of the title of Section III, referring to the federal government's list of strategically important languages, a list that changes over time. Further, grouping languages under a heading of "with strong community connections" is not meant to suggest that languages in other sections do not have equally strong connections. There is inevitable overlap across sections, and the editors acknowledge that there may be some disagreement on the use of terms. We have tried to make the volume reflective of the breadth of this dynamic field and inclusive of many of the relevant contexts in which it operates.

Overview

This handbook provides an overview of issues related to heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States based on current knowledge and research and drawing from a variety of perspectives—the speakers; use of the languages in the home, community, and wider society; patterns of acquisition, retention, loss, and revitalization of the languages; and specific education efforts devoted to developing stronger connections with them and proficiency in them.

In developing a handbook on this topic, we believed that there needed to be both commentaries on the field (history, policy, educational practice) and language-specific chapters to provide grounding in actual cases. Sections I and VI deal with the broader themes, while Sections II through V focus on specific languages. For each chapter, we invited a leading scholar on the topic or language to provide a discussion of background, development, and future prospects of their subject. As will be evident, the authors of chapters on languages often also dealt with broader themes in heritage language education, perspectives that we welcomed. We grouped 35 chapters in the volume into six sections, which are described below. Each section begins with an overview by a leader in language education and research who summarizes and synthesizes the major ideas discussed in the section. This Preface and an Afterword complete the volume.

Section I: Foundations of Heritage, Community, and Native American Language Education

After an introduction by the book editors, the eight chapters in this section frame the research, policy, and practice dimensions of heritage, community and Native American language education. The demographic context sets the stage in the first chapter, along with an examination of some basic constructs, including definitions of the languages and their speakers and profiles of the speakers as bilingual individuals. After a review of the history of heritage language use and study in the United States, the discussion turns to policy formation related to heritage, community, and Native American languages and frameworks for determining the vitality of the diverse languages spoken in this country. An exploration of professional opportunities for bilingual and multilingual individuals documents one aspect of the value of maintaining these languages. Finally, the history and current status of research on heritage, community, and Native American language issues is reviewed.

Section II: Commonly Taught Languages

After an introduction by Ofelia García, chapters in this section discuss the history, current profile, and learning of five languages that have been, and continue to be, commonly taught in U.S. schools: Spanish, French, German, Italian, and Portuguese.

Section III: Critical and Less Commonly Taught Languages

Following a section introduction by Scott McGinnis, chapters examine four languages that are less commonly taught in U.S. schools and determined “critical” by the U.S. government: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Russian. The authors explore the role of these languages in the national landscape and a range of efforts to promote their maintenance and development.

Section IV: Native American Languages

After a section introduction by Teresa McCarty, chapter authors discuss the history in the United States of seven Native American languages and current efforts to revitalize them: Navajo; Pueblo; Miami; Hawaiian; and three languages spoken on the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation in Central Oregon, Kiksht (a Chinookan language), Ichishkiin (a Sahaptian language), and Numu (an Uto-Aztecan language).

Section V: Languages with Strong Community Connections

An introduction by Sarah Shin leads into a set of chapters that explore aspects of Japanese, Korean, Yiddish, American Sign Language, Khmer, and Tagalog. These languages are not traditionally taught in U.S. schools, but they have important meaning for the populations that speak and sign them and an education system that supports their learning and development.

Section VI: Promotion of Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages

The final section in the volume addresses a variety of topics in the maintenance and development of heritage, community, and Native American languages, particularly focused on language programs and instruction. After a section introduction by Wayne Wright, authors discuss different types of programs, stakeholder views of those programs, and approaches to funding their operation; identity construction with students, instructional approaches to working with them, and assessment of the language proficiency and development of heritage, community, and Native American language speakers; and resources for and approaches to preparing teachers who are effective in working with these students.

As the contributions to this handbook attest, the field of heritage, community, and Native American languages is vibrant and growing, benefiting from the cooperation of diverse disciplines and dedicated communities. The volume provides a foundational perspective for serious students of these languages as they are learned in the classroom, transmitted across generations in families, and used in communities. It provides background on the history and current status of many languages in the linguistic mosaic of U.S. society and stresses the importance of drawing on these languages as societal, community, and individual resources, while noting their strategic importance within the context of globalization. We offer this work as a celebration of our linguistic treasures and a tribute to all of those researchers, practitioners, and policy makers who protect and nurture these treasures.

Acknowledgments

We extend our thanks and sincere appreciation to all of the contributors to this handbook (see the List of Contributors), who wrote such thorough and compelling accounts of important issues in the field and of the profiles of specific heritage, community, and Native American languages. Their

participation made the volume possible, and their ongoing efforts will continue to advance the field. We also appreciate the guidance, support, and enthusiasm of Naomi Silverman and her fine team at Routledge, who brought this handbook to reality.

References

- Beaudrie, S. M., & Fairclough, M. (2012). *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Brinton, D. M., Kagan, O., Bauckus, S. (2008). (Eds.) *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. London: Routledge.
- Campbell, R., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2003). Directions in research: Intergenerational transmission of heritage languages. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1(1), 1–44. Retrieved from <http://www.heritagelanguages.org/Journal.aspx>.
- Fishman, J. A. (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States: The maintenance and perpetuation of non-English mother tongues by American ethnic and religious groups*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.
- He, A., & Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language in the United States*. National Foreign Language Resource Center. University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Hornberger, N. (Ed.). (2005). Heritage/community language education: US and Australian perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8(2–3).
- Krashen, S., Tse, L., & McQuillan, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Heritage language development*. Los Angeles, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., & McGinnis, S. (2001). *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. Washington, DC, & McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Seals, C., Liu, N., & Moore, S. (Compilers). (2012). *Dissertation and thesis abstracts on heritage language education, 2000–2012*. Washington, DC: Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/heritage/pdfs/dissertation/heritage-language-education-dissertation-and-thesis-abstracts.pdf>.
- University of California, Los Angeles. (2001). *Heritage language research priorities conference report*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/heritage/involved/hlprioritiesconf00.pdf>.
- Webb, J. B., & Miller, B. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Wiley, T. G. (2013). A brief history and assessment of language rights in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Second Edition (pp. 61–90). London: Routledge.
- Wiley, T. G., & Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language instruction in the United States: A time for renewal. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4).