Introduction: Minoritised languages and revitalisation strategies[1]

Carla FERRERÓS PAGÈS

Université de Perpignan – Via Domitia & Universitat de Girona

For the first time in human history, our physical and cultural environment is seriously threatened by direct human action. This implies that there are several factors that globally affect the relationships between humans and their environment, and that also condition the (often unequal) relationships that are woven between human communities. Phenomena linked to globalisation and climate change increase the economic poverty of social sectors around the world and facilitate the political marginalisation of certain communities while increasing the intensive exploitation of the places where they live: less industrialised territories suffer the effects of mining, overfishing and intensive agriculture and livestock farming, and this seriously affects the physical environment because it implies deforestation, drought, water pollution and, ultimately, loss of biodiversity (Skutnabb-Kangas & Harmon, 2018). All of this has major repercussions on the preservation not only of the environment, but also of the communities living in the affected territories, and thus on the maintenance of cultural heritage and the preservation of linguistic diversity.

All the estimates that have been carried out in recent decades (see, for example, the review by Romaine, 2018, 45-49), provide data that allow us to state that the linguistic diversity of the planet is seriously threatened: those languages with the fewest speakers, which are the majority of the more than 6,000 languages in the world, are the ones most at risk of disappearing; the groups made up of indigenous communities stand out in particular:

> "[T]he vast majority of today's threatened languages and cultures are found among socially and politically marginalized and/or subordinated national and ethnic minority groups, who face unprecedented pressure to abandon their local languages. Estimates of the number of such groups range from 5,000 to 8,000, among them Indigenous peoples, who are particularly vulnerable to forces of language shift.

Comprising about 4% of the world population, and one-third of the world's 900 million extremely poor rural people, they speak around 60% of the world's languages."

(Romaine, 2018, p. 43)

According to Amnesty International (n.d.), there are 476 million indigenous people in the world, distributed in more than 90 countries, living in the most vulnerable regions of the planet: what contributes to the threat to the languages they speak has to do with the very threat to these communities and their surroundings. The global changes that humanity is undergoing make it easier for them to be discriminated against and stigmatised by urban and/or majority groups, to have less social protection and to lack sufficient economic resources (cf. https://www.undp.org). Furthermore, and it is necessary to remember this, the threat to these peoples is not new: they have already suffered demographic, cultural, territorial, and linguistic pressures derived from the colonisation processes that have taken place throughout our history (United Nations, 2007). But despite the ecological and socio-economic threats listed above, indigenous peoples contribute enormously to safeguarding linguistic and biological diversity on our planet: indigenous peoples speak a very high percentage of the world's approximately 6,000 languages, and where they control the land, much more biodiversity is found (Skutnabb-Kangas & Harmon, 2018).

All of the factors affecting the territories inhabited by these minority groups have resulted in population movements of very large numbers of people, who have been pushed to move from the affected areas to urban areas. These migrations have inevitably contributed to the loss of patterns of life, of relationships with the immediate physical environment, of traditional economic systems, of cultural traits and, inevitably, of linguistic diversity. With migration, the contact of the displaced with the dominant population groups has led to the growth of homogenising pressures, both linguistic and cultural. These pressures contribute to a large extent to the minoritisation of their languages.

Linguistic minoritisation, however, need not necessarily be the product of population movements. The world is full of examples of minoritised languages spoken by communities that have not moved from their territory of origin. In these cases, the factor of minoritisation is the same as in displaced groups: contact with other languages spoken in the same territory and the imbalances in the power relations established between the different linguistic groups. Thus, for example, socio-economic integration into mainstream global economies by vulnerable communities (migrant groups, indigenous peoples, colonised peoples, etc.) often also entails linguistic assimilation (Mufwene, 2001).

Whether due to displacement, colonisation, mass deportations or pressure based on institutional discourse and the political, cultural, economic and linguistic hegemony of certain groups within a territory, languages disappear because their speakers abandon them to speak another language with which they are in contact. Language abandonment is never a free decision and often involves great

pain, which is caused both by the pressure mechanisms that force substitution and by the feeling of loss of cultural and linguistic heritage.

1. MINORITISED LANGUAGES

Linguistics approaches phenomena related to minoritisation from different perspectives. Firstly, and in a broad sense, much research has focused on describing what linguistic diversity looks like in the world with a special focus on minoritised and endangered languages. From this perspective, it is remarkable that all estimates in recent years predict that between 25% and 90% of the world's languages will soon disappear (Romaine, 2018, p. 46). Because of the difference in percentage numbers mentioned above, it is clear that it is difficult to obtain precise estimates: we do not know exactly how many languages there are in the world, nor what their precise number of speakers is. Even so, authors such as Lewis et al. (2015) or Romaine (2018) claim that out of the approximately 7,000 languages in the world, only about 400 have more than one million speakers, and that a little more than half of the world's languages are spoken by less than 1% of the world's population. These numbers alone illustrate the inequality between language communities.

Even so, it is crucial to bear in mind that the number of speakers is not the only indicator of language vulnerability: there are languages with few speakers that have a high vitality, as is the case for example in Vanuatu, an island state in the Pacific Ocean where languages with around a hundred speakers are spoken and intergenerationally transmitted (François et al., 2015). Less commonly, languages with fairly large numbers of speakers may suffer the effects of pressures from other dominant languages that contribute to the accelerated loss of speakers. This is the case, for example, of Amazigh, which has approximately 20 million speakers (or more, according to estimates) spread throughout North Africa, especially in Morocco and Algeria. Amazigh is, however, an eminently oral language, which occupies private spheres of use and which, in some territories, is beginning to suffer from interruption of intergenerational transmission (see, for example, Alalou, 2023). This is why, in addition to the number of speakers, other factors must be taken into account when determining the level of threat or vulnerability of languages: firstly, the degree of intergenerational transmission, but also the areas of use occupied by the language in question, the attitudes that speakers have towards the languages that make up their linguistic repertoire, and the official language policies of governments and institutions.

As multilingualism is not an exclusively territorial fact, but is also a feature of people's cognitive systems, other fields of linguistics study it from these two points of view: the social and the individual. As for the latter, it can be analysed from different sub-disciplines: psychology, language acquisition, education, or sociology. In relation to the situations that concern us, linked to the phenomenon of minoritisation, these individual factors are approached above all from the study of linguistic uses and

ideologies and the interactions that are established and that condition the appearance of phenomena linked to bilingualism and multilingualism, such as code switching: speakers' repertoires, the use they make of languages, possible interlinguistic transfers, etc. are affected by the consideration they have of each of the languages in contact. But language contact and linguistic minoritisation are also addressed through the study of grammar. Nowadays, theoretical research is increasingly interested in minority, minoritised and typologically diverse varieties, which contributes to their recognition at a scientific level, and there is a growing tendency to investigate multilingual environments from this perspective as well (D'Alessandro et al., in press). Thus, for example, in contexts where there is language contact resulting from migration, theoretical research related to language acquisition and variation is essential. This type of study constitutes a meeting point between the two aspects of the study of language: the individual and the social.

From a social point of view, the fact that different linguistic groups are in contact with each other generates problems that are not inherent to the phenomenon itself, but are the result of imbalances in power relations. Despite the fact that linguistic borders almost never coincide with geopolitical borders, the nation-state constitutes a key piece for the analysis of these phenomena (Romaine, 2018, p. 43), taking into account that the policies applied within state borders grant different statuses to the languages spoken there. The construction of nation-states implies the promotion of a certain language or variety: the dominant group's own language or variety becomes hegemonic and causes other languages and varieties to be undervalued and, in some cases, even persecuted.

> "Where the other languages/dialects present on the territory of the state nations survived the pressures of nationalism, they mostly retreated to the private domain, were not taught in schools and were not permitted in any contact with the state. At the very least, use of other languages in place of the state language was disbarment to employment and inclusion in state life; at the worst, it could occasion persecution, if the government saw it as an act of defiance against the state. Nationalist ideology discouraged minority language us with a variety of sanctions from mockery to punishment. This nationalist stance survives to this day."

(Wright, 2016, p. 49)

The pressures of nationalism therefore mean that language varieties that are not linked to hegemonic groups are relegated to familiar domains because they are perceived to hinder social cohesion, because of the idea that the ideal situation is that all citizens of a given political entity are able to communicate in the same language variety.

Diglossia is a consequence of this difference in perception of the power of speakers of each variety in contact. This explains why one language variety is associated with functions considered high (i.e., those of the public and formal domains) and why some other languages and varieties are associated with functions considered low (familiar and colloquial). High and low varieties are differentiated from an internal, grammatical point of view, but also by their social characteristics, i.e., function, prestige, literary and cultural heritage, standardisation, etc.: the former is proposed as a common heritage and as a vehicle of culture, while the latter are considered only as suitable for private relations. The latter are not learned at school but are transmitted intergenerationally, and are often described as "endearing", "curious", in some cases referred to as "patois", or perceived as "poorly spoken" versions of the high varieties.

In relation to these perceptions, prejudices of all kinds have been generated, whereby indigenous and minoritised languages are considered to be spoken by rural people who come from underdeveloped societies, by ignorant individuals, and that they are not suitable for use in urban environments and in modern settings (see, for example, Tuson, 1988; Junyent, 1996; Moreno Cabrera, 2000, etc.). This is why many speakers from minority communities abandon their language when they come into contact with the dominant language (whether as a result of displacement or not). If language is the most visible element that distinguishes a person from the stigmatised group, speakers decide to acquire the language of the majority group and sometimes also other foreign or colonial languages with which it is more prestigious, such as English (Skutnabb-Kangas & Harmon, 2018; Grenoble, 2021). In many cases, learning these new languages is accompanied by the abandonment of one's own language:

> "Most ITM [Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities and minoritzed groups] children (and their parents) obviously want in their own best interests to learn the official language of their country. [...] Most children also want to learn English if it is not one of the official languages, given its current ascendancy as the dominant world language. [...] But learning new languages, including dominant languages, should not occur in a subtractive bilingual environments, do not value children's bilingualism/multilingualism, or its maintenance. The rationalizations based on the stigmatization and glorification, the promises of benefits connected with leaving one's language and culture behind, which at the same time lead to the killing of the dominated languages and cultures, are false. Substractive formal education, which teaches children (something of) a dominant language, but almost always at the cost of their mother tonge or first language, is genocidal."
>
> (Skutnabb-Kangas & Harmon, 2018, p. 18).

Linguistic homogenisation has been amplified by the new communication systems that have emerged in the internet era, and this affects all language communities around the world in one way or another. The maintenance of minority and minoritised languages has become difficult within the communities that speak them and, even more so, in the diaspora forced by the displacement of speakers, where it has become a challenge.

2. LINGUISTIC REVITALISATION: A QUESTION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Despite, or perhaps because of, the unprecedented loss of cultural capital implied by the enormous disappearance of linguistic diversity in the world, initiatives to counteract the effects of linguistic diversity loss and the promotion of multilingualism have grown in recent years (Olko & Sallabank, 2021). In addition to the interest of maintaining cultural heritage alone, language loss affects the physical and psychological well-being of the individuals who used to speak the language:

> "Many groups who have lost (or are losing) their language suffer from trauma. This trauma can be the result of a host of causes, but frequently in endangered language communities the trauma involves a history of colonization and has had deep psychological effects and low levels of self-worth. [...] This is no surprise that people who have access to their language have improved mental health, lower suicide rates, and lower rates of substance abuse than do comparison groups in similar communities who do not use their language. In addition, there is evidence that having access to your ancestral language improves physical health, in terms of reducing the rate of cardio-vascular disease, lowering blood pressure and hypertension, and lower rates of diabetes. These benefits are tied to many things, including living a traditional lifestyle."
>
> (Grenoble, 2021, p. 18)

Linguistic revitalisation is an interdisciplinary field, and related fields include education, language policy, sociology, anthropology or ethnography, among others (see Comajoan-Colomé & Coronel Molina, 2021). Whatever the disciplines involved and the perspective from which they are approached, revitalisation initiatives are always conscious decisions taken by a language community with the aim of reversing a situation of minoritisation. This decision is always preceded by an awareness of a language substitution process. These revitalisation actions may be carried out from two different methodological approaches, which may be based on the institutions (top-down) or on the linguistically threatened communities themselves (bottom-up).

Language revitalisation initiatives, as we have said, aim to reverse a situation of substitution not only because of a question of linguistic rights, but also because of various factors that may vary

according to the speaker community. But these motivations, whatever they may be, always affect the social and personal (psychological and physiological) sphere of individuals. According to Grenoble (2021, p. 10), the drivers of revitalisation strategies are, above all, the desire to connect with ancestors, the past and cultural heritage; issues related to physical and psychological healing; the need for community (re)building; the acquisition of cultural knowledge; the increase of individuals' physical well-being; and the enhancement of cognitive benefits. From a global point of view, moreover, revitalisation strategies contribute to the preservation of the world's languages:

> "És evident que la preservació de la diversitat lingüística és una qüestió de drets humans. El procés de substitució lingüística que experimenta una comunitat de parlants acostuma a anar acompanyat d'altres tipus de discriminacions o pressions, que habitualment provenen de l'àmbit polític i social. Per això [...] molts afanys de revitalització van lligats als esforços per recuperar o preservar espais comunitaris (físics o simbòlics), terres ancestrals, poder polític, prestigi social i altres elements que conformen la identitat grupal dels quals han estat privats."

> (Badosa & Moser, 2023, p. 7)

Linguistic revitalisation is a process that goes beyond individual actions and involves reflection and the implementation of a strategy to be carried out jointly by linguists and by the community itself, according to its wishes and needs. Actions related to revitalisation often involve teaching the endangered language to children or adults (Hinton, 2018), sometimes in formal settings and sometimes in rather informal settings, through ludic and cultural activities. The field of multilingual and multicultural education is central to these processes. In addition to this key element, there are resources and strategies that are closely related to language teaching in contexts of language revitalisation. For example, information technologies have emerged as essential elements for developing and distributing teaching materials and for creating new digital interaction environments (Badosa & Ventayol, 2023).

In addition to what has been mentioned so far (in relation to the field of study of linguistic rights and language recovery and plurilingual and pluricultural education), linguistic documentation and description are also fields of study closely linked to revitalisation. Traditionally, language professionals have endeavoured to contribute to safeguarding endangered languages by creating language corpora of as many different languages as possible, always bearing in mind the undeniable scientific and cultural interest that this can have. Today, however, some aspects are being questioned that have to do with the relationship that is woven between the scientists who document the language and/or undertake revitalisation actions and the community itself, and this reflection focuses on the power

relations that are established, and makes it possible to assess all the ethical implications that derive from these relations between the two communities, the academic and the speaker communities.

> "The emphasis of documentation on collecting (i.e., archiving) to the exclusion of preservation, strengthening and revitalization, reveals an underlying primacy of the interests of research, of academia, over the interests and needs of the language "holders". In the same way that guidelines for the participation of human subjects in research state that the researcher cannot burden a specific population [...], in the same way academia should not use a given community (the Language community) for the extraction of data (Language data to be archived) for the extensive benefit of a different community (the research community)."

> (Benedicto, 2018, p. 64).

Linguistic revitalisation and all the notions related to it must therefore involve reflection on the part of the agents involved (linguists, institutions, social activists, etc.), and a review of the participants' interests and their linguistic attitudes, which will be key elements in any process carried out with the intention of reversing a situation of linguistic substitution (Dołowy-Rybińska & Hornsby, 2021). This reflection will enable strategic planning to become a powerful tool for reversing the effects of globalising models and capitalism applied to languages; in this case, to minoritised languages and the communities that speak them.

Reflection on these processes must go beyond the revitalisation actions carried out in a given context; it must also evaluate the causes of the success of certain programmes, which involve strengthening communities and fostering the commitment of the agents involved in these initiatives (Wiltshire, Bird & Hardwick, 2022). Linguistic revitalisation is a sociological process that must bring about significant changes in different spheres (individual, social, political and also scientific, as it contributes to the knowledge we have of the phenomenon of language from all points of view). For all these reasons, therefore, it must be much more than a symbolic act: it must be a fundamental instrument to contribute to the formation of a wiser, fairer, more sustainable and more egalitarian society.

3. THE CONTRIBUTIONS IN THIS VOLUME

This issue includes articles derived from contributions that were presented at the third edition of the International Conference on the Revitalisation of Indigenous and Minoritised Languages, which was held between the Universitat de Girona and the Université de Perpignan - Via Domitia in September 2022. This conference, as conceived before the first edition in 2017 by the much-missed Carme Junyent, aims to be a meeting point for professionals, researchers and activists from around

the world working on different aspects related to language revitalisation. Thus, all the articles included in this issue describe experiences in revitalising minoritised languages. It is a multilingual volume, in accordance with the spirit and desire that all languages can occupy the same areas of use: articles are included in Catalan, French, English, Silesian and Spanish. Even so, the languages studied in these contributions are broader in number; the articles deal with Basque, Catalan, Forro, Frisian, Gaelic, Mayan, Quechua, Silesian, S'án Sàvǐ ñà Yukúnanǐ and Tù'un nà ñuu Sàví. It also includes a contribution on the *silbo* (whistled language) of the island of El Hierro, the *silbo herreño*.

We have organised the articles in this volume according to the topics they deal with and which are related to the aspects described in this introduction. Although there are no explicit divisions, the first part of the volume is devoted to linguistic uses and ideologies, and the second part to the revitalisation of endangered languages in a broad sense: some articles describe concrete actions of revitalisation by groups linked to the social and academic spheres, some focus on the field of education and teaching (in and) of the minoritised language, and finally on the codification and translation of texts.

The volume opens with an article on **language use**; Ingeborg Birnie presents an analysis of the areas of Gaelic use in Barra (Scotland), and shows the results obtained from surveys on the use of the language in this island community. In contrast to previous work, which takes into account the number of speakers or the degree of knowledge of the language, Birnie focuses on the areas in which it is used. Despite the fact that the majority of the population claims to be able to speak the language, the article shows that the use of Gaelic in public spaces is very limited and that English is the language most widely used. Gaelic is mostly reserved for interactions in which the speaker knows the language preference of the other person. The fact that Barra has a dispersed population means that two Gaelic-speaking individuals are less likely to meet, and this makes the spontaneous use of Gaelic even more difficult. The article argues for the need for language planning initiatives to take into account the strengthening of opportunities for the creation and maintenance of networks by facilitating encounters to ensure that the language is used and that the choice of Gaelic becomes the unmarked one.

The next three contributions deal with the **linguistic ideologies** of minoritised language speakers: the first is an article on Quechua speakers who have migrated to urban areas, and the other two papers deal with empowerment and linguistic assertiveness, one from a more general point of view and the other with a specific case study, that of Catalan.

Firstly, Tania Rodríguez analyses the discourse of Quechua migrants from communities in Northern Potosí established in a neighbourhood of Cochabamba. She focuses specifically on aspects related to the identity function of the Quechua language in people who have migrated from a rural context to an urban environment, and on the ideologies and linguistic representations of the discourses obtained through the interviews. Thus, although the language is a symbol of the traditional community,

and as such can be a mark of social stigma, it also stands as the language that links the migrants to each other and differentiates them from the local urban population. Despite this, among young people it is increasingly losing this identity function that it has for adult speakers. The author of the article argues for the need for revitalisation strategies in contexts such as the one she analyses to take into account the ambiguities and fragmentation of the ethno-identity function of the minoritised language.

Guillem Belmar's article is presented as a reflection arising from different studies on minoritised languages. His work also focuses on the analysis of linguistic ideologies, in this case those that have an impact on the dynamics of linguistic minoritisation. Based on ethnographic observations and the author's work with the Frisian community in the Netherlands and the Catalan community in Catalonia (together with data published by other authors on Galician, Basque, Welsh and Karelian), Belmar points out that assertiveness is a linguistic resilience strategy that favours diversity. The article closes with the presentation of a series of points that should serve to contribute to reflection on the linguistic ideologies of politeness that influence the processes of minoritisation and the environment of linguistic assertiveness as a tool of resistance in multilingual contexts.

Within the same block, David Berga presents the synthesis of an investigation into the processes of linguistic empowerment of a group of Catalan speakers who have chosen to contravene the norm of convergence to the dominant language, Spanish. The author, through the analysis of discourses obtained from in-depth interviews with six informants, focuses on analysing the reasons that have led them to make the decision to preferentially use the minoritised language and the impact that this decision has had on their immediate context. Although each trajectory is different and the reasons for linguistic empowerment change, Berga detects common factors: the change, which is never reversed, favours the use of the minoritised language by interlocutors who usually prioritise the dominant language, and this is why the informants value positively the change towards assertiveness and linguistic empowerment, which makes them have greater linguistic self-esteem. The author points out that these changes may, in the medium term, have a visibilising effect on the minoritised language, which may also contribute to revitalisation.

The three contributions that follow present **language revitalisation actions**, and in particular show how these actions can reverse the perceptions that speakers inside and outside the community may have towards the languages involved. Each of the three articles shows strategies carried out by different means (playful activities, social networks, teaching) and by different actors (academics, community members, activists, associations).

First, the article by Maria Montroy and Inés M. García-Azkoaga aims to present the effects of an activity carried out in a minoritised language, Forro, on participants' perceptions of the language in question. Forro is an indigenous language of São Tomé and Príncipe, which coexists with Portuguese

and Creole languages, has few young speakers and does not benefit from social prestige. The article presents results obtained from surveys on language attitudes carried out with participants before and after carrying out recreational and cultural activities that included the use of this language. These activities brought together older people, who are the transmitters of the language, and young people who do not speak Forro. Surveys show that after the activity, the attitudes of the younger participants towards the indigenous language improved and awareness of what the loss of the language means increased. This article therefore shows how revitalisation activities contribute to improving positive perceptions towards minoritised languages among both speakers and non-speakers of these languages.

Josep Cru's work discusses the use of digital platforms such as Facebook, Twitter/X, or TikTok by activism in favour of minoritised languages, with the aim of promoting learning and raising awareness of their minority status. Bearing in mind that social networks are one of the most important means of communication nowadays, making use of these languages in them facilitates their destigmatisation and allows those that have never been written to access writing, with all that this implies (interdialectal communication, use of colloquial written language, etc.). The study focuses on the example of Mayan, a language of the Mexican Yucatán peninsula that is quite vital and has a certain prestige in some spheres, with an emerging standard, but displaced by Spanish. The article analyses examples of digital activism in the Mayan language based on the analysis of interviews with young volunteer activists. This work contrasts the results obtained with general reflections on the presence of minoritised languages in digital spheres, highlighting some paradoxes derived from the fact that although the internet is a medium that allows for the visibility and destigmatisation of minoritised languages, it inevitably reproduces minoritisation.

José Gavilán López also focuses on describing linguistic revitalisation strategies, in this case the author exhaustively describes all the actions that have been carried out to revitalise the *silbo herreño*, mainly through social activism. The *silbo herreño* is a communication system that translates oral Spanish into whistles and allows communication at a distance. This type of whistling was used by the shepherds of the island of El Hierro on a regular basis until the 1960s. After presenting the main characteristics of the *silbo herreño* and the methods of teaching this communication technique, the article describes the revitalisation strategies carried out, above all, by the Asociación Cultural para la Investigación y Conservación del Silbo Herreño (ACICSH). It includes, at the end, a list of bibliographical resources that allow the interested reader to find out more about the *silbo herreño*. The article stresses the convenience of avoiding folklorised activities and, at the same time, of escaping from overly standardising initiatives. This work shows the achievements, tenacity and efforts of an association made up of researchers and activists to maintain and make known a system of communication that is much less known than other whistled languages.

The next section is made up of four articles that deal with minoritised languages as **teaching languages**, bearing in mind that teaching is one of the key areas in language revitalisation processes. The first article analyses the attitudes of families and students towards Gaelic as a vehicular language at school, the second one promotes a reflection on the model of written Quechua language used by teachers, the third raises questions related to the unifying role of the varieties used as a teaching language, and the fourth one presents a didactic proposal that promotes reflection on the situation of the Catalan language in Northern Catalonia.

First, Ingeborg Birnie presents a study on the formal acquisition of Gaelic in schools that use this language as a vehicular language, in a context in which there is no intergenerational transmission of Gaelic, and focuses on analysing how family linguistic ideologies can influence it. In particular, the author analyses the results of a study carried out during the confinement caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, in which the closure of schools led students to engage in distance learning from home. Although parents are the ones who have chosen to send their children to a Gaelic school, the fact that they are not sufficiently proficient in the language led some families to avoid helping their children with homework, which resulted in some students more openly challenging the use of Gaelic in the classroom than their peers who had received family support when they returned to school. This study provides evidence to support what other existing studies on other minoritised languages point to: although families may have favourable ideas about bilingualism and knowledge of Gaelic language and culture, in many cases they do not expect Gaelic to enter everyday life at home, and this has an impact on learners' attitudes and the type of homework teachers give students.

The article by Alexis Pierrard and Jean Léo Leonard presents a reflection on the textual productions of (future) teachers, conditioned by linguistic insecurity in the face of an imposed standard. This reflection is based on the analysis of didactic texts written in Bolivian Quechua by students and teachers from bilingual and intercultural schools during a workshop in Cochabamba using the TERPLO ethno-educational method (Talleres de Elaboración de Recursos Pedagógicos en Lenguas Originarias - Workshops for the Elaboration of Pedagogical Resources in Native Languages). These texts show phenomena of linguistic variation and narrative and discursive reduction related to cultural contents that are described from a sociolinguistic perspective (related to codification, standardisation and the relationship between language and culture) and from a didactic and educational perspective (following Paulo Freire's pedagogy). The authors claim the need to work with different oral versions before the transition to written language in texts produced for school environments in order to prevent teachers from finding themselves in situations of linguistic insecurity in the face of a standard imposed on them through textbooks and syllabuses. This, they argue, would ensure good linguistic quality which would help to tackle the effects of diglossia and linguistic subordination in contexts of minoritisation.

Eukene Franco-Landa's contribution aims to determine the unifying role of the linguistic variety used in the academic sphere, and focuses on studying it in two different contexts: the United States (where, in the absence of an official standard variety, Midwestern English plays this role) and the Basque Country (where the standard variety of Basque, which is the one used in the education system, plays this unifying role). In the first case, the author points out that Midwestern English is the hegemonic variety that relates to socially privileged white speakers, and that this can marginalise social sectors that are not so privileged. Secondly, and despite the fact that in the beginning, standard Basque was an obstacle for speakers of other varieties, nowadays those whose L1 is another linguistic variety have become bidialectal. The study shows that the academic language has enabled socially marginalised sectors to become part of a community of speakers, helping to reduce social differences and offer more equal opportunities. Nevertheless, the author advocates the incorporation into the respective academic curricula of contents related to linguistic variation that contribute to the prestige of the other varieties of the languages taken into account in the study.

The fourth article in this block devoted to teaching, authored by Ester Baiget-Bonany and Mariona Sabaté-Carrové, presents a joint didactic action between university students in Lleida and secondary schools in Northern Catalonia. The revitalisation project they present begins with a study by university students of the processes of linguistic substitution in the territory of the north of the Albera. These students, following the phases of participatory action-research methodology, draw up specific didactic proposals to be carried out by secondary school pupils in the territory of Northern Catalonia, which will make them reflect on the situation of the language in their community. Reflection on the linguistic situation within the field of education is key to revitalisation processes in contexts where the minoritised language is in an advanced state of substitution. The article includes examples of activities and teaching proposals that encourage this reflection on the situation of Catalan in Northern Catalonia.

The last section is made up of two articles, the first on **codification processes** and the second on the **translation** of medical material into minoritised languages. Both analyse these issues from the point of view of the revitalisation of minoritised languages.

Camil Czaiński's article, written in Silesian and including a long summary in English, aims to show examples of linguistic ideologies on the codification of Silesian. Silesian is a Slavic language spoken between Poland and the Czech Republic, which has traditionally been considered a dialect of Polish. The results presented in the article are drawn from interviews with activists and cultural representatives of the community and reveal conflicting views on codification that relate to the way in which interdialectal differences may hinder the tasks of language codification. In addition to analysing the discourses that emerge from these interviews, the author contrasts the proposals they make with solutions that have been arrived at in other contexts, such as that of Sorbian, Norwegian, Romansh

and Basque. The article thus frames a debate that is currently taking place in relation to the codification of a minoritised language, focusing on the discussions that this generates among members of the community itself, and points out the importance of taking into account all voices (both in favour and against the process) to ensure that a codification project for a minoritised language is a truly effective tool for linguistic revitalisation.

Finally, the article by Jeremías Salazar, Griselda Reyes Basurto, Guillem Belmar, Simon L. Peters and Eric W. Campbell presents the work of translating important information dissemination resources on Covid-19 into two Mixtec languages spoken by the Ñuu savi community in the indigenous diaspora in California due to migration from Mexico to the United States: Sà'án Sàvĭ ñà Yukúnanĭ and Tù'un nà ñuu Sàví from Tlahuapa. The motivations that justify the translation into minoritised languages such as the two Mixtec languages taken into account are described, as well as the translation projects, the translated materials, the collaborative model established among the team members (mostly made up of members of the speaker community) and the choice of a multimodal translation that goes beyond writing and that points out the importance of audiovisual material. The work ends with a reflection on the fact that the production of this type of material is a question of linguistic and social justice, which brings well-being to the members of the communities and at the same time contributes to the documentation of languages and, therefore, to scientific knowledge.

REFERENCES

Alalou, A. (2023). The sociolinguistic situation in North Africa: Recognizing and institutionalizing Tamazight and new challenges. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, *9*, 155-170.

Amnesty International (n.d.). Pueblos indígenas. https://www.amnesty.org/es/what-we-do/indigenous-peoples/

Badosa, A. & Moser, A. (2023). Introducció. In A. Badosa, A. García, A. Moser, & A. Ventayol (Eds.), *La revitalització lingüística* (pp. 5-9). Ciemen.

Badosa, A. & Ventayol, A. (2023). El procés de revitalització. In A. Badosa, A. García, A. Moser, & A. Ventayol (Eds.), *La revitalització lingüística* (pp. 20-30). Ciemen.

Benedicto, E. (2018). When Participatory Action Research (PAR) and (Western) academic institutional policies do not align. In S. T. Bischoff & C. Jany (Eds.), *Insights from practices in community-based research. From theory to practice around the globe* (pp. 38-65). De Gruyter.

Comajoan-Colomé, L., & Coronel-Molina, S. (2021). What does language revitalisation in the twenty-first century look like? New trends and frameworks. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *42*(10), 897-904.

D'Alessandro, R., & Putnam, M., & Terenghi, S. (Eds.). (in press). Heritage languages and syntactic theory. Oxford: OUP.

Dołowy-Rybińska, N., & Hornsby, M. (2021). Attitudes and ideologies in language revitalization. In J. Olko & J. Sallabank, J. (Eds.), *Revitalizing endangered langauges: A practical guide* (pp. 104-117). Cambridge University Press.

François, A., Franjieh, M., Lacrampe, S., & Schnell, S. (2015). The exceptional linguistic density of Vanuatu. In A. François, S. Lacrampe, M. Sébastien, M. Franjieh & S. A. Schnell (Eds.), *The languages of Vanuatu: Unity and diversity* (Studies in the languages of Island Melanesia 5) (pp. 1-21). Asia-Pacific Linguistics.

Grenoble, L. (2021). Endangered languages and well-being. In J. Olko & J. Sallabank (Eds.), *Revitalizing endangered languages: A practical guide* (pp. 9-22). Cambridge University Press.

Hinton, L. (2018). Approaches to and strategies for language revitalization. In K. L. Rehg & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of endangered languages* (pp. 443–465). Oxford University Press.

Junyent, M. C. (1996). *Vida i mort de les llengües*. Editorial Empúries.

Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2015). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (18th ed.). SIL International. www.ethnologue.com.

Moreno Cabrera, J. C. (2000). *La dignidad e igualdad de las lenguas. Crítica a la discriminación lingüística*. Alianza editorial.

Mufwene, S. S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Olko, J., & Sallabank, J. (Eds.). 2021. *Revitalizing endangered languages: A practical guide*. Cambridge University Press.

Romaine, S. (2018). Language endangerment and language death: The future of language diversity. In A. F. Fill & H. Penz (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics* (pp. 40-55). Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Harmon, D. (2018). Biological diversity and language diversity. Parallels and differences. In A. F. Fill & H. Penz (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of ecolinguistics* (pp. 12-25). Routledge.

Tuson, J. (1988). *Mal de llengües. a l'entorn dels prejudicis lingüístics*. Editorial Empúries.

United Nations (2007). Declaración de las Naciones Unidas sobre los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_es.pdf

Wiltshire, B., Bird, S., & Hardwick, R. (2022). Understanding how language revitalisation works: A realist synthesis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2134877

Wright, S. (2016). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. Palgrave Macmillan.