

Journal of Global Indigeneity

The Use of Technologies in Language Revitalisation Projects: Exploring Identities

Marcela I. Huilcán Herrera
Macquarie University, Australia &
University of Groningen, Netherlands
[ORCID](#)

Journal of Global Indigeneity

© The Author

Vol.6, Issue 1, 2022

1-17

<https://www.journalofglobalindigeneity.com>

Abstract

Historically, Indigenous-language speakers have tried to counter the effects of colonising forces on their cultures by speaking their languages as much as they could, even when this represented going through traumatic experiences (Hermes & Kawai'ae'a, 2014). In recent decades many communities have worked together to foster language revitalisation. Many of these projects have incorporated different technologies as part of their research design; technologies that can potentially offer a wide range of opportunities for Indigenous language communities to increase the use of their languages in new domains of use and subsequently invigorate the vitality of their languages (e.g. Elliot, 2021; Galla, 2018; Soria, 2016). Taking part in these revitalisation efforts represents a political act of decolonisation (Leonard, 2017), concrete actions in which communities are exercising their self-determination by reclaiming their voice. In this respect, this paper will explore how the use of technologies in language revitalisation conceptualises identity and how this impacts Indigenous identities. Through the review of current published literature, different aspects will be analysed to offer insights on how the use of technology can be more than the use of a technological device and support communities to renew or reconstruct their Indigenous identity. Exploring and assessing the role of such technologies will offer an overview of the current practices in language revitalisation projects and new perspectives on how to best support Indigenous futures.

Keywords

Indigenous futures, identity, digital technologies, language revitalisation.

Corresponding author:
Marcela I. Huilcán Herrera

Department of Indigenous Studies, Faculty of Arts
Room 422, Level 4, 25B Wally's Walk, Macquarie University NSW 2109 Australia
Email: m.i.huican.herrera@rug.nl

Introduction

Different non-linguistic forces have affected the vitality of Indigenous languages. However, their speakers have resisted these actions, the languages still exist, and many communities across the world are engaged in revitalisation efforts to strengthen their languages or to bring them back in the case of the ones that have almost disappeared. These individual and collective actions to maintain them have historically exist. Language speakers in the communities countered colonising actions that tried to erase their languages and assimilate the community into the dominant culture. They retained the language despite the associated trauma (Hermes & Kawai'ae'a, 2014). In many cases, whether through a legal or social ban, speaking using Indigenous languages was forbidden. This caused the languages to usually be relegated only to the private sphere, subsequently interfering with the vitality of these languages in many communities (Bell, 2013; Eira, 2010).

As a consequence, language use decreased drastically, as did the domain of use of these languages (Austin & Sallabank, 2014; Fishman, 1991; Soria, 2015). However, the current century seems to bring new avenues for Indigenous communities and their languages. Communities are now, with support from Elders, linguists and technology, working together to foster language revitalisation processes in projects with a wide range of goals including language documentation, creation of educational materials, and design of language programs. These goals, of course, are concrete steps towards the main goal of ensuring intergenerational language transmission (Fishman, 2007; Hinton, 2011).

The dynamics within language revitalisation efforts call for attention on how these processes are developing, and what possible impact they might have on communities in terms of identity. Many language revitalisation projects incorporate different technologies as part of their research design. These technologies can potentially offer a wide range of opportunities for Indigenous-language communities. Which opportunities or how these digital technologies are embedded in projects vary according to the context, the overall purpose, and the particular language practices that the project aims to strengthen. Generally speaking, there is agreement on the fact that the inclusion of these languages in new domains of use, such as the digital world, and in technology in general, can offer concrete evidence that these languages are "good enough" for every aspect of life and in this era (Galla, 2018, p. 173). To summarise, technologies might represent a way forward for Indigenous communities.

Through a review of current literature, this paper will explore how the use of technology can be more than the use of a technological device, and be of support to communities who are reclaiming their voices, and in processes of renewing or reconstructing their Indigenous identity. Particularly, it will explore how identity is conceptualised in this literature and how these technologies can impact Indigenous identities. This analysis aims to understand how technology can be more than the use of a technological tool and become a revitalisation tool.

Technologies, in general, and digital technologies, in particular, are constantly developing and changing. Their relevance across communities is undeniable and this calls for our attention to critically think of their role in our communities. Being a sociolinguist of Mapuche origin, I consider it is fundamental for all Indigenous communities to constantly assess what technologies represent to us, to previous generations and to the ones to come. We want to revitalise and maintain our languages, the languages that once were denied to us. And for this, we need to ensure that the use and implementation of such technologies is done according to what truly represent to us and according to our needs. For this reason, it is essential that we explore and re-think the role and impact of such technologies so we can find the best avenues for our voices to thrive.

In the next section, I will reflect on the possible meanings of language revitalisation actions to then move to the concepts of identity and language, and finally to the tripartite entity: technology and language revitalisation and identity.

Intergenerational language transmission

The main goal of language revitalisation – in its broader sense – is to ensure intergenerational language transmission (Fishman, 2007; Hinton, 2011). Regaining intergenerational language transmission would represent the concretisation of a reclaimed world, the world of our ancestors, the world that was once taken from First Nations peoples. Hermes and Kawai'ae'a (2014) argue that “speaking through an indigenous language is one of the deepest forms of identity reclamation and validation for people of indigenous heritage” (p. 307). For Indigenous-language speakers, being able to speak their languages and contribute to bringing that voice back to others through a revitalisation process is to reassert their Indigenous heritage and identities. Leonard (2017) states that taking part in language revitalisation efforts represents a political act of decolonisation. In other words, a concrete action in which communities are exercising their self-determination by reclaiming their voice.

In the context of the development of immersion schooling aimed at increasing the vitality of Native American languages, Hermes and Kawai'ae'a (2014) asked, “What do we know about how identity is driving Indigenous immersion efforts?” (p. 304). This question is directly related to what motivates participation in immersion programs. They argue motivation is based on identity and that it is this Indigenous identity that is driving Native American immersion efforts. The current paper aims to unpack this matter from the other side of the spectrum: how these efforts – in this case, language revitalisation efforts – are driving identity. It is important to highlight that this does not mean that there is no identity without language but rather that our identity might be shaped by the dynamics of language revitalisation practices. As it was mentioned above, language revitalisation might be seen as an act of resistance to counter settler colonialism and its current consequences. It might be a way to bring our voice back, reclaim what it was taken from our ancestors, and denied to us since birth. It might be a way to return to ourselves and to our original Indigenous world. Previous literature has established that “revitalization is deeply identity-driven (May, 2013; McCarty, 2003; McCarty & Zepeda, 2006; Timutimu et al., 2009; Wilson & Kamanā, 2006, 2011). Moreover, it has been shown that language greatly impacts identity building (Timutimu et al., 2009; Wilson & Kamanā, 2011). However, how

this is understood in current literature on language revitalisation projects needs to be explored.

Identity and Indigenous language speakers' identity

The definition of identity, in general, and Indigenous identity, in particular, is not straightforward. It is not the aim of this paper to offer a static or delimited definition. Rather, it aims to delve into different aspects that might be influencing Indigenous identities within language revitalisation projects. Bucholtz & Hall (2005) define identity as “the social positioning of the self and other” (p. 586). As such, it is a relational and socio-cultural phenomenon that creates and circulates in contexts of interaction, in general, and discourse contexts, in particular. It is, therefore, not a static structure that is found in the “individual psyche” (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p.586) but rather the self-construction and perception of the individual over time. This self-construction, also understood as identity building, is based on how a speaker positions herself in a given social context and, in particular, within language revitalisation projects.

Following this perspective, it could be argued that identity could not possibly exist prior to interaction or that pre-existing linguistic forces with an influence on the self, such as our cultural heritage, do not exist. However, this is not what identity represents. Identity – as the self-positioning on the social context – should be necessarily understood as a non-static entity with no social meaning outside the interactional context. This context constitutes a space for the positioning of the self and therefore a space for identity as a sociocultural phenomenon to emerge and circulate. In this sense, all aspects influencing identity will be shaped by the interactional context. Thus, we are referring to a social identity that is materialised in language in the social interaction (Bucholtz & Zimman, 2019). In the case of Indigenous peoples, the conceptualisation of identity as a socio-cultural matter is key: “each language carries with it an unspoken network of cultural values” (Reyhner, 2007, p.5). These values can be observed and hidden and shape emerging identity. This identity carries both traditional and current forms of identification that engage in the active production of meanings. Traditional and contemporary considerations around identity are part of what identity is. In other words, identity is our past, including our ancestors, our daily life, and what we aim for in our future.

Based on these perspectives, the following question arises: how do Indigenous language speakers, particularly participants in language revitalisation efforts, integrate their current experiences in language revitalisation processes with their previous subjectivities (Higgins, 2011)? It may be presumed that language revitalisation efforts might have a direct influence on identity since these projects can be seen as social practices that foster the use of Indigenous languages and identity is a product of social practices. This approach “enable[s] us to view identity not simply as a psychological mechanism of self-classification that is reflected in people’s social behaviour but rather as something that is constituted through social action, and especially through language.” (Bucholtz & Zimman, 2019, p. 588) This last point is fundamental: identity is constituted through language as social practice, therefore the use of a given language and, in this case, the organised action of revitalising a language evokes or constructs a social identity. This process of evoking and/or creating a social identity in the social interaction is known as indexicality: the relationship between linguistic forms and what these forms evoke in speakers (Johnstone, 2010). Speaking in an Indigenous language can be seen as belonging to a given group and can also be interpreted in connection with a particular political stance.

The action of speaking a language within a revitalisation effort might index identities. In other words, it might trigger different conceptualisations about the speakers from an outsider perspective and self-conceptualisation in the speakers. In both cases, these processes are believed to create an impact on the dynamic of the revitalisation effort because “indexical forms can both evoke and construct identities, and they always potentially do both” (Johnstone, 2010, p.31). The language that we speak, or choose to speak, not only informs who we are but also offers us the possibility of creating the individuals that we are (Joseph, 2010). In other words, our linguistic practices can make us part of a particular group and, at the same time, that group can become a community because of our linguistic choice. One of the elements that can hold a group together is language as language is social practice.

Indigenous languages and culture, with everything that is part of our daily life and our immediate world, are indivisible. However, how this link is built and how it emerges in the socio-political order of these communities varies, and it is certainly complex. For instance, in the case of Indigenous peoples in Australia, language is connected to land because it is there it originates (e.g. Christie, 1993; Evans, 2001, 2011). As Christie (2007) points out “neither the shape of the world nor the shape of its languages are ontologically prior. They are co-extensive and co-constitutive” (pp. 57–58). In this sense, languages should not be seen as a mere communication system but rather as a fundamental part of being an individual in or from a particular place (Bow, 2021). In the Indigenous Latin-American context, language and cultural identity have been shown to be evident and strong (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004; Sánchez et al., 2018). This deep link can sometimes present a challenge in the context of language revitalisation where language ideologies and attitudes intervene. For instance, in the case of Quichua¹, Hornberger & Coronel-Molina (2004) indicate that in some geographical areas particularly where the status of Quichua is strong, language is seen as a key component of ethnicity. In other words, for many, if someone auto-identifies as Quichua, they need to speak the language otherwise they are not seen as a Quichua person. This is positive for the community of speakers. However, it might cause exclusion of some who identify as Quichua but are not accepted by the community because they do not speak the language. In many cases, this not as a result of their own decision but rather the impact of colonisation, which, among other consequences, caused forced displacement to the city where the dominant language is Spanish. These two examples, one pointing to the ontological conception of the universe from an Indigenous perspective (cf. Aikenhead & Ogawa, 2007; Ermine, 2000) and the other from the impact of language ideologies and attitudes (cf. Dołowy-Rybińska & Hornsby, 2021; Woolard, 2020) are far from being representative of both geographical areas or their communities. They are meant to show a glimpse of the complex interconnections between language and culture. Across the world, Indigenous languages and their communities are part of the same construct, they influence each other, and they nurture mutually. These interconnections can be assumed to influence the identity of these communities. In the following section, some considerations about the aspects of identity that arise in the dynamic of language revitalisation efforts that make use of technologies will be outlined.

¹ Quichua is the language of the Quichua people in South America, particularly in the geographical area of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Perú. It is an endangered language; however, it has a large population of speakers of about seven million (Ethnologue, 2022).

Technologies in language revitalisation projects: the links with identity

In recent decades, the use of digital technologies in language revitalisation has grown and become a tool of support to increase the use of Indigenous languages in communities that are working to strengthen their vitality (Galla, 2018; Soria, 2016). Their potential to support communities “in their transmission of knowledge and even in the maintenance of relationships, and caring for country, is a natural progression” (Bow, 2021). Bird (2020) indicates that the presence of Indigenous languages in the digital world can represent a point of access for learners, especially young generations who have rapidly adopted their use (Dołowy-Rybińska & Hornsby, 2021; Johnson, 2016). They have adopted it not only because of its attractiveness but also because many new technologies are more affordable and accessible (Li et al., 2021). Nowadays, most new technologies include online features and, in this sense, it has been argued that the use of these languages in online settings might generate prestige in the community of speakers since it can contribute to show that these languages are functional and are being used in modern domains (Galla, 2018; Karstens-Smith, 2018; Patton, 2018; Pine & Turin, 2017; Soria, 2016), it might enhance feelings of pride in the community (Coronel-Molina, 2019; Galla, 2018), and subsequently contribute to generating a renewal in cultural identity (Eisenlohr, 2004; Galla, 2016). This is explained by the fact that it is believed in many cases, speakers lose pride or struggle to regain this pride in their languages when there is a belief that their languages do not have a place in the modern world, a world that relies on social media, mobile apps and online platforms (Galla, 2018).

In revitalisation projects that make use of digital tools, identity is connected with the impact that the concrete outcomes of the projects can have in shortening the digital divide. This is the digital presence and the creation of digital material:

In a digital world, it means Internet chats in indigenous languages, indigenous web pages, multimedia CD-ROMs for learning indigenous languages, and cultural information published by indigenous groups for a global audience. These are proven examples of how traditional knowledge and modern technology can be blended. Without a doubt, Indigenous people are aware of the importance of media and technology to revitalize their languages in contemporary times. (Lieberman as cited in Coronel-Molina, 2019, p. 93)

Studies in the school context, have shown that pupils report an increase in feelings of pride towards their Indigenous identity after taking part in language immersion programs (Harrison & Papa, 2005; Reyhner, 2010). On the other hand, students have also reported that these endeavours generate anxiety in them due to the cultural and linguistic responsibility that is assigned to them (Hinton, 2011; Luning & Yamauchi, 2010).

Through digital technology, participants in revitalisation efforts – both community members and outsiders – are empowering Indigenous communities to strengthen their languages and reduce the digital divide. Coronel-Molina (2019) argues

the most successful projects are those that involve a wide range of participants, especially members of the communities the projects seek to serve [...] there are some projects in different parts of the world that involve the creation of digital videos about Indigenous cultures. These videos often are made by community members themselves, which it is hoped will serve not only to help revitalize the

languages and cultures of their respective nations but also to reaffirm their ethnic identity. (p. 96)

Technology as a supporter of identity has been connected with the notion of technology as having an essential role in language education. This role refers to the potential that (digital) technologies have as supporters in the development of pedagogical tasks such as language learning and literacy skills (e.g. Akumbu, 2018; Coronel-Molina, 2019; García et al., 2016; Levin et al., 2006; Li et al., 2021), production of literature in Indigenous languages (García et al., 2016), and task-based teaching and learning (Quintrileo, 2019).

In the context of the use of digital technologies for Indigenous languages, identity is also found in connection to language reclamation (Littell et al., 2017), usually language reclamation as a political stance. Eisenlohr (2004) argues that in revitalisation efforts involving the use of technologies the notion of identity is understood as a political marker of recognition of identity. This reclamation, embedded in language revitalisation efforts, is one of the pillars of the identity within postcolonial settings for communities that are decolonising their culture. It becomes a type of decolonising action, especially if we consider that language loss was caused, to some extent, by colonisation (Leonard, 2017; López 2017 in McCarty, 2020). In this context, language reclamation is identity reclamation at the same time and in current discourse, necessarily point to the conceptualisation of identity as a non-static construct. In this interconnection, this emerging feature calls for a conceptualisation of language as “constituted in the everyday here-and-now life, and as such is constantly in flux. This approach modifies and moderates the common practice of treating language as a found object which is somehow separable from other aspects of life, and enables work with the entanglements of language and technology” (Bow, 2021, p. 23). Moreover, in one project, the project itself and particularly the creation of technological material, was based on the idea that speaking the languages is necessary to reclaim territory because “without language we are nothing...we would have to speak the language to identify this is Rama² territory” (Grinevald & Pivot, 2013, p.196). Therefore, making the link between language and all other aspects of life indivisible.

Another concept that appears linked to identity is the notion of legitimacy. Heller (2003) explains that legitimacy is a common area of struggle, a struggle : “over who has the legitimate right to define what counts as competence, like authenticity, as excellence, and over who has the right to produce and distribute resources of language and identity” (p. 474). This authority to produce resources of language and identity is crucial in any discussion around language-revitalisation efforts. Who has the authority and who assigns legitimacy has been reported as an area of political struggle in revitalisation and use of digital technologies. Particularly in the case of Indigenous media (Eisenlohr, 2004), it was found that producers seek visibility and legitimacy, therefore, making use of this tool as a space to assert their socio-political stance. Digital domains have also become spaces in which individuals and communities find a place as a legitimate entity (Bow, forthcoming), their online presence gives them, from the participants’ perspective, a feeling of validation.

² Footnote from the author of this current paper to clarify to the reader. Rama corresponds to the language of the Rama people in Nicaragua (Central America). It is severely endangered and it has a population of about seven thousand speakers (Ethnologue, 2022).

Another recurring link to identity is the concept of self-determination. Revitalisation projects and the use of digital technologies are seen as tools that support self-determination in terms of ownership and control over design. This is based on the possibility that the community has to design their own tools, that is, online platforms, software, mobiles apps (Ovide & García-Peñalvo, 2016). This factor allows the community to create a culturally appropriate tool in terms of design and functionality (Koole & Lewis, 2020). Czaykowska-Higgins et al. (2018) in the CURA project³, indicate that “these tools were a creative means of empowering Indigenous governance and self-determination” (Czaykowska-Higgins et al., 2018, p. 86). All the tailored features make that a project suitable for one community but might not be for another one, which emphasizes the specificity of each community (Koole, 2020). In the literature, self-determination is also regarded as an opportunity to foster student-led learning, since educational apps might favour the proactive participation of students as opposed to teacher-led learning systems. These digital tools provide students with autonomy over their learning and empower their feelings of self-identification (Miangah & Nezarat, 2012).

In the dynamics of language-revitalisation projects that make use of digital tools, it is not infrequent to find prescriptivist ideologies. These ideologies are expressed in discussions on authenticity that aim to establish some level of standardisation of the language. They have been found when decisions about language use need to be made or associated to underlying conceptions about the role of technologies. Some papers report intra-community conflict within the projects, or between participants and non-participants of the projects, regarding the real need for digital technologies. They argue that *real* community members do not let their language be taught via apps, they do it themselves (Begay, 2013). Additionally, conflicts have been reported in terms of decision-making about language, related to notions of standardisation or unification (Benedicto et al., 2002). These dynamics of prescriptivist practices could hamper language-reclamation actions and also the pursuit of self-determination.

Identity is also tied to notions of empowerment and capacity building. These concepts are particularly found in literature regarding language-revitalisation projects that make use of digital technology and that, at the same time, are based on collaborative work. This does not mean that other projects previously mentioned are not designed as collaborative, or that they do not foster these practices but, rather, that the following projects place a particular emphasis on community impact by focusing on empowerment and capacity building. The argument is based on the fact that these projects seek to include the community at all stages of the research process by actively integrating them, whether in consultation or as part of the research team (Genee, 2018; Genetti & Siemens, 2013; Junker, 2018; Rice, 2018). There is great emphasis on promoting training that allows the community to keep working on their own and continue with their language-revitalisation work, since it is argued that this might empower them by increasing their self-confidence and autonomous work, which might support Indigenous self-determination and cultural ownership (Kraisame, 2018).

³ The CURA project was a language-revitalisation project that run from 2001 to 2011 in Vancouver Island Salish Communities (Canada). It focused on two Coast Salish languages of Southern Vancouver Island: the SENĆOTEN (which has a population of about three thousand speakers with 20 fluent speakers) and the Hul’q’umi’num’ (which has a population of about six thousand people and about 100 fluent speakers). Its objective was to contribute to language revitalisation, to produce relevant material, and strengthen relationships between the Coast Salish communities and the University of Victoria. For more information see Czaykowska-Higgins et al., 2018.

It is beyond the scope of this paper but it is important to mention the great role that social media is playing in the construction and expression of Indigenous identities. Online platforms, such as Facebook, became quickly popular among Indigenous communities and create new ways to express Indigenous identities (Brady et al., 2008; Virtanen, 2015). A recent study has also shown that Indigenous people are adapting and mobilising social media platforms to their needs as distinctive individuals and groups: “Indigenous people are harnessing the affordances of digital technologies to express their identities and their collective survival of colonialism. Thus, social media platforms play a significant role in public articulations of identity” (Carlson & Kennedy, 2021, p. 1). Additionally, it has been shown that in these virtual contexts, dynamics that exist in face-to-face interaction still apply. Indigenous people “embody rather than disembody their identity when interacting online and particularly on social media” (Carlson & Kennedy, 2021, p.4). From the point of view of Elders, it has been reported that technologies can contribute to young generations both as a tool that will offer them more opportunities in life⁴ (Li et al., 2021), and one that can help the community to strengthen and amplify their voices in a contemporary world (Singleton et al., 2009).

Reflections on the impact on identity

Literature about language revitalisation in general (e.g. Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Stebbins et al., 2017) and language revitalisation projects, in particular (e.g. Grinevald & Pivot, 2013; Junker, 2018; Quintrileo, 2019; Taylor et al. 2020), offers very little information about what identity entails in the context where those efforts occur. It is, of course, not the aim of such literature to delve into the broad spectrum of considerations around the concept of identity, but considering that the same literature usually stresses the intrinsic link between language and identity, there seems to be a gap or an aspect that needs to be strengthened. Indigenous communities and researchers will benefit from more insights about how identity is understood and how the identity of participants might be impacted during language-revitalisation efforts. The literature that has been reviewed is not based on a particular conceptualisation of identity that allows us to directly explore how the use of technologies in language revitalisation could impact Indigenous identities. Nonetheless, there are several aspects that relate to the notions of identity as a self-positioning in an interactional context that has been extracted and offers some insights into the possible impact on identity.

From information extracted from the theoretical and case studies’ literature, it is possible to state that identity is impacted by the use of technology in revitalisation efforts. Additionally, it is possible to state that these efforts can contribute to showing that Indigenous languages can be and are part of the modern world. Such renewed perspectives enhance feelings of pride in the community. These efforts can become a place physical or imagined, where language reclamation as a political or socio-political stance is possible. They can become a place where discussion around legitimacy can develop and subsequently such discussions can lead to strengthening the right of self-determination (in the broadest manner in which this can be understood). Lastly, when language revitalisation is conducted collaboratively, it can contribute to community

⁴ Development of literacy skills is beyond the scope of this paper, however, if the reader is interested in this area, she might find of particular interest the systematic review by Li et al. (2021) on research evidence regarding the impact of technologies in enhancing literacy skills in Indigenous communities.

empowerment and autonomy. It can be argued that all these threads will have an effect on the self-positioning of community members taking part in the revitalisation effort as well as those in the community who are not actively taking part in such projects as they will possibly make use of the resources created in the projects. The participants will certainly have to take a stance when decisions about language need to be made, when designs need to be drawn, and these decisions will need to be communicated to other community members. Of course, the decision-making process by itself might cause an impact on identity as well. For the broader community, the impact might be more related to feelings of pride, since they see the final outcome that already includes their languages and confirms that Indigenous languages can be present in all domains of use.

This analysis confirms that technology in revitalisation work and its connection with notions of identity can represent more than the use of a technological device, and be of support to communities to renew or reconstruct their Indigenous language and identity. From the reviewed literature, even though it is not possible to establish the success of projects in terms of actual strengthening of ethnolinguistic vitality, it shows that these tools are not only technological platforms or devices, but that these projects rely on community and on community agency. Therefore, technology can certainly represent a revitalisation tool because in its interaction with the community, technology realises its power of transformation and it can support Indigenous futures.

Final remarks

Digital technologies are being used by Indigenous communities as instruments that can support their language revitalisation efforts. Such instruments and their use can have a positive impact on identity. However, this can only occur when community are active agents in the design and production of their language materials. Indigenous identity is intrinsically tied to building relationships and understanding our positioning in relation to everything that is around us. New advancements are extremely relevant in the context of language revitalisation. However, the relevance of digital technologies must not be understood as one based on technologies as instruments with agency power, but rather, as instruments that can potentially support speakers in their revitalisation endeavours. It is speakers' agency, among, of course, many other aspects that were not analysed in this paper (such as institutional support), that strengthens and maintains the language. Speakers are the ones who ultimately drive changes in linguistic practices and the people who make languages thrive.

The impact *of* identity and the impact *on* identity need to be taken into account when the aim is to work with technological tools that support revitalisation efforts because these tools within these processes become revitalisation tools. In other words, they become instruments that can be used to maintain our culture and help to bring our voices back. Therefore, it should be encouraged that publications and research about revitalisation efforts using digital tools address the matter of identity even if it is not the main goal of the paper. Additionally, further research could explore the perspectives of the participants of these projects through qualitative methods to investigate how the use of digital technology impacts their identities and how they feel their identities are shaped throughout the projects. These analyses and reflections around contemporary Indigenous identities could offer not only more insight into current practices but also light up new pathways to best support Indigenous peoples in the digital era.

References

- Aikenhead, G. S., & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous knowledge and science revisited. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 2(3), 539–620.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-007-9067-8>
- Akumbu, P. W. (2018). Babanki literacy classes and community-based language research. In *Insights from Practices in Community-Based Research From Theory To Practice Around The Globe* (Vol. 319, pp. 266–279). De Gruyter Mouton.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018-015>
- Austin, P. K., & Sallabank, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Endangered Languages: Beliefs and Ideologies in Language Documentation and Revitalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Begay, W. R. (2013). *Mobile apps and indigenous language learning: New developments in the field of indigenous language revitalization* [Masters Thesis, University of Arizona]. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Mobile-apps-and-indigenous-language-learning%3A-New-Begay/2d2975a469b614e4e1ba4eed6c1e1e40b4eda60f>
- Bell, J. (2013). Language attitudes and language revival/survival. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(4), 399–410.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.794812>
- Benedicto, E., Dolores, M., & McClean, M. (2002). Fieldwork as a Participatory Research Activity: The Mayangna Linguistic Teams. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 28(1), 375–386.
<https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v28i1.3852>
- Bird, S. (2020). Decolonising Speech and Language Technology. *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 3504–3519.
<https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.313>
- Bow, C. (2021). *Entanglements of digital technologies and Indigenous language work in the Northern Territory* [Doctoral, Charles Darwin University and the Australian National University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/1885/233083>
- Bow, C. (forthcoming). Technology for Australian Languages. In C. Bown (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Australian Languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Brady, F., Dyson, L., & Asela, T. (2008). Indigenous adoption of mobile phones and oral culture. *ICT And Indigenous Oral Culture*, 384–398.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>

- Bucholtz, M., & Zimman, L. (2019). *Language in the Social World*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6k09p11n>
- Carlson, B., & Kennedy, T. (2021). Us Mob Online: The Perils of Identifying as Indigenous on Social Media. *Genealogy*, 5(2), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy5020052>
- Cassels, M., & Farr, C. (2019). Mobile applications for Indigenous language learning: Literature review and app survey. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle*, 29(1), 1–24.
- Christie, M. (1993). Yolngu linguistics. *Ngoonjook*, 8, 58–77.
- Christie, M. (2007). Yolngu language habitat: Ecology, identity and law in an Aboriginal society. In G. Leitner & I. G. Malcolm (Eds.), *The habitat of Australia's Aboriginal languages: Past, present and future* (pp. 57–78). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197846.57>
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2019). A World of Indigenous Languages: Politics, Pedagogies and Prospects for Language Reclamation. In T. L. McCarty, S. E. Nicholas, & G. Wigglesworth (Eds.), *4. Media and Technology: Revitalizing Latin American Indigenous Languages in Cyberspace* (pp. 91–114). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923071-008>
- Czaykowska-Higgins, E., Daniels, X. D., Kulchyski, T., Paul, A., Thom, B., Twance, S. M., & Urbanczyk, S. C. (2018). Consultation, relationship and results in community-based language research. In *Insights from Practices in Community-Based Research: From Theory To Practice Around The Globe* (Vol. 319, pp. 66–93). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018-004>
- Dołowy-Rybińska, N., & Hornsby, M. (2021). Attitudes and Ideologies in Language Revitalisation. In J. Sallabank & J. Olko (Eds.), *Revitalizing Endangered Languages: A Practical Guide* (pp. 104–126). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108641142.008>
- Eira, C. (2010). Languages of revival: Understanding a new type of aboriginal language. *Ngoonjook*, 35, 74–83.
- Eisenlohr, P. (2004). Language Revitalization and New Technologies: Cultures of Electronic Mediation and the Refiguring of Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33, 21–45. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.143900>
- Elliot, R. (2021). Technology in Language Revitalization. In J. Sallabank & J. Olko (Eds.), *Revitalizing Endangered Languages: A Practical Guide* (pp. 297–311). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108641142.008>

- Ethnologue.(2022). *Quechua*. https://www-ethnologue-com.proxyub.rug.nl/language/que?ip_login_no_cache=D%98%B6%CDQ%C3%B5%1F&cache
- Ethnologue. (2022). *Rama*. <https://www-ethnologue-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/language/rma>
- Ermine, W. (2000). Aboriginal Epistemology. In M. Batiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 101–111). UBC Press.
- Evans, N. (2001). The last speaker is dead—Long live the last speaker! In P. Newman & M. Ratliff (Eds.), *Linguistic Fieldwork* (pp. 250–281). Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, N. (2011). *Dying words: Endangered languages and what they have to tell us*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages* (Issue Vol. 76). Multilingual Matters.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=16823&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Fishman, J. A. (2007). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 71–81). Northern Arizona University.
<http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/jar/SIL.pdf>
- Galla, C. K. (2016). Indigenous language revitalization, promotion, and education: Function of digital technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(7), 1137–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2016.1166137>
- Galla, C. K. (2018). *Digital Realities of Indigenous Language Revitalization: A Look at Hawaiian Language Technology in the Modern World | Language and Literacy*. 20(3), 100–120.
- García, S. S., Cruz, T. C. de la, & Amaro, K. I. V. (2016). The revitalization of Wixárika: A community project in the midwest region of Mexico. In G. Pérez Báez, C. Rogers, & J. E. Rosés Labrada (Eds.), *Language Documentation and Revitalization in Latin American Contexts*. De Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110428902-004>
- Genee, I. (2018). The Blackfoot Language Resources and Digital Dictionary project: Creating integrated web resources for language documentation and revitalization. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 12, 274–314.
- Genetti, C., & Siemens, R. (2013). Training as empowering social action. In E. Mihás, B. Perley, G. Rei-Doval, & K. Wheatley (Eds.), *Responses to Language Endangerment: In honor of Mickey Noonan. New directions in language documentation and language revitalization* (pp. 59–78). John Benjamins.
<https://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs.142.04gen>

- Grenoble, L. A. & Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grinevald, C., & Pivot, B. (2013). On the revitalization of a 'treasure language': The Rama Language Project of Nicaragua. In *Keeping Languages Alive: Documentation, Pedagogy and Revitalization* (pp. 181–197). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139245890.018>
- Harrison, B., & Papa, R. (2005). *The development of an indigenous knowledge program in a New Zealand Maori-language immersion school*. 36(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2005.36.1.057>
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00238.x>
- Hermes, M., & Kawai'ae'a, K. (2014). Revitalizing indigenous languages through indigenous immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 2(2), 303–322. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.2.10her>
- Higgins, C. (2011). Identity Formation in Globalizing Contexts: Language Learning in the New Millennium. In *Identity Formation in Globalizing Contexts*. De Gruyter Mouton. <http://www.degruyter.com/view/title/122511>
- Hinton, L. (2011). Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education*, 25(4), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.577220>
- Hornberger, N. H., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2004). Quechua language shift, maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: The case for language planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 167, 9–67. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2004.025>
- Johnson, G. M. (2016). Technology use among Indigenous adolescents in remote regions of Australia. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 21(2), 218–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2013.823553>
- Johnstone, B. (2010). Locating Language in Identity. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and Identities* (pp. 29–36). Edinburgh University Press. https://web-b-ebscohost-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzMzMyNDk1NI9fQU41?sid=9388de6b-007f-4443-8c38-039a8768f7ce%40pdc-v-sessmgr03&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_7&rid=0
- Joseph, J. E. (2010). Identity. In C. Llamas & D. Watt (Eds.), *Language and Identities* (pp. 9–17). Edinburgh University Press. https://web-b-ebscohost-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzMzMyNDk1NI9fQU41?sid=9388de6b-007f-4443-8c38-039a8768f7ce%40pdc-v-sessmgr03&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_7&rid=0

- Junker, M.O. (2018). Participatory action research for Indigenous linguistics in the digital age. In *Insights from Practices in Community-Based Research: From Theory To Practice Around The Globe* (Vol. 319). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018-009>
- Karstens-Smith, G. (2018). B.C. teen creates app to help revive fading Indigenous language. *Toronto Star*. <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2018/01/07/bc-teen-createsapp-to-help-revive-fading-indigenous-language.html>.
- Koole, M., & Lewis, K. (2020). *Mobile Learning as a Tool for Indigenous Language Revitalization and Sustainability in Canada: Framing the Challenge* (pp. 520–532). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-0423-9.ch028>
- Kraisame, S. (2018). Language endangerment and community empowerment: Experience form community training in the Moken language documentation and preservation project. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(2), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2017.05.002>
- Leonard, W. Y. (2017). Producing Language Reclamation by Decolonizing ‘Language’. *Language Documentation and Description*, 14, 15–36.
- Levin, L., Vega, R. M., Carbonell, J. G., Brown, R. D., Lavie, A., Canulef, E., & Huenchullan, C. (2006). *Data Collection and Language Technologies for Mapudungun*. <https://doi.org/10.1184/R1/6604598.v1>
- Li, J., Brar, A., & Roihan, N. (2021). The use of digital technology to enhance language and literacy skills for Indigenous people: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education Open*, 2, 100035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2021.100035>
- Littell, P., Pine, A., & Davis, H. (2017). Waldayu and Waldayu mobile: Modern digital dictionary interfaces for endangered languages. *ComputEL-2: The 2 Workshop on Computational Methods*. ComputEL-2.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2018). Reinvigorating Language Policy and Planning for Intergenerational Language Revitalization. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Revitalization* (pp. 36–48). Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Handbook-of-Language-Revitalization-1st-Edition/Hinton-Huss-Roche/p/book/9781138674493>
- Luning, R. J. I., & Yamauchi, L. A. (2010). The Influences of Indigenous Heritage Language Education on Students and Families in a Hawaiian Language Immersion Program. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(2), 46–75.
- May, S. (2013). Indigenous immersion education: International developments. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 34–69. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.03may>
- McCarty, T. L. (2003). Revitalising indigenous languages in homogenizing times. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060302556>

- McCarty, T. L. (2020). The holistic benefits of education for Indigenous language revitalisation and reclamation (ELR2). *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 0(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1827647>
- McCarty, T. L., & Zepeda, O. (Eds.). (2006). *One voice, many voices: Recreating indigenous language communities*. Arizona State University Center for Indian Education.
- Miangah, T. M., & Nezarat, A. (2012). *Mobile-Assisted Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.5121/IJDPS.2012.3126>
- Olko, J., & Sallabank, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Revitalizing Endangered Languages: A Practical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108641142
- Ovide, E., & García-Peñalvo, F. J. (2016). Internet technologies as a tool in indigenous education: The case of the wichi people in ‘the impenetrable’ area in Argentina. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Technological Ecosystems for Enhancing Multiculturality*, 441–445. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3012430.3012554>
- Patton, J. (2018). New app hopes to revitalize, teach Indigenous languages. *Global News*. Retrieved from <https://globalnews.ca/news/4288160/indigenous-language-app-wikwemikong-first-nation/>
- Pine, A., & Turin, M. (2017). Language Revitalization. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.8>
- Quintrileo, E. J. (2019). Technology’s role in Mapudungun language teaching and revitalization. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 15(3), 205–216.
- Reyhner, J. (2007). Rationale and Needs for Stabilizing Indigenous Languages. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 3–14). Northern Arizona University. <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/jar/SIL.pdf>
- Reyhner, J. (2010). Indigenous Language Immersion Schools for Strong Indigenous Identities. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(2), 138–152.
- Rice, K. (2018). Collaborative research: Visions and realities. In *Insights from Practices in Community-Based Research: From Theory To Practice Around The Globe* (Vol. 319, pp. 13–37). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110527018-002>
- Sánchez, L., Mayer, E., Camacho, J., & Alzza, C. R. (2018). Linguistic attitudes toward Shipibo in Cantagallo: Reshaping indigenous language and identity in an urban setting. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 22(4), 466–487. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006918762164>

- Singleton, G., Rola-Rubzen, M. F., Muir, K., Muir, D., & McGregor, M. (2009). Youth empowerment and information and communication technologies: A case study of a remote Australian Aboriginal community. *GeoJournal*, 74(5), 403. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-009-9277-6>
- Soria, C. (2016). What is digital language diversity and why should we care? In J. Cru (Ed.), *Linguapax Review 2016—Digital Media and Language Revitalisation*. Linguapax International. <https://www.linguapax.org/en/linguapax-review-en/>
- Soria, C. (2015). Towards a notion of 'Digital Language Diversity'. In E. Kuzmin, A. Parshakova, & D. Ignatova (Eds.), *Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Cyberspace-Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference* (pp. 111–125).
- Stebbins, T., Eira, K. & Couzens, V. (2017). *Living Languages and New Approaches to Language Revitalisation Research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315269078>
- Taylor, J.L., Wujal Wujal Aboriginal Shire Council, Soro, A., Esteban, M., Vallino, A., Roe, P. and Brereton, M. 2020. 'Crocodile Language Friend: Tangibles to Foster Children's Language Use'. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–14. CHI EA '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3383031>.
- Timutimu, N., Ormsby-Teki, T., & Ellis, R. (2009). Reo o Kainga (language of the home): A Ngai te rangi language regeneration project. In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization* (pp. 109–120). Northern Arizona University.
- Virtanen, P. K. (2015). Indigenous Social Media Practices in Southwestern Amazonia. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 11(4), 350–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011501100403>
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2006). "For the interest of the Hawaiians themselves": Reclaiming the benefits of Hawaiian-medium education. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 3, 153–182.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2011). Insights from indigenous language immersion in Hawai'i. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 36–57). Multilingual Matters.
- Woolard, K. A. (2020). Language Ideology. In *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 1–21). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217>