

Language Documentation and Description

ISSN 1740-6234

This article appears in: *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 5. Editor: Peter K. Austin

Language activism and the 'new linguistics': expanding opportunities for documenting endangered languages in Indonesia

MARGARET FLOREY

Cite this article: Margaret Florey (2008). Language activism and the 'new linguistics': expanding opportunities for documenting endangered languages in Indonesia. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 5. London: SOAS. pp. 120-135

Link to this article: <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/066>

This electronic version first published: July 2014



This article is published under a Creative Commons License CC-BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial). The licence permits users to use, reproduce, disseminate or display the article provided that the author is attributed as the original creator and that the reuse is restricted to non-commercial purposes i.e. research or educational use. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

EL Publishing

For more EL Publishing articles and services:

Website: <http://www.elpublishing.org>
Terms of use: <http://www.elpublishing.org/terms>
Submissions: <http://www.elpublishing.org/submissions>

Language activism and the ‘new linguistics’: expanding opportunities for documenting endangered languages in Indonesia¹

Margaret Florey

1. Introduction

This paper discusses the role that language activism can play in raising the level of language documentation and support for revitalisation activities in linguistically diverse and resource poor countries such as Indonesia. Section 2 discusses the rise of language activism within the dual contexts of the extinction crisis facing linguistic, cultural and biological diversity, and the development of international policies addressing indigenous rights. In Section 3, I argue that these contexts are framing what is conceptualized here as a ‘new linguistics’, and that capacity building and mentoring are core activities through which external language activists can support internal language activists. A small-scale training programme which was developed and piloted in Indonesia in 2006-2007 is described in Section 4. This programme is an exemplar of the kind of initiatives which are emerging more and more within contemporary linguistics and which are forging new relationships between linguists and community language activists. Concern for the diverse goals of all stakeholders in the language documentation and revitalisation enterprise is considered to be a crucial factor in the success and ongoing value of a training programme. Section 5 then examines the impact of training on language activism, which is evidenced first through the range of language documentation projects which the Indonesian workshop participants are beginning to undertake across the country, and second, through the ways in which the participants are beginning to transfer their language documentation and maintenance skills to their colleagues, students, and community members.

¹ I am very grateful to Susan Penfield for exchanging ideas on this topic and for comments on an earlier draft of this paper, which has also benefited from discussions held in 2007 with Tony Woodbury, Nora England and students at the University of Texas at Austin, Phil Cash, Jane Hill, Ofelia Zepeda, Mary Willie and students at the University of Arizona; Melissa Axelrod and students at the University of New Mexico; Jennie de Groat, Louise Lockard, and Jon Reyhner at Northern Arizona University; and Michael Fillerup at the Flagstaff Unified School District, Arizona.

2. Language activism and international policy

Over the past several years, the term 'language activism' has progressively become a part of the lexicon of contemporary linguistics and is enjoying wider public usage. Web site entries provide a rough measure of the extent of use of this term. A Google search currently reveals approximately 3,800 entries for 'language activism' and some 4,200 for 'language activist' while a Yahoo search finds about 2,100 entries for 'language activism' and almost 11,000 for 'language activist'. The entries found by such searches link to the activities of indigenous and non-indigenous people who are at the front line of language documentation and revitalisation activities across the world, and to scientific publications, encyclopaedias and Wikipedia entries, blogs, school language programmes, media reports, conferences, organisations such as the Foundation for Endangered Languages and the recently established Living Tongues Institute for Endangered Languages, and training programmes such as the Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Symposium, the Center for Indigenous Languages of Latin America, and the American Indian Language Development Institute.

These web entries demonstrate a broad acceptance of the terms 'language activism' and 'language activist' and the range of people, institutes, events and projects to which they have been applied. However, to date very little has been written in our field either about language activism as a concept or about the ways in which it might be supported and sustained. Few definitions can be found in the literature, and Penfield and colleagues (Penfield, Flores and Tucker 2007; Penfield 2008) are among the first to problematise these concepts. Penfield (2008:2) defines a language activist as 'a person who focuses "energetic action" toward language' vis-à-vis their work in endangered language communities. Language activists undertake language-related activities ranging from documentation, training and skill-sharing, to materials development, language programmes, raising community awareness and encouraging participation in language work.

Various stakeholders in language documentation and revitalization activities may have diverse perspectives on language-related issues and strategies, as well as different skills and training needs. For these reasons, it can be useful to distinguish different groups of language activists. Penfield et al (2007) draw a primary distinction between *internal* and *external* language activists. The former are members of a language community with a link to their heritage language, whether or not they are speakers. The latter are not members of the language community and have no heritage link to the language. Within this framework, the term 'language activist' is applied to both indigenous and non-indigenous activists, internal and external to academia, and with a broad spectrum of interests and skills in linguistics and allied disciplines. It is important to note, as Penfield et al do, that internal and

external language activists are linked by action, their passion about the fate of the language, and what Phil Cash Cash has called ‘radical hope’.

For some purposes, it may be helpful to draw more fine-grained contrasts between various groups of external language activists. Some external language activists will choose to base their activities in their own country. These *in-country external language activists* (may) usefully share with internal language activists knowledge of, for example, local political and educational systems, social and cultural features, and other language/s, such as lingua francas, the national language(s), and so forth. This shared knowledge may permit them to work more closely and more effectively alongside internal language activists. It is not difficult to postulate that it might also create certain conflicts over goals, priorities, and choice of strategies. In-country external language activists also include indigenous people who choose not to focus their activism on their own heritage language, but rather to work with another language in their country (as will be seen later for the Indonesian situation). *Out-country external language activist* are carrying out projects in countries other than that of their heritage or nationality. This group most commonly denotes linguists undertaking international research programmes but also includes, for example, members of relevant organizations with international bases and activities (such as funders, non-profit organizations, educational institutions, and so forth).

Language activism has emerged within the dual contexts of, first, what authors such as Harmon (1996) and Maffi (2001; 2005) have described as the ‘converging extinction crisis’ confronting linguistic, cultural and biological diversity², and second, the growing recognition of indigenous rights internationally. The extinction crisis has triggered a vociferous struggle for linguistic and cultural rights by both indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. There is a large linguistic literature on minority language rights, and arguments are increasingly made for the place of those rights within the wider human rights movement (for example, the papers in Argenter and Brown 2004; Freeland and Patrick 2004). A number of recent international policy documents which enshrine indigenous rights also address the issue of language rights. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations 2007), adopted on 13 September 2007 by a vote of 144 to 4, recognizes language rights most directly in Article 13:

indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral

² The issues confronting these diversities are taken up in considerable detail in the background papers prepared for the Symposium on *Sustaining Cultural and Biological Diversity in a Rapidly Changing World: Lessons for Global Policy*, held at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, 2-5 April 2008. See <<http://symposia.cbc.amnh.org/biocultural/background.html>>.

traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.

Rights to interpreting and translating, education in indigenous languages, and media in indigenous languages are set out in Articles 13, 14 and 16 respectively, while Article 31 addresses intellectual property rights. Article 15 of the Declaration recognizes the right to diversity:

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

A sub-commission of the United Nations Economic and Security Council, chaired by Erica-Irene Daes, earlier drafted and revised a set of Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous People. Principle 7 of the draft noted that 'to protect and preserve their heritage, indigenous peoples must control their own forms of cultural transmission and education. This includes their right to the continued use and, wherever applicable, the restoration of their own languages and orthographies' (E.a.S.C. United Nations 2000).

The Convention on Biological Diversity addresses Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices in Article 8(j) (CBD 1993). Traditional knowledge refers to:

the knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities around the world. Developed from experience gained over the centuries and adapted to the local culture and environment, traditional knowledge is transmitted orally from generation to generation. It tends to be collectively owned and takes the form of stories, songs, folklore, proverbs, cultural values, beliefs, rituals, community laws, local language, and agricultural practices, including the development of plant species and animal breeds.

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage was adopted on 17 October 2003 and entered into force on 20 April 2006 with ratification by 30 states. The 93 States Parties which are now signatories to the Convention are bound by Article 11 to 'take the necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory', which Article 2 notes are manifested in various domains along with 'oral traditions and expressions including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage' (UNESCO 2003).

3. The 'new linguistics'

Each of the policy documents described above highlights the need for control by indigenous peoples over intellectual property and strategies and actions, as well as 'development in accordance with their aspirations and needs' (United Nations 2007). For example, the UNESCO Convention (2003) requires that the signatory Parties 'shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals, that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management'. From within academia, calls for indigenous control over research have been voiced in publications such as Battiste (2000), Mihesuah and Wilson (2004), and Smith (1999).

Calls for a participatory agenda and for an ethical framework for linguistic research and language activism are relatively long-standing in linguistics — perhaps best known through the work of authors such as Cameron et al (1993) and Grinevald (Craig 1992; Grinevald 2003). The rise of language activism and the international policy developments are further challenging the field of linguistics to review its practices, to reconsider the role of linguists as external language activists, and to find new ways to support indigenous control — even where countries are not (yet) signatories to the Conventions and Declarations. I suggest that what we are now seeing is the emergence of a 'new linguistics', conceptualized here as a more participatory and politicized linguistics in which language activism is at the heart. Alliances are being formed between external and internal language activists who are working together towards the shared goal of documenting and supporting minority languages and cultures. The new linguistics is characterised by profound changes to ethics, methods and practice in the field. As Woodbury and England (2006: 2) suggest, 'documentary and descriptive linguistics ... are the starting point for both scientific study and community language activism'.

The new linguistics is not bounded by academia, and we are witnessing the foundation of independent institutes dedicated to language documentation and revitalization activities, such as the Piegan Institute in Montana³ and the Living Tongues Institute in Oregon.⁴ In response to widespread discussion about the latter, Lise Dobrin argued in a recent blog⁵ that 'language documentation, community language development, and language activism have a rather peripheral place in the academy, especially in the US' and suggested that perhaps linguists should broaden their perspective on the kinds of institutions and structures that might best support language documentation

³ See <http://www.pieganinstitute.org/>.

⁴ See <http://www.livingtongues.org/index.html>.

⁵ See http://blogs.usyd.edu.au/elac/2007/09/no_we_should_become_the_press.html

and revitalization. This stance has held currency for some time in Australia through the work of Aboriginal language centres, as noted by a respondent to Dobrin's blog (Dez 2007). Florey and Himmelmann (forthcoming) also argue that the language resource centre model appears well suited to large, diverse countries such as Australia and Indonesia. However language activists working within academia also have an opportunity (and, some might consider, a responsibility) to continue to make universities more responsive to the needs of internal language activists. We are now seeing this happen through the development of training programmes such as InField (The Institute on Field Linguistics and Language Documentation), which aims to bring together language activists from a wide range of academic and language community backgrounds.⁶

Training in the methods of documentary linguists is essential to the work of language activists, whether within or external to the academy. Many linguists have had some experience of meeting highly motivated internal or in-country external language activists who are struggling to undertake documentation and/or revitalization without knowledge of modern methods. For example, in a fieldtrip following the International Conference on Austronesian Endangered Language Documentation held in Taiwan in mid-2007, a group of linguists met internal language activists from the Paze, Thao and Gahabu communities who were vigorously supporting their own severely endangered Austronesian languages (discussed in Florey 2007)⁷. Whilst these language activists were not waiting for foreign intervention in their programmes, they were keen to talk with us about methods, and we were all conscious that with some training their work could be expedited. Training workshops also provide a venue for both internal and external language activists to come together to co-develop goals, methods and directions for activism. The following section describes one example from Indonesia.

4. Supporting the development of Language activism in Indonesia

Indonesia is a nation of great linguistic diversity, with some 737 Austronesian and Papuan languages representing almost 11% of the world's linguistic resources (Gordon 2005). High levels of language endangerment have been reported for Indonesia, particularly in the smaller ethnolinguistic communities in the east of the country (Florey 2005), yet very few of Indonesia's languages have been adequately documented using modern methods, technologies and

⁶ This summer intensive programme will be held for the first time at the University of California at Santa Barbara in July 2008.

⁷ See also Peter Austin's blog post at:
http://blogs.usyd.edu.au/elac/2007/06/endangered_languages_and_taiwa.html

archiving practices (Adelaar forthcoming). Despite the urgent need for documentation, there are still only limited opportunities in Indonesian universities for training in modern language documentation methods. Few, if any, opportunities exist for internal language activists to receive training in documentation and revitalisation strategies, and the concept of indigenous control over research and language activities is virtually unheard of. With this background, Himmelmann, Florey and colleagues developed and piloted an intensive, residential language documentation training model through two workshops which were held in Bali in mid-2006 and mid-2007 (Himmelmann, Basri, Pastika and Florey 2005).⁸

4.1. Combining diverse groups of activists

Three groups of language activists took part in the Bali workshops. The eleven volunteer lecturers and tutors for the first workshop in 2006 included both out-country and in-country external language activists (linguists with research based in various parts of Indonesia).⁹ Eight of the eleven were able to return in 2007 for the second workshop. Twenty-five Indonesian language activists participated in Workshop 1, including both in-country external language activists (Indonesians undertaking research in communities other than their own heritage language) and a small number of internal language activists (particularly from eastern Indonesian regions such as Maluku where there is no locally-available linguistics programme). The student body was heterogeneous in region, culture, education, gender and religious affiliation. We prioritized the participation of people who were relatively early in their careers and would have the greatest opportunity to utilize the training they would receive, or those who were further into their careers and in leadership roles in teaching and thus would have the opportunity to introduce documentation-related topics into their curricula. The number of participants in the first workshop was determined by financial and teaching constraints. Participation in the second workshop required the students to demonstrate that

⁸ The two workshops were funded by the Volkswagen Foundation Endangered Languages Programme (DoBeS) under the auspices of the project 'Capacity building on a local and national level: Documenting Totoli, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia'. Florey and Himmelmann (forthcoming) analyses and discusses the goals, methods and curriculum of the Indonesian training programme and evaluates its sustainability.

⁹ I gratefully acknowledge all the linguists who volunteered their time to come and teach alongside Himmelmann and Florey in Bali: I Wayan Arka (Australian National University), Michael Ewing (University of Melbourne), Anthony Jukes (SOAS, London), Jani Kuhnt-Saptodewo (Museum of Ethnology, Vienna), Claudia Leto (Bochum University, Germany), Betty Litamahuputty (Max Planck Institute Jakarta Field Station), Simon Musgrave (Monash University, Melbourne), Antonia Soriente (Max Planck Institute Jakarta Field Station) and Jan Wohlgemut (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig).

they had begun to apply the skills gained in Workshop 1. Of the original 25 participants, 16 met the eligibility criteria, and 11 (four women and seven men) eventually took part in Workshop 2.

An early concern was faced over whether it was useful and/or possible to train the different groups of language activists in one workshop. These two groups had quite disparate educational backgrounds. Most of the internal activists had extensive documentation experience with foreign research teams, but limited formal education. In contrast, most of the in-country external activists were highly-educated professionals working as university academics or in allied institutions (museums, libraries), or graduate students in linguistics. However, many of the in-country external activists had been trained within a non-participatory framework which is still common amongst academic researchers in Indonesia. Our decision to bring together in the same workshop the diverse groups of activists represented amongst the trainers and students gave all parties a significant opportunity to co-develop frameworks and goals, to learn from each other, and to build new partnerships.

4.2. Stakeholders' goals

Consideration of the diverse goals of all stakeholders in the language documentation and revitalisation enterprise is considered a crucial factor in the success and ongoing value of a training programme. The organizers considered that our role as trainers was to demystify linguistics and language documentation and to support the development of local autonomy in decision-making and actions related to language programmes. We therefore formed as our key goals for the workshops: (1) to build the capacity for Indonesian linguists and language activists to initiate locally developed and implemented language documentation and maintenance projects, and (2) to facilitate a flow-on effect from this training to other people and institutions in the country (Himmelmann et al. 2005). The curriculum was driven by four principal objectives which outlined the skills that we hoped participants would have gained upon completion of the two workshops:

1. gained a basic understanding of the theory and principles of language documentation and language maintenance,
2. developed the ability to begin applying language documentation and maintenance methods and technologies in the field,
3. acquired knowledge of funding agencies and skills in the preparation of grant proposals, and
4. gained familiarity with pedagogical methods to support the transfer of skills more widely in universities and communities in Indonesia.

Workshop 1 included fourteen lecture topics which focused primarily on Objectives 1-3 and aimed to build technical skills. Workshop 2 included eight lecture topics which built the skills taught in Workshop 1 and focused intensively on Objective 3 and introduced Objective 4. Indonesian (of various varieties and skill levels) was the lingua franca of the workshops and the language used in all lectures and tutorials.

The 25 participants were asked to describe the goals which they held prior to attending the workshop and to assess in an evaluation session at the conclusion of Workshop 1 whether they felt their hopes and needs had been met. Their initial goals were that, at the conclusion of the workshop, they:

- would be able to skilfully use tools for linguistic analysis and language documentation (9),¹⁰
- have gained knowledge about language documentation as a branch of linguistics (8),
- have gained theoretical and practical knowledge about methods for documenting language (6),
- have learned ways of becoming a professional researcher (1), and
- would be able to prepare a research proposal (1).

The participants' goals thus grouped principally around the first two of the trainers' stated objectives. Most students had had some exposure to computational tools used in linguistic analysis through the work of foreign linguists, but few had had the opportunity to learn and practise these tools themselves. At the conclusion of the workshop, the students reported that they had gained a deeper understanding about the theory of language documentation, and had at least preliminary skills in the use of tools such as *Audacity*, *ELAN*, and *Toolbox*. However, five of the twenty-five participants felt that they had not had sufficient opportunity to practise these programs and to internalise the skills to be able to use them independently in their language work.

The goals of the participants and trainers in Workshop 2 aligned more closely. The participants wrote that they hoped to:

- deepen knowledge of the technical skills introduced in Workshop 1, particularly *ELAN* and *Toolbox* (7),
- learn to write a research proposal and grant application (4),
- gain knowledge of methods in digital archiving and metadata preparation and tools (2),

¹⁰ Numbers identify the number of respondents who cited this goal. Responses have been translated from Indonesian by the author.

- practise dictionary making (exporting via MDF from *Toolbox*) (2),
- increase skills in language documentation methods (1),
- strengthen research skills overall (1).

Students had come to Workshop 1 with very little exposure to international funding agencies and grant-writing practices. Several lectures and tutorials focused on developing these skills, and the participants' goals reflected their growing awareness of the role that grant-writing could play in supporting their future language activism. Students felt particularly satisfied with the depth of skills they gained in this area (discussed in some detail in Florey and Himmelmann forthcoming). The students also noted that their aspirations had been met in the areas of technical skills and dictionary production. Most were confident that they could now work independently in the field. However, a number of participants felt that they still had insufficient knowledge of methods in digital archiving and metadata preparation.

5. The impact of training on activism

The impact of a training programme may perhaps best be measured by the extent of 'uptake' — whether and how skills are utilised independently by the trainees. Repeated assessment over a period of at least ten years would indicate the long-term value of the training. Here, the impact of the Bali workshops is evaluated by first examining the range of language documentation projects which the workshop participants are beginning to undertake across the country, and second, through the ways in which the participants are beginning to transfer their language documentation and maintenance skills to their colleagues, students, and community members.

5.1. Project development

The workshop organisers felt strongly that the grant-writing sessions at the two workshops were a critical strategy both for meeting capacity building needs and for building towards autonomy so that Indonesian language activists could develop and implement their own documentation and revitalisation projects. Participants in Workshop 1 commented on the importance of these sessions and asked for more time to be devoted to this topic in Workshop 2. In response to this request, in the second workshop each participant was allocated two tutors who worked closely with the student to bring their proposal to a standard acceptable for submission to a national or international funding agency. The participants redeveloped and improved their proposals both in tutorials and during breaks. Revised drafts were given to the tutors every second day, and the tutors then provided individual feedback to

the two or three students they were mentoring. As their grant-writing skills and understanding of funding agencies developed, participants' plans for future projects or for the next phase of current projects became both more realistic and more sophisticated.

The participants developed proposals for language documentation projects in various parts of Indonesia, including four languages in Nusa Tenggara (Ndao, Hamap, Helong, Balinese), one in Kalimantan (Oma Longh), two in Sulawesi (Bantik, Tonsawang), two in Maluku (Haruku, Alune), and five in Papua (Irires, Sarmi, Yali, Waropen, Melayu Papua). The projects focused on various aspects of documentation and description, ranging from recordings of oral genres, to documenting legal language, traditional musics, and dialect variation. One participant who had undertaken his PhD some years earlier recognized important gaps in his previous research, and hoped to return to gather audio and video recordings. A large proportion of the participants also planned to prepare materials which could be used in community language programmes. One real test for the success of this workshop programme will be the number of proposals which are actually submitted. We are optimistic that a majority of the participants (perhaps eight of the eleven) will proceed to this point within the next year (though of course the outcomes of the applications remain uncertain). This number would represent approximately one third of the original group, and may seem to be a relatively small, however, given that (a) most participants had never previously drafted a proposal and that (b) so far there has only been a single successful application by an Indonesian scholar in the field of language documentation (Arka's ELDP-funded work in Flores), it would be considered a very positive outcome if this goal is achieved.

The participants identified a number of factors hindering documentation projects. The most commonly cited was the lack of equipment, ranging from audio and video recording equipment to computers with which they could digitise, transcribe and analyse their data. In a resource poor country, the ability to write successful grant applications to international agencies provides the greatest chance of addressing these problems. Several participants discussed other financial issues, notably the quite widespread belief in communities that projects bring large amounts of money which community members should be able to access. This became the subject of intense discussion during the workshop.

5.2. Skill-sharing

We considered that the two workshops were a critical first step in providing essential training in language documentation skills for language activists. However, we were cognisant of the fact that various factors (particularly

finances and conflicting family, community and work obligations) would inevitably limit the number of people who would be able to receive such training. This awareness drove the development of Objective 4, which sought to provide participants with some pedagogical methods to support the transfer of skills more widely in universities and communities in Indonesia. We hoped that the benefit of the training workshops could be multiplied if trained language activists were able to share their own training with others. To this end, participants in Workshop 2 were asked to complete a questionnaire (provided in Appendix 1) which would help us to identify the ways in which they were (a) applying their training in their workplace or community, and (b) sharing their training more widely in their workplace or community. The questionnaire also allowed us to understand and, where possible, to address the challenges which the participants were facing in transferring their skills.

A considerable number of the participants have already begun to share their documentation skills in an impressive range of activities with their colleagues, students and fellow community members. A course in linguistic research methods focusing on the documentation of minority Indonesian languages was introduced by participant Katubi at the Universitas Nasional in Jakarta. A new upper level subject on language documentation was planned by Yusuf Sawaki to be introduced in 2008 in the Arts Faculty at the State University of Papua in Manokwari. Sawaki has also begun to train students in the use of audio and video equipment, and in the preparation of metadata. Participant Jermy Balukh and tutor Wayan Arka co-taught a short course on *ELAN* and *Toolbox* in the Linguistics Program at Udayana University in Denpasar in August 2006. Co-applicant and participant I Wayan Pastika has now begun to teach *Audacity*, *ELAN*, and *Toolbox* and archiving practices at the same university. The National Language Centre in Jakarta (*Pusat Bahasa*) invited Himmelmann to give a short course on language documentation in August 2006, which he did with the assistance of the four *Pusat Bahasa* participants in Workshop 1 (Luh Anik Mayani, Citra Aniendita Sari, Dira Hildayani, and Yayat Hendayana). The director and staff of *Pusat Bahasa* were very enthusiastic about putting language documentation on their main agenda and participant Luh Anik Mayani intends to run further short courses on the subject for her colleagues at *Pusat Bahasa*. More informally, participants in West Papua, Maluku and Nusa Tenggara reported raising awareness of language endangerment among community members and training fellow university students in recording techniques and in the use of relevant documentation software.

The participants identified a number of factors hindering the transfer of the skills they had acquired during the workshops. One participant discussed the attitudinal challenges of community members who felt that documentation activities could only be undertaken by highly educated people. Several people reported on challenges from within the academy, where documentation was

not considered a priority. Another participant highlighted the time needed to repeat training exercises with his colleagues to ensure that they understood recording techniques. Again, the lack of essential equipment was of concern to the majority of participants.

6. Evaluating outcomes

The groups of activists trained in Bali in 2006 and 2007 represents the largest pool of trained documentary linguists in Indonesia. As indicated in this paper, they face very real challenges in their communities and workplaces, and the lack of funding and equipment are at the forefront of the issues which they must address. However, the training workshops also provided both hope and encouragement to all groups of language activists — both students and trainers. The participants now have a larger support base, both in-country and internationally, and have made some steps towards breaking down traditional status barriers which have kept internal and in-country external language activists apart in Indonesia. Some of the mentoring relationships will continue into the future, and a number of the trainers are seeking ways to further develop the participants' skills and to support their aspirations for language-related activities. A deeper understanding also began to develop of the Indonesian language activists' role in the growth of a new participatory linguistics internationally. We are also hopeful that this group will continue to share their skills, and that the training will continue to impact on language activism and documentary linguistics in Indonesia into the future.

APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire: *Transferring skills in language documentation*

BACKGROUND

Name

Role (at work or in your community)

Research community: its language and location

What is your relationship to your research community?

APPLYING YOUR TRAINING

1. How do you plan to use the training you have received in the Volkswagen Foundation workshops? For example, will you document a language (if so, which one), or prepare language maintenance or revitalization activities for a language, or will you teach language documentation in your workplace?
2. What do you identify as the documentation needs in your research community? In what order would you prioritize the needs? What is the most urgent task? For example, has there already been some documentation of the language or none at all? Is there a grammar or a dictionary of the language? Are there already some story books and/or some teaching materials?
3. Are there challenges concerning documentation which you have encountered and with which you'd like some support or ideas?

SHARING YOUR TRAINING

1. How do you plan to share the training you have received in the Volkswagen Foundation workshops? For example, will you train other people in your own community, or students in university classes, or fellow workers in your workplace?
2. If you are already sharing your training, where, when and how are you doing it? For example, are you teaching a class in a university or training people in a local community? What aspects of documentation are you teaching? When do you hold your classes? Are people learning by working with you as you do your documentation work?
3. How successful is the training you are already doing? Tell us some stories about the things you think have been most successful. For example, have some of your students started documentation projects of their own? Have some of the people in your research community started writing down stories, or interviewing the old people?
4. Are there challenges you have faced in the training you are already doing? What kinds of strategies have you used to try to overcome those challenges?
5. If you haven't yet started to share your training, what kinds of difficulties are preventing you from training other people? What would need to happen in your workplace or your community to make it possible to start training people?

References

- Adelaar, Alexander K. (forthcoming). An overview of language documentation in the Austronesian world. In Margaret Florey (ed.), *Endangered Languages of Austronesia* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Argenter, Joan A. and R. McKenna Brown. (eds.) 2004. *On the margins of nations: Endangered languages and linguistic rights. Proceedings of the Eighth FEL Conference*. Barcelona (Catalonia), Spain: Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Battiste, Marie. (ed.) 2000. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, Ben Rampton, and Kay Richardson. 1993. Ethics, Advocacy and empowerment: issues of method in researching language. *Language and Communication* 13, 81-94.
- CBD 1993. *Convention on Biological Diversity*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: <http://www.cbd.int>.
- Craig, Colette. 1992. Fieldwork on endangered languages: a forward look at ethical issues. In Andre Cochetiere, Jean-Claude Boulanger and Conrad Ouellon (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Linguists*, 33-42. Quebec: Presses de l'Universite de Laval.
- Dez. 2007. Comment on NGO model of cultivated self-promotion for activism. In Jane Simpson (ed.), *Transient Languages and Cultures blog* <http://blogs.usyd.edu.au/elac/2007/09/>: 27 September.
- Dobrin, Lise. 2007. NGO model of cultivated self-promotion for activism. In Jane Simpson (ed.), *Transient Languages and Cultures blog* <http://blogs.usyd.edu.au/elac/2007/09/>: 26 September.
- Florey, Margaret. 2005. Language shift and endangerment. In K. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 43-64. London: Routledge.
- Florey, Margaret. 2007. Introduction: documenting and revitalizing Austronesian languages. In D. Victoria Rau and Margaret Florey (eds.), *Documenting and revitalising Austronesian languages*, 1-12. Honolulu: Language Documentation and Conservation Special Publication No. 1.
- Florey, Margaret and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. (forthcoming). New directions in field linguistics: Training strategies for language documentation in Indonesia. In Margaret Florey (ed.), *Endangered languages of Austronesia* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freeland, Jane and Donna Patrick. 2004. Language rights and language survival. In Jane Freeland and Donna Patrick (eds.), *Language rights and language survival: sociolinguistic and sociocultural perspectives*, 1-33. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Fifteenth edition. SIL International.

- Grinevald, Colette. 2003. Speakers and documentation of endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin (ed.), *Language documentation and description, Volume 1*, 52-72. London: SOAS.
- Harmon, David. 1996. Losing species, losing languages: connections between biological and linguistic diversity. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 15, 89-108.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., Hasan Basri, I Wayan Pastika, and Margaret Florey. 2005. Capacity building on a local and national level: Documenting Totoli, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. Application to Volkswagen Endangered Languages Program.
- Maffi, Luisa. (ed.) 2001. *On Biocultural Diversity: linking language, knowledge and the environment*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Maffi, Luisa. 2005. Linguistic, cultural, and biological diversity. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34, 599-617.
- Mihesuah, Devon Abbott and Angela Cavender Wilson. (eds.) 2004. *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Penfield, Susan. 2008. Revitalization and language activism. *ELAP Workshop: Issues in Language Revitalisation and Maintenance* SOAS, London, 9 February 2008.
- Penfield, Susan, Emilia Flores and Benjamin Tucker. 2007. The role of the language activist in documentation and revitalization. *Conference on the Endangered Languages and Cultures of America (CELCNA 2007)* Salt Lake City.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research And Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- UNESCO. 2003. *The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris
<http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00006>.
- United Nations. 2007. *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. New York: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/declaration.html>.
- United Nations, Economic and Social Council. 2000. *Draft principles and guidelines for the protection of the heritage of indigenous people*. New York:
<http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/0/42263fd3915c047ec1256929004f1ffc?Opendocument>.
- Woodbury, Anthony C. and Nora C. England. 2006. Training speakers of indigenous languages of Latin America at a US university. *Linguistic Discovery* 4 (1).