

Training Communities, Training Graduate Students: The 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop

Colleen M. Fitzgerald
The University of Texas at Arlington

Mary S. Linn
University of Oklahoma

While grassroots organizations like the American Indian Language Development Institute have long shown the importance of training to indigenous language communities, an increasing emphasis on training in language documentation and revitalization is emerging in new funding initiatives, training institutes and consortia world-wide. In this current atmosphere the 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop presents a case study in training in which the goals of training indigenous community members and graduate students can take place simultaneously. With the rising prominence of training models in language documentation and revitalization, and the practical dimension faced by limitations on resources like personnel and funding, the importance of satisfying multiple goals in a single training venue cannot be underestimated. Additionally, this project demonstrates how learning can take place outside of the typical, credit-bearing university class, offering flexibility to indigenous community members and filling a gap in training for graduate students that formal coursework does not provide. Four factors were essential: team selection process; mentoring; final projects by community member participants; and reflection by graduate student mentors. We outline in detail the elements of these four factors, as well as provide evidence of continued engagement in language work by participants through post-workshop activities.

1. INTRODUCTION.¹ A major response to language endangerment has been in the area of training. Two main audiences, indigenous community members and graduate students, have been targeted in the present project, although the two are not always mutually exclusive. More and more, the discipline is drawing in indigenous scholars seeking doctorates, and graduate students seeking applied training to bolster their interests in language docu-

¹ This work would not be possible without the following support. For funding, the National Science Foundation, BCS grant #1065068 and #1065510, “Collaborative Research: Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop and Documentation Project” and NSF BCS grant #0651992, “Oklahoma Digitization and Access.” Thanks to our participants in the 2012 Workshop, who represented seven languages and nine different tribes, and to the graduate students and faculty from five different universities who served as mentors and instructors. A very special thanks to Daryl Baldwin for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

mentation. When directed more to indigenous communities, training has typically focused on linguistics, language acquisition and teaching, and curriculum and materials development for indigenous communities and scholars. University-housed training programs, such as the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI at the University of Arizona), the Northwest Indigenous Language Institute (NILI at the University of Oregon), and the Canadian Indigenous Language and Literacy Development Institute (CILLDI at the University of Alberta) have met changing trends and needs of communities for over twenty years. Grassroots organizations such as the Oklahoma Native Language Association and non-profit ones such as the Indigenous Language Institute (ILI in Santa Fe, New Mexico) reach out to communities in training workshops and seminars. The Consortium of Indigenous Language Organizations (CILO) builds on these models, providing workshops presented by experienced indigenous language workers for communities throughout the US, and the Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity (RNLD) functions similarly in Australia. Many of these institutes use both indigenous scholars and graduate students as instructors. In many cases, participants enrolled at these institutes comprise indigenous community members and indigenous and non-indigenous graduate students.

The training in the linguistics and anthropology programs is more academically oriented, as it targets graduate students and is oriented towards production of doctoral degrees. At least since the 1996 Mid-America Linguistics Conference session entitled Training Students for Fieldwork in Endangered Language Communities (chaired by Akira Yamamoto) there has been active discussion about the need for training and the nature of training in these disciplines, if not redesign and expansion of existing course curriculum (Yamamoto 1999). The institutes and organizations mentioned above have often served to introduce students to community engagement and response in applying linguistic training, and helped to train new generations of linguists working with endangered languages. New training institutes like the Institute on Collaborative Language Research (CoLang, formerly InField), the 3L Summer School, the 2009 African Linguistics School, among others, have surfaced to address training needs worldwide for students, faculty, and community members together. An increasing emphasis on training in language documentation, description, and revitalization is also emerging in a broader context. Funding initiatives such as the Volkswagen Foundation's DoBeS (Dokumentation bedrohter Sprachen) and the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project Documentation grants now include training as part of their granting.

The 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop (OKBOL) presents a case study in training in which the goals of training indigenous community members and graduate students can take place simultaneously. This workshop is an ongoing collaboration led by co-directors² and teams at the University of Oklahoma (OU) and The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA). With the rising prominence of training models in language documentation and revitalization, and the limitations on resources like personnel and funding, the importance of satisfying multiple goals in a single training venue is becoming progressively more important. Graduate training was also a major goal of the grant proposal that funded the workshop. Our approach to implementing the workshop offers a way to deploy limited

² The co-directors are also the co-authors of this paper.

resources effectively and train two diverse audiences.

This is an important issue to consider as researchers and training consortia are more frequently being asked to do more with less. It is essential for projects to find an effective approach to balance the competing demands of an increasing emphasis on training in language documentation and an increasing need for training in language revitalization with limitations on resources like personnel and funding. The value of satisfying multiple goals in a single training venue is highly important. We will highlight our approach through the team selection process, mentoring, final projects, and reflections—the four factors that critically underlie the successes of the 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop.

Also inherent within our work here is an example of how learning can take place outside of the typical, credit-bearing university class. One reason this is important is because graduate students' skills and needs do not always fit well with the skills and needs of community members.³ The goals of the two typically diverge as applied use of linguistic knowledge is privileged over theoretical linguistics, and there may be considerable differences in background and technical skills. On the other hand, community members have a wealth of cultural knowledge from their community that graduate students lack, no matter how well they know the structure of that community's language. Therefore, closing this gap to create a better fit between the two groups would better serve and train both, as well as foster supportive long-term partnerships. As an ongoing event, OKBOL offers a way that does train graduate students and addresses this gap. The mentoring activities serve as a way for graduate students to learn teaching in a small group context, to find ways to work in a team with participants from a diverse background and an extraordinary commitment to connecting with their heritage, and to gain on-the-ground experience in language revitalization work, a growing expectation for those doing language documentation. Importantly, for our community participants, linguistic knowledge needs to be put into a practical context. Participants are seeking to learn their language, learn more about their language, and to use and teach it. Instructors focus on topics relevant to the specific indigenous languages determined by the background of participants, with the goal to help them mobilize this linguistic knowledge back into use in the home communities. All this learning occurs in the lead up to OKBOL, and during the workshop week itself.

Especially important to this effort was Daryl Baldwin, who holds credentials in both the academic world (with a master's degree in linguistics) and on the community side (as a member of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma). Baldwin has many resources and experiences to draw on for the indigenous participants and the graduate students. He offers a critical and realistic eye to language reclamation in terms of goal setting. He shares his own struggles as a language learner, and in trying to understand academic materials on his language. Community participants were open to sharing with him what they thought about their mentors or other aspects of the workshop. His practical experience in learning and teaching his language in a variety of contexts was a great resource for participants as they considered their own language reclamation possibilities. For the graduate students, who were likely more comfortable in the linguistic and database lessons, his daily teaching sessions offered something very new for them to learn, both in content and pedagogical style. Moreover,

³ Thanks to Daryl Baldwin for making this point.

this scheduling move privileged his lectures in the teaching environment, giving prominence to his perspective as an indigenous community member. Unless they had previously had professors who were indigenous, this was perhaps an unfamiliar experience for the students, who were generally more accustomed to the dominant majority perspective being presented in the classroom setting. He spoke on practical applications needed by language communities and of indigenizing education as a whole (not just language). He also offered a different perspective by expressing reservations about the role of technology, and sharing his challenges with trying to understand the linguistic documentation of his language. While Baldwin was the only indigenous member of the teaching staff, he was not the only indigenous member of the team. In both 2010 and 2012, the OU graduate research assistant has been indigenous—their role has been to work with communities and reach out to potential participants, to assist with local arrangements and to gain valuable experience in putting on training events. Returning to Baldwin and his role, he contributed in key ways, including in curriculum, in setting the tone for the overall workshop, in mentoring both community participants and graduate students, and in his daily lessons.

In the following sections, we first present background information on the *Breath of Life: Silent No More* model, developed in California and more recently, extended to Oklahoma and other contexts. We then examine each of the four factors underlying the success of the 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop, focusing on how we thought out these issues ahead of time and how others might incorporate them into their own training models. In the final section of the paper, we assess these elements and show how participant and mentor feedback are helping as we plan ahead to the 2014 OKBOL.

2. BACKGROUND ON THE OKLAHOMA BREATH OF LIFE WORKSHOP. In 1995, Dr. Leanne Hinton of the University of California, Berkeley and the Advocates for California Language Survival pioneered the *Breath of Life, Silent No More* model for California tribes whose languages no longer had speakers (Hinton 2001). The Breath of Life workshop, which now occurs every other year, involves one week of intensive linguistic instruction to community members, pairing them with linguistic mentors. Participants present a final project at the end of the week. The goals of these workshops are twofold. First, the linguistic knowledge serves to unlock access to archival materials housed at the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages (now the California Language Archive) and at other campus locations. Because these materials are from earlier historical periods and were usually compiled by linguists or anthropologists, their format and writing systems often present major barriers for heritage community members who seek to reclaim and use these materials. Second, the goal is to move toward putting the linguistic materials into practical use and to work to create new speakers of these languages. The reclamation project undertaken by Daryl Baldwin of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and his wife and children is perhaps the most well-known example of this, with linguist David Costa (1994) key to this effort. Leonard (2007, 2008) provides extensive information of language use in this family. Other successful efforts at reclamation in California include the Mutsun, Tongva and Barbareño Chumash languages. Legacy materials on Mutsun were analyzed to produce a grammar of the language (Okrand 1977). More recently, growing out of the Berkeley Breath of Life, a successful collaboration has developed between linguists and Mustun

community members, who have worked with legacy materials to work on a dictionary project and to further document the language (Warner et al. 2006).

Oklahoma is a viable site for extending the Breath of Life Model. National Geographic's *Enduring Voices: Saving Disappearing Languages* listed Oklahoma as one of the linguistic hotspots in the world: a place with high language diversity but where the languages are severely endangered and have very little documentation. Although, with 39 distinct Native languages spoken in the early 20th century in addition to mutually intelligible dialects, Oklahoma has the highest Native language diversity in the US, today all the languages of Oklahoma are endangered, as the details below outline (Linn 2010). Kickapoo, with about 1,500 speakers, has the only population of children learning the language. Cherokee (including Keetoowah Band) has no more than 9,000 speakers and only through immersion efforts are children learning to speak the language. The majority of Native languages in Oklahoma are moribund or not spoken by first language speakers at all. At least seventeen languages have no fluent first language speakers. Of these languages, five have speakers in other states: Meskwaki (Fox) in Iowa, Mikasuki (Hitchiti) in Florida, Alabama in Texas, Koasati (Quassarte) in Texas and Louisiana, and Chiricahua (Fort Sill Apache) in New Mexico. For the other thirteen languages, however, their languages are silent. Some, like Delaware (Lenape), Plains Apache, and Osage have seen their last fluent speaker pass in the 21st century. Others, like Natchez, Wyandot, Kitsai (Keechi), and Tonkawa, have not been spoken for many years. The Siouan language family is particularly hard hit. Iowa, Otoe-Missouria (Jiwere language), Kaw, Quapaw, and Osage have no first language speakers. Only Ponca, precariously on the brink, has elder speakers today. This represents a huge loss of human intellectual and cultural knowledge.

Existing training opportunities in the state include the Oklahoma Native American Language Development Institute 1991-1993 and Oklahoma Native American Language Association (ONLA) 1994-present, which have provided workshops and college seminars in linguistics and language revitalization for indigenous people. While providing excellent training, these workshops have been geared towards teachers who are speakers, or participants who have elder speakers as resources. Participants from communities with no fluent first language speakers often expressed frustration that the primary concerns and the pace of the workshops did not reflect their needs. For example, with the increased emphasis on immersion approaches for teaching indigenous communities, communities without speakers face significant challenges with how this could be implemented in reality. There was a real need to extend the Breath of Life model to these Oklahoma indigenous communities.

A successful first Breath of Life: Silent No More Workshop (BOL) was held at the Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History (SNOMNH) at the University of Oklahoma in May 2010. Although it had been a goal of the Department of Native Languages at SNOMNH since its inception, it was only through a National Science Foundation Documenting Endangered Languages grant that the museum was able to fund the week-long workshop. Daryl Baldwin collaborated with the Oklahoma Director in 2012 to design and help lead the programming. It followed the curriculum outline and structure of the California BOL Workshops, teaching participants how to use local and remote archives, to read linguistic materials, to begin linguistic analysis, and to adapt these materials for language learning and create new language materials. The theme was on strengthening community with language renewal. Participating heritage community members came from the Osage,

Otoe-Missouria (Jiwere) and Natchez tribes. Each group attending consisted of two to three participants, with mentors drawn from students and faculty from OU, UTA, and the University of Kansas.⁴

The two co-directors developed an expanded implementation of the model for the 2012 workshop with several innovations, working from the experiences from the 2010 OKBOL including participant evaluation responses. First, the curriculum included two levels of instruction, with Level 1 (beginner) and Level 2 (returnee) tracks. The levels allowed linguistic instruction to build on previous knowledge and language experience. Second, we incorporated databasing through language for both levels. As part of this, we constructed language-specific database shells in Fieldworks Language Explorer (FLEX) software for potential participants, furthering their ability to move forward on their language work. The instruction uniquely combine linguistic instruction with databasing at the beginning stages of learning, allowing database activities to build on the lessons planned for each day of the workshop. Third, we included a major unit on language teaching and learning. This helped the participants think immediately about transforming their own learning into teaching others. Table 1 gives the full curriculum and instructors for 2012.

The workshop days were structured so that each day participants began and ended together. Each morning began with morning announcements, made by the co-directors. Daryl Baldwin set the theme of language in the home, and contributed his perspective as a Miami tribal member involved in language reclamation. Linguistics and Community and Family units were daily each morning, while the afternoons were spent on homework, language learning, and databasing. Meals were at the dining hall so everyone could congregate, network, and groups could further their discussions.

| |
|--|
| Using Archives (on-line and local) |
| Mary Linn & Nicholas Wojcik (OU) |
| Linguistics for Language Renewal |
| Level 1: Colleen Fitzgerald (UTA) & Mary Linn (OU) |
| Level 2: Dylan Herrick (OU) & Brad Montgomery-Anderson (NSU) |
| Language Renewal: Community and Family |
| Daryl Baldwin (Myaamia Project) |
| Language Learning and Instruction |
| Tracy Hirata-Edds (KU) |
| Introduction to Databasing (Fieldworks Language Explorer, FLEX) |
| Joshua Jensen (UTA) |

TABLE 1. Curriculum and Instructors at the 2012 OKBOL.

⁴ The instructors in 2010 were Daryl Baldwin, Colleen Fitzgerald, Tracy Hirata-Edds and Mary Linn and the mentors were Marcellino Berardo, Dylan Herrick, Ashley Lober McKeever, and Juliet Morgan. The instructors in 2012 are listed in Table 1, mentors in 2012 were Nathaniel Eversole, Amy Lyons, Juliet Morgan, Andrea Muru, Lori McLain Pierce, Jessica Rohr, Elizabeth Tatz, plus Daryl Baldwin mentored the Myaamia participants.

The 2012 OKBOL participants represented nine different tribes and seven distinct languages. Level One had seven participants, including representatives from Wichita (Wichita and Affiliated Tribes), Shawnee (Eastern Shawnee Tribe, Absentee Shawnee Tribe, and the Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma), Natchez, and the Alabama (Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town). In Level Two we had nine participants coming from the Natchez, the Cheyenne (Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma), the Ft. Sill Apache, and the Miami. Two mentors were students from the University of Oklahoma and five were from UT Arlington and additionally, Daryl Baldwin acted as the Myaamia language mentor.

Mentor-participant teams worked together during the linguistics lessons asking questions and finding answers for their language as the instructor presented topics. The teams worked together throughout the afternoon, for the homework period, the database instruction, and the pedagogical instruction. Throughout the week there were opportunities to make use of the resources offered by the SNOMNH instruction site. The in-house recording studio and the ethnology collections offered participants opportunities to make new language resources, explore cultural heritages, and otherwise further their development. Most evenings were spent with the mentor-participant teams working on daily homework and their final projects. However, there were also opportunities for sharing traditional games and cultural activities, and a group viewing of *We Still Live Here*, a documentary on the Jessie Little Doe Baird and the Wampanoag tribe's language reclamation.

At the end of the week, after their final project presentations, participants and mentors were given an opportunity for feedback and evaluation before leaving. All participants were given a three page feedback/evaluation form for the workshop, with questions submitted by us, mentors, and teachers (Appendix 1). This covered all subject areas, in addition to effectiveness of mentors and teachers. All mentors were asked to write a short reflection paper about their experiences/perspectives. We also shared a lunch of traditional foods, took group photos, observed participants' final project presentations, and then the workshop officially ended.

3. TEAM SELECTION. Recruitment was a major priority, both in terms of reaching out to the appropriate indigenous communities in the region and for generating a pool of qualified and willing graduate students to serve as mentors. In this section we outline in more detail recruitment and team selection.

We used a team selection process to distribute the workload according to the distinct institutional and personnel resources available to each of the co-directors. One co-director took primary responsibility for recruitment of participants from indigenous communities in Oklahoma. The other co-director had a large pool of graduate students with linguistic background to draw from, and so took responsibility for mentor recruitment at UT Arlington. This was often a balancing act, as commitment from potential participants changed or, by necessity, came in close to the deadline for enrolling. But it was especially important considering the diverse number of language families represented among Oklahoma indigenous languages. To help with this, regular communication between the two co-directors ensured the ability to forecast potential participants. In addition to phone calls and email, we found that keeping logs and spreadsheets in shared Dropbox files allowed us all to keep up to date.

The Oklahoma-based co-director assigned her graduate research assistant, Donna

Longhorn, to participant recruitment. We felt that many of the communities that could benefit from BOL Workshop were not as connected to university training. Therefore, going to these communities to help get their questions asked and answered was appropriate. Longhorn made four trips to language communities to do face-to-face recruitment (Fort Sill Apache, Eastern Shawnee, Lenape Delaware, Modoc). She also called and emailed many other tribal offices, tribal and language representatives, sent out brochures, answered phones, and did follow-up information for any requests for more information and any leads of interested persons who may not be associated with a language program or tribal office. As a result, 32 distinct contacts were made with 22 different tribes. Also beneficial to participant recruitment were the Co-directors' activities promoting the 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop in a variety of venues: for example, a joint presentation in the October workshop of the Oklahoma Native Language Association (ONLA) and the 2012 Oklahoma Youth Language Fair at SNOMNH.

With several interested advanced graduate students at both the University of Oklahoma and the University of Texas at Arlington already in the pool, the remaining prospects for graduate student mentors were found at UTA, which has a doctoral program in linguistics and thus a larger pool of potential mentors. An advantage in the region, both for training mentors and recruiting new ones, is that there are numerous revitalization activities providing volunteer opportunities for prospective mentors, as well as venues in which their emerging skills can be assessed. An annual Indigenous Languages Documentation and Revitalization Workshop in Tahlequah at Northeastern State University in April provided one such opportunity, as did demonstrations and training sessions on and off campus for FLEx software.

We considered a number of factors in mentor selection. First, expressed interest in participation, or interest when made aware of the Breath of Life Workshop, was obviously important. Second, ideal mentors had a strong background in traditional core coursework and knowledge areas. In addition to this background, other positive coursework included training in field methods, language revitalization, second language acquisition and pedagogy, and Native American (or non-Western, more generally) linguistic structures. Given that there were revitalization activities as opportunities, we also looked to see who volunteered to participate in these training activities as mentors, or as learners of software like FLEx. Such participation allowed the assessment of whether they performed positively as mentors, as well as how they rated in terms of relevant personality traits such as people skills, maturity, patience, and empathy.

The frequent communication between the co-directors also meant that mentor training and recruitment could be directed in such a way as to better fit the participants' backgrounds. For example, early on, participant interest suggested there would be strong turnout from Algonquian tribes, so it was important to find ways to build knowledge of that language family to assist potential mentors. Ultimately, there were three different Algonquian languages at the OKBOL. Several mentors had expertise in language families such as Muskogean and Athabaskan that matched up nicely with participants. With some participants, there were not mentors with a background in that language, but using the factors mentioned above helped us in making successful mentor-participant language teams. In addition to general comments from participants that reflected positively on mentors, the final evaluation served as a tool to assess this question anonymously. Responses to ques-

tions on this topic appear in Table 2.

| |
|--|
| My mentor displayed a sound knowledge of the information. |
| Level 1: Strongly agree (6), somewhat agree (1) |
| Level 2: Strongly agree (3), somewhat agree (1) agree (1) |
| My mentor answered questions to my satisfaction. |
| Level 1: Strongly agree (6), somewhat agree (1) |
| Level 2: Strongly agree (6), somewhat agree (1), agree (1) |
| I feel comfortable asking the teachers or my mentor for help. |
| Level 1: Strongly agree (6), somewhat agree (1) |
| Level 2: Strongly agree (5), agree (1) |

TABLE 2. Results on Mentors and Instructors from OKBOL final evaluation.

Overall, Table 2 responses show that participants gave very strong ratings to the effectiveness of the mentors at the workshop, which shows very positive commentary from participants on the final evaluation. More open-ended questions also showed that participants felt very positively about mentors being able to further participants' work on the heritage language. For example, commentary from Level 1 participants discussed wanting to do more activities like "Picking out specific sentences that the learner actually speaks and showing how those can be broken into morphemes" and "More FLEx/more breakup of sentence structure." A Level 2 participant concurred, requesting, "More work with our own languages with mentors' help." These comments will be used as we plan the 2014 OKBOL.

4. MENTORING THE MENTORS. The mentoring team during the week of the OKBOL included experienced participants in indigenous language revitalization. In addition to the co-directors, Daryl Baldwin contributed his perspective as a Miami tribal member who has been heavily involved in language reclamation, and Tracy Hirata-Edds contributed expertise from language teaching and assessment. Several strategies were employed to mentor the mentors, in advance of and during the workshop, so as to better support the graduate students and help them be more effective with participants.

First, there were a number of steps taken before the workshop in order to prepare the mentors. The co-directors had individual meetings with mentors from their respective institutions prior to the workshop. Having seen the mentors in various revitalization workshops prior to this point and having had them in class, the co-directors provided feedback and initial guidance to them. For example, expectations in how much linguistic analysis can be achieved in four days, or how to do linguistic analysis 'with' instead of 'for' them could be discussed in these meetings. Importantly, on Sunday morning before the opening of BOL later that afternoon, the full group of mentors and instructors met. All of the instructors are active in language revitalization, with years of experience working with communities. This meeting established an openness and comfort level for the mentors to feel that they could ask any of the instructors for help or guidance throughout the day or to come to anyone for more involved questions throughout the week. In this meeting they saw that flexibility to

achieve understanding of the material *and of each other in their language teams* was more important than adherence to schedules or the most technically accurate linguistic description and terminology taught in their graduate coursework. This went a long way to setting the tone for the mentors.

Although not initially on the week's schedule, Baldwin and the co-directors saw a need to have a mid-week meeting with the mentors, so that the team could informally share impressions and made adjustments or responses on the ground as situations developed. As with the pre-meeting, all the instructors were present as well. Graduate students were able to ask how to deal with specific situations, personalities, and bring up concerns. Additionally, we were able to highlight some dynamics and challenges emerging in some of the teams and problem-solve with mentors on approaches. While some of these situations may have been specific to particular mentors or teams, a larger discussion allowed them to serve as case studies for all the mentors to learn from. Importantly, Baldwin also brought his indigenous perspective and his personal experience to help strengthen the mentors. We feel that this meeting was vital to the success of the program and to our students' emerging mentoring skills. It will be added to future OKBOLs and we highly recommend the process to any extended training.

At the conclusion of the workshop, mentors were asked to reflect upon their experiences and write a short essay on the week. It also offered an opportunity for them to process the experience, drawing on research on reflection as a tool in service-learning (Fitzgerald 2009, 2010). The model of service-learning provides a framework for assessing the graduate students' learning experience. Moreover, in the experience of both of the co-directors, service and 'giving back' is a big component of community life, so invoking these notions allows us to invoke familiar values for indigenous students and participants.⁵

The reflections offered another perspective on how the mentors viewed their own strengths and weaknesses and learning throughout the week, as well as that of the participants with whom they were paired. They are important aids for us in working with future mentors and with our students in general. For example, one student reflected on learning to be a mentor and the effort and time involved to develop such a relationship:

I learned that it takes work to get people comfortable with you. He and I walked around the museum and talked a lot about our families and his interest in [another Native language]. He was open to me giving linguistic examples from languages I've studied, and it helped us find some common ground.

Another student developed agency in seeking outside resources to problem-solve, looking to find help to support the language team's work, as seen in this reflection:

[Participant] didn't always seem particularly engaged in the sessions, was difficult to motivate about homework and the final project, so I tried to call in Tracy as a

⁵ For an example of a service-learning collaboration in the Oklahoma context that instantiates community-based language research principles, especially with providing access and learning opportunities for folks on both sides of the partnership, see Fitzgerald and Hinson (2013).

language learning/teaching material expert to help direct [Participant] towards a goal.

Another of our mentors considered and questioned the role mentors play in facilitating language-specific examples, as noted in this excerpt:

From my previous understanding of Breath of Life, I thought we were there to help our participants work through the materials and learn how to decipher some of the linguistic jargon to get at how to use their language. However, if it was supposed to be that way, I don't think that we really allowed time to struggle with the materials and figure out the patterns. Instead, when I could look ahead at what part of the grammar we were working on, it was easier (and hopefully more beneficial) for me to go directly to the data that would most help them and guide them through it. So, I think that at least for Level 1, it would have been better if I had the actual handouts for the lessons a week beforehand. That way, I could go through the literature, find the best examples and have those prepared to show the participants.

Overall, the mentoring before and during the workshop proved an effective tool in supporting the graduate students during this intense week. In Section 6, we look more at the role that reflection played in helping with the evaluation and assessment of the week's success.

5. FINAL PROJECTS. Hinton (2001) outlines the goals for the original California Breath of Life workshops. One of the goals is a final project, conceived of as an “oral or written products at the end of the week — such as the beginnings of phrase books of communicatively useful phrases, or a reading aloud of a story in their language, or a language lesson based on their work” (Hinton 2001: 420). Importantly, the final project is designed by participants and applies what they have learned throughout the week. In the OKBOL participants also created a final project, which they shared with all attendees on the final day. In the 2012 OKBOL both levels presented their projects together. We did not find that Level 1 participants felt shy about this but, instead, that more ideas and energy were shared. The final day activities were designed to end on a positive and empowering note for participants, and to allow the co-directors to assess the success of the activities. We are sharing some of the final projects here to also show what can be achieved in a short period of time, in learning about their languages, gaining confidence in speaking and sharing their languages, and creating new language materials.

The Level 1 presentations were put together by the Wichita, Shawnee and Alabama groups.⁶ Both the Wichita and the Shawnee made use of patterns in teaching vocabulary and grammar. In the case of the Wichita presentation, this consisted of a Wichita Pattern Book in PowerPoint using pattern sentences. The lesson included a call and response

⁶ The Natchez Level 1 participant worked with the Natchez Level 2 participants for a single final presentation.

style interaction with the embedded audio. For example, the recording asks, “What did grandmother want?” and with the slide prompt, the class responds, “She wanted a (animal name).” But then the elder voice asks, “What did grandmother get? She got a (animal name).” The revealed animal each time ends up being humorously disappointing, thereby keeping the attention and involvement of the students, as in the exchange shown in Figure 1. This format taught the question/answer grammar patterns, animal names, and the irrealis (question)/realis (answer) distinction in pronominal agreement.



FIGURE 1. Wichita Pattern Book Final Presentation.

A similar teaching strategy was used in creating a Shawnee Pattern Book: Brown Bear, Brown Bear What Do You See?, shown in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. Shawnee Pattern Book Final Presentation.

For the Alabama final presentation, the group created *Albaamo Innaaʔiilka* (Alabama Alphabet Book). The book was a Powerpoint format to include audio recording made by the two participants. The Powerpoint had several goals. One was to teach the words for the sounds, for example, ‘el’ is the ‘l’ for English, or ‘elka’ in Alabama. In addition, each sound had an Alabama word provided and pronounced. There was no English pronunciation or language used, keeping the focus on Alabama. The Alabama group came in with no prior experience or contact with their language, and the creation of this Powerpoint marked a major milestone for both participants.

The Level 2 presentations ranged considerably. From Myaamia, there were four participants and each did an individual final project.⁷ One presented a lacrosse lesson plan done immersion style, with the vocabulary needed to do such a lesson. Another presentation focused on Making Miami Ribbonwork and consisted of a Powerpoint with an introduction about ribbonwork and the vocabulary, followed by teaching basic steps in the language to a willing participant. One goal of this presentation was to make sure women’s activities were incorporated into the language curriculum. The ribbonwork in the Sam Noble archives proved helpful in tackling this topic. Another Myaamia presentation was an environmental lesson. Developed for a week-long Myaamia summer camp, it focused on environmental vocabulary for use during daily hikes. The lesson included practice and extended the vocabulary for each day. The final Myaamia presentation focused on history from the Miami perspective, rather than a traditional Western perspective, and it drew on the published collection of Miami and Peoria narratives and winter stories (Costa 2010). In addition, Daryl and Karen Baldwin’s two youngest children presented a Myaamia poem, written and read for their sister’s upcoming wedding.

In the Algonquian family, the Cheyenne final project was on pronunciation of Cheyenne sounds not found in English. This consisted of a Powerpoint with minimal pairs and near minimal pairs to help potential teachers and learners practice long vowels versus short vowels among other sounds. It had built-in vocabulary tests as well. Cheyenne has pitch, which distinguishes it from most of the other Algonquian languages, and from English, and it also has a voiceless velar fricative, which English does not. Helpful teaching examples of these are key for learners and second language speakers who are also teachers.

The Natchez Level 1 and 2 participants worked collaboratively on an audio recording in Natchez and English of a traditional tale, to be put on their website. Their website and online resources has been an important part of networking with other community members interested in the language.

The last presentation was an immersion lesson focusing on Chiricahua Apache handling verbs. In the Athabaskan language family, handling or classificatory verbs are stems that incorporate the qualities of the object, for example, something that is round, ropelike, or a liquid (see Figure 3). In this demonstration lesson, the participant asked the mentor to “pick it up” using a particular classificatory verb, and the mentor demonstrated an un-

⁷ Daryl Baldwin (p.c.) notes that what struck him about the ‘individual’ directions taken by the Myaamia attendees was that young people want to connect to the language on a personal level and they do that through their own individual interests, adding that this is an important lesson when working with young people and motivating them to connect to their heritage language.

derstanding of what object type the verb stem is used for by picking up the correct shape/texture from a variety of objects. Once the rest of the class understood the change in command with the type of object, other students were drawn from the class to see if they could understand the commands. The class figured out the idea of handling verbs and the classifications without overt explanation in English.



FIGURE 3. Chiricahua Apache Handling Verbs Final Presentation.

The evaluations reflected the goals of BOL final projects: that participants felt empowered to move forward and extend their work into their communities, even based on the week's workshop. One person noted, "I plan to make changes in the way I'm presenting information. I am also changing the type of initial information currently being presented." Another's future activities included "To be able to speak our language and teach others. Thank you for everything. Our mentor was very good." The week also helped participants synthesize new and existing knowledge in a more productive way, with one writing that they planned, "...to begin a language class...Had some ability of the tools but did not know how to make use of them." The participants also carried the inspiration of the Baldwin family, especially the younger children, into their future with "...more activities to do with the youth of my tribe." And finally, the reflections of one mentor sums up the inspiration and collaboration that is generated, reporting, "Over the course of the week my participant and I identified several extra projects we wanted to complete."

6. REFLECTIONS. Open discussion, often in the form of letters and now email from the field, have always existed between graduate mentors and students working in indigenous communities. The written method of reflection offers another way to get feedback from the mentors and to help them process their experiences working in language research and revitalization. Bringle and Hatcher (1995:112) describe service-learning as including the following elements:

A course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

Principles of service-learning pedagogy include reflection, ideally before, during and after the service activity (Fitzgerald 2009, 2010). Although the mentors were not doing this as part of a course, reflective writing provided a way for the graduate students to process their own experience, as well as what they observed of the participants' experience. The reflective writing strategy was modified, with mentors doing their reflection as part of the final day activities, while the participants completed the evaluation sheet.

The reflections were informative, and the writing can be categorized into several types of commentary from the mentors: role of the mentor; being a mentor; logistics; and final project (the latter two are not discussed here.) One student mentor captured the depth of loss at being confronted with a new culture, something that everyone working in another culture feels at some time.

...given that this was my first interaction with Native American community members, I feel that I would have benefitted from understanding more of the sensitive cultural mores beforehand. As it was I felt I had to play catch up to understand some of the cultural attitudes toward intellectual property and general views of the place of language within the community.

No one can predict every new cultural norm or language attitude that will be encountered, nor can anyone ever know them all to pass them on to learners. And one does have to learn how to navigate these issues like this mentor did. However, OKBOL gave the student a controlled situation to be aware of social and cultural issues outside of linguistic structures and formal linguistics training. That is the point of having our students be mentors and simultaneously creating a graduate training opportunity with serving communities focused on documentation and revitalization. It is the next step in training to do collaborative language research, and one that is often not able to be covered in standard one-semester field methods courses.

The challenge expressed above was accompanied by reflections that assessed the workshop as beneficial. The following illustrates that:

I believe that the mentor/community member partnership format was instrumental in helping me to understand the personal value of language revitalization to a particular community.... Breath of Life was a life-changing experience for me as a mentor and one that I will always remember fondly.

Overall, graduate students characterized their week as a positive one in terms of their service as a mentor, especially for those students interested in Native American languages, some of whom may be new to documentation and revitalization with communities. And as noted above, such service or 'giving back' expectations are frequently part of community norms for American indigenous communities. We find feedback is helping to understand how the workshop creates a learning experience for graduate students and to shape the way we prepare students for the 2014 OKBOL. Continuing the reflective process, and adding in directed reflective questions to assist in reflection, will also be a part of 2014.

7. CONTINUING COLLABORATIONS. We believe that mentoring is a continuing collaboration. One of the goals of the OKBOL is to work towards long-term mentoring between participant and academic individuals and further between indigenous and academic community relationships. It is important to keep participants and mentors involved throughout the off years, with continual grassroots training activities to support communities, as well as facilitate generating new prospects for both groups.

The rapidly changing online environment is important in this continuing communication and collaboration. Social media, like Facebook, allows us to keep in touch with participants after the workshop ends. For example, the creation of a Facebook page for the Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop means that participant successes, upcoming workshops, and media can all be shared with those who ‘like’ the page (Oklahoma Breath of Life, Silent No More Workshop). In Figure 4, the OKBOL page shares the news that Steve Daugherty, from the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, has had students register for the Oklahoma Native American Youth Language Fair (ONAYLF). The OKBOL and ONAYLF (Oklahoma Native American Youth Language Fair) pages can work back and forth to share information, increasing the viral reach of a post like this, and co-advertising the activities.



FIGURE 4. The OKBOL Facebook page shares the success of a participant.

Importantly, these social and in-person networking opportunities figure into language work in the state. In October 2012, Steve Daugherty was elected Member at Large for the Oklahoma Native Language Association, and he also appeared in a recent video on YouTube by the 1491s comedy troupe. The troupe collected all sorts of North American contributions on how to say I love you in indigenous languages for Valentine’s Day. Steve was in a group saying this in Shawnee.

The Facebook page can be updated each year and be used to keep in contact with alumni and other organizations, both in and out of the region, with similar goals, and can be used to recruit new attendees for future workshops.

In Figure 5 two of our OKBOL participants are interacting via the comments section on the Facebook page for the Native American Languages Lab (Native American Languages Lab). Henryetta Ellis, from the Shawnee language team, is anticipating the annual April Indigenous Languages Documentation and Revitalization Workshop. At the point when she made the comment in Figure 5, she was applying to the National BOL workshop,

which we advertised on our OKBOL Facebook page. Terri Parton, of the Wichita and Affiliated Tribes, became President of her tribe this summer, a wonderful accomplishment, and she expresses a wish for more time for language work. The spontaneous and unmediated aspect of this and other interactions allows us to facilitate support networks and to evaluate and assess the success of the workshop.



FIGURE 5. Post-OKBOL participants interact on the Facebook page for the Native American Languages Lab.

8. CONCLUSIONS. We have used the 2012 OKBOL to demonstrate how to train two diverse audiences as part of a single workshop. The design mobilizes limited personnel and funding resources to be optimally effective. As a case study, the 2012 OKBOL can help other training venues build capacity in an efficient and effective manner.

First and foremost, a workshop like the 2012 OKBOL is one where active learning is going on the entire week, and there are lots of different ways that learning is stimulated: sound production (often the first time the language has been heard in years) objects from the collections; sharing historical, environmental and cultural heritage; finding linguistic patterns and learning concepts behind these; and sharing new-found knowledge about each others' languages.

For mentors and participants alike, there is no better training than through experience. By doing extensive pre- and post-planning, workshops like the 2012 OKBOL allow resources to be maximized in a thoughtful way. Formal evaluations and reflective writing allow participants and mentors to actively shape future workshops and related activities. Facilitating continued collaborations through social media has allowed easy, quick, and informal interaction between participants, mentors, and instructors. In any situation, not all potential collaborations work, but we feel that the 2012 OKBOL training and follow-up lays the groundwork for indigenous participants and students to learn to build these relationships.

As the organizers, we are also considering what to rework for 2014 and how we might approach possible changes. Following up on a suggestion from Daryl Baldwin based on his experiences from the 2013 National Breath of Life Workshop, and drawing from some comments in the reflective writing, we will also add a designated time for mentors and participants to discuss their goals. According to Baldwin, this proved effective in helping language teams to set a clear course for the National BOL sessions, and we plan to add this to the 2014 OKBOL.

We would like to follow up on whether participants continue to use and maintain their FLEx databases, and if so, for what purposes. For new first year participants, we may tailor database work to defined tasks, such as building a lexicon. Yet having now collected the linguistic resources and constructed the database shells and training materials for 22 languages, we can also expand upon the training materials to offer more linguistic complexity in examples so that participants can practice breaking words into morphemes or working with sentence structure. We are also considering expanding the set of languages for 2014 to draw in some of the smaller languages of the southeastern United States, as several had close relationships to some of the languages targeted by the OKBOL. Resources permitting, we will construct database shells for those languages. Another change under consideration is the reconfiguration of instruction to use a buffet-style approach, as opposed to two distinct levels, offering options for the language teams, in hopes of having more participants return for a second (or third) OKBOL workshop.

As we move towards the 2014 OKBOL, we have been working to enrich our mentor pool, so that it might include at least one indigenous graduate student in 2014 and in 2016. OU offers more potential for this. With a number of indigenous graduate students in their Anthropology program, there are several prospective mentors. Additionally, with some second and third time returning participants, this creates a more advanced cohort who can serve as informal peer mentors to their fellow participants. Ultimately, the capacity-building inherent in this model is likely to continue to blur the boundaries between indigenous communities and graduate students and to create a space for mutual learning and respect—essential elements for long-term partnerships.

REFERENCES

- Bringle, Robert B., & Julie A. Hatcher. 1995. A service learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2. 112-122.
- Costa, David J. 1994. *The Miami-Illinois Language*. Berkeley, CA: University of California dissertation.
- Costa, David J. 2010. *Myaamia neehi peewalia aacimoona neehi aalhsoohkaana. Myaamia and Peoria Narratives and Winter Stories*. Oxford, Ohio: Myaamia Project.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. 2009. Language and Community: Using Service-Learning to Reconfigure the Multicultural Classroom. *Language and Education* 23(3). 217-231.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. 2010. Developing a Service-Learning Curriculum for Linguistics. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(4). 204-218.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. and Joshua D Hinson. 2013. 'Ilittibaatoksali' We are working together: Perspectives on Our Chickasaw Tribal-Academic Collaboration. In Norris, Mary Jane, Erik Anonby, Marie-Odile Junker, Nicholas Ostler & Donna Patrick (eds.),

- FEL XVII: Endangered Languages Beyond Boundaries: Community Connections, Collaborative Approaches, and Cross-Disciplinary Research*, 53-60. Bath, England: The Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Hinton, Leanne. 2001. The Use of Linguistic Archives in Language Revitalization. In Hinton, Leanne & Ken Hale (eds.), *The Green Book of Language Revitalization*, 419-423. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. 2007. *Miami Language Reclamation in the Home: A Case Study*. Berkeley, CA: University of California dissertation.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. 2008. When is an 'Extinct Language' Not Extinct? Miami, a formerly sleeping language. In Kendall A. King, Natalie Schilling-Estes, Lyn Fogle, Jia Jackie Lou, & Barbara Soukup (eds.), *Sustaining Linguistic Diversity: Endangered and Miami Languages and Language Varieties*, 23- 33/34. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Linn, Mary S. 2010. Thoughts on Twenty Years of Language Revitalization. *World Literature Today* July-August 2010. 56.
- National Geographic. Enduring Voices. Accessed September 8, 2010. <http://www.national-geographic.com/mission/enduringvoices/> Enduring Voices: Saving Disappearing Languages.
- Native American Languages Lab. Facebook page. Accessed February 15, 2013. <https://www.facebook.com/Native.American.Languages.Lab>.
- Okrand, Marc. 1977. *Mutsun Grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Oklahoma Breath of Life, Silent No More Workshop. Facebook page. Accessed February 15, 2013. <https://www.facebook.com/OKBOL>.
- Oklahoma Native American Youth Language Fair. Facebook page. Accessed July 1, 2013. <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Oklahoma-Native-American-Youth-Language-Fair/435432880653>
- Warner, Natasha, Lynnika Butler & Quirina Luna-Costillas. 2006. Making a dictionary for community use in language revitalization: The case of Mutsun. *International Journal of Lexicography* 19. 257-285.
- Yamamoto, Akira. 1999. Training for fieldwork in endangered language communities. *Practicing Anthropology* 20(2). 12-15.

Colleen M. Fitzgerald
cmfitz@uta.edu

Mary S. Linn
mslinn@ou.edu

APPENDIX 1.
2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop
Feedback/Evaluation

Please check which Level you attended:

Level 1 Level 2

A. PROGRAM (Circle one)

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. The topics were relevant to me. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 2. Most of the information presented was new. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 3. The course material was clear and easy to use. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 4. I learned information and skills I can use when I get home. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |

B. TEACHING and MENTORING (Circle one)

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. The teachers were informative and prepared. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 2. The materials presented were understandable. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 3. My questions were answered to my satisfaction. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 4. The discussions were helpful and handled to my satisfaction. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 5. My mentor displayed a sound knowledge of the information. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 6. My mentor answered questions to my satisfaction. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 7. I feel comfortable asking the teachers or my mentor for further help. | strongly disagree | somewhat disagree | agree | somewhat agree | strongly agree |
| 8. How was the speed of the linguistic courses for you? | much too slow | a little slow | just right | a little fast | much too fast |
| 9. How was the level of the linguistic courses for you? | too technical | just right | | not technical enough | |

C. FLEx DATABASING (Circle one)

1. How was the speed of teaching for FLEx databasing for you personally?

| | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| much too slow | a little slow | just right | a little fast | much too fast |
|---------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|

2. How would you judge the technical level of the FLEx databasing teaching?

| | | |
|---------------|------------|----------------------|
| too technical | just right | not technical enough |
|---------------|------------|----------------------|

3. What did you learn in the databasing sessions that was especially helpful to you personally?

4. What did you learn in the databasing sessions that you did not find useful?

5. What could we have done in the databasing sessions to make the instruction more useful to you?

D. OTHER

1. What comments do you have about lodging, facilities, food, etc?

2. What would you have liked more of?

3. What would you have liked less of?

4. What other suggestions do you have for the next Breath of Life workshop?

5. What future results or activities do you expect to result from your participation in OKBOL? This can include anything you define as 'success' post-OKBOL.