



Culture Sector  
Communication and Information Sector  
Education Sector

***UNESCO's Language Vitality and  
Endangerment Methodological Guideline:  
Review of Application and Feedback  
since 2003***

**Background Paper**

prepared by UNESCO's Culture Sector for expert meeting  
"Towards UNESCO guidelines on Language Policies:  
a Tool for Language Assessment and Planning" ( 30 May - 1 June  
2011)

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Structure of this paper.....	2
Review of the LVE application and feedback.....	3
Synthetic summary of suggestions for a revision of LVE and the questionnaire.....	10
Bibliography.....	144

### I. Introduction

UNESCO's methodological guideline entitled 'Language Vitality and Endangerment' (LVE)<sup>1</sup> was developed by an Ad hoc expert group comprising linguists from various regions in 2001-2002 and adopted by an international meeting 'Safeguarding Endangered Languages' held at UNESCO Headquarters in 2003. LVE is a tool intended for those involved in designing language maintenance and/or revitalization measures, surveying the status of languages and linguistic diversity and developing language policies<sup>2</sup>.

The present paper<sup>3</sup> reviews the use of LVE over the past eight years based on a literature survey and on feedback received from researchers, government officials and language community members.

The aim of this review is to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of LVE in its current form, and to recap the suggestions made by various types of users on how it could be improved.

### II. Structure of this paper

The present background paper is structured as follows:

#### Review of the LVE application and feedback

- a. LVE commented on and applied by individual researchers

This section contains a survey of papers and monographs that acknowledge and describe LVE or present a case-study of its application to assess the vitality of a particular language.

- b. LVE used in governmental surveys

---

<sup>1</sup> UNESCO document CLT/CEI/DCE/ELP/PI/2003/1, available online in Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Spanish at <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/cultural-diversity/languages-and-multilingualism/endangered-languages/language-vitality/>

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see *Outline of the expert meeting* and document CLT/CEI/DCE/ELP/PI/2003/1

<sup>3</sup> This paper was written by Anahit Minasyan based on a literature review by Renata de Queirós Mattoso Shafe

This section focuses on how LVE has been applied and evaluated by two public institutions (in Australia and China).

c. LVE and alternative methodologies

This section examines two alternative approaches in comparison with LVE.

d. LVE and UNESCO survey on *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity*

This section covers UNESCO's attempt to operationalize LVE in 2006-2009 by carrying out a questionnaire-based survey entitled 'Linguistic Vitality and Diversity'.

### **Synthetic summary of suggestions for a revision of LVE and the questionnaire**

- Overall evaluation and suggestions
- Specific suggestions on LVE and the questionnaire

The second part of the paper summarizes the feedback and suggestions UNESCO has received through the Language Vitality and Diversity survey (the respondents were invited to comment on each question and the questionnaire as a whole), as well as the critical comments and proposals made by the following experts and groups of experts:

- Paul Lewis (2005)
- AIATSIS (2005)
- 1st Summer School on Language Documentation and Description in Lyon co-organized by the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS, London) and the Universities of Lyon and Leiden (Lyon group, 2008)
- Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (IEA) of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS, 2009)
- An expert meeting on approaches to developing a language vitality index held at UNESCO in 2009

### **Bibliography**

## **III. Review of the LVE application and feedback**

LVE identifies the following nine criteria ('factors') to be used in determining the degree of vitality/endangerment of a language and developing measures for its maintenance or revitalization:

1. Intergenerational language transmission
2. Absolute number of speakers
3. Proportion of speakers within the total population
4. Shifts in domains of language use
5. Response to new domains and media
6. Availability of materials for language education and literacy
7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies including official status and use
8. Community members' attitudes toward their own language
9. Amount and quality of documentation

Each factor is accompanied by a graded scale, whereby value '5' is assigned to the optimal situation and value '0', to the direst one.

LVE states that no single factor is sufficient to assess the state of a language but that, taken together these factors may allow language communities, linguists, educators and administrators to determine the vitality of a given language and its specific vulnerabilities in order to better prioritize and target the safeguarding measures.

*a. LVE applied by individual researchers*

Since its publication in 2003, LVE has been described, commented on and applied by various researchers. Some of these works are presented below in chronological order.

In the study of Beni Iznassen Amazigh in Morocco, **El Kirat** (UNESCO, 2003) applies LVE in order to assess the validity of her conclusions (she infers that the speakers' negative attitudes toward their own language, reinforced by its marginalization, are the main cause of its endangerment). For El Kirat, LVE can be used to confirm or refute the validity of conclusions of a study, and also to guide research in relation to what actions need to be taken, and which are more urgent.

**Legère** (UNESCO, 2003) analyses whether or not the Vidunda language is endangered in the Tanzanian context. He refers to LVE examining the relevance of its 9 factors. For Legère, intergenerational transmission and language attitudes should be given special attention (i.e., LVE Factors 1, 7 and 8).

According to **Villalón** (UNESCO, 2003), LVE can be applied to more than one language for comparative purposes, which is important to "establish priorities for action" where multiple languages coexist. Villalón provides a table assessing and comparing three indigenous languages of Venezuela, based on the 9 LVE factors.

**Lewis** (2005) analyzes 100 languages based on the 9 LVE factors. His aim is to test the LVE methodology's validity when applied to a larger number of languages rather than to assess the vitality of these languages. In this paper, Lewis provides comprehensive feedback on the methodology as a whole and in relation to each of the 9 factors (more details in section IV (i) below). According to the author, the framework is "reasonable and feasible"; it represents a useful "research agenda" for language researchers. The main criticism relates to the definition of the degrees of endangerment, which needs to be better elaborated and harmonized. In addition, Lewis claims that the way in which the LVE factors are formulated and the questions they ask are at odds with the way researchers usually organize their data.

**Maffi** (2005) discusses the relevance of LVE to biodiversity-related research. According to Maffi, LVE provides researchers with "a set of recommendations for the assessment of linguistic vitality (...), which should provide useful guidance (...) for the development of linguistic diversity indicators" (Maffi, 2005: 610-11).

**Brenzinger et al.** (2007) describe LVE and insist on the necessity of using the 9 factors together and emphasize the need for this kind of comprehensive assessment.

The same point is made by **Grenoble & Whaley** (2006) within the context of language revitalisation and the complexities involved in assessing language vitality with a view to revitalizing languages.

**Austin** (2008) describes LVE and singles out Factor 1 (intergenerational transmission) as “the most critical factor in language vitality: for a language to remain healthy, it must be spoken by children” (p. 217).

**Guérin’s** (2008) uses LVE in her assessment of the degree vitality/endorsement of the Mavea language of Vanuatu, based on the data collected during fieldwork in 2005-2007.

In her study of the Neverver language, **Florey** (2009) applies LVE to examine the state of the language according to the nine vitality factors.

**Norris** (2010) uses LVE Factor 1 (intergenerational transmission) to determine the degree of vitality/endorsement of aboriginal languages in Canada. She argues that intergenerational transmission is the “major” factor for this kind of assessment.

In a more recent publication, **Grenoble** (2011) focuses on “the nature of the speaker base [which] is the single most important factor here. This base includes not only the number of speakers, but more importantly, the generational distribution of these speakers, and the proportion of speakers of the target language within the total population” (p. 38). Thus, for Grenoble, the most significant factors are Factor 1 (intergenerational transmission), 2 (absolute number of speakers) and 3 (proportion of speakers within the total population).

*b. LVE used in governmental surveys*

In Asia and the Pacific, LVE has already been tested on a large scale.

The Australian case

In 2004, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) carried out a survey of indigenous languages vitality status and resources. The findings of this survey were published in 2005 under the title ‘National Indigenous Languages Survey’ Report 2005’.<sup>4</sup>

The NILS used an online questionnaire supplemented with telephone interviews and meetings, in order to gather sufficient data to assess the vitality of all Australian indigenous languages.

The NILS identified ten indicators to carry out the survey (these included the nine LVE factors, and an additional indicator on language programmes). The report argues that

In order to assess what kinds of programs are appropriate and how urgently they need to be implemented, it is necessary to measure both language vitality and language endangerment. It is best if these measuring methods are as widely agreed upon as possible ... (AIATSIS, 2005: 27).

AIATSIS adjusted LVE for NILS in the following way:

- For **Factor 1** – Intergenerational Language Transmission - NILS introduced the use of ‘actual age-ranges’ (i.e., 0-19, 20-39, 40-59, 60+), instead of LVE’s ‘notional ‘generations’ (i.e., children, parents, grandparents). According to the NILS Report, notional generations should be used only as an alternative method, when it is difficult to establish age groups.

---

<sup>4</sup> NILS determined that only 145 of Australia’s more than 250 known indigenous languages continue actually to be spoken. In addition, approximately 110 of them have been classified as severely or critically endangered. Only 18 indigenous languages are described as “strong” according to such a crucial factor as intergenerational transmission (AIATSIS, 2005).

- To the nine LVE factors, NILS added a tenth – **Status of Language Programmes** - with an accompanying six-point grading scale presented in the table below, reproduced from the NILS report.

*Table 1: Grading scale for 'Status of language programmes' indicator*

	Grade	Status of Language Programs
<b>Successful</b>	5	A regular and successful program is running involving >5 per cent language identifiers.
<b>Good</b>	4	A program is running with two out of three of the following: regularly; successfully; >5 per cent language identifiers.
<b>Fair</b>	3	A program is running with one out of three of the following: regularly; successfully; >5 per cent language identifiers <sup>5</sup> .
<b>Basic</b>	2	A program is running involving a small group (<5 per cent of identifiers) irregularly and with few or no outcomes.
<b>Aspiring</b>	1	No language programs but a group are talking of starting one.
<b>None</b>	0	No language program and no interest in starting one.

Source: NILS report 2005

### The Chinese Case

The nine LVE factors were used in 2009 by the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (IEA) of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), seeking to assess the vitality of the minority languages in China and, based on the results, to decide what measures need to be taken on priority basis. During the survey, CASS identified and applied 3 extra factors in order to address the specific sociolinguistic situation in China:

**Factor 10** – Distribution of the language community: concentrated, mixed (living together with other ethnic groups), scattered (the more concentrated a community is, the safer its language is);

**Factor 11** – Degree of internal variation of the language: more variation, lower vitality;

**Factor 12** – Distribution of languages transnationally (transnational languages, according to many studies, tend to be better preserved - e.g. the case of French, Italian and German in Switzerland).

Using these 12 factors, CASS was able to classify over 100 Chinese minority languages into the following categories:

- (1) dynamic languages,
- (2) robust/active languages,
- (3) languages of moderate vitality/threatened and showing some signs of endangerment,
- (4) languages of dwindling vitality/definitely endangered,

---

<sup>5</sup> If more than a month passes by without any significant activity lasting several hours, the program is categorized as 'irregular'. If a year passes without any significant activity then the program registers in the 'aspiring' or 'none' categories. 'Successful' is defined in terms of outcomes. 'Language identifiers' are people who identify with a language (cf. AIATSIS, 2005).

(5) languages of minimal vitality/severely endangered, and

(6) inactive/critically endangered or extinct languages.

The Chinese report submitted to UNESCO in late 2009 provides an evaluative analysis of the LVE methodology, and explains the addition of the extra factors prior to its application.<sup>6</sup>

The two examples above – the Australian and the Chinese cases – use LVE as a linguistic standard for qualitative/quantitative surveys on language vitality. In both cases, the assessment was done at the national scale, using all nine LVE factors and adding extra ones according to the national priorities and specificities.

*c. LVE and alternative methodologies*

In his seminal 1991 work, Joshua Fishman introduced the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) and the cause of ‘reversing language shift’ (RLS), suggesting that the main focus of an RLS initiative should be determined by the GIDS stage of the language.

*Table 2. Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)*

<b>Stage 1</b>	Some use of Xish <sup>7</sup> in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts
<b>Stage 2</b>	Xish in lower governmental services and mass media but not in the higher spheres of either
<b>Stage 3</b>	use of Xish in the lower work sphere (outside of the Xish neighborhood/community) involving interaction between Xen and Ymen
<b>Stage 4</b>	Xish in lower education (types a and b) that meets the requirements of compulsory education laws
<b>Stage 5</b>	Xish literacy in home, school and community, but without taking on extra-communal reinforcement of such literacy
<b>Stage 6</b>	the attainment of intergenerational informal oralcy and its demographic concentration and institutional reinforcement
<b>Stage 7</b>	most users of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age
<b>Stage 8</b>	most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories

---

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix 1 for more detailed comments made by CASS on the UNESCO Language Vitality and Diversity survey questionnaire. The suggestions to improve the questionnaire include the 3 factors proposed by CASS and a proposal to address not only the micro-level (‘reference communities’), but also the macro-level (languages).

<sup>7</sup> Endangered languages are referred to as Xish, while dominant languages are called Yish.

Source: Fishman (1991)

It appears that LVE Factors 4 (Shifts in domains of language use) and 6 (Availability of materials for language education and literacy) loosely correspond to the first six stages of GIDS, while stages 7 and 8 match more closely Grades 2 and 1 of LVE Factor 1 (Intergenerational transmission).

Table 3: GIDS and LVE correspondence with regard to intergenerational transmission

GIDS stage		LVE Factor 1 grade	
Stage 7	most users of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age	Grade 2 (severely endangered)	language is spoken by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may understand it, they do not speak it to children or among themselves
Stage 8	most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories	Grade 1 (critically endangered)	the youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently

Source: Fishman (1991), UNESCO Ad Hoc Group (2003)

**Lewis and Simons** (2010) attempt to bring together elements from different existing standards to create a new, more effective one, capable of addressing the needs of different regions of the world. The proposed methodology is called EGIDS, the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale.

The EGIDS tries to incorporate both Fishman's GIDS and LVE, proposing a harmonization of their scales and 13 levels of language endangerment/vitality. One of the reasons for proposing more levels is the authors' attempt to introduce more nuanced categories to the languages lumped together as 'safe' in LVE. Another motivation for proposing an expanded version is to create a more dynamic scale, as compared to the original GIDS.

A 'diagnose tree' composed of a limited number of questions is proposed to facilitate and harmonize a large number of assessments. According to the authors, the EGIDS provides an efficient alternative to categorising all languages of the world, which can be used for language planning, revitalisation and other language projects.

d. LVE and UNESCO survey on *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity*

In 2006, UNESCO elaborated a detailed questionnaire titled *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity* based on LVE augmented by the NILS' 10<sup>th</sup> factor and a set of additional questions that will be discussed below. This questionnaire was intended to be a language community-based data collection tool on a variety of sociolinguistic parameters, including numbers of speakers, degree of endangerment



and spatial location. The objective was to help standardize data collection on endangered and indigenous languages, so that local, national, regional and global assessments, surveys and tools could be based upon a consistent methodology.

The questionnaire was made available online and also disseminated through various networks in 2006 – 2009 to conduct a sample survey on *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity*.

It is addressed to linguists who can provide reliable information on the endangered languages they have studied, which would allow UNESCO to build a sample of comparable data on languages worldwide, particularly on endangered and indigenous languages.

The first edition of the questionnaire is admittedly complicated and imperfect.

The questionnaire is divided into two sections:

1. Language Vitality and Endangerment within the reference community
2. Linguistic Diversity

The first section, 'Language Vitality and Endangerment within the reference community', is based on LVE, and the questions generally reflect the 9 LVE factors. This section also includes two additional questions, one of them based on the extra factor proposed by AIATSIS ("Language Programs") and the other, aiming to single out a specific domain highly relevant to indigenous languages but somewhat under-used in LVE: traditional knowledge.

The second section, 'Linguistic Diversity', contains a set of questions designed in order to elicit information on linguistic environment of the 'reference community'.

The unit of analysis is 'a language as spoken in a given reference community'.

In order to determine the reliability of the data provided by linguists, the questionnaire includes a "reliability index". The respondents are asked to choose a reliability score from 0 to 3 for each reply, as follows:

3	Evidence from field work and direct observation
2	Evidence from other reliable sources
1	Very little evidence; a 'best guess'
0	No data available [no score provided]

Respondents were also invited to comment on the quality and validity of individual questions, on their own replies and on the questionnaire as a whole.

Some 300 questionnaires, of which 105 from China, have been partially or totally answered and returned to UNESCO over the survey period. The reasons why not many linguists have taken their time to fill in and submit the questionnaire are not clear but may be linked to its length (24 questions with sub-questions) and a certain degree of ambiguity.

## IV. Synthetic summary of suggestions for a revision of LVE and the questionnaire

In spite of the low number of replies, a lot of constructive feedback has been received. This section provides a synthetic summary of the suggestions made both with regard to LVE and the questionnaire by:

- Paul Lewis (2005)
- AIATSIS (2005)
- Numerous questionnaire respondents (2006-2009)
- 1st Summer School on Language Documentation and Description in Lyon co-organized by the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS, London) and the Universities of Lyon and Leiden (Lyon group, 2008)
- Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (IEA) of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS, 2009)
- An expert meeting on approaches to developing a language vitality index held at UNESCO in 2009

### Overall evaluation and suggestions:

#### *(i) LVE*

Researchers and public institutions who have applied LVE over the past eight years find it a useful tool, which needs, however, some adjustments.

**Factor 1** seems to be generally considered either the most important, or one of the most important LVE factors.<sup>8</sup> With regard to Factor 1 (intergenerational transmission), it has been proposed to take into account second language immersion at school in order to determine the strength of intergenerational transmission (Legère, 2003). It has also been proposed to replace 'generations' by more specific 'age groups' (AIATSIS, 2005).

With regard to **Factor 2** (absolute number of speakers), it has been argued that it needs an interpretative framework and a graded scale similar to those developed for the other eight factors (Lewis, 2005).

**Factor 3** (proportion of speakers within the total population) presents two difficulties. First, even though LVE defines the 'total population' in reference to the 'ethno-linguistic group', the title of the Factor may be interpreted to mean 'total population of the country'. Second, the term 'speaker' is not defined at all. The Australian National Language Survey Report (NILS 2005) suggests that it would be useful to introduce a measuring scale for language proficiency (keeping the grades 5 to 0

---

<sup>8</sup> This is certainly also linked to the highly influential work published in the 1990s by Joshua Fishman, Michael Krauss and Stephen Wurm.

to distinguish between various levels including active use, speaking, understanding and 'identifying with' the language).

With regard to **Factor 4** (shifts in domains of language use), it has been argued that its format and its diachronic perspective is not easily compatible with the way in which linguists normally collect data (Lewis, 2005).

**Factor 5** (response to new domains and media) lumps together 'schools, new work environments, new media', etc., which has been found confusing by many. Considering the wide range of domains that it covers and the ever-increasing role that new technologies (mobile devices, Internet, etc.) play in people's lives, it is important to re-examine this factor and its graded scale very carefully. Factors 4 and 5 both cover areas outside of the scope of linguistics, which is why contributions from specialists in education, media, Internet and related fields are crucial in trying to enhance and better rationalize it.

**Factor 6** (availability of materials for language education and literacy) has produced a very high degree of variation in responses during the UNESCO survey (see below). It may be necessary to revise it.

Commentators on the **Factor 7** (governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official status and use) and **Factor 8** have stressed that attitudes change - and sometimes quickly - which is why building a diachronic perspective into this factor may be useful. With regard to **Factor 8**, it has also been suggested that it should be more specific in relation to age groups: in a speaker community language attitudes are often closely linked to the age of the speakers.

**Factor 9** (type and quality of documentation) admittedly fails to capture a very important aspect: whether or not language documentation is actively used in order to implement a language programme or a revitalisation project. It is only through such use that existing documentation can have an impact on the vitality of a language.

Four additional factors have been proposed (see section II.b above for a more detailed discussion):

**Factor 10** – Status of language programmes (AIATSIS, 2005)

**Factor 11** – Distribution of the language community: concentrated, mixed or scattered (CASS)

**Factor 12** – Degree of internal variation of the language (CASS)

**Factor 13** – Distribution of languages transnationally (CASS)

### (ii) Questionnaire

The comments by linguists who filled in the questionnaire point, in general, to the following weaknesses:

- The questionnaire is too long; therefore, respondents are not willing to dedicate time to fill it in;
- The specialists do not feel that filling in the questionnaire would be beneficial for them or their work in any respect;
- Some questions are not phrased clearly, and many people have misunderstood or not understood them at all, which becomes apparent from many misguided answers provided for these questions or answer spaces that were left blank;

- The unit of analysis of the questionnaire, i.e., the 'reference community', seems to be problematic and leads to misinterpretation;
- Some questions might be considered either uninformative or not applicable.
- The first section of this questionnaire (Q1-Q12) is clearer compared to the second section (Q13-Q24).

The Lyon group argued that at times, the questionnaire lacked context, as well as clearer distinctions between different terms and concepts used, and needed more specific and objective questions. Their overall conclusion was that the questionnaire was too general and perhaps vague, compromising its utility. The Lyon group proposed to break down certain questions into more specific questions. This, however, may make the questionnaire even less suitable for volunteer informant-based data collection than it currently is.

The CASS team of specialists provided a substantial report accounting for the 105 questionnaires they had filled in and translated into English, highlighting problems similar to the ones listed above. Overall, the CASS team felt that the questionnaire was markedly Western in its approach and assumptions: language communities are taken into account individually, while the collective factors that emerge from the interactions of each individual community with its surroundings remain neglected.

CASS specialists suggested that more attention should be given to the role of school education in relation to mother tongue maintenance and intergeneration transmission. Other relevant suggestions consisted in adding the age factor to as many questions as possible, as age groups should be considered separately in relation to many questions; adding a 'religious factor' to the questionnaire, as they consider it to have an impact on language use; adding questions that could account for presence or absence of written systems, and computerizing systems for specific languages. As with the suggestions by Lyon group, implementing all these would make the questionnaire even longer than it already is.

Finally, the Chinese team pointed out that the questionnaire should be accompanied by more detailed instructions on how to fill it in, guaranteeing a better understanding of the meaning of each question, so that answers would be more informative and consistent.

To sum up, the main issues with the questionnaire appear to be its length and its ambiguity. It has been suggested that the first section (Q1 to Q12) be revised, and the second section (Q13-Q24) either be dropped, or used as a separate questionnaire.

#### Specific suggestions on LVE and the questionnaire

- A large number of commentators recommend shortening the questionnaire by keeping and restructuring its first section, and dropping the second section. In Appendix 1, the analysis show that some important elements found in the second section can be incorporated in the first section. The second section can also be revised, but should be kept as a separate survey tool.
- Question 1 (Overall vitality / endangerment score) should be placed at the end to be addressed after the respondent has answered the other questions. It was felt that

reaching a conclusion on the overall vitality/endangerment of a language would make more sense after analysing the language situation in relation to the 9 LVE factors.

- Question 2 (Generational language use): it has been suggested to replace notional generations by age groups or age cohorts.
- Question 3 (Number of speakers) and 4 (Proportion of speakers within the reference community): respondents often declared low reliability related to the sources that provide data on numbers of speakers, and the problematic issue of comparing data using different sources. In addition, these questions need a better-defined concept of “speaker”.
- Question 5 (Domains of language use) did not cover all situations that were particular to some languages, as shown by the analysis of the answers to this question (Appendix 1 of the report). Restructuring this question needs to take into account age groups, gender, and situations of multiple languages sharing domains of use.
- Questions 6 and 7 did not generate specific suggestions.
- Question 8 should be revised or dropped, as suggested by participants of the 2009 meeting at UNESCO. Some options in this question refer to domains of use, e.g. “the language is used in administration and education”. If this question needs to be kept, it should be more specific, and focus only on actual materials for language education and literacy, without broadening the options to include domains of use.
- Question 9 (Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official status and use) needs to be revised as it fails to differentiate between situations where policies exist and are applied, and situations where existing policies are not enforced.
- Question 10 (Reference community members’ attitudes towards their own language) could be revised to incorporate a diachronic perspective, gender and age groups.
- Question 11 (Type and quality of documentation) needs to be with view to eliciting information not only about existing documentation, but also about its practical application.
- Question 12 (Status of language programs) could be dropped, as the analysis of answers to the returned questionnaires show that the information it elicits largely coincides with the information elicited in question 11.

## V. Bibliography

- Austin, P. (2008). *One Thousand Languages: Living, Endangered and Lost*. University of California Press.
- Brenzinger, M. (2007). Indicators for Assessing Language Vitality. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), *Language Endangerment Throughout the World* (pp. ix - xii). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cunningham, D., Ingram, D. E., Kenneth Sumbuk (Eds.) (2006). *Language Diversity in the Pacific: endangerment and survival*. Multilingual Matters.
- Dobrin, L.M., Austin, P. K. & Nathan, D. (2007). *Dying to be counted: the commodification of endangered language is documentary linguistics*. Retrieved 30 March, 2011, from:  
[http://www.hrelp.org/publications/ldlt/papers/dobrin\\_austin\\_nathan.pdf](http://www.hrelp.org/publications/ldlt/papers/dobrin_austin_nathan.pdf)
- El Kirat, Y. (2003). *Language Endangerment in Morocco: The Case of the Beni Iznassen Amazigh* (paper presented at the 2003 UNESCO expert meeting on endangered languages)
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theory and Practice of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Florey, M. (2009). *Endangered Languages of Austronesia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grenoble, L. A. (2011). Language Ecology and Endangerment. In P. K. Austin & J. Sallabank, (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grenoble, L. A. & Furbee, L. (2010). *Language Documentation: Practice and Values*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Grenoble, L. A. & Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guérin, V. (2008). Writing an Endangered Language. *Language Documentation and Conservation*, vol. 2/1, 47-67.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language*, 18 (1), 1-42
- Krauss, M. (1997). Indigenous Languages of the North: a Report on Their Present State (Northern Minority Languages: Problems of Survival, ed. By H. Shoji and J. Janhunen). *Senri Ethnological Studies* 44:1-34.
- Legère, K. (2007) "Vidunda (G38) as an endangered language?" in *Selected Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. Doris L. Payne and Jaime Peña, 43-54. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lewis, P. and Simon, G. F. (2010). *Assessing Endangerment: Expanding Fisherman's GIDS*. Retrieved 14 April 2011 from [http://www.lingv.ro/resources/scm\\_images/RRL-02-2010-Lewis.pdf](http://www.lingv.ro/resources/scm_images/RRL-02-2010-Lewis.pdf)
- Lewis, M. P. (ed.). (2009). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 16th edition*. Dallas: SIL International.

- Lewis, M. P. (2005). *Towards a Categorization of Endangerment of the World's Languages*. Retrieved 30 March 2011 from: <http://ftp.sil.org/silewp/2006/silewp2006-002.pdf>
- Maffi, L. (2005). Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 34, 599-617.
- Magga, O. H.; Nicolaisen, I.; Trask, M.; Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Dunbar, R. (2005). *Expert Paper Written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues*. Retrieved 29 March 2011 from:  
  
<http://arcticlanguages.com/papers/PFIIndigenousChildrensEducation.pdf>
- Mooney, P. (2006). Hype and Hope: A past and future perspective on new technologies for development. *Development*, 49 (4), 16-22.
- Moseley, C. (2009). Each Language is a Unique World of Thought. *Let's Talk, The UNESCO Courier*, October 2009, 4-5.
- Norris, M. J. (2010). Canada and Greenland. In C. Moseley (ed), *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. Paris: UNESCO Publications.
- Norris, M. J. (2007). *Aboriginal Languages in Canada: Emerging Trends and Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Retrieved 20 February 2010 from:  
<http://www.turtleisland.org/resources/ablang07.pdf>
- Pretty, J. N. (2007). *The SAGE Handbook of Environment and Society*. SAGE.
- Sterkenburg, P. G. J. van (Ed.). (2004). *Linguistic Today: facing a greater challenge*. (2004) John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. (2003). *Language Vitality and Endangerment*, UNESCO.
- Villalón, M. E. (2003). Appendix 1. Language Vitality Assessment: An Example from Venezuela. In UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, *Language Vitality and Endangerment*, UNESCO (pp.24).
- SIL International (2008). *A Proposal for the Use of Standardized Language Identifiers in National Censuses*.