RISE UP

REVITALISING LANGUAGES AND SAFEGUARDING CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Grant Agreement: 101095048

D3.2 Guidelines for language revitalisation

Document Information

Deliverable number:	D3.2
Deliverable title:	Guidelines for language revitalisation
Deliverable version:	1.0
Work Package number:	WP3
Work Package title:	Linguistic Ecosystems
Due Date of delivery:	30.11.2025
Actual date of delivery:	29.11.2025
Dissemination level:	Public (PU)
Type:	Report (R)
Author(s):	Kingsley Ugwuanyi (SOAS) Julia Sallabank (SOAS)
Contributor(s):	Eva Eppler (RU) Violeta Heinze (M&S) Gisela Hagmair (M&S) Marie Sauer (M&S) Maarja Veisson (UT) Kristin Kuutma (UT) Stefanie Cajka (UNIVIE) Eva Vetter (UNIVIE) Katharina Strasser (UNIVIE) Maika Casali (ESPRONCEDA) Yash Shekhawat (ESPRONCEDA) Jenny Browne (YEN)
Reviewer(s):	Katharina Strasser (UNIVIE), Stefanie Cajka (UNIVIE) & Eva Vetter (UNIVIE)
Project name:	Revitalising Languages and Safeguarding Cultural Diversity
Project Acronym:	RISE UP
Project starting date:	01.02.2023
Project duration:	36 months
Rights:	RISE UP Consortium

Table 1: Document history

Version	Date	Beneficiary	Description
0.1	07.08.2025	SOAS	Structure and table of contents
0.2	03.11.2025	SOAS	First draft for review
0.1	26.11.2025	UNIVIE	Reviewed draft
1.0	30.11.2025	SOAS	Final draft submitted

Executive summary

Deliverable 3.2 (Guidelines for Language Revitalisation) builds on the ecological model developed in D3.1 (Description of a European Language Preservation Ecosystem), as well as findings from other RISE UP deliverables, to transform research insights from RISE UP communities and examples from across the world into practical strategies for policy and community action related to language revitalisation (LR). It presents a comprehensive, evidence-based framework for sustaining endangered and minoritised languages across Europe.

The report begins by clarifying the ideological and ethical foundations of revitalisation, drawing attention to the need for inclusivity, humility, respect and reciprocity in all LR work, based on RISE UP's (2024) *Guidelines for linguists and other researchers working with minoritised language communities*. D3.2 argues that revitalisation must be understood as a systemic, ongoing process that connects language, people and environment, rather than as a technical project or an educational intervention alone. Building on this foundation, the report, in line with domains identified in the literature, presents the following key spheres where revitalisation takes shape: education, cultural visibility, community socialisation, wellbeing and empowerment, governance and digital innovation. Each of these areas is analysed through the lens of the RISE UP linguistic ecosystem model (see D3.1) in order to show how local initiatives, institutional frameworks and (inter)governmental policies interact to either strengthen or weaken vitality, conceived here as the overall health of a language within its ecosystem (see D3.1).

From these analyses, the report proposes practical pathways for action. It shows how revitalisation can be planned coherently across governmental, institutional and community levels, ensuring that strategies are both locally relevant and structurally supported. It also outlines how progress can be monitored through participatory, ecological evaluation methods that value not only numerical growth but also motivation, emotional attachment and continuity. Throughout the report, the emphasis is on collaboration, learning and long-term commitment rather than short-term interventions.

By integrating insights from RISE UP's case studies and deliverables, as well as from other LR examples mentioned in other studies, D3.2 offers a shared reference for policymakers, educators, researchers and community leaders. It demonstrates that LR contributes directly to social inclusion, wellbeing, innovation and sustainability. The Guidelines conclude that safeguarding Europe's minoritised languages means strengthening the conditions that allow them to evolve and to continue giving meaning to the lives of those who use the language. Drawing on the ecological perspectives outlined in the literature (e.g. Mühlhäusler, 2000) and prior RISE UP deliverables (e.g. D3.1 and D4.1), revitalisation is understood as creating long-term sustainability of languages and varieties, and sustaining long-term linguistic diversity by restoring functional links between languages, their users and the sociocultural, economic, educational, environmental and other contexts in which they live. In this sense, revitalisation is not only a cultural or linguistic goal but a broader commitment to resilient, diverse and equitable societies.

Contents

Tables

Table 2: Acronyms & abbreviations

Term	Description
AI	Artificial intelligence
AR	Augmented reality
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
D	Deliverable
D2.1	Report on Past and Present Language Policies, Including Reasons for Becoming an Endangered Language
D3.1	Description of a European Language Preservation Ecosystem
D4.1	Collection of Practices, Activities and Tools that Promote Minority Languages
D4.2	Definition of Quality Criteria for Practices, Activities and Tools
D5.1	Description of Pilot Case Studies: Preconditions, Stakeholders, Special Requirements, Suggested Methods
D5.2	Involvement of Local Cultural & Creative Sector: Possible Strategies and Experience
D6.3	Documentation of RISE UP Digital Toolset
ECML	European Centre for Modern Languages
Erasmus+	EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport
EU	European Union
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable
L1	First language
LE	Linguistic Ecosystem
LR	Language Revitalisation
M&S	Minds & Sparks
NGO(s)	Non-governmental organisation(s)
SDG(s)	Sustainable Development Goal(s)
SOAS	School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIVIE	University of Vienna
UR	University of Roehampton
UT	University of Tartu
VR	Virtual reality
WP	Work Package
YEN	Youth of European Nationalities

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

Linguistic diversity is central to Europe's vision to preserve its cultural heritage and promote sustainable and inclusive societies (European Commission, 2019). However, many of Europe's minoritised and endangered languages face declining intergenerational transmission, limited visibility in public life, and insufficient institutional support (Climent-Ferrando, 2023). Building on the earlier findings of the RISE UP project, this report provides practical and evidence-based guidelines for language revitalisation across Europe. The purpose of these guidelines is to support communities, policymakers, educators, and cultural organisations in developing coherent, long-term strategies for strengthening linguistic diversity and vitality.

These Guidelines for Language Revitalisation in Europe (D3.2) are a direct continuation of Deliverable D3.1 (Description of a European Language Preservation Ecosystem), which analysed the ecological conditions that shape language vitality across our five language communities (Aranese, Aromanian, Burgenland Crotian, Cornish and Seto). D3.1 mapped the interlinked social, cultural, political, economic, and emotional factors that influence the vitality of languages. It emphasised that linguistic vitality is both an outcome and a driver of resilient and culturally rich societies. Findings from other RISE UP reports (such as D3.1, D4.1 and D4.2) demonstrate that language revitalisation cannot be achieved through isolated measures, but through systemic collaboration between individuals, communities, institutions, and governments at different levels.

While D3.1 described the current ecosystem of minoritised languages in our case study communities, D3.2 translates those insights, as well as insights from other Deliverables, into actionable recommendations for LR. It also draws on comparative research on revitalisation models (e.g., Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, forthcoming) to propose practical approaches to LR. Examples of successful revitalisation strategies and activities from other minoritised language communities are also included, but these are considered critically and with recognition that each language community has its own context, needs and capacities (see also D4.1 and D4.2). The outcome is a set of bottom-up guidelines rooted in three pillars: a) the ecological understanding of language vitality developed in D3.1, the empirical evidence from RISE UP case studies and European language communities, and the global frameworks and tools for revitalisation identified in recent research (Leonard, 2017; Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, forthcoming).

Specifically, these guidelines aim to:

a) promote approaches to language revitalisation that integrate education, use, cultural production, governance, and wellbeing;
b) encourage collaborative and community-led strategies, supported by institutions and policy;
c) highlight the importance of intergenerational transmission and everyday language use in informal contexts, alongside formal education; and
d) provide evaluation frameworks to help stakeholders (i.e. speakers, communities, institutions, governments etc) assess progress and ensure that revitalisation efforts remain relevant and adaptable.

1.2 Relation to other WP tasks and deliverables

This section outlines how D3.2 relates to the wider RISE UP project and interacts with the work of other work packages. It identifies the deliverables that provide essential input to this report and those that will draw on its findings to support further development and implementation activities. The development of the Guidelines for Language Revitalisation (D3.2) draws from the analytical, methodological and applied work carried out across the RISE UP project. The guidelines build on results from earlier work packages, particularly those addressing language policy, linguistic ecosystem, and revitalisation practices, and will in turn inform later deliverables related to implementation, evaluation and the digital toolkit, set out in Table 3 below.

These inputs also provide the analytical, empirical and practical foundations on which D3.2 builds. The deliverable integrates these insights into a single framework of Guidelines for Language Revitalisation in Europe. It combines the policy analysis of D2.1, the ecological model of D3.1 (which is also described in D4.1 and D4.2), the practical evidence from D4.1, and the community perspectives of D5.1. This integration ensures that the guidelines are realistic, evidence-based and aligned with both community needs and European values of cultural and linguistic diversity.

Table 3: Input from other tasks and deliverables for D3.2

Deliverable/Task	Due Date	Input for D3.1
D2.1	M26	Report on past and present language policies, including reasons for becoming an endangered language: provides insights into how policy environments influence language vitality and offers a comparative overview of governance frameworks that D3.2 builds upon for its policy recommendations.
D3.1	M24	Description of a European language preservation ecosystem: defines the ecological model on which D3.2 is based and identifies the key actors, relationships and contextual factors influencing language revitalisation in Europe.
D4.1	M12	Collection of practices, activities and tools that promote minority languages: offers examples of existing bottom-up revitalisation initiatives that have been analysed for their applicability within the D3.2 guidelines.
D5.1	M12	Description of pilot case studies: preconditions, main stakeholder groups, special requirements, suggested methods: provides contextual information on community needs, stakeholder groups and conditions in the five case study regions, ensuring that D3.2 remains grounded in real ecological settings.

On the other hand, D3.2 will contribute directly to subsequent deliverables by providing a coherent policy and strategic framework for revitalisation actions, evaluation, and tool development, as shown in Table

Table 4: Output for other tasks and deliverables from D3.2

Deliverable/Task	Due Date	Output from D3.1
D2.2	M35	Report on need for further research: D3.2 will highlight remaining knowledge gaps and areas requiring deeper investigation.
D4.3	M34	Report on best practice strategies in language revitalisation: the conceptual and policy guidelines in D3.2 underpin the criteria and frameworks used for assessing good practice
D5.2	M32	Involvement of local cultural & creative sector: possible strategies and experiences: D3.2 offers policy guidance on how to embed linguistic revitalisation within cultural and creative industries.
D5.3	M35	Evaluation report of methods being used: the evaluation indicators proposed in D3.2 support consistent assessment across all pilot activities.
D6.3	M36	Documentation of RISE UP digital toolset: D3.2's recommendations on digital innovation and community participation contribute to the design principles of the RISE UP toolkit.

Through these interconnections, D3.2 functions as a bridge between research and implementation. It translates the analytical work of WP2 and WP3 into concrete guidance that supports the methodological innovations of WP4, the cultural and creative strategies of WP5, and the digital developments in WP6. In doing so, D3.2 contributes to a unified European approach to language revitalisation that links research, policy, and community perspectives.

1.3 Structure of the deliverable

Following this introduction, Section 2 presents the conceptual clarification underlying language revitalisation, including ideological, ecological, and ethical principles. Section 3 identifies the key arenas and approaches for effective revitalisation, based on the models proposed by Sallabank (forthcoming), Olko & Sallabank (2021) and evidence from RISE UP case studies. Section 4 outlines implementation and evaluation frameworks, drawing on language planning theory and the lessons from European communities. Section 5 concludes with reflections on adaptation, resilience, and the future of language revitalisation in Europe. This report is intended to provide policymakers, community actors, and cultural institutions with a clear framework for planning, supporting, and assessing revitalisation efforts across Europe.

Through these guidelines, RISE UP contributes to a shared European vision of linguistic sustainability. By combining community perspectives, cultural creativity, and policy coherence, language

revitalisation can become an instrument of inclusive cultural development and democratic participation in multilingual Europe.

2 Conceptual clarification

A framework of guidelines for language revitalisation requires a clear understanding of what revitalisation means, what it seeks to achieve, and how progress can be sustained. This section defines the conceptual foundations that guide these guidelines. It builds on the ecological model developed in D3.1, 4.1 and 4.2, which views languages as part of interconnected systems of people, institutions, and environments, and on the ideological and practical considerations identified in the wider research literature (Fishman, 1991; Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, forthcoming).

2.1 Ideological clarification

Before any language revitalisation (LR) initiative begins, communities, policymakers, and any other stakeholders for that matter, must clarify the ideologies and principles that guide their work. Such clarification also depends on a shared understanding of what "revitalisation" means. It has been observed that the term "revitalisation" is nebulous, as it means different things to different people. King (2001) defines LR as the process of adding new linguistic forms or social functions to a minoritised language in order to expand its use and user base, while Williams (1992) sees LR as shifting a language into new domains of activity. However, as Sallabank (forthcoming) points out, these definitions are underpinned by predominantly Western ideological assumptions: for example, that revitalisation always aims to restore fluent speakers and intergenerational transmission; that revitalisers buy into Western ideologies of what language is and does; that expanding the language into new domains is a necessary goal; that revitalisation is about the language itself rather than about people or social justice; that there is a clear boundary between "living" and "dead" languages; and that experts rather than communities determine what counts as success. Making such assumptions explicit is essential for developing inclusive, context-sensitive LR policies.

In recent years, LR scholars (e.g. Leonard, 2012, 2017; Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, forthcoming) have highlighted that LR is closely associated with – and sometimes used interchangeably with – concepts such as "language reclamation" and "language revival". Some have, however, explained the need to differentiate them. For example, Leonard (2017, 2012) differentiates between revitalisation, which he argues focuses on increasing speakers and usage, and reclamation, which for him centres on community agency, historical justice and the right to determine linguistic futures. For the purposes of this report, we conceive LR as inclusive of both perspectives, as LR should begin not with externally defined measures of success but with speaker and community priorities, needs and values. This understanding agrees with the view of Grenoble & Whaley (2006) who explain that revitalisation must address the social context in which people make choices about language use, including attitudes, opportunities and empowerment.

These distinctions underline the importance of ideological clarity from the outset. Revitalisation is not only about language forms or speaker numbers but about changing the social conditions and attitudes that interact with language use. To guide this reflection, Sallabank (forthcoming) suggests that communities and policymakers should consider the following questions:

- Why is language revitalisation desirable?
- Who is it for?
- How to go about it?
- Who decides?
- What is being preserved or revived?
- What form of the language and culture should be preserved?
- What makes revitalisation effective or successful? (more domains? more speakers? more younger speakers? intergenerational transmission? etc.)
- How do we measure success?
- How can we evaluate LR?
- Who should measure success?
- Willingness to learn about and from others' experiences.

The RISE UP case studies demonstrate why this clarification is necessary. In Cornwall, debates on orthography and accessibility reflect deeper questions about authenticity and inclusion, not only in terms of written norms but also about what the language is/should be used for: which varieties and registers are treated as "proper" Cornish, which domains (home, school, online, culture) it should be used in, and how much variation is considered acceptable. In the Aromanian and Seto cases, communities navigate complex multilingual realities and differing views of what counts as legitimate language use. For Aranese and Burgenland Croatian, the challenge lies less in recognition than in maintaining daily use within informal, multilingual settings. These situations show that revitalisation requires dialogue, negotiation and flexibility to ensure that policy and institutional frameworks align with community and speaker aspirations and understandings.

Ideological clarification also extends to recognising different types of speakers and who constitutes a language speaker (or language user, more broadly). New speakers, heritage users and second-language learners, as well as traditional speakers and latent speakers (also called 'rememberers'), all contribute to language vitality in complementary ways (Sallabank & Marquis, 2018). Revitalisation policies should promote inclusivity and avoid rigid distinctions between "authentic" and "new" speakers. Research on minority languages across Europe and beyond confirms that revitalisation increasingly depends on new speakers, who extend the social base of language use and introduce it into new domains (Costa, 2015; O'Rourke et al., 2015; Woolard, 2016). Studies also show that hierarchies of authenticity of speakers can discourage participation and create divisions that weaken revitalisation efforts (O'Rourke & Ramallo, 2013), while practical experience from revitalisation movements likewise demonstrates that inclusive approaches which value all speaker identities strengthen communities and ensure continuity (Olko & Sallabank, 2021).

2.2 Ecological thinking

An ecological approach, as defined in D3.1 and D4.2, and rooted in the work of scholars such as Haugen (1972), Mühlhäusler (2000) and Murugova & Evtushenko (2023), understands languages as living systems that depend on the health of the environments in which they exist. That is, the vitality of a language is shaped by a network of social, cultural, economic, geographical, political etc factors that interact in complex ways. In light of this, revitalisation cannot succeed by focusing on languages alone

or even on one language/variety; it must address these broader multilingual ecologies and social conditions that enable or constrain language use and overall vitality.

As highlighted in RISE UP's previous deliverables (D3.1, D4.1 and D4.2), the vitality of a language depends on the strength of its entire ecosystem, including its speakers, institutions, media and cultural life. When these elements support each other, language becomes part of the everyday fabric of society. Conversely, when any one of them weakens, such as when policies are inconsistent or education opportunities are limited, the entire ecosystem suffers.

The ecological model developed in D3.1 identifies five interdependent components of a healthy linguistic ecosystem:

- community-driven activism, where local actors lead initiatives with institutional support;
- supportive structural conditions, including consistent funding and legal recognition;
- emotional attachment and identity, which sustain motivation and positive attitudes over time;
- practical motivation, through opportunities for language use in everyday life and work; and
- momentum, generated when policy and community actions reinforce each other.

Revitalisation policies should therefore strengthen the links between community action and institutional structures rather than treating them as separate domains. As D2.1 shows, policy measures are most effective when they respond to local realities and are developed collaboratively with communities. Integrating bottom-up policy orientation with top-down support ensures that LR initiatives are sustainable.

Olko & Sallabank (2021) reinforce this approach by emphasising that there is no "one-size-fits-all" solution to language endangerment. Each language has its own context, history and reasons for decline, and strategies must be shaped accordingly. They caution that while learning from other communities' experiences is useful, assuming that a given approach will have the same impact elsewhere is risky and can undermine local agency. Instead, successful revitalisation begins with understanding specific contexts and designing tailored LR initiatives. The guidelines outlined in Section 3 of this report are sensitive to these concerns. The case studies analysed in previous RISE UP reports (e.g. D5.1) illustrate that what works for one language may not work for another, even within similar regions. Similarly, D3.1, D4.1 and D4.2 show that each language has its own ecology, and policy interventions must therefore be tailored to the community's size, resources, history and goals.

Finally, ecological thinking calls for coordination across all factors and sectors that influence language use, namely education, governance/policymaking, culture, media, technology, economy etc. It recognises that LR must balance practical measures (such as policy reform, education and funding) with social goals of empowerment, cultural continuity and wellbeing. Seeing languages as ecosystems means recognising interdependence: between people and institutions, between material resources and symbolic values, and between local actions and wider language policy frameworks. Adopting an ecological perspective helps policymakers and practitioners to see language revitalisation as an ongoing process of balancing interrelated forces. It encourages holistic planning that values diversity and resilience rather than standardisation. These ecological insights also shape the guiding values and ethical principles discussed in the following section.

2.3 Guiding values and ethics

Language revitalisation is not only a policy process but also an ethical commitment to inclusion, respect and reciprocity. Across all RISE UP deliverables, and consistent with the RISE UP Guidelines for Researchers (RISE UP, 2024), a set of shared principles have been proposed to guide how revitalisation should be planned and implemented. So we thought to explain these principles here, as they underline all the guidelines put forward in this report.

At the heart of these guidelines is inclusivity and participation. All speaker groups (including all generations of speakers – new, young, traditional, latent, heritage and diaspora – and all genders) should have agency in shaping decisions. Collaboration must therefore be understood as co-creation: language users, communities, educators, policymakers and researchers working together on equal terms and shared goals to design, deliver and evaluate LR initiatives. This principle, described in RISE UP (2024) as "collaborative collaboration," ensures that revitalisation remains accountable to the people it serves.

Sustaining languages also depends on intergenerational continuity, so that learning and use occur naturally within families, schools and peer networks. Equally important is cultural and linguistic diversity, recognising that every language contributes to Europe's democratic life and sociocultural wellbeing. Relationality and reciprocity are central to this approach: revitalisation must build long-term relationships that endure beyond project cycles and produce mutual benefit by strengthening community confidence.

An ethical framework also requires humility, listening and sensitivity. In RISE UP, these expectations extend beyond theoretical values to a set of working principles that shape how researchers should engage with communities. These principles outlined in RISE UP (2024) emphasise that relationships should be prioritised over outcomes (relationality – Principle 1), community expertise is recognised (humility – Principle 2), and researchers commit to attentive and culturally appropriate listening (listening – Principle 3). Goals and methods are revised as collaboration evolves (flexibility – Principle 4), and practitioners remain alert to historical and social conditions that require careful, trauma-informed engagement (sensitivity – Principle 5). Further, LR work is conducted transparently and respectfully, with communities fully informed and able to shape decisions (respect/transparency – Principle 6), and benefits are shared in mutually sustaining ways, and researchers do not just 'mine' data for their publications (reciprocity – Principle 7). Researchers are also expected to reflect continuously on their own assumptions and positionalities (self-awareness/self-reflexivity – Principle 8), to act with clarity and accountability regarding their responsibilities and work (responsibility – Principle 9), and to treat collaboration itself as a co-created process in which communities have equal agency from design to delivery (collaborative collaboration – Principle 10).While these RISE UP principles relate to the wider ethical issues discussed by Olko & Sallabank (2021), they place particular emphasis on long-term relational work and flexible, co-created processes. Revitalisation, in this sense, is inseparable from wellbeing, as it reinforces identity, belonging and collective self-esteem while challenging inequalities. These principles also show that LR should rest on ethical practices that sustain healthy multilingual ecologies rather than narrow language-focused interventions (Olko & Sallabank, 2021).

Because language ecosystems evolve, principles of adaptability and sustainability are essential. Revitalisation strategies must remain flexible, revisiting goals as circumstances change and

continuously reflecting on their assumptions and impact. This self-awareness and reflexivity ensure that actions are principled and aligned with community priorities.

To recap, the ten RISE UP guiding values/principles for those working with minoritised language communities are: relationality, humility, listening, flexibility, sensitivity, respect/transparency, reciprocity, self-awareness/self-reflexivity, responsibility, and collaborative collaboration (RISE UP, 2024). Together, these principles translate the ecological model into ethical practice. They affirm that LR succeeds only when it is participatory, context-sensitive and grounded in trust, respect and shared responsibility. These principles ensure that every guideline proposed in this report is grounded in respect, participation and shared responsibility. By embedding ethical considerations within revitalisation planning, D3.2 aims to connect the ecological analysis of D3.1 with the practical guidance in order to create a coherent and people-centred framework for language policy and practice in Europe.

3 Key arenas and approaches in language revitalisation

3.1 Education

The education space is a key component of the ecosystem that sustains language revitalisation. For instance, in contexts where intergenerational transmission is no longer active, the education space provides an opportunity for younger speakers to acquire the language. It also provides the chance for skilled educators to be trained, as well as serves as a public space where the language gets legitimacy. As Sallabank (forthcoming) notes, drawing on Grenoble and Whaley (2006), this is particularly important because, historically, formal schooling was one of the main sites of language suppression. In many communities, schools that once punished children for speaking their mother tongue have become the very institutions leading its revival. Moreover, school-based adoption of the language also functions as a form of status planning and official recognition, which can raise prestige and create further opportunities for use.

We define education in its broadest sense, without limiting it to schools. It includes early years, formal primary and secondary schooling, further and higher education, adult and community provision, as well as digital learning environments. Education works best when it is embedded in the wider linguistic ecosystem and when it is planned to support intergenerational transmission, everyday use and community goals rather than standing apart from them (see RISE UP D3.1; Sallabank, forthcoming). Experience from other LR contexts shows that education systems are most effective when they are part of a holistic, community-wide process of re-establishing value and pride in the language (Warner, 2001). Beyond the classroom, education helps sustain learners' motivation when it provides real opportunities for use and connects learning with actual use, linked to culture, identity and community (Olko & Sallabank 2021).

3.1.1 Evidence and challenges from RISE UP and the literature

As stated earlier, there is no single approach to success in educational LR. Each language community has different histories, resources and aims. Educational policies and programmes must therefore be tailored to context and should avoid assuming that an approach used elsewhere will produce the same results locally. The diversity of educational responses around the world confirms this. For example, the Māori language movement in New Zealand and the preschools in Hawai'i, which started what is now called "language nests", demonstrate how community-led early-years education can revive

intergenerational transmission (King, 2001; Sallabank, forthcoming; Warner, 2001). Some European language communities have followed this model too; e.g. Sorbian (Dołowy-Rybińska, 2023; Zorja, 2022) and Manx (Mooinjer Veggey, n.d.; Sallabank, 2013, forthcoming). However, evidence from other contexts shows that even well-developed immersion and bilingual schooling does not automatically lead to the re-establishment of intergenerational transmission. In Wales, for example, research suggests that many pupils educated through Welsh do not continue to use the language widely after leaving school (Edwards & Newcombe, 2005), which re-echoes the situation in the Aranese-speaking community (one of RISE UP's case study communities; see D3.1 for a detailed discussion of this). This underlines the need for educational approaches to be embedded in a wider ecosystem of community, family and societal support.

For education to be meaningful, it must go beyond symbolic provision, as is the case in some RISE UP communities. We found that in the Cornish context, for example, Cornish language teaching is mostly symbolic (as it is not part of the curriculum and so is not intensive enough to be effective for learning), and therefore lacks the potential to help learners become proficient in the language, as most of the teachers do not have adequate training and are sometimes themselves not proficient in the language (Broadhurst, 2020, 2023; Eppler, 2025; Schukking et al., 2019). Many communities rely on short weekly lessons delivered by teachers without training, with no suitable materials or progression routes. These can raise awareness but rarely produce fluent users and may unintentionally signal that the language is peripheral to serious learning. Olko and Sallabank (2021) advise careful planning of aims and staged objectives, alongside realistic assessments of resources, teacher training and materials development, before launching classroom provision that risks low impact and learner discouragement. Comparable patterns can be seen in the Irish and Aranese contexts, where both lessons in the language and using the language as the medium of instruction in schools have raised awareness but have not resulted in widespread everyday use. In both contexts, research shows that school-based provision remains superficial unless learners receive sustained exposure to the language in school *in addition to* having real opportunities to use it outside the classroom (Haarmann, 1990; see also D3.1).

Educational outcomes depend on supportive policy, stable funding and visible public use. When education is not connected to community life, media, culture and family domains, gains in the classroom do not translate into everyday use. D3.1 identifies this challenge in some of the RISE communities (e.g., Aranese community) where while there is a robust presence of Aranese in the classroom, this has not translated into the use of the language in people's everyday lives. Effective strategies for education in LR must therefore link any form of schooling with informal learning, cultural participation and opportunities for language use in public spaces and services, as it has been consistently shown that without complementary support in family and social spheres, formal education alone is often insufficient to sustain long-term vitality (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Hickey, 2007; King, 2001; Olko & Sallabank, 2021). Even highly successful immersion initiatives such as Māori and Hawaiian LR examples rely on strong family and community participation outside school hours (Hinton & Hale, 2001).

Modern LR programmes rely on new speakers, heritage users and adult learners. Education systems should therefore value these user profiles equally and design programmes that recognise different starting points and motivations. Insisting on narrow authenticity can exclude those who are most active in revitalisation. The practical guidance in Olko and Sallabank (2021) and the analysis in D3.1 support inclusive approaches that welcome all learners and create bridges between classroom learning and community participation (Leonard, 2017; O'Rourke et al., 2015).

3.1.2 What works across the educational continuum

Language nests, playgroups and culturally anchored early childhood settings create strong foundations for transmission and positive attitudes. Support for parents and caregivers, including family classes and mentoring, helps language use at home and connects early years to primary school. D3.1 highlights that motivation and emotional attachment are sustained when very young children and their families experience the language as normal and enjoyable in daily life. Sallabank (forthcoming), citing King (2001) and Warner (2001), notes that Māori and Hawaiian language nests successfully combined language learning with traditional stories, music and childcare practices, which helps embed the language in daily routines.

During a fieldwork visit to Cornwall in 2024, we learned of a nursery-school teacher who had initiated a bilingual English-Cornish class but had only a single learner of Cornish in attendance at the time. The child's mother was insistent that her child gain competence in Cornish; however, the mother herself declined to learn the language, citing time and resource constraints as her main challenges. According to teacher, the mother's lack of interest greatly limited the child's opportunity to use the language outside the classroom. Such an example illustrates how parental capacity (or the lack thereof) to engage directly in the language-learning process may inhibit acquisition and later family transmission. Programmes that offer targeted support for parents, such as family-classes, mentoring schemes and easily accessible materials, could therefore make a critical difference in connecting early-years settings to home practices. Comparable approaches have been impactful elsewhere. In the Isle of Man, for example, the Manx-medium school places strong emphasis on supporting parents to learn Manx and use it at home, an approach that has helped rebuild family transmission (Sallabank, forthcoming). One example that RISE UP communities and indeed other minoritised languages in Europe can learn from is the Parents for Welsh Medium Education programmes in Wales (funded by the Welsh government), which supports parents and guardians to support their children in learning Welsh (Parents for Welsh Medium Education, 2025). Programmes such as this require a great deal of thinking and planning and the provision of well-designed materials that families can use together. It might even require providing material or financial support to help interested parents work less to devote more time to attending classes and learning with/teaching their children, which boils down to funding, a key drawback in LR efforts (see D3.1).

Where possible, immersion or strong bilingual models with clear time allocations and curriculum integration are preferable occasional learning opportunities. Schools need coherent progression, age-appropriate resources in subject areas, and assessment that values communicative competence as well as literacy. Teacher education and in-service support are decisive. Without trained language teachers, provision cannot scale or maintain quality. D3.1 and D2.1 both underline the importance of policy frameworks that secure time, staffing and funding for minority language education, and that align school level practice with regional or national objectives for linguistic diversity. Although immersion and bilingual models require financial commitment, research shows that improved educational achievement for minority children, enhanced cognitive skills and stronger social participation among bilingual learners generate long-term economic gains that help recoup the initial investment (Filippi et al., 2025; Grin, 1990; Limon & Novak Lukanovič, 2017). The Diwan network in Brittany, established by parents in 1977, provides a model of sustainable community-school partnerships. It grew from a handful of preschools to a full network of primary and secondary immersion schools (Vetter, 2013). Comparable developments can also be seen in the Basque Country, where the Ikastola movement expanded from community-run schools to a well-established immersion network integrated into the regional education system (Zalbide & Cenoz, 2008).

Post-school pathways also help sustain momentum and motivation. Options include foundation courses for adult new speakers, vocational modules that enable the use of the language in tourism,

culture and public services, and teacher training opportunities. Scholarships, micro credentials and partnerships between universities, colleges and community organisations can support this tier. An excellent example in this regard is the work of the Institute of Cornish Studies at the University of Exeter, which currently runs several programmes and courses in Cornish (University of Exeter, 2025). Such university-level modules and research opportunities help to legitimise the languages academically, thereby contributing to the availability of the next generation of teachers and linguists. Comparable initiatives elsewhere show how post-school learning can open routes into new professional domains. In Brittany, intensive Breton-language training has supported professional reorientation into education and cultural work, while the Zorja Project in Lusatia provides structured pathways for adults to gain Sorbian skills for employment in public services and community institutions (Zorja, 2022).

Adult learners are active agents in LR work. As a result, flexible evening classes, conversation circles, language cafés, intensive weekend camps and mentorship schemes constitute practices that can encourage them to learn minoritised languages (Olko & Sallabank, 2021). Such learning opportunities are most effective when they include regular opportunities for real use, peer support and clearly signposted routes from beginner to advanced language skills. Community- and learner-based assessment of progress and recognition of volunteer mentors can help retain motivation. Master–Apprentice style approaches to LR, where learners are mentored by a fluent elder on everyday tasks, are widely recognised in international LR practices (Jenni et al., 2017) and could offer a model for European contexts even though they are not yet widely used in the RISE UP regions.

In today's world, digital tools have become essential complements to face-to-face provision. Online forums and "safe spaces" for practice, such as the Cornish "I pledge to become more fluent in Cornish" Facebook group, have also proved effective in supporting informal use and sustained learner engagement. D4.1 documents a wide range of resources that extend exposure, enable self-paced study and connect dispersed communities. Effective strategies include blended courses that combine classroom sessions with apps and online tasks, short video content for youth audiences, community curated repositories of materials, and moderated online groups for practice. Digital work should be accessible and low barrier, and it should be linked to offline opportunities for use and to locally relevant content that reflects community culture and identity (see RISE UP D4.1; RISE UP D3.1).

3.1.3 Case-anchored illustrations from RISE UP

The examples presented above show how educational approaches differ across ecologies and why tailoring educational LR initiatives is essential. In the Aranese community, for example, Aranese has strong legal status within Catalonia and is well established as a medium of instruction in the school system. The challenge, however, is sustaining everyday use of the language beyond school. Policy attention should therefore focus on bridges between school learning and community use, including youth cultural activities, media and employment routes where Aranese is useful in practice. With regard to Burgenland Croatian, there is bilingual education (even if uneven) and cultural associations. Targeted measures include teacher recruitment and training, contemporary curricular materials that reflect present-day youth interests, and vocational modules that connect language skills with local economy sectors such as culture and tourism. These measures reinforce structural conditions and practical motivation identified in D3.1. For Cornish, provision is growing through community and a few school initiatives, but mostly through adult learning. Challenges in this context include a lack of coherent progression from primary tasters to sustained programmes in later schools, lack of teacher training (Eppler, 2025), and lack of opportunities for learners to use Cornish in their everyday life activities. Digital micro learning and children media content can widen access and support families who want to introduce Cornish at home, consistent with the emphasis on informal domains in D3.1 and on practical planning outlined in Olko and Sallabank (2021). With Seto, community-based early

years and informal provision are strongly recommended as a first step, as sustained progress depends on secure recognition and a clear, long-term plan to increase provision, including resourcing, trained educators and institutional support.

Lastly, in Aromanian-speaking communities, school-based provision is limited and uneven across regions. Strategies should therefore initially emphasise weekend schools, diaspora classes, digital content and teacher training for community educators. Collaboration with cultural associations can provide space and legitimacy. D2.1 notes policy constraints and uneven recognition, which makes bottom-up and cross-border educational cooperation especially important in the context of Aromanian.

3.1.4 Enablers of language revitalisation in education

For LR to be sustainable in education, trained teachers are indispensable. Measures to increase the number of qualified educators might include scholarships for prospective teachers, paid internships in community programmes, co-teaching models that pair expert speakers with trained educators, and regional centres that provide ongoing professional development. Peer networks and mentoring for teachers reduce isolation and help maintain quality. D3.1 and D4.1 both point to the benefits of structured support for volunteers who often teach the community classes, including training in pedagogy and access to adaptable materials.

Materials should be locally relevant, age-appropriate and diversified across domains. They should develop methodologies relevant to local cultures and to minoritised languages that do not have the resources available for larger ones. Materials might include storybooks, content modules for science, arts and local history, and sector-specific resources for vocational routes. Open licensing and community co-production can accelerate availability while keeping costs low, a practice highlighted in several resources compiled in D4.1. Materials development, design and illustration costs etc. can be shared across minoritised language groups. Iterative improvement of these materials based on user feedback is encouraged.

Assessment of learning should reward communicative ability, participation and real-world use, and should be appropriate to age and context. It should be noted that many minoritised languages do not have standards to measure performance against, and are used in more than one country; in such cases any assessment should be flexible (e.g. accepting alternative writing systems), and alternative models such as a polynomic approach (Jaffe, 2008; Van der Lubbe, 2023) can be adopted. ‘Can-do’ descriptors such as those in the Common European Framework of Languages (CEFR, 2001) may need to be adapted for minority languages which have restricted domains of use and number of users. Micro-credentials for achievement in adult learning, recognition for volunteer mentors and credits for community service in the language are examples of practical means of sustaining motivation. Where national systems allow, alignment with recognised qualification frameworks can provide further visibility and valorisation. For example, several contacts in Cornwall mentioned that the fact that England’s national curriculum does not include the Cornish language discourages many students from taking interest in the language.

Long-term funding, clear policy mandates and coordination across education, culture and media are essential. D2.1 documents how fragmented governance and short project cycles undermine educational provision. For example, the Go Cornish programme in Cornwall, which has been commended by many as successful in taking Cornish to schools (Broadhurst, 2023) is currently under threat due to funding challenges. Funding criteria should favour partnerships that link schools with community organisations, cultural institutions and media producers so that learning connects with use and visibility.

Finally, provision of learning opportunities must reach rural areas, small schools and dispersed communities. Solutions include itinerant or peripatetic teaching teams, hybrid delivery, digital resource hubs and support for travel to intensive camps. Policies should remove financial barriers for families and adult learners through fee waivers, childcare support and transport subsidies where feasible. One interviewee in Cornwall explained how transport challenges limited their ability to travel for classes even after having paid the fees for the sessions. The measures mentioned above align with RISE UP's ethical principles of inclusion, reciprocity and responsibility (RISE UP, 2024).

3.1.5 Recommendations for action

The issues discussed above are summarised in the following recommendations for action:

1. Establish an education plan that covers early years, school, adult learning and digital provision, with clear progression and pathways into community use and employment.
2. Invest in teacher training through scholarships, co-teaching models and continuous professional development, including support for community educators and volunteers.
3. Prioritise approaches that involve or encourage real use, such as immersion programmes, conversation groups and project-based learning linked to local culture and economy.
4. Fund the development of adaptable, locally relevant materials across age groups and sectors. Use open licences and community co-creation initiatives to scale availability.
5. Align schooling with community and cultural activities so that learners have places and reasons to use the language outside the classroom. The "Icelandic Village" model being adapted into the Burgenland Croatian context by RISE UP WP4 colleagues at the University of Vienna is a good example here (see D4.3 for details).
6. Design inclusive activities for new speakers, heritage users and adult learners, with recognition of achievements through micro-credentials and community awards.
7. Provide stable multi-year funding and coordination across education, culture, media and governance to create momentum and visibility.
8. Ensure equitable access through hybrid delivery, support for travel and childcare, and outreach to rural and diaspora communities.
9. Monitor outcomes with indicators that track not only enrolments and test scores but also participation in community activities and use of the language in daily life, taking into account the language's vitality level.
10. Review plans regularly with communities to adjust aims and methods as contexts evolve, consistent with the reflective practice recommended for LR.

3.2 Raising awareness and prestige

Raising awareness about minoritised languages is one of the key conditions for language vitality. It strengthens both the emotional and social factors that enable use, pride and motivation for the use of the languages. Since no revitalisation effort can succeed without positive attitudes, public visibility and sustained legitimacy for the language (Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, forthcoming), it is therefore essential that concerted efforts be made towards creating more awareness about minoritised languages. Awareness is not guaranteed to increase prestige and use, but it is a necessary first step. In line with this, this section outlines the main approaches to awareness and prestige planning, drawing on global evidence from the literature (Olko & Sallabank, 2021; Sallabank, 2005, forthcoming) and the practical experiences of RISE UP communities.

3.2.1 Official recognition and prestige planning

Prestige planning covers a wide range of activities, including campaigns for official recognition, domain expansion, and initiatives in the arts, media and the linguistic landscape. For many communities, their

language being granted official status is a key symbolic goal for its users, as it can lead to inclusion in governance, education and access to funding for further revitalisation efforts. However, findings presented in D3.1 show that for official recognition to be meaningful, it must be linked to use. A case from the RISE UP language communities is Aranese, which, despite enjoying official recognition, is still endangered because its recognition is not complemented by opportunities for the everyday use of the language in informal social contexts (see D3.1).

Another example can be drawn from Cooper (1990) who compared the revitalisation of Māori and Irish, observing that New Zealand's success came from the efforts of the members of Māori community, whereas Irish language policy was largely government-driven, which has failed to mobilise local enthusiasm. This contrast illustrates that top-down officialisation without community participation can alienate speakers and hinder revitalisation. In Ireland, compulsory Irish-language schooling combined with inadequate teaching methods and insufficient teacher training reportedly created resistance among learners (Cooper, 1989). At the same time, initiatives such as *BÁC le Gaeilge* in Dublin and the *Gaeltacht Quarter* in Belfast demonstrate how awareness campaigns and prestige planning can successfully reposition a language as modern, urban and relevant when supported by effective public communication (Haarmann, 1990).

The point here is not to say that official recognition is not important. In fact, Spolsky (2004) argues that while use and community efforts play important foundational role in promoting LR, lasting success can sometimes depend on institutional recognition. In most cases, it is the grassroots activism for LR that eventually leads to governmental policies in support of LR (Edwards & Newcombe, 2005). This is because official status can transform the "linguistic market" (Bourdieu, 1991) to such an extent that it can lead to greater social and economic value for a language (Ó Riagáin, 2004). For policymakers, this underlines the importance of timing: it is preferable that recognition should occur while communities remain linguistically active and capable of leading revitalisation, not waiting until the language becomes already critically endangered. As noted by Grenoble and Whaley (2006), revitalisation is considerably harder when vitality levels have fallen to critical levels. Nevertheless, as the Cornish case demonstrates, it is never too late to revitalise a language, especially where documentary material is available. Communities should have the right to reclaim their language that has been taken away from them through earlier policies.

3.2.2 Expanding domains and media presence

UNESCO's (2003) vitality framework lists "Response to New Domains and Media" as a key indicator of linguistic vitality. Expanding minoritised languages into non-traditional domains of usage (such as digital communication, media, creative industries and local governance) challenges their perceptions as belonging to the past (Moriarty, 2011). This aligns with the RISE UP approach to revitalisation, which sees innovation in media, technology and the arts as essential for building prestige and interest (see D5.2).

For example, digital content creation, bilingual media outlets and local business branding have become critical to language visibility. In several European contexts, these strategies should complement rather than replace the visibility of the languages in education or raising their status and prestige via legislation. In today's digital world, the presence of minoritised languages in broadcast and social media is important in making the language present in everyday life, which is pivotal in any LR effort. RISE UP case studies show that young people engage more readily with revitalisation when the language appears in popular culture, online spaces and creative collaborations (see D3.1, D5.2).

The Cornish experience offers an excellent illustration of this aspect of media-inspired linguistic vitality. Following the release of the singer Gwenno's Cornish-language album *Le Kov*, the Cornish Language

Board recorded a 15% rise in people taking Cornish language exams (BBC, 2018). Examiners attributed the surge partly to Gwenno's cultural influence, describing her album as "a fantastic boost for the language." Gwenno herself noted that it was "quite incredible that the language is alive" and that "people are seeing it a lot more around them and they have become interested." She added that Cornish use was becoming more "casual," reflecting its growing integration into everyday life. This shows how creative output can contribute to the prestige of a language, raising awareness beyond traditional language learners and generating measurable educational impact.

More recently, Gwenno's role as a cultural ambassador has extended into the classroom. In 2025, she delivered a Cornish-language music workshop to Year 5 pupils at Mevagissey Community Primary School in Cornwall, encouraging them to sing in Cornish and learn about its history (Dixon, 2025). She explained that she wanted to share her experience of speaking Cornish because it was "a lovely thing that's about love and relationships," while one teacher observed that "seeing how inspired they [the students] were was great, and they're already asking if we can start a Cornish language club." These initiatives highlight how media figures can connect their visibility with informal education, transforming awareness into participation and emotional attachment. Examples such as these demonstrate how arts, media and education can reinforce one another in LR efforts. By making the language both visible and enjoyable in public life, creative collaboration helps sustain the motivation and pride, both of which are essential for long-term vitality.

3.2.3 Celebrating culture and the arts

Awareness-raising also involves celebrating heritage languages through cultural expression. Across the world, festivals and artistic initiatives have proved powerful vehicles for changing perceptions and stimulating interest. Examples include the Welsh National Eisteddfod, the Inter-Celtic Festival in Brittany (in which Cornwall will be celebrated as the Honoured Nation in 2026); Dan Mladine (a key festival for Burgenland Croatian); Jejuan children's speech contests in Korea; the *Wilamowia* theatre group in Poland; the Manx Music, Speech and Dance Festival; *Speak Cornish Week* in Cornwall; and *Sonsorolese Language Day* in Palau (Micronesia). These events serve more than symbolic purposes: they attract new learners, foster cultural tourism and create platforms for exchange. Several of such cultural activities exist across RISE UP communities, such as Cornish-language performances and Seto singing groups, with strong evidence of how cultural participation strengthens both visibility and motivation.

There is evidence that teaching minoritised languages using cultural activities can increase interest in the language among young learners (Olko & Sallabank, 2021), which shows that education and performance can be mutually reinforcing. In Sark, Channel Islands, for example, schoolchildren rediscover Sercquiais through plays and poetry, bringing visibility to a language spoken as L1 by only a couple of elderly speakers (Sallabank, forthcoming). At the opposite end of the educational spectrum, Hawaiian university students studying language and culture are assessed on traditional oration and hula dance. Both examples illustrate how integrating artistic practice into education can support learning in LR contexts This synergy between arts and education reflects a broader position of D3.2: that revitalisation succeeds when it links to use, and that this use can involve creative contexts.

3.2.4 Visibility in the linguistic landscape

Another vital dimension of awareness-raising is public visibility. Bilingual signage, community displays and digital branding normalise minoritised languages in everyday life. On the Isle of Man, nearly all public buildings and street signs now include Manx alongside English, while the airport welcomes visitors in both languages. One example from the RISE UP case studies is the Cornish community, where "[a]ll new and replacement street signs are either bilingual or solely in Cornish" (Cornwall Council,

2019, n. p.), and Cornish has become increasingly visible in public buildings such as museums, cultural centres and council offices. Other RISE UP communities are adopting similar initiatives, developing bilingual signage, museum exhibitions and creative public art to make their languages visible. These measures have an important symbolic effect: they make the language visible, legitimate and modern. However, as Adrian Cain, former Manx Language Development Officer, cautions, "language awareness raising isn't an end in itself — if it doesn't encourage people to learn and speak, then it hasn't worked" ((cited in Sallabank, 2013, forthcoming). Visibility should therefore be coupled with opportunities for use, such as in community events, school projects, public services, and everyday spaces such as supermarkets, bakeries and cafés.

3.2.5 (Re)categorising a variety

Prestige building also involves redefining what counts as a "language." Awareness campaigns and *Ausbau* (language elaboration) planning (Kloss, 1993; Trudgill, 1992) are critical for languages historically dismissed as dialects or patois. Guernesiais and Sercquiais, for example, were long perceived as regional varieties of French rather than distinct languages in their own right. Seto is still not recognised as a separate language from Estonian despite clear cultural and linguistic distinctiveness (see D3.1). In the RISE UP context, this process corresponds to the ideological clarification outlined in Section 2.1: communities must first assert the independent value of their language before policy measures, education and other LR efforts can take effect.

3.2.6 Policy implications and lessons

In summary, raising awareness and prestige creates the social conditions in which people know that minoritised languages exist in their communities, which might lead to their wanting to speak, learn and identify with them. As discussed above, achieving this requires synergy between stakeholders and measures, including legislation, education, presence in cultural and media spaces, and visibility in the linguistic landscape in order to transform awareness and recognition into real vitality. As Ayres-Bennett & Forsdick (2025) argue, effective language policy depends on interaction between top-down and bottom-up approaches, creating an ecosystem in which governmental frameworks, community initiatives and educational practice reinforce each other. Based on this understanding and the points presented above, the following key recommendations (especially for policymakers) emerging from this section are summarised below:

- Link official recognition to tangible policy actions and community participation.
- Prioritise early, proactive recognition at all stages of vitality, including for languages that already show signs of contraction or reduced transmission.
- Invest in creative industries, cultural festivals and youth-led media as vehicles of prestige.
- Support linguistic visibility through signage, branding and digital outreach.
- Support language development processes, including where appropriate polynomic approaches, in ways that respect linguistic diversity and cross-border variation.
- Ensure that awareness-raising always connects back to use, learning and intergenerational continuity.

In conclusion, the impact of awareness and prestige planning ultimately depends on whether it leads to real opportunities for interaction. In other words, visibility, cultural celebration and official recognition are effective only when they encourage people to speak and hear the language in everyday life. As D3.1 shows, prestige and awareness are ecological enablers that prepare the ground for community use, which then create the emotional, social and identitarian conditions that make revitalisation sustainable. The next section therefore turns to community language use and

socialisation, examining how informal domains such as family, peer networks and leisure spaces transform awareness into lived practice.

3.3 Community language use and socialisation

As has been stated in several places above, community-based use is the heart of the linguistic ecosystem. Without active, informal use in families, peer groups, and social networks, no amount of schooling, policy, or awareness-raising can sustain vitality. In the ecological model, community use functions as the link between emotional attachment, structural support, and real linguistic behaviour. This factor is discussed under the following subheadings.

3.3.1 Intergenerational transmission

Fishman, one of the key theorists of "Reversing Language Shift" (RLS), argued that family and community language use are essential for long-term maintenance: "Without intergenerational mother tongue transmission … no language maintenance is possible. That which is not transmitted cannot be maintained" (Fishman, 1991, p. 113). According to his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS), securing "informal intergenerational oralcy" must precede the widening of domains and formal education. Yet, as Romaine (2006) observed, most revitalisation efforts invest heavily in schools rather than families. A global survey of revitalisation projects by Pérez Báez et al. (2019) found that only a small number of them mentioned intergenerational transmission or parental involvement as part of their strategy.

This pattern is also visible in the RISE UP case studies. For instance, in Val d'Aran, and to some degree in Cornwall and Setomaa, learning opportunities for the languages are available, but everyday family use remains limited. D3.1 and D5.1 both note that where parental capacity, time, or confidence are lacking, learners rarely continue using the language beyond structured lessons. Policies therefore need to support parents and caregivers directly, by offering mentoring, flexible learning and community resources that make home-based language use feasible.

Once disrupted, intergenerational transmission is often difficult to restore. Ireland's experience illustrates this challenge: even direct financial incentives for parents to raise children in Irish have proved ineffective (Ó hIfearnáin, 2014). One classic example to support the power of family-level LR is the story of Daryl Baldwin of the Miami Tribe in North America, who revived *myaamia* in his family, inspiring a movement known as *myaamiaki eemamwiciki* ("the myaamia awakening"), with a new generation of children who have come to see the language as part of their community (Baldwin, 2024). Similarly, the Manx revival was driven by parents determined to speak Manx with their children and to establish Manx-medium education.

In this light, supporting families through flexible work policies, local learning hubs and parent-focused initiatives can help bridge the gap between schooling and home life (Olko & Sallabank, 2021). These measures also align with the ecological factor of "practical motivation" identified in D3.1.

3.3.2 Building new speaker communities

Romaine (2006) asked whether future linguistic diversity might depend on new forms of reproduction, forged not only through families, but also through adult learning and peer networks. This raises both practical and ethical questions: can "postvernacular" languages (Shandler, 2008), no longer used in daily life, become the primary medium of socialisation again? And how do we create realistic pathways for "new speakers" to participate meaningfully?

In order to build a sustainable new speaker community, regular opportunities for social use are vital. Fishman's (2006) model and later studies show that fluency and confidence develop only when learners can use the language outside classrooms, within wide-ranging social settings. Examples of such initiatives drawn from Sallabank (forthcoming) include:

- "Walking whilst chatting" events in Manx;
- The Manx-medium school football team, which uses Manx as a "secret language" — a method also adopted by American Indigenous athletes;
- Informal conversation cafés and social gatherings;
- Immersion retreats where participants use only the target language for days or weeks, such as the Tlingit Immersion Retreat in Alaska;
- Cultural and thematic outings, e.g. a goat farm visit conducted in Guernesiais;
- Online and social media interaction in online communities and groups; and
- Master–Apprentice programmes pairing learners with older speakers

D4.3 also discusses in detail two similar initiatives:

- "Safe spaces" for using a minoritised language. The "Icelandic Village" is a space of informal language use for Icelandic learners to participate in everyday communication in Icelandic, designed to build a bridge between the classroom and everyday life outside the classroom.
- Linguistic risk-taking, also known as linguistic challenges: spontaneous, real-life acts of communication that occur beyond the classroom, where speakers use the target language meaningfully and in context; for example, for ordering a drink, reading a book, or watching a video in that language (Cajka et al., 2023).

These types of initiatives are equally observed in RISE UP contexts. For example, D3.1, D4.1 and D5.1 document similar practices such as Yeth an Werin ("language in use") informal gatherings in Cornwall, Seto summer camps and Burgenland Croatian youth clubs, which are all examples of informal learning environments that allow participants to practise the language without fear of judgement. O'Rourke et al. (2015) emphasise that such social settings for language practice must be "safe spaces"; that is, environments where learners can experiment without stigma, since linguistic risks involves making mistakes in language learning, which is considered essential for building fluency and confidence (Cajka et al., 2023). Creating such safe environments is vital for sustaining motivation among new speakers, heritage users and returning learners, especially in small or dispersed communities. These safe spaces can also be virtual, for example, the Facebook page "I pledge to become more fluent in Cornish", where learners share tips and ask questions.

Equally important is inclusion. While many language activists are motivated by cultural or ancestral identity, excluding interested outsiders can limit growth (Olko & Sallabank, 2021). We are aware of learners of Cornish based in London, Switzerland and Australia. This insight echoes D3.1's framing of "community" as both local and relational, encompassing all speakers and learners of the language in diaspora and everywhere. A revitalised language community thrives when it welcomes all participants who share commitment and interest, not only those who share heritage.

Programmes that connect elderly, youth, and new speakers can revitalise language through shared purpose and collaboration rather than hierarchy. Policymakers should recognise these community-driven practices not as "extra" activities but as constitutive of the core of revitalisation. Funding opportunities and other forms of support should involve such local associations and volunteer-led groups that provide infrastructure for community language events, retreats, and cultural networks.

3.3.3 Policy implications and recommendations

Community use and socialisation form the living ecosystem in which revitalisation either succeeds or fails. Policies and projects should therefore prioritise community-driven action/use by supporting spaces, relationships and networks that make language use part of daily life.

Key recommendations emerging from this section include:

1. Prioritise family and community transmission by supporting parent-focused learning, flexible working hours, and mentorship schemes (Olko & Sallabank, 2021).
2. Invest in "new speaker" networks through social groups, immersion retreats, cultural events and digital communities.
3. Create safe, inclusive spaces for language use that encourage risk-taking and welcome participants of all backgrounds (Cajka et al., 2023; O'Rourke et al., 2015).
4. Recognise volunteer contributions by funding community organisers, language mentors and peer facilitators, who constitute the backbone of grassroots revitalisation.
5. Integrate community initiatives into regional policy so that informal activities are recognised as legitimate and measurable components of language planning.
6. Strengthen links between education, awareness and community practice to ensure that classroom learning, cultural engagement and daily use reinforce one another (D3.1; D5.1).

3.4 Linking language to wider societal issues

As highlighted in D3.1, the vitality of a language cannot be separated from the wellbeing of the community, its environment and economy. LR depends on wide-ranging factors such as social justice, cultural confidence and local resilience. In this sense, LR is not only a cultural activity but also part of a wider agenda for sustainable development, inclusion, decolonisation and regional renewal. This section examines how linguistic vitality interacts with cultural heritage, environmental awareness and economic opportunity, drawing on evidence from global and European contexts, including RISE UP communities.

3.4.1 Language, economy and inequality

Language shift is closely tied to economic and social inequalities (Grenoble, 2021; King et al., 2008). Local languages are often associated with traditional lifestyles that may be perceived as outdated or economically unviable. Choices about which language to use are shaped by the social and material advantages attached to dominant languages, often reinforced by systems that marginalise minoritised communities (Grillo, 2009; Williams, 1992). As D3.1 also observes, the erosion of linguistic vitality is both a symptom and a driver of wider structural marginalisation, relating to education, employment and civic participation. For example, in the Burgenland Croatian context, decades of economic changes and migration have reduced the presence of the language in everyday life, particularly as younger speakers move to urban centres for work and education (see D5.1).

Economic necessity is frequently cited as a reason for language abandonment, as many see limited instrumental value in learning or maintaining a minoritised language. Grin (1989) cautions that investing in minority-language regions yields limited impact unless accompanied by genuine efforts to enhance the language's status and relevance. This reinforces a key policy message: revitalisation must connect linguistic value to tangible benefits, such as employment, entrepreneurship, cultural industries and tourism, all of which are also emphasised in D5.2.

Language shift is reinforced by monolingual ideologies that deny the option of multilingualism or stable diglossia. Although linguists promote multilingualism as a social good, poverty tends to be most

pronounced in areas with high cultural and linguistic diversity (Harbert et al., 2009). In India, for example, members of Scheduled Tribes show lower literacy and educational outcomes than the national average. Romaine (2009) further argues that western models of economic growth equate efficiency with homogenisation that sustains monolingual language ideologies. The ecological approach adopted in RISE UP challenges this logic by viewing linguistic diversity as an asset for innovation, wellbeing and sustainability rather than an obstacle to modernity. Learning a majority language does not have to entail losing a heritage language; on the contrary, multilingualism has many social, cognitive, economic and health benefits (Amoruso et al., 2025; Hallett et al., 2007). Educational and healthcare policies, therefore, need to be aligned to maximise these benefits (see 3.4.3 below).

The Naro case in Botswana (Batibo, 2005) shows that combining language revitalisation with economic empowerment can produce significant social gains. The Kuru Development Trust integrated language development with vocational training and community industries, including crafts, jewellery-making, and publishing. This effort led to higher literacy, income growth and a stronger sense of pride. Alcoholism declined, education improved, and the Naro language became one of the country's most vital minoritised languages. This model demonstrates the principle that language revitalisation succeeds when tied to tangible benefits and community ownership, a lesson that European contexts seeking to align cultural, economic and linguistic policy can learn from.

D3.1 emphasised that revitalisation is holistic: it works best when language is embedded in everyday livelihood, wellbeing and other aspects of the people's lives. Projects linking linguistic revitalisation to environmental stewardship, mental health, or sustainable tourism can achieve both symbolic and practical impact. However, these initiatives must balance valorisation with authenticity. As Sallabank (forthcoming) warns, commodifying language for "heritage tourism" can reduce it to a static cultural brand rather than a living practice. In Wales, for instance, the National Eisteddfod generates an estimated £22 million annually, but maintaining its role as a space for living Welsh language use remains broadly unachieved.

3.4.2 Language for empowerment and wellbeing

Empowerment and wellbeing can transform revitalisation from a cultural objective into a driver of social justice, community resilience, and psychological health. Language use builds belonging, confidence, and control over one's future — outcomes that reinforce every other dimension of revitalisation discussed in this report.

Language shift is often both a cause and a symptom of social and economic inequality. Around the world, disempowered communities' languages become associated with disadvantage, poverty, and low prestige — a perception rooted in hegemonic power relations, not linguistic inferiority. In the UK and France, for example, minority languages were systematically denied recognition and suppressed (Grillo, 1989), often downgraded to the status of dialects of the majoritised languages. Romaine (2008) reminds us that revitalisation must centre people, not only languages: when communities are overlooked, preservation becomes abstract. This human-centred principle underpins the RISE UP approach: revitalisation is effective only when it enhances community agency, wellbeing, and social equity.

Indigenous and minoritised populations frequently experience poorer health outcomes and higher levels of poverty and trauma. Historical displacement and cultural suppression have created deep intergenerational wounds (Skrodzka et al., 2020; see also D3.1). As Gracey & King (2009) and Whalen et al. (2016) note, forced language shifts disrupt social knowledge accumulated over millennia, contributing to health crises such as diabetes, addiction, and mental illness.

To give one example, LR projects in the Kaqchikel-speaking region of Guatemala show how language revitalisation can directly improve wellbeing. In collaboration with the NGO Wuqu' Kawoq: Maya Health Alliance, communities created indigenous-language medical terminology and training materials, allowing health services to operate in Kaqchikel. The use of culturally grounded terms such as *kab'kïk'el* ('sweet blood') for diabetes made care accessible and destigmatised (Henderson et al., 2014).

The COVID-19 pandemic underscored how inequality magnifies vulnerability. With elderly people most at risk, many Indigenous communities faced the loss of their most fluent speakers — the keepers of linguistic and cultural knowledge — and severe isolation that damaged mental health (Brant-Birioukov, 2021). Nevertheless, in some communities, online revitalisation networks mitigated these effects by maintaining social connection and purpose. RISE UP findings mirror this experience. D3.1 and D5.1 report that online Cornish and Aromanian networks sustained motivation and community cohesion during the pandemic, proving that digital participation can complement in-person practice and support psychological wellbeing. Similarly, Burgenland Croatian communities expanded their online presence during COVID, with platforms such as Novi Glas online and other community-led initiatives helping to maintain language visibility and interaction despite physical distancing. Policies promoting digital inclusion for minoritised languages are therefore not only educational but therapeutic and social investments.

Recent studies show strong correlations between language vitality and health, self-esteem, and community resilience. As mentioned earlier, Hallett et al. (2007) found that First Nations communities in Canada with higher Indigenous-language knowledge had dramatically lower suicide rates. Similarly, Hodge & Nandy (2011) reported that Native Americans with strong linguistic identity scored higher on wellness measures. These findings resonate with RISE UP's ecological model: language vitality generates social capital that supports wellbeing. As a result, LR should thus be recognised as a public-health and community-development strategy, not only a cultural or linguistic one.

Whalen et al. (2016) stress that improved outcomes arise not merely from speaking the language, but from participation in a joint endeavour, community validation, intergenerational learning, and empowerment through identity. Similarly, Grenoble & Whaley (2006) describe a shift in thinking: from saving languages for their own sake to valuing revitalisation because it enhances wellbeing and belonging. Olko & Sallabank (2021) echo this orientation by showing how participation in community teaching, arts, and digital creation improves self-confidence and reduces isolation. The empowerment that comes from using one's language is psychological as well as political.

3.4.3 Policy implications and recommendations

Relating language to wider issues requires policy coordination across sectors, including culture, environment, economy, education and social inclusion. Language policy should not stand alone but function as part of broader strategies for sustainable development and regional cohesion.

Key policy directions emerging from this section include:

1. Integrate language revitalisation into regional and rural development policies, ensuring that economic initiatives promote and use local languages (Batibo, 2005).
2. Develop sustainable funding models that tie revitalisation outcomes to social and economic wellbeing, not only linguistic indicators (Grin, 1990; Olko & Sallabank, 2021)
3. Avoid over-commodification of language and culture, maintaining authenticity and living practice alongside economic valorisation.

4. Promote intersectoral cooperation between cultural institutions, environmental agencies and creative industries, as recommended in RISE UP's ecosystem model (D3.1; D5.2).
5. Recognise language revitalisation as a determinant of wellbeing, and integrate it into health, education, and social policy initiatives
6. Support cross-sectoral partnerships between linguistic, cultural, educational and health organisations to deliver integrated community programmes relevant to LR.

3.5 Governance, policy and partnerships

As briefly explained in section 3.2.1, governance and policy are a key component of the LR ecosystem. They help align community initiatives with institutional support and ensure that local energy translates into sustained impact. Effective governance is not limited to formal policymaking; it also includes how decisions are shared, how partnerships are built, and how accountability is maintained. In this section, we outline key governance mechanisms and collaborative frameworks necessary for successful language revitalisation in Europe.

3.5.1 Multi-level governance and policy coherence

Language revitalisation requires coordination across multiple levels of governance — local, regional, national and supranational. D2.1 identifies fragmentation as one of the main obstacles to policy effectiveness: responsibility for minority languages is often divided between cultural, educational and administrative bodies without clear coordination or shared efforts. This leads to gaps in implementation and inconsistent long-term support.

To address this, governance systems should be guided by policy coherence across different levels in order to ensure that all relevant domains (education, culture, media, economy, digital innovation and social inclusion) pursue complementary goals. As has been pointed out earlier, revitalisation cannot succeed through isolated initiatives; it requires a unified strategy that links language to every sector of community life (Olko & Sallabank, 2021).

At the European level, coordination can be strengthened through frameworks that integrate linguistic diversity into existing agendas such as *Creative Europe*, *Digital Europe* and the *European Green Deal*, the New European Agenda for Culture, and the Council of Europe's instruments on minority languages and national minorities. These programmes already recognise cultural and linguistic heritage as part of sustainable development. Further, it has been noted that the SDGs make little reference to linguistic diversity, despite its relevance for education (SDG 4), reduced inequalities (SDG 10) and sustainable communities (SDG 11). Highlighting this gap at EU level would strengthen coherence between language policy and broader sustainability goals (Eze et al., 2013; Harding-Esch & Coleman, 2017). Embedding LR within these programmes would help reinforce the EU's commitment to cultural rights and innovation.

3.5.2 Shared responsibility and participatory decision-making

Governance in LR must be necessarily participatory. As emphasised in the RISE UP Guidelines for Researchers (RISE UP, 2024), effective collaboration requires collaboration between communities, practitioners, researchers, stakeholders and policymakers working together on a shared vision. Local and regional governments play a crucial bridging role. They can provide institutional stability and funding continuity while giving communities control over specific LR initiatives. This balance between top-down support and bottom-up agency is at the heart of what D3.1 calls a "healthy linguistic ecosystem."

Successful examples include the *Gaeltacht* model in Ireland, where local development committees plan community-based language strategies with state funding, and the *Manx Language Network* (Jeebin), which coordinates between government departments, NGOs and volunteer groups. In Cornwall, for example, the Cornish Language Forum brings together Cornwall Council, cultural organisations, schools and volunteer groups to plan activities, share resources and monitor progress, creating a clear structure for shared responsibility. Similarly, Burgenland Croatian initiatives rely on similar multi-actor cooperation, with municipalities, cultural associations, church networks and schools jointly organising events that support different aspects of LR. These examples from RISE UP case studies demonstrate similar hybrid governance structures, where cultural associations, schools, municipalities and creative institutions share responsibility, leadership and accountability.

3.5.3 Sustainable funding and institutional support

Long-term sustainability depends on predictable and adequate funding. D2.1 and D3.1 both show that short project cycles and unstable grants undermine continuity and motivation. Revitalisation requires long-term investment horizons, linked to measurable social, cultural and economic indicators rather than short-term outputs. Funding models should combine:

a) public investment from local, regional and national budgets,
b) European-level co-financing (e.g. via Erasmus+, Horizon Europe, Creative Europe), and
c) community-based contributions such as cooperative funds or crowdfunding initiatives.

Olko & Sallabank (2021) stress that funders must adopt a realistic understanding of revitalisation timelines, because language recovery is generational, not annual. They also highlight the importance of supporting infrastructure, such as community centres, training programmes, archives and digital tools. Accountability mechanisms should be transparent but not overly bureaucratic, with community organisations empowered to define success according to their local realities. In RISE UP terms, this corresponds to “structural conditions” and “momentum”, two factors that allow ecosystems to grow through mutual reinforcement between funding, motivation and visibility.

3.5.4 Cross-sectoral partnerships

As stated previously, LR intersects with many fields: culture, education, economy, health, tourism, digital innovation and creative industries. Partnerships across these sectors amplify impact and distribute responsibility.

D5.2 emphasises the role of the *cultural and creative sector* as a catalyst for dissemination, visibility and participation. Collaboration with museums, artists, designers, media producers and educational institutions ensures that revitalisation is more thorough, and addresses all issues implicated in language use. These partnerships should not be *ad hoc*; they should be formalised through memoranda of understanding, co-creation agreements and integrated planning frameworks.

Examples from the RISE UP case studies illustrate this approach:

- In Cornwall, cooperation between cultural associations (*Kesva an Taves Kernewek*, *Kowethas an Yeth Kernewek*) and local authorities (Cornwall Council) has expanded Cornish language teaching and programmes.
- In Burgenland, partnerships between schools, churches, and Croatian cultural associations maintain bilingual identity through shared events and resources.
- In Setomaa, collaboration between cultural NGOs, municipalities and the creative economy links Seto heritage with sustainable tourism and crafts.

These models show that partnerships work best when they generate mutual value: for communities (empowerment), for institutions (legitimacy) and for governments (social cohesion).

3.5.5 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Governance must be adaptive. Regular review cycles and community-led monitoring ensure accountability and continuous improvement. As Olko & Sallabank (2021) emphasise, revitalisation is an ongoing process that benefits from reflective practice and exchange of experience.

Monitoring should include both quantitative indicators (e.g. participation rates, speaker numbers, use in public services) and qualitative measures (community satisfaction, intergenerational engagement, cultural vitality). RISE UP's ecological model encourages evaluation that captures how one part of the ecosystem (e.g. education or cultural activity) influences others. Partnership networks can establish learning platforms, exchange programmes and annual review meetings at regional or European level to share progress and coordinate strategies. Such mechanisms would institutionalise the mutual learning ethos that underpins RISE UP as a European LR project.

3.5.6 Policy implications and recommendations

1. Embed language revitalisation into cross-sectoral policy frameworks at local, national and European levels
2. Institutionalise participatory governance models that include community representatives in planning, implementation and evaluation
3. Ensure sustainable, long-term funding through integrated budget lines and multi-year programming
4. Develop cross-sectoral partnerships linking education, culture, health, environment and creative industries
5. Establish evaluation frameworks that measure social and cultural outcomes alongside linguistic indicators
6. Encourage inter-regional and European cooperation for exchange of good practices and co-financing of revitalisation initiatives.

3.6 Digital and technological innovation

Digital innovation extends access, visibility and participation across geographies, generations and abilities. As D3.1 notes, technological tools can reinforce the ecological factors of vitality (community activism, structural support, emotional attachment, motivation and momentum) by connecting people, resources and content in new ways. This section highlights how digital technologies can sustain revitalisation ecosystems, and what policy measures are needed to support their ethical and effective use.

3.6.1 Digital transformation and linguistic sustainability

The digital space affects all dimensions of linguistic health – education, media, creative industries and community networks. For minoritised languages, it presents both risk and opportunity: without active engagement, digital spaces become domains of language loss; with the right policies, they become engines of renewal. RISE UP D4.1 identifies digital tools as among the most powerful enablers of participation. Online courses, podcasts, subtitled films, and social-media initiatives help small languages reach dispersed audiences.

A few European policy frameworks (such as *Europe's Digital Decade* and *Creative Europe*) already support digital culture and multilingual access. Integrating endangered and minoritised languages into

these programmes would turn inclusion into innovation and ensure that technological progress reinforces rather than erodes diversity.

3.6.2 Digital education and learning tools

Online and blended learning environments expand opportunities for formal and informal acquisition. D4.3 documents successful practices including:

- open-source course platforms for Cornish and Aromanian;
- mobile apps for Seto and Burgenland Croatian vocabulary learning;
- online teacher-training modules in small-language pedagogy; and
- digital storytelling workshops linking language learning with creative writing.

These initiatives show that accessibility, design and cultural relevance are important in LR. Sustainable digital education requires locally produced content, user-friendly interfaces, and long-term hosting infrastructure. Policy support should focus on:

a) open licensing to share materials across regions;
b) investment in training digital educators and developers;
c) community control of language data (data sovereignty) (see below); and
d) cooperation between universities, cultural institutions and community groups to curate and update resources.

Digital media and creative technologies amplify prestige and emotional connection. Streaming platforms, community radio, and short-form video have made small languages visible in youth culture. D5.2 highlights how creative partnerships extend the reach of revitalisation into popular culture and tourism. These examples confirm that digital creativity should be treated as cultural infrastructure, not a by-product. Policymakers can strengthen impact by funding language-based digital arts, supporting local creative studios, and promoting cross-border collaborations that use technology to connect language communities.

3.6.3 Data sovereignty, ethics and inclusion

As Olko & Sallabank (2021) emphasise, technology must serve communities, not replace them. Ethical innovation includes community ownership of data, respect for consent, and transparent benefit-sharing (RISE UP, 2024).

Given that unequal access to technology can reproduce inequalities, policies must ensure digital inclusion through affordable connectivity, multilingual interfaces, assistive tools for persons with disabilities, and training for older speakers. This is essential to prevent the digital world from becoming a new space for exclusion. Linguistic data collected through digitisation or AI applications should remain the property of the communities who generate it, for example, by establishing local or regional digital repositories under community governance would align with European principles of FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data.

3.6.4 Innovation for the future

Emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, speech recognition, and augmented-reality learning, offer new possibilities for minoritised languages. AI-assisted transcription and translation tools can speed up corpus development; immersive VR and AR experiences can bring endangered languages into gaming and tourism; and low-code development environments can allow communities to design their own applications.

However, these innovations must be accompanied by ethical frameworks that prevent bias and ensure representation. This also includes respecting data sovereignty, so that communities retain control over how their linguistic data is collected, stored and used. European research programmes (e.g. Horizon Europe) can fund community-driven digital projects for linguistic diversity.

Even in Europe, rural and marginalised areas have lower broadband speeds and lower levels of access to digital services. There are proportionately fewer programmes, websites and apps available in minoritised languages. Thus, the "Digital Divide" needs to be addressed alongside other more concrete aspects of infrastructure. Digital inclusion and literacy are necessary for realistic evaluation of the possibilities of new developments, such as AI. AI can be useful for linguistic analysis and processing research, but minoritised languages are unlikely to have the levels of digitised data necessary for the large language models used for generating AI output in majority languages. Data sovereignty is also a major issue when using AI.

Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer (1998) warned of the risks associated with "passing the buck" to technology instead of taking responsibility for using languages in communities. Richard Littlebear noted in (Gina, 2007) that "we now have a litany of what we have viewed as the one item that will save our languages. This one item is usually quickly replaced by another". AI is the latest in this litany, but as Littlebear points out, "despite the advances in teaching methods and technology and our increasing dependency on them, our languages are still dying." He recommends that "We must use all of the items … in the litany to preserve our languages instead of pinning all of our hopes on just one."

RISE UP's forthcoming digital toolkit provides a practical foundation for digital inclusion: it will integrate examples, templates and open-access resources to help minoritised language communities harness digital technologies effectively and responsibly. It must be stressed, however, that digital tools cannot replace human interaction and wellbeing as the primary drivers of language revitalisation. In light of this understanding, RISE UP's digital toolkit includes tools for connecting with other speakers and growing new speaker communities.

3.6.5 Policy implications and recommendations

1. Mainstream linguistic diversity in European digital-culture and innovation programmes
2. Support community-driven digital projects through long-term funding, training and infrastructure.
3. Promote open-access, multilingual and interoperable resources while protecting data sovereignty and cultural rights.
4. Invest in digital education and creative industries to link revitalisation with employment and youth engagement
5. Develop ethical guidelines for AI and emerging technologies to ensure equitable representation of minoritised languages, and equitable access to digital tools.
6. Encourage cross-border collaboration to share digital tools, standards and best practices among European language communities.

4 Evaluating revitalisation

Evaluation is essential to ensure that LR policies remain accountable, adaptive and effective. As D3.1 stresses, vitality is ecological: so success cannot be judged only by a few factors such speaker numbers or formal teaching provision, but by the strength and health of the entire ecosystem. This section

outlines guiding principles, levels and types of indicators, and proposes a practical framework for monitoring progress in LR across Europe.

4.1 Purposes and principles of evaluation

Evaluation serves three main functions:

1. Learning – enabling communities and institutions to reflect on what works and why.
2. Accountability – demonstrating responsible use of resources and transparent outcomes.
3. Adaptation – updating goals as social, demographic and technological conditions change.

As stated previously, Olko & Sallabank (2021) emphasise that revitalisation is a long-term and often unpredictable process; therefore, evaluation must prioritise reflection and flexibility over rigid benchmarking. They propose a "learning-through-doing" model in which planning, implementation and assessment form a continuous cycle.

According to Olko & Sallabank, key evaluation principles include:

- participation of all stakeholders, especially language users themselves;
- balance between quantitative and qualitative data;
- contextual sensitivity, i.e., each language ecology defines its own indicators; and
- ethical responsibility, i.e., evaluation should empower, not penalise, communities.

4.2 Levels of evaluation

Because revitalisation occurs simultaneously at governmental, institutional and community levels, monitoring must be multilevel as well.

- Supragovernmental level: coordination between countries (especially withing the EU) to support cross-border minority languages and promote best practices internationally (see D3.1, D4.1 and D5.1)
- Governmental level: measures structural conditions, such as legal recognition, funding stability, inter-ministerial coordination, inclusion in education and media policy.
- Institutional level: assesses programme quality and reach, such as teacher training, curriculum delivery, public-service provision, digital access.
- Community level: tracks lived practice, such as language use in families and social networks, participation in cultural events, perceptions of pride and identity.

Data from these levels should feed into a single evaluation system, allowing patterns of reinforcement or weakness to be identified across the ecosystem.

4.3 Quantitative and qualitative approaches

Quantitative indicators, such as enrolment numbers, funding, publications or media outputs, are essential for comparability and resource planning. Yet they must be complemented by qualitative methods that capture the lived experiences of people in relation to LR.

Examples of qualitative approaches include:

- community focus groups evaluating changes in motivation or attitudes;
- interviews documenting intergenerational transmission in families;

- case-study narratives of successful projects;
- ethnographic observation of language use in cultural events or online spaces; and
- reflective diaries by teachers and learners.

Combining both types of evidence provides a holistic picture that avoids equating "more speakers" with "greater vitality" when social cohesion or wellbeing might tell a different story.

4.4 Participatory monitoring and reflexive learning

With regard to evaluation, communities must help define what success means to them. Local monitoring committees, annual self-assessment workshops and peer-review exchanges between regions can ensure shared ownership of results. Olko & Sallabank (2021) advocate involving community members in data collection and interpretation, turning evaluation into capacity-building rather than external scrutiny.

At national or European level, aggregated results should feed into open knowledge platforms, such as the digital toolkit being developed by RISE UP, to enable comparison and mutual learning across language communities. These mechanisms can complement existing European evaluation structures, including the Council of Europe's monitoring cycles under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Framework Convention, as well as capacity-building and evaluation work led by the ECML. Such mechanisms institutionalise reflexivity, while keeping revitalisation transparent and evidence-based.

4.5 Using evaluation to inform policy and practice

The ultimate aim of evaluation is improvement. Findings from evaluation should lead to timely adjustments in policy, as well as community-led initiatives. Regular review cycles can ensure that strategies remain responsive to demographic and technological change.

4.6 Policy recommendations

1. Adopt an ecological evaluation framework integrating all components of the linguistic ecosystem (D3.1)
2. Ensure multilevel monitoring so that governmental, institutional and community data inform each other.
3. Combine quantitative and qualitative methods for a balanced view of outcomes.
4. Institutionalise participatory evaluation to build capacity and trust.
5. Establish regular review cycles and open data sharing to sustain learning and accountability.

When evaluation becomes part of the revitalisation process itself, communities, institutions and governments learn together, helping reinforce the momentum that keeps languages going. The implementation and evaluation frameworks presented here complete the ecological cycle introduced in D3.1. Planning provides direction; evaluation ensures continuity and renewal. Together, they translate RISE UP's vision of a European language-preservation ecosystem into a living, measurable practice capable of evolving with its communities.

5 Conclusion

These Guidelines for Language Revitalisation build on the ecological framework established in D3.1, as well as insights from other contexts (including those of RISE UP), to show how European linguistic

ecosystems can be strengthened through coordinated policy, institutional action and community participation. The report began by clarifying the ideological, ecological and ethical principles that must underpin all revitalisation work. It emphasised inclusivity, intergenerational continuity, adaptability and sustainability as the ethical core of revitalisation practice.

It then explored the main arenas where revitalisation occurs. Education emerged as one of the most powerful long-term enablers of transmission, particularly when it is connected to community life. Raising awareness and prestige was shown to influence language attitudes and policy legitimacy, while community use and socialisation confirm that everyday interaction remains the ultimate measure of vitality. Section 3 demonstrates that revitalisation is inseparable from wider questions of equality, mental health and sustainable development, and that language can act as both a driver and an outcome of social cohesion and inclusion. The discussions on governance and digital innovation highlighted how strong partnerships, transparent policymaking and responsible use of technology can connect efforts across Europe.

The final section translated these insights into practical tools for evaluation of success in LR. It outlined how planning should be distributed across governmental, institutional and community levels, each reinforcing the others within a single ecosystem. It also proposed evaluation and monitoring approaches based on D3.1's ecological indicators so that success can be understood as a living process rather than a static goal.

Overall, these elements form a coherent approach that bridges theory and practice. D3.2 positions language revitalisation as a collective responsibility requiring coordination across stakeholders and sectors. The recommendations proposed in this report emphasise reflection, adaptability and mutual accountability, which will ensure that LR remains sustainable and community-led. In doing so, the report affirms RISE UP's vision of Europe as a multilingual ecosystem in which linguistic diversity is not a problem to be managed but a resource for social wellbeing, inclusion, and democratic participation.

References

Amoruso, L., Hernandez, H., Santamaria-Garcia, H., Moguilner, S., Legaz, A., Prado, P., Cuadros, J., Gonzalez, L., Gonzalez-Gomez, R., Migeot, J., Coronel-Oliveros, C., Cruzat, J., Carreiras, M., Medel, V., Maito, M. A., Duran-Aniotz, C., Tagliazucchi, E., Baez, S., García, A. M., & Ibanez, A. (2025). Multilingualism protects against accelerated aging in cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of 27 European countries. *Nature Aging*, *5*(11), 2340–2354.

Ayres-Bennett, W., & Forsdick, C. (2025). Why top-down language policy matters. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1–12. Online First: https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2025.2562084

Baldwin, D. (2024). *Family, tribe, and the revitalization of the Myaamia language* (No. 45(3); HUMANITIES). https://www.neh.gov/article/family-tribe-and-revitalization-myaamia-language

Batibo, H. (2005). *Language Decline and death in Africa*. Multilingual Matters.

BBC. (2018, October 20). Gwenno 'sparks record numbers' in Cornish exams. *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cornwall-45917661

Brant-Birioukov, K. (2021). Covid-19 and In(di)genuity: Lessons from Indigenous resilience, adaptation, and innovation in times of crisis. *Prospects*, *51*(1–3), 247–259.

Broadhurst, K. (2020, October 2). *How does the decline and revival of Irish in Northern Ireland compare with the decline and revival of Cornish, and what successes from Northern Ireland can the Cornish language community adapt in its language policies?* Skians Conference. https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/articles/conference_contribution/How_does_the_decline_and_revival_of_Irish_in_Northern_Ireland_compare_with_the_decline_and_revival_of_Cornish_and_what_successes_from_Northern_Ireland_can_the_Cornish_language_community_adapt_in_its_language_policies_/29774594?file=56805803

Broadhurst, K. (2023). Cornish: Can an Indigenous Language Become a Fixture in the Local Primary Curriculum? In C. Blyth (Ed.), *'Other' voices in education—(Re)stor(y)ing stories* (pp. 31–51). Springer.

Cajka, S., Vetter, E., Griffiths, E., & Slavkov, N. (2023). Linguistic risk-taking and informal language learning in Canada and Austria. In D. Toffoli, G. Sockett, & M. Kusyk (Eds), *Language learning and leisure: Informal language learning in the digital age* (pp. 207–238). De Gruyter Mouton.

CEFR. (2001). *The CEFR levels—Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*. Cambridge University Press.

Climent-Ferrando, V. (2023). *Assessing the European Union's support to Regional and Minority Languages: 10 years after the Alfonsi Resolution (2013-2023)*. https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/study/assessing-the-european-unions-support-to-regional-and-minority-languages-10-years-after-the-alfonsi-resolution-2013-2023

Cooper, R. L. (1990). *Language Planning and Social change*. Cambridge University Press.

Cornwall Council. (2019). *Cornish Language Plan for Cornwall Council 2019–2022*. https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/lxdkl5mg/cornish-language-plan-2019-2022.pdf

Costa, J. (2015). New speakers, new language: On being a legitimate speaker of a minority language in Provence. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2015*(231), 127–145.

Dauenhauer, N. M., & Dauenhauer, R. (1998). Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response* (pp. 57–98). Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, D. (2025, June 11). Children get Cornish lessons with award-winning singer Gwenno. *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c5yxr2l611lo

Dołowy-Rybińska, N. (2023). Upper Sorbian language policy in education: Bringing the language back, or bringing It forward? In *Upper Sorbian language policy in education*. Brill.

Edwards, V., & Newcombe, L. P. (2005). When school is not enough: New initiatives in intergenerational language transmission in Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *8*(4), 298–312.

Eppler, E. (2025). *Minority language teaching and teacher training in the RISE UP case-study communities: Do Aranese, Aromanian, Burgenland Croatian, Cornish & Seto teachers share any experiences?* Cultural Heritage Management and Conservation Conference 18-19 September, University of Nottingham, UK.

European Commission. (2019). *European framework for action on cultural heritage*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/949707

Eze, N. G., Udaba, R. O., & Obiwulu, A. C. (2013). The role of language in achieving the world's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS). *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, *8*(6), 53–61.

Filippi, R., Ceccolini, A., Perry, R. C., & Thomas, M. S. C. (2025). The impact of multilingualism and socio-economic status on academic performance: Evidence from the SCAMP and the national pupil databases. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *28*(1), 53–72.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Multilingual Matters.

Gina, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (2nd edn). Northern Arizona University Press.

Gracey, M., & King, M. (2009). Indigenous health part 1: Determinants and disease patterns. *Lancet (London, England)*, *374*(9683), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60914-4

Grenoble, L. A. (2021). Language Shift. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.347

Grenoble, L. A., & Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Grillo, R. D. (2009). *Dominant languages: Language and hierarchy in Britain and France*. Cambridge University Press.

Grin, F. (1990). The economic approach to minority languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *11*(1–2), 153–173.

Haarmann, H. (1990). *Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework*. *1990*(86), 103–126.

Hallett, D., Chandler, M. J., & Lalonde, C. E. (2007). Aboriginal language knowledge and youth suicide. *Cognitive Development*, *22*(3), 392–399.

Harbert, W., McConnell-Ginet, S., Amanda, M., & Whitman, J. (Eds). (2009). *Language and poverty*. Multilingual Matters.

Harding-Esch, P., & Coleman, H. (Eds). (2017). Language and the Sustainable Development Goals. In *Selected proceedings of the 12th Language and Development Conference*. British Council.

Haugen, E. (1972). The ecology of language. In A. S. Dil (Ed.), *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen*. Stanford University Press.

Henderson, B., Rohloff, P., & Henderson, R. (2014). "More than Words: Towards a development-based approach to language revitalization. *Language Documentation and Conservation*, *8*, 75–91.

Hickey, T. M. (2007). Children's language networks in minority language immersion: What goes in may not come out. *Language and Education*, *21*(1), 46–65.

Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. Brill.

Hodge, F. S., & Nandy, K. (2011). Predictors of wellness and American Indians. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, *22*(3), 791–803.

Jaffe, A. (2008). Language ecologies and the meaning of diversity: Corsican bilingual education and the concept of 'polynomie'. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 3106–3116). Springer.

Jenni, B., Anisman, A., McIvor, O., & Jacobs, P. (2017). An exploration of the effects of mentor-apprentice programs on mentors' and apprentices' wellbeing. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, *12*(2), 25–42.

King, J. (2001). Te kōhanga reo: Māori language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 133–144). Brill.

King, K. (2001). *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Multilingual Matters.

King, K., Schilling-Estes, N., Fogle, L., Lou, J. J., & Soukup, B. (2008). *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties.* Georgetown University Press.

Kloss, H. (1993). Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *35*(1/4), 158–170.

Leonard, W. Y. (2012). Reframing language reclamation programmes for everybody's empowerment. *Gender and Language*, *6*(2), 339–367.

Leonard, W. Y. (2017a). Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language'. *Language Documentation and Description*, *14*, 15–36. https://doi.org/10.25894/ldd146

Leonard, W. Y. (2017b). Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language'. *Language Documentation and Description*, *14*, 15–36.

Limon, D., & Novak Lukanovič, S. (2017). Does bilingualism have an economic value in the ethnically mixed regions of Slovenia? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(8), 659–670.

Mooinjer Veggey. (n.d.). *Pre-School | Learn Manx*. Mooinjer Veggey. https://www.learnmanx.com/learn/pre-school/

Moriarty, M. (2011). New roles for endangered languages. In P. K. Austin & J. Sallabank (Eds), *Endangered languages: Beliefs and ideologies in language documentation and revitalization* (pp. 446–458). Oxford University Press.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2000). Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *1*(3), 306–367.

Murugova, E., & Evtushenko, S. (2023). Current trends in language ecosystem for a sustainable world. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *420*, 1–8.

Ó hIfearnáin, T. Ó. (2014). Paradoxes of engagement with Irish language community management, practice, and ideology. In P. K. Austin & J. Sallabank (Eds), *Endangered Languages: Beliefs and Ideologies in language documentation and revitalization* (pp. 29–52). Oxford University Press & British Academy.

Ó Riagáin, P. (2004). *Does achieving the status of an official language make a difference in the long-term viability of a previously dominated minority language?* Linguapax Congress 2004: Dialogue on Language Diversity, Sustainability and Peace, Barcelona.

Olko, J., & Sallabank, J. (Eds). (2021). *Revitalizing Endangered Languages: A Practical Guide*. Cambridge University Press.

O'Rourke, B., Pujolar, J., & Ramallo, F. (2015). New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity – Foreword. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2015*(231), 1–20.

O'Rourke, B., & Ramallo, F. (2013). Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst new speakers in contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society*, *42*(3), 287–305.

Parents for Welsh Medium Education. (2025). *Parents for Welsh Medium Education*. Rhieni Droa Assysg Gymraeg/Parents for Welsh Medium Education. https://rhag.cymru/en/home

Pérez Báez, G., Vogel, R., & Patolo, U. (2019). Global survey of revitalization efforts: A mixed methods approach to understanding language revitalization practices. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, *13*, 446–513.

RISE UP. (2024). *Guidelines for linguists and other researchers working with minoritised language communities*. RISE UP Project. https://www.riseupproject.eu/about/research-guidelines/

Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the survival of linguistic diversity. *Language Policy*, *5*(4).

Romaine, S. (2008). Linguistic diversity, sustainability, and the future of the past. In K. King, N. Schilling-Estes, L. Fogle, J. J. Lou, & B. Soukup (Eds), *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties.* (pp. 7–22). Georgetown University Press.

Romaine, S. (2009). Linguistic diversity and poverty: Many languages and poor people in a globalizing world. In L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds), *Contemporary Applied Linguistics Volume 2: Volume Two Linguistics for the Real World* (Vol. 2, pp. 46–64). Continuum.

Sallabank, J. (2005). Prestige from the bottom up: A review of language planning in Guernsey. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *6*(1), 44–63.

Sallabank, J. (2013). *Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies*. Cambridge University Press.

Sallabank, J. (forthcoming). *Models of language revitalisation around the world: Processes and outcomes*.

Sallabank, J., & Marquis, Y. (2018). 'We don't say it like that': Language ownership and (de)legitimising the new speaker. In C. Smith-Christmas, N. P. Ó Murchadha, M. Hornsby, & M. Moriarty (Eds), *New Speakers of Minority Languages: Linguistic ideologies and practices* (pp. 67–90). Palgrave.

Schukking, A. F., Sayers, D., Davies-Deacon, M., & Croome, S. (2019). *Cornish: The Cornish language in education in the UK [* (2nd edn). Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.

Shandler, J. (2008). *Adventures in Yiddishland: Postvernacular language and culture*. University of California Press.

Skrodzka, M., Hansen, K., Olko, J., & Bilewicz, M. (2020). The twofold role of a minority language in historical trauma: The case of Lemko minority in Poland. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 551–566.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1992). Ausbau sociolinguistics and the perception of language status in contemporary Europe. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 167–177.

UNESCO [Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages]. (2003). *Language vitality and endangerment: By way of introduction*. UNESCO. https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf

University of Exeter. (2025). *Language Centre in Cornwall Modules 2025/6*. University of Exeter. https://www.exeter.ac.uk/study/studyinformation/modules/

Van der Lubbe, G. (2023). Introducing a polynomic approach in Ryukyuan language learning. *Languages*, *8*(1), 11.

Vetter, E. (2013). Teaching languages for a multilingual Europe – minority schools as examples of best practice? The Breton experience of Diwan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2013*(223), 153–170.

Warner, S. L. N. (2001). The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 133–144). Brill.

Whalen, D. H., Moss, M., & Baldwin, D. (2016). *Healing through language: Positive physical health effects of indigenous language use*. F1000Research. https://f1000research.com/articles/5-852

Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*. Routledge.

Woolard, K. A. (2016). *Singular and plural: Ideologies of linguistic authority in 21st century Catalonia*. Oxford University Press.

Zalbide, M., & Cenoz, J. (2008). Bilingual education in the Basque Autonomous Community: Achievements and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *21*(1), 5–20.

Zorja. (2022). Program – Zorja. *Zorja*. https://zorja.org/zorja/