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ABSTRACT

In recent decades, communities across the world have been impacted by a raft of deep economic, social and political changes within their local and global environments. For some communities, these changes have had little effect on the vitality of their music genres, or have even strengthened them. For others – especially indigenous and minority communities – the changes have threatened the viability of certain genres, often against the will of the communities concerned. This in turn holds potential repercussions for individual and social identity, social cohesion, and the strength of other forms of cultural expression within those communities, as well as holding wider repercussions for the diversity of human heritage and even potentially the adaptability of our species.

Since the early 1990s, when linguists fully recognised the dire predicament of many of the world’s 6,000+ languages, the study of language endangerment and maintenance has raised general awareness of language loss, as well as increasing practical knowledge of how endangered languages might be supported. Relatively, efforts to sustain endangered music genres remain incipient. Breaking with a tradition in ethnomusicology of ethnographic and fieldwork-based studies, this dissertation theoretically investigates the ways in which research and practical experience from the field of language maintenance can inform efforts to support the sustainability of music genres. It responds to an increasing sense of urgency to address the wide-scale endangerment and loss of intangible expressions of culture, including music, as underscored by the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage.

Drawing on literature from both language maintenance and ethnomusicology, interviews with linguists and ethnomusicologists, and a case study (in turn based on literature, interviews, and a field visit), in this dissertation I argue that the extensive experiences and discourse from language maintenance hold significant relevance to efforts that support music genres to become or remain vibrant and viable.

The dissertation presents four key outcomes of the research. The first is a theoretical framework articulating the synergies and disconnects between language and music, specifically in relation to their viability. The second is a framework for assessing the level of vitality of music genres, based on an equivalent framework for languages. The third is a case study of a specific music genre demonstrating how this framework
functions in practice. The fourth is a set of recommendations for progressing efforts in music sustainability. I hope these outcomes may act as points of reference and departure for researchers, policy-makers, culture-bearers themselves, and other stakeholders in cultural vitality and viability, with the overarching aim to ultimately benefit the communities whose music genres are facing challenges to their viability. In this way, this dissertation contributes to a growing body of applied ethnomusicological research on the broad topic of music sustainability.

The dissertation itself is divided into two parts. Following the introductory Chapter 1, which presents the background context and rationale for the research, Part 1 (Chapters 2-4) addresses the theoretical aspects of the research topic. Chapter 2 reviews the state of research and practical approaches to music sustainability, identifying current strengths as well as a number of salient gaps and limitations. Chapter 3 develops a comparative framework presenting the key similarities and disconnects between languages and music genres in relation to their sustainability. This framework forms a foundation for appraising, in Chapter 4, the extent to which knowledge and experience from language maintenance may be able to help repair the major limitations in current approaches to music sustainability. Part II (Chapters 5-6) builds on the findings in Part I to demonstrate one specific way in which theory from language maintenance may be used to advance efforts in music sustainability. Chapter 5 develops a tool for assessing music vitality and endangerment, and Chapter 6, a case study, applies that tool to the north-Vietnamese vocal genre ca trù. The concluding Chapter 7 synthesises the findings of the research, and makes recommendations for future investigation and action in the area of music sustainability.

**Key words:** applied ethnomusicology, endangered languages, endangered music, intangible cultural heritage, language maintenance, language revitalisation, music sustainability, music vitality and viability.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

I live in what has been termed a ‘disappearing world’. Language diversity is declining but the recognition that endangered languages require attention is increasing. So it should be with other cultural manifestations, and I concur with the late Alan Lomax, who quipped that the world was an agreeable and stimulating habitat precisely because of cultural diversity (1985:40-6). (Howard, 2006, p. 173)

1.1 The problem

Arguably more than at any other period in history, recent decades have seen massive global change. Economic and industrial development, urbanisation, increased international tourism and migration, and the advance of technology and global information networks are just a few of the factors that have led to deep and rapid socioeconomic transformations at both local and global levels. There are certainly positive upshots, including wide-scale access to information, increased intellectual exchange, and access to and appreciation of other values and cultures. In other ways, though, these transformations are taking their toll on the planet. The threat they pose to biodiversity is no longer contested, and addressing that as a matter of urgency is high on the public agenda.

While environmental concerns are widely profiled, somewhat less so are the repercussions that these transformations have on cultural expressions, particularly those of indigenous and minority peoples. Tangible manifestations of cultures, such as buildings, temples, historic sites, and artworks have been placed in physical peril for a range of reasons (Ahmad, 2006, pp. 292-293), including encroaching industrialisation, tourism, and economic development. Also in jeopardy are intangible expressions of culture – what the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) calls “Intangible Cultural Heritage.” This heritage includes, among other things, the music, language, theatre, dance, and rituals of a people, as well as the spiritual and philosophical systems that inform them (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.2).

In the case of music, the many and complex local and global changes of recent decades continue to have a range of effects on the vitality and viability of genres. In some cases, the cultural shifts occurring in response to these forces represent successful
adaptation to the changing environment, and may even result in new forms of creativity that invigorate a music genre or the musical vitality of a community at large (Kartomi & Blum, 1994, p. x). At a general level, the state of music is arguably “as healthy as it’s ever been,” and there is “a lot more possibility nowadays for musicians to really experience a diversity of music-making” (T. Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011). It is even feasible that musical diversity has increased in past decades, as a result of the interconnections and influences between genres brought about especially by the rise of communications technology (U. Hemetek, personal interview, 22 July 2010).

This possibility does not, however, contradict the conviction expressed in UNESCO’s Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003a) that cultural (including musical) expressions are being lost at an unprecedented rate. Sometimes this is by the free choice of the communities concerned. In other cases it is against their will, such as when a population disperses or is decimated due to poverty, disease or war, or in situations of political and/or economic imbalances of power. A glance to Aboriginal Australia illustrates the point, where a “massive cultural extinction” is occurring (Marett, 2010, p. 253). When any music genre comes under pressure from cultural, socioeconomic, or political shifts, its viability may be in jeopardy. Inter-generational transmission processes may weaken, performance contexts may disappear, or the social function of the genre may become redundant.

Specific threats to the viability of music genres may take various forms. Open international borders means that small, local music cultures – those “belonging to the weak end of power distribution” (Nettl, 2005, p. 168) – may be forced to contend with more dominant external ones. Cultural hegemony adds to the likelihood of displacement by larger powers (most saliently, western pop music; Mundy, 2001). The increasingly widespread use of the internet, while it facilitates the dissemination of music, raises complex issues with regard to copyright, intellectual property, artists’ rights, and fair trade (World Intellectual Property Organisation, 2009). In turn, trade liberalisation agreements affect the right of governments to specifically support local music genres (Letts, 2003).

In addition to these external forces, forces situated mostly within a community may also threaten the viability of its music. As local peoples lose their rural ways of life, or as population drift to urban centres occurs, the cultural function and context of music may be forced to adapt (e.g. McLean, 1996, pp. 276-278). Former modes of transmission (such as through family ties) may be disrupted, and changes in ways of learning and teaching, for example when a traditional genre begins to be taught in a
formal institution, may prove unviable (Wiggins, 2005, p. 20). Community attitudes to music may change (driven by either internal or external factors), leading to traditional music genres falling out of favour, especially with young people (e.g. Moore, 2003, p. 25). Although these shifts take place within a community, they are often intimately linked with wider processes of change. The community is not always able to exercise control over them.

An estimate of the number of music genres in the world is difficult to find in the literature. Baumann refers to an extant 15,000 cultures (5,000 of them indigenous or aboriginal; 1992, p. 162). If each culture is steward of more than one music genre, the total number of genres will probably be significantly larger than this, setting aside, for the moment, the complexities of defining genre. How many of these genres are endangered is unknown, but qualitative research indicates that many “small” music genres are under considerable threat. UNESCO’s Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003a) articulated the urgent need to address the precarious situation of much of the world’s intangible cultural heritage, including music. A subsequent International Music Council report commissioned by UNESCO underscored the imperative, declaring that the homogenisation of music at an international level is a real risk (Lettis, 2006).

This dissertation, however, concerns itself less with global musical diversity than with the endangerment and loss of musical expressions at the local level. It is at the community level that the loss of musical expressions is arguably most keenly felt, and here too that counteractive measures are likely to be most effective:

I think we can point to the general loss [of music genres] and say, “Well, there is an issue,” but the only people who are going to change that are at the local level. . . We can talk about cultural grey-out, but it’s actually light by light that it’s greying out. (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011)

Some scholars argue, then, that the possibilities for ethnomusicological activism predominantly arise in specific situations where there exist “real, immediate pressures on musical practices . . . includ[ing] political and social oppression or dramatic ecological impacts” (T. Ramnarine, personal communication, 15 June 2011). Even so, it may be helpful to remember that each local situation of musical endangerment is positioned in a wider context too, and that the threat to musical expressions exists across the world.

Ethnomusicologists have a long-standing engagement with the ethnographic documentation of musical traditions seen as doomed to extinction; the concern has
persisted almost throughout the history of the discipline. In the mid-twentieth century, it found resonance and validation through certain movements in linguistics and anthropology, like the so-called “urgent anthropology” of the 1950s that concerned itself with “the imminent destruction of societies, cultures, and artefacts by modernization” and which argued for the need to focus anthropological resources on preserving them (Nettl, 2005, p. 167). By the early 1990s, however, there was a general perception among ethnomusicologists that earlier “salvage” or “white knight” efforts (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010) to save dying music genres were overly romanticised and neo-colonial. This led Myers to observe: “Out of favour is urgent ‘survival’ ethnomusicology whereby the fieldworker aims to preserve a dying tradition” (1992, p. 26).

Current ethnomusicological approaches to musics in decline tend to be more pragmatic than those earlier ones. They typically acknowledge the natural processes of the emergence, change, and decay of musical expressions, while showing an awareness of the many powerful global and local forces acting upon “small” music genres. Yet ethnomusicological understanding of music endangerment and possibilities for the maintenance and revitalisation of endangered genres is incipient compared with the research and concerted, international effort directed towards keeping languages strong:

[Sustaining music genres] is a process I think we talk about, but I don’t think that it’s been systematically studied to the extent that we can say, “Well, this is going to work” . . . . Instead we are reinventing the wheel every time we face a community that’s trying to preserve its own traditions. . . . I think we could do better. (A. Seeger, in QCRC, 2008, 3:00-3:33)

As intangible manifestations and expressions of culture, music and language are impacted by many of the same forces within the global and local environment. Like music genres, languages (particularly those of indigenous and minority peoples) may be adversely affected by cultural dominance, loss of traditional ways of life, unsustainable tourism and travel, the homogenising influence of the mass media, hegemonic governmental policies, and the impact of technology, among other things. The scale of the threat is egregious: of the six to seven thousand languages worldwide (Lewis, 2009), the figure usually estimated by linguists is that around half may be lost by the end of the twenty-first century (Krauss, 1992; Mackey, 2003).

Although languages seen to be in danger of disappearing have long been a topic of research for linguists (indeed, much early anthropological linguistics was devoted to documenting “dying” languages), it was the early 1990s when sociolinguists began to
perceive the severity and urgency of the situation, and take co-ordinated action. In 1995, the opening statement of the Endangered Language Fund had a ring of desperation:

Languages have died off throughout history, but never have we faced the massive extinction that is threatening the world right now. . . . The cultural heritage of many peoples is crumbling while we look on. Are we willing to shoulder the blame for having stood by and done nothing? (Foundation for Endangered Languages, 1995, para. 1)

Five years later, Crystal estimated that in the time it took to write his book *Language Death*, another six or so languages “died”; he implored linguists to act quickly “using as many means as possible to confront the situation and influence the outcome. . . . [T]ime is running out” (2000, p. 166). Almost a decade on, the Indigenous Language Institute (ILI, New Mexico) issued the following statement:

ILI is driven by the urgency of the work to revitalize indigenous languages. We believe that there is a ten-year window of opportunity to make a difference, and to turn the tide of language decline so that indigenous languages become a vibrant component of everyday life in [American] Indian communities. There is a race against time to save the precious human heritage and to maintain diversity. (Heritage Languages in America, 2009, “Insights” section, para. 1)

Agitated by several landmark articles about the world’s language crisis in the journal *Language* (foremost among them Hale, et al., 1992), academic research quickly gave rise to practical initiatives directed towards maintaining and reviving languages under threat. In 1993, UNESCO adopted its *Endangered Languages Project* and launched the *Red Book of Endangered Languages of the World* (now supplanted by UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger*; Moseley, 2009); within a couple of years, the International Clearing House for Endangered Languages had been established at the University of Tokyo, and the UK-based Foundation for Endangered Languages was inaugurated. Since that time, research into language endangerment has underpinned a range of practical approaches to maintaining and revitalising threatened languages.

Approaches to language maintenance may represent trodden pathways to maintaining and revitalising other cultural expressions, including music. The parallels between the predicament of language and music in the local and global environment suggest that there may also be parallels in ways to help them survive. As such, it seems the field of language maintenance may hold significant potential to inform our understanding of how to best support the vitality and viability of music genres. From
this premise arises the central question of this research project: how can theory and practice relating to the maintenance of endangered languages inform ways to support the sustainability of endangered music genres?

1.2 Rationale for the research

Despite certain complexities surrounding the ethics of cultural maintenance (described further in Section 1.6), in general, researchers, cultural activists, and national and international agencies are strongly in favour of making efforts to protect and promote intangible expressions of culture, including music. Decades ago, Lomax argued that scholars are “impelled to a defense of the musics of the world” (1977, p. 137); according to Baumann, “the protection of music as living tradition is not only an academic postulate but a cultural and political necessity” (1992, p. 15). The international non-governmental organisation Terralingua professes that resilient and vibrant cultures in general are a matter of social justice and basic human rights (2009). There are several reasons for views like these; the five most salient serve as a rationale for this research.

The first reason is applicable to intangible expressions of culture at large, and is eloquently expressed in the literature on language maintenance. Languages, the argument goes, often contain instances of intellectual genius (Hale, 1998); they also offer a direct glimpse at the creativity of the human mind (Mithun, 1998). The loss of a language therefore means an intellectual and creative loss for humanity. According to the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, “heritage in all its forms must be preserved, enhanced and handed on to future generations as a record of human experience and aspirations” (UNESCO, 2001b, Article 7). The disappearance of a music genre arguably also represents the loss of a manifestation of human intellect and creativity. Music serves functions beyond language, holding the potential to express aspects of culture and cultural identity that are incommunicable through words. Because each music genre manifests a unique expression of what it is to be human, often displaying a continuum of human creativity and imagination through generations, the loss of a music genre is a loss to human heritage.

A second reason we should care about the vitality and viability of music genres is that they contribute to the rich diversity of the planet, and of humankind. According to the International Society for Music Education, a rich diversity of musics “provides opportunities for intercultural learning and international understanding, co-
operation and peace” (2006, ‘ISME Core Values’ section). Further, as with biodiversity, the greater the diversity of cultural practices and music genres (the “richer the gene pool”), the better the chances that new combinations and permutations will permit cultures to successfully adapt to changing contexts (Letts, 2006, p. 9). Existing cultural expressions are informed by past expressions, and will inform future ones; emerging cultural expressions are almost always nourished by older traditions, which form a point of departure for invention and transformation. Cultural diversity therefore “widens the range of options open to everyone” (UNESCO, 2001b, Article 3; see also Marett, 2010, p. 255). The corollary is that the loss of cultural (including musical) diversity holds “dramatic consequences” for humankind (Maffi, 2005, p. 599). Marett highlights the consequences to the whole of humanity of “vanishing songs;” since songs represent ways of being in the world, their extinctions could “potentially compromise our ability to adapt to as yet unforeseen changes” (2010, p. 251).

Third is the consideration that intangible cultural expressions like language, music, visual art, dance, theatre, ritual, and ceremony are often interdependent within a culture. The loss of a music genre (for example) may mean the loss of the unique language embedded within it (see Marett & Barwick, 2003, p. 146) or the loss of an associated dance or ritual. By the same token, efforts to maintain or revitalise endangered music genres may strengthen the vitality of other forms of cultural expression; this is particularly true of language and song (e.g. Miyashita & Shoe, 2009; UNESCO, 2009a). Importantly too, songs are sometimes the unique vehicles of the transmission of local knowledge, culture, and history. Songs may encode knowledge of genealogies and mythologies; records of ancestors and clan names; knowledge of the universe and the land; medicinal and culinary knowledge; social norms, taboos, and histories; and cultural skills and practices, among other things. Thus, “the intimate link between music, speech, and the entire experience of ourselves” (Wachsmann, 1982, p. 211) creates a powerful motive to ensure the vitality and viability of music genres.

A fourth rationale for this research on maintaining and revitalising endangered music genres relates to the role music plays in building individual and collective identity. Music is a means by which identity can be expressed, and in most cultures, music’s core function in social events, ceremony, and daily life means that it plays a crucial role in defining and strengthening personal, social, and cultural identity. Music reaffirms our membership of a community, and our sense of being and belonging. Consider the words of an elderly Venda woman: “I am no longer a person because I can no longer sing” (Eisaei & Davidson, 2010), or those of the Amazonian Suyá: “When we
stop singing, we will really be finished” (Seeger, 2004, p. xix). Like languages, music can be used “to express who we are, to differentiate ourselves from our neighbours, and to group ourselves with the people that we consider to be part of us” (Austin, 2006, p. 7). Particularly among indigenous and minority peoples, music can provide a sense of continuity with the past, with cultural traditions and ancestral heritage. The Garma Statement on Indigenous Music and Performance exemplifies the link: “It is through song, dance, and associated ceremony that [Australian] Indigenous people sustain their cultures and maintain the Law and a sense of self within the world” (Corn, 2011, ‘Statement’ section, para. 1). Maintaining the music genres of indigenous and minority peoples may strengthen the sense of identity of future generations, by making it possible for them to engage with their cultural heritage.

Finally, in addition to helping strengthening individual and collective identity, vital and viable music genres can also strengthen social cohesion and individual well-being, both within and between cultures. It is well established that can be important for expressing emotion, for entertainment, communication, aesthetic pleasure, and to validate social institutions and religious rituals (e.g. Merriam, 1964, p. 219). There are indications across cultures that participation in music assists full participation in wider society, and can increase the likelihood of children and adults being well-adjusted members of society (Letts, 2006, p. 67). Also, if understanding a culture requires some understanding of its music, then the importance of cultivating vibrant music genres is clear, with implications for cross-cultural understanding and exchange. Significantly, the theme of connection between musical diversity and peace forms an entire chapter of Lett’s seven-chapter report, The Protection and Promotion of Musical Diversity (2006, Chapter 3).

The five reasons outlined above are certainly not the only reasons we should make efforts towards vital and viable music genres. Cultural revitalisation can contribute to social reconciliation, community capacity building, cultural tourism, and improved community health for Indigenous people (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011, p. 112); cultures and cultural diversity contribute to economic growth and the development of a knowledge-based economy (Mühlhäuser & Damania, 2004; UNESCO, 2001b). It might be argued too that just as efforts to maintain endangered languages are important on linguistic (as well as humanitarian) grounds (Ladefoged, 1992, p. 810), there are quite simply musicological grounds to keep music genres strong. Having access to a wide diversity of “small” music genres, for example, may
help us better understand the nature of music itself. Together, though, the five reasons outlined above form a compelling rationale for this research.

1.3 Positioning the research

In 2009, the five-year project *Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures: Towards an Ecology of Musical Diversity* commenced (Australia Research Council Linkage Project LP0989243; hereafter referred to as *Sustainable Futures*). Led by Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre Griffith University (QCRC; Brisbane) in collaboration with nine partner organisations across the world, the project was designed to provide a solid base of knowledge and resources to help communities and other stakeholders develop and implement more successful approaches supporting the vitality and viability of music genres. My own interest in this topic evolved during the preparatory stages of *Sustainable Futures*, during which time I was a research assistant at QCRC. My interest in languages derives from (or is perhaps simply reflected in) my professional training and experience as an English as a Second Language teacher and teacher-trainer, both in Australia and abroad, in the decade or so preceding this research.

Although independently funded and developed, my doctoral research relates to the *Sustainable Futures* project in two key ways: I employ the primary theoretical framework of that project, the *Five Domains of Musical Sustainability in Contemporary Contexts* (Schippers, 2010, pp. 180-181), to orientate the analysis and presentation of data in Chapter 3; and my case study music genre (Vietnamese ca trù, presented in Chapter 6) is also a case study for *Sustainable Futures*. In this second regard, benefits for my research included access to the project’s preliminary interviews relating to the vitality of ca trù, as well as to a network of relevant researchers and musicians. I hope that associating my research with *Sustainable Futures* in these ways brings reciprocal benefit, in terms of facilitating the use and maximising the relevance of my findings within that larger project.

Like *Sustainable Futures*, my research ultimately concerns the practical application of the knowledge it creates. It foregrounds the philosophy and principles of the sub-discipline *applied ethnomusicology*, which has recently begun to gain ground in the international arena (cf. Bithell, 2011; Harrison & Pettan, 2010, pp. 1-3). Challenging the idea of ethnomusicological research being used only within academia for the benefit of academics (Sheehy, 1992), applied ethnomusicology is “guided by principles of
social responsibility, which extends the usual academic goal of broadening and deepening knowledge and understanding toward solving concrete problems and toward working both inside and beyond typical academic contexts” (Harrison & Pettan, 2010, p. 1). My research aims to help develop effective instruments to maintain and revitalise endangered music genres, primarily by developing theory that may then be put at the service of this real-life problem. In this way, it responds to a perceived need to extend the theoretical foundations of applied ethnomusicology (S. Pettan, personal interview, 30 July 2010).

To a limited but growing extent, ethnomusicologists are attentive to the conceptual and theoretical parallels between language and music in relation to vitality and viability. Marett draws on language maintenance theory to argue that the extinction of music genres, like that of languages, is a tragedy not only for the communities who lose them, but for humanity as a whole (2010). Two recent doctoral projects demonstrate how language maintenance frameworks may offer new perspectives on issues of music sustainability: Coulter (Kent State University, USA) adapted and applied a model for assessing language vitality to the music of the indigenous Alamblak people of Papua New Guinea (2007); and Saurman (Chiang Mai University, Thailand) engages with language revitalisation theories in his ongoing research into music revitalisation within the Tampuan minority group in the Cambodian highlands (2010). These projects signal the potential for more general theoretical research into the relevance to music of language maintenance.

Academic investigation into the relationship of language and music has a long history (outlined by Feld & Fox, 1994). Up to the mid-1970s, research mostly centred on the possibility of applying linguistic models to musical analysis, and the overlap of musical and linguistic phenomena: the musical properties of speech, for example, or the relationships between song structure, texts, and poetics (Feld, 1974, p. 197). These fields of investigation have continued to develop, but since the 1980s have expanded to include broader aspects of the language-music relationship, like the biological origins of language and music and their relative functions in the survival of our species (e.g. Mithen, 2006). In these later studies, research from other disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, and neuroscience has significantly contributed to our understanding of the language-music equation.

In relation to the links between language and music within their social and ecological environments, the relatively new field of biocultural diversity investigates the “inextricable link” (International Society of Ethnobiology, 1988, para. 2) between
natural ecosystems and human cultures. The connection between linguistic and musical (and environmental) vitality and viability within a society is neither direct nor simple, and scholarly knowledge about it remains partial. One thing at least is clear: language and music do not exist in separate, parallel spheres, and the vitality of one can affect the vitality of the other. This connection is confirmed by certain initiatives that successfully use music as a vehicle to maintain or revitalise endangered languages (e.g. Green, 2010; Miyashita & Shoe, 2009; UNESCO, 2009a). Although my research acknowledges these “inextricable links” between the vitality and viability of language and music, it is more concerned with the parallels between language and music in relation to their vitality and viability: that is, it relates first and foremost to the conceptual, not actual, links between the maintenance and revitalisation of language and music.

1.4 Issues of terminology

The concept of intangible cultural heritage, encompassing both language and music, provides a useful starting-point for considering the terminology relevant to this research. According to the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.2), intangible cultural heritage includes oral traditions and expressions (language, poetics, story-telling), performing arts (music, theatre/drama, dance), social practices, rituals, festive events, traditional craftsmanship, traditional medicine, and knowledge and practices about nature and the universe. It is defined as the “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage” (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.1). According to that same Convention, safeguarding refers to

measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage. (2003a, Article 2.3)

By these definitions, my research explicitly concerns the safeguarding of intangible cultural (musical) heritage. Yet by and large, I do not employ these terms in this dissertation, despite the fact that its Part II draws heavily on a language framework developed under the auspices of UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage division. My
reservations about the terms are closely aligned with (and indebted to) those of Titon, who suggests:

If we think of music as heritage, primarily a thing of the past, we are immediately in a defensive posture of collecting, preserving, safeguarding, protecting, and mediating music, through proclamations and set-asides, special spaces and sanctuaries. (2009b, p. 135)

He offers an alternative:

But if we think of a music culture as something here, living, a renewable daily resource among us, we move into a discourse of sustainability, people in partnership, taking on the privilege and excitement and reaping the rewards of stewardship. (2009b, p. 135)

Titon’s partiality towards the notion of sustainability (over safeguarding) is reflected by – or reflective of – an increasing occurrence of that term and concept within ethnomusicological discourse (e.g. Schippers, 2009, 2010b; Titon, 2009c), and more broadly in relation to culture, especially in the United States (cf. the Cultural Sustainability Institute at Vermont Folklife Center in Middlebury, Vermont, 2011; and the new Master of Arts in Cultural Sustainability program at Goucher College, Baltimore, 2011).

Yet the term sustainability is contentious too. In relation to culture at large, economist Sen argues it harbours a similar preservationist stance to that which Titon believes is inherent in the term heritage:

The rhetoric of ‘sustaining’ – as opposed to having the freedom to grow and develop – frames the cultural debate in prematurely conservationist terms . . . There is a dis-analogy with the environment here. When it comes to the natural environment, we don’t try to improve the best that nature gave us; we try to ‘conserve’ what we have got, and perhaps return to what we had earlier. But culture is the fountain of our creativity and progress. Sustaining is too feeble a role for it to play in development. (in Graves, 2005, p. 107)

At the second meeting of the Applied Ethnomusicology Study Group of the International Council of Traditional Music (Hà Nội, Vietnam, July 2010), where sustainability was a ‘talking circle’ theme, participants voiced reservations about whether the term appositely reflects desirable aims and approaches in relation to music. Without consensus, a host of other possible terms were proposed, including cultivation, revitalisation, transformation, and creative regeneration. Other terms found in the literature include preservation and conservation (Chaudhuri, 1992; Stubington, 1987).
Revival is its own discrete sub-field of ethnomusicological investigation (e.g. Livingston, 1999; Rosenberg, 1993b), but refers to something other than explicit efforts aimed at strengthening the viability of music genres in decline.

Evidently, ethnomusicological research on music vitality and viability has not yet developed standardised terminology, even to refer to itself. The risk is of reaching deadlock: no term, perhaps, is perfect. Precedent from the sociolinguistic literature is not fully helpful: meanings of terms are often more clearly defined than in the ethnomusicological discourse, but the acknowledged lack of consistency across the discipline (cf. Walsh, 2005) is bewildering. Definitions of revival, revitalisation, maintenance, renewal, reclamation, and restoration, while often well-articulated, fluctuate according to researcher, country, and context. Even the most common umbrella term for efforts towards language vitality and viability – language maintenance – is sometimes used more narrowly, to refer to efforts directed towards a language still spoken by all or most members of a community (in which case it contrasts with language revitalisation, which is used in relation to “weaker” languages). Sustainability and safeguarding are terms rarely found in research on endangered languages, though exceptions exist (e.g. Lewis & Simons, 2010).

Taking all these factors into consideration, in this dissertation I use the term language maintenance to refer to the field of study that encompasses efforts to maintain and revitalise languages, unless specified otherwise. I frequently use the phrase vitality and viability in relation to both music and language: notwithstanding some limited academic use (e.g. Coulter, 2007) it harbours no heavily-laden meaning, and avoids unwanted implications of either a static tradition or a preservationist bearing. Despite the lack of consensus among ethnomusicologists, I employ the term sustainability to refer to the ability of a music genre to endure, without in any way implying that it should be preserved unchanging. In an attempt to avoid some of the charges – which I believe are reasonable – raised against the rhetoric of safeguarding, I reserve my use of the terms musical heritage, (intangible) cultural heritage and safeguarding for specific cases where the context warrants their use, or in direct reference to literature that itself employs these terms.

In ways, the term endangerment is problematic too: it arguably falsely implies a simple dichotomy between safe and endangered, and may be redolent of the “romanticised” view of dying cultures characterised by scholarship of earlier decades. Labelling a music genre or language endangered may also too strongly, wrongly, imply that it is on the inexorable path to extinction. These philosophical concerns are raised
again in the course of this dissertation. Despite its inadequacies, I have chosen to use the term: in part for lack of a better alternative, since *endangerment* seems the clearest and simplest term for the state I wish to describe; but also because the term is employed constantly and consistently in the language maintenance literature, and is not foreign within ethnomusicological discourse either (e.g. Harrison & Pettan, 2010, pp. 4, 5; Marett & Barwick, 2003). When I define *endangerment*, then, as “under threat of extinction” (as UNESCO does; 2003b, p. 2), I do so with the understanding that endangerment is best conceived as a continuum, and without intending to imply the irreversible demise of the language or music genre in question.

In this dissertation, I use the term *music genre* to refer to a discrete musical tradition, a defined or in some way unified sub-set of repertory (notwithstanding the fact that boundaries between one genre and another can be difficult to define). Three examples are Javanese *gamelan gong kebyar*, Andalusian flamenco music, and Vietnamese *ca trù*. In the literature, a common term for *music genre* is *musical tradition*, which I have chosen to avoid for its uncertain relationship to change and innovation (a theme I explore at some length in Chapter 2). I sometimes refer loosely to “small” music genres – genres which by virtue of their non-dominance (culturally, socially, demographically, or otherwise) may face particular challenges to their viability. Several *music genres* collectively contribute to making up a *music culture*: a group of people’s total involvement with music, including concepts, practices, beliefs, institutions, and materials (after Titon & Slobin, 1996, pp. 1-2; see also Small, 1998, on *musicking*). Members of a *music culture* may or may not share a language, nationality, or ethnic origin (Titon & Slobin, 1996, p. 13).

*Music culture* has overlap with the concept of a *community*, a term I use broadly, to refer to either a group of people who share their language or *music culture* by virtue of their common geographical, cultural or ethnic background, or to denote a “community of practice” (Wood & Judikis, 2002, p. 12): a group of people bound together first and foremost by their linguistic or musical practice and interests. This is consistent with the more general concept of a *community* as “any group of individuals who share something, anything, in common, and consider themselves to have some allegiance to each other as a result” (Graves, 2005, p. 25).

Unless otherwise specified, *indigenous* should be taken to refer to the native populations of any country. Following convention, the term *Indigenous* (with capitalisation) refers specifically to the indigenous populations of Australia (that is, Aboriginal Australians and Australian Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people).
A Glossary is provided to clarify further how I use these and other terms in the context of this research. Throughout this dissertation I use Australian English spelling, except when quoting directly from a source that uses American English. In that case, I retain the original.

1.5 Approaching the research

In order to answer its central question, how can theory and practice relating to the maintenance of endangered languages inform ways to support the sustainability of endangered music genres?, this research aims:

1. to identify and appraise the range of current theory and practice relating to the vitality and viability of music genres;
2. to identify the similarities and differences between music genres and languages in relation to their vitality and viability;
3. to propose some ways in which theoretical and practical approaches to language maintenance may help repair the key gaps and weaknesses of current approaches to music sustainability; and
4. to provide a concrete example of how theory from the field of language maintenance could be adapted for use with music.

Qualitative research typically employs multiple data collection methods, enabling triangulation of the data and enhancing their interpretability (Robson, 1993). Three core data collection methods were used for this research (see also Table 1.1):

1. Since the research primarily draws on existing knowledge (about language maintenance) and puts it to use in a new way (for ethnomusicological purposes), its primary data collection method was an extensive survey and critical appraisal of literature across the fields of language maintenance, ethnomusicology and cognate areas. The survey extended over more than 350 sources, from conventional academic outputs to non-academic sources such as policy documents, governmental and institutional reports, internet sites, and media outputs. Its findings are integrated throughout this dissertation.

2. Semi-structured interviews with ethnomusicologists and linguists increased the scope and depth of data gained from the literature survey, and provided the opportunity to gain more focused insights on the research topic than those found in pre-existing sources. The informants were chosen for their expertise in some
### Table 1.1 Research design matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How can theory and practice relating to the maintenance of endangered languages inform ways to support the sustainability of endangered music genres? | 1. To identify and appraise the range of current theory and practice relating to the sustainability of endangered music genres | • Identifies current state of play in relation to music sustainability  
• Indicates gaps and weaknesses of current theory and practice  
• Enables subsequent comparison with languages | • Literature survey  
• Interviews with linguists and ethnomusicologists | (preliminary) | Chapter 2 |
|                                                                                  | 2. To identify the similarities and differences between music and languages in relation to their vitality and viability | • Signals areas of greatest potential for drawing on language maintenance to inform ways to sustain endangered music genres  
• By identifying differences, minimises risk of misapplying language maintenance theory and practice to music | | 1. Comparative framework articulating the synergies and disconnects between language and music, in relation to their vitality and viability | Chapter 3 |
|                                                                                  | 3. To propose some ways in which theoretical and practical approaches to language maintenance may help repair the key gaps and weaknesses of current approaches for music | • Answers central research question | | 2. Set of recommendations on ways forward for music sustainability | Chapters 4 and 7 |
|                                                                                  | 4. To provide a concrete example of how theory from language maintenance could be adapted for use with music | • Demonstrates that language maintenance can inform research into music sustainability  
• Demonstrates the applied potential of this research | | 3. Theoretical framework for assessing music vitality | Chapter 5 |
|                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                    | Case study:  
• Literature survey  
• Interviews  
• Field visit |                                                                 |                                                                                           | Chapter 6 |
aspect of the topic, and were identified through background research. I conducted a total of 13 interviews between May 2009 and March 2011, and for the case study in Chapter 6, I drew on a further seven interviews conducted by other researchers in the context of Sustainable Futures. Appendix A comprises materials relating to all these interviews, including metadata and sample questions.

3. A **case study** demonstrates the practical application of a theoretical framework developed as a part of this research (the Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework presented in Chapter 5). Three data collection methods were used within this section of the research: a literature survey, semi-structured interviews, and a field visit. Details of each of these, and the broader methodology for the case study (including criteria for its selection), are presented in Chapter 6.

Throughout the research, circularity between the data collection and data analysis phases generated new insights and shaped both the methods and outcomes, in a process characteristic of qualitative research (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Data collected through one method informed collection via other methods; data collected in one stage influenced subsequent stages. Analysis of my findings led to fine-tuning of some of the data collection processes and tools, such as the semi-structured interview questions. Another example of the circularity was the process of coding of data from the *ca trù* case study, which both informed and was informed by the twelve developing factors of the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework*.

Table 1.1 presents a matrix aligning the research question with the aims, methods, and outcomes of the research. Figure 1.1 displays how these various aspects of the research are presented in the dissertation itself.

### 1.6 Ethical considerations

It is now widely accepted that researchers are not detached from the phenomena, people, and processes they study. Qualitative research in particular acknowledges the subjective role of the person who undertakes it. The researcher is ever present in designing the research, and designing it ethically: in conceptualising the topic, formulating an appropriate methodology, selecting the underlying paradigms and frameworks, reviewing an appropriate range of literature, collecting and analysing data in a way that does not favour the generation of certain viewpoints, and describing
I designed my research in accordance with Griffith University ethics protocol. Interviewees participated voluntarily following an informed consent procedure; an adapted version of the consent package was created for non-native speakers of English (see Appendix B). Each interviewee was given the opportunity to verify and amend any information they provided me, and to remain anonymous in the research outcomes if analysis methods clearly, among other things (Sarantakos, 2005, p. 14). Acknowledging my presence and my obligations in these ways, I believe I have shaped this research in a manner that upholds these ethical standards.
they wished. In September 2011, I emailed a summary of research outcomes to all interviewees, along with details of how to access the aggregated results of the research following the completion of the doctoral examination process. Ethical clearance (Human expedited review 1) for the research was granted through Griffith University on 23 April 2009 (Protocol number QCM/04/09/HREC), and two minor amendments were approved during the course of the project.

Complex ethical dimensions to this research arise in relation to the particular topic at hand: sustaining endangered music genres. Perhaps not least of the moral concerns of the researcher of endangered cultures is that of a self-fulfilling prophecy – redolent, as Myers would say, of the geologist who yells “avalanche” on a snowy mountain (1992, p. 23). This may be a particular risk in contexts where “outsider” researchers are, for whatever reason, held in high esteem by a community. Conversely, the attention of outsiders may act as a mechanism that aids musical vitality and viability, for example when it stimulates a community to recognise the decline – or the inherent value – of a genre, and thus take steps to strengthen it (Baumann, 1996, p. 74).

Even more fundamental to this research is the question of whether (or when) it is moral for researchers – or even for communities themselves – to engage in endeavours to maintain or revitalise endangered music genres. Within the field of language maintenance, it is sometimes seen is an ethical responsibility for researchers of endangered languages to actively support efforts to maintain them (e.g. Foundation for Endangered Languages, 1995, para. 1). On the other hand, it is far from clear that endeavours to maintain endangered cultural expressions are always ethically sound. Almost certainly in some cases they are not: for example, in repressive regimes where musicians or language speakers may be persecuted for their expression of culture. The sociolinguistic literature is racked by internal dissent about the ethics of language maintenance efforts, both with regard to specific cases and on general principle: arguably, they intervene and interfere with natural evolutionary processes of the rise and decay of cultures; they emphasise ideologies of purism, disallowing change in tradition; they are too often driven by neo-colonial and authoritarian outsider involvement; and not least, time and time again they have been ineffective, or have brought unanticipated or unwanted consequences, such as an adverse effect on community cohesion (outlined in Grant, in press).

In relation to music too, these are important and complex moral considerations, and I raise them again at various points in this dissertation. In general, though, I believe it wholly possible for a researcher to ethically engage with a community that is trying to
create a viable future for its music; in some cases, this may even be a moral obligation. The nature of this researcher engagement will vary widely according to the situation at hand. Variables include the nature of the community’s concern at the predicament, the cohesiveness of its attitudes and ideas about the future of its music, the factors contributing to endangerment, and the resources at hand. In all cases, the notion of the “First Voice” should be paramount (Galla, 2008), with communities in full control of making their own informed choices about the future of their cultural expressions.

One aim of the researcher could be to empower the community, and especially with regard to minority communities “to do whatever is necessary . . . to strengthen or to make a better image of the group via the music” (U. Hemetek, personal interview, 22 July 2010). Other possible roles include documenting the genre, building the capacity of the community, generating community leadership and offering support and advice (Wurm, 1998, p. 198), creating learning or teaching resources or otherwise supporting education and transmission processes (Tan, 2008, pp. 71-72), alerting communities to the possibilities for revitalisation (M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010), engaging in advocacy and lobbying, increasing public or scholarly awareness of the local or global situation, or helping implement revitalisation projects or strategies.

An ideology of preserving anything and everything endangered, or of top-down prescriptions about what should be maintained, is far from my conception of what it is to sustain music genres. Most contemporary ethnomusicologists (me included) would recoil at the attitude to preserving music in the early twentieth century, whereby “the collector would intrude, trying to persuade people not to change their ways, insisting that it was incumbent on them to retain preindustrial practices” (Nettl, 2005, p. 167). A given community may sense little or no loss at the impending extinction of a certain music genre; perhaps that genre no longer serves a purpose, or the community decides it would rather the genre die out than be given artificial life-support or be kept alive in “corrupt” form. I make no value-judgements on these matters; those decisions are to be made by the community concerned. When in this dissertation I refer to the importance of keeping music genres strong, then, I mean either only in a general sense (for the kinds of reasons given in Section 1.2), or in relation specifically to those genres whose communities wish for their ongoing viability.

I hope and intend that the outcomes of this project stimulate further ethnomusicological discourse on the issue of musical sustainability, as well as the development of approaches to support vibrant and viable music genres. To that extent, my research aims to ultimately help communities in their efforts towards the vitality
and viability of their musical, and wider cultural, expressions. In keeping with the spirit of applied ethnomusicology – and social research in general, which commonly involves some intent to “improve the quality of life of a group of people” (Sarantakos, 2005, pp. 12-13) – the overarching motive of this research is to positively impact upon people’s lives, ultimately helping communities to reap the benefits that flow from vibrant music cultures, for example in terms of identity and social cohesion. In this way, I hope my research holds a small place within a larger system of contributions to a better world.
CHAPTER TWO

CURRENT APPROACHES TO MUSIC SUSTAINABILITY:
THEORY AND PRACTICE

In this chapter, I first present an overview of the main theoretical foundations that underpin current understanding of the dynamics of music sustainability, and then present and assess some common practical approaches that aim to support musical vitality and viability. My intent is to pinpoint the strengths of current approaches to sustaining music genres, as well as the deficiencies and weaknesses. In this way, this chapter lays the groundwork for identifying where language maintenance approaches may represent pathways to better practice (the focus of later chapters).

2.1 Theoretical foundations

Current understanding of music sustainability is underpinned by research that largely falls within four main theoretical areas: globalisation and musical diversity; musical transculturation and change; music revivals; and ecological models for sustainability. While these are by no means the only relevant areas of research, they represent keystones for understanding musical vitality and viability.

a) Globalisation and musical diversity

*Globalisation* has been defined in myriad ways, but one relatively straightforward definition is “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (Giddens, 1990, p. 64). Other definitions refer to the manifold dimensions to globalisation: fundamentally, the political and economic, but also the technological, military, legal, environmental, and cultural (e.g. Held, 1997, ‘Globalisation’ section, para. 5). The complex and many processes invoked by the term have brought with them a number of boons for the vitality of “small” music genres. Nettl writes:

> It’s hard to overstate the harm done to most of the world's peoples by colonialism, capitalism, and globalization, but difficult to make a case for a pejorative evaluation of the musical results. The musical experience of the average individual is much broader today than in the past. The hybrids and mixes resulting from intercultural contact could be interpreted as enrichment as
easily as pollution, and old traditions as a class have not simply disappeared. (2005, p. 434)

One of the most obvious upsides of globalisation in relation to music is the vastly increased access to local music genres, at least among those with access to modern technology (Nettl, 2010, p. 57); these days, a teenager in Jakarta can listen to a Peruvian folk song or Azerbaijani *mugam* at whim.

Yet globalisation can bring with it commoditisation, exploitation, and cultural homogenisation that inhibits the vitality of some music genres, and Nettl’s statement that “old traditions as a class have not simply disappeared” (2005, p. 434) is true only in general; specific genres have certainly been lost, such as many of Aboriginal Australia, as instanced in Chapter 1. Concerns about the impact of globalisation on cultures resonate within anthropology and environmental sciences too, where some perspectives are sombre (e.g. Davis, 2003, 14:31-14:46). At the heart of discourse on musical diversity and sustainability, then, is the question of whether an increasingly globalised world is bringing about “a musical life of wonderful flexibility and intellectual breadth” or is expediting the atrophy of genres that do not find a ready place in the global environment (Mundy, 2001, p. 14).

Ethnomusicological perspectives on this matter cover the gamut from those warning of mass cultural “grey-out” (Lomax, 1968, p. 4) to those proposing that musical diversity is on the rise. In the mid-1960s, Wiora wrote of an era of “global industrial culture” and the convergence of music cultures (1965, pp. 147-197); in the 1970s, Alan Lomax published a call-to-arms to his colleagues based on his belief that “cultural variety lies under threat of extinction” (1977, p. 125). Nettl believes that these kinds of perspectives viewing the twentieth century as a period of musical homogenisation are rather pessimistic (2005, p. 434), yet he too seems to concede that musical diversity is fading, despite increased access to a range of music:

… on the one hand, distinctions among musical cultures seems to be receding – are we coming to Lomax’s feared “cultural grey-out”? – and musical variegation is maybe declining. On the other hand, the typical individual in the world has access to a vastly greater variety of music than was the case fifty years ago. (Nettl, 2010, p. 106)

Hemetek doubts that homogenisation has in fact occurred; she argues that if anything, musical diversity at the global level may even be increasing due to factors like greater accessibility of music and cross-fertilisation of genres and cultures. Her interest in sustainability therefore lies more at the local level, where the loss of musical
expressions can be keenly felt and can have a direct impact on the community in question (personal interview, July 22 2010).

Efforts to develop theoretical constructs describing the effect of globalisation on musical sustainability and diversity are frustrated by the inherent paradox in the simultaneously “universalising” and “particularising” tendencies of globalisation (captured in Robertson’s term *globalization*, 1995). One way in which this paradox might manifest with regard to sustainability is through the strain between the source and output of globalised culture, including music. A simple example is inherent in one use of the term *world music*, used since the late 1980s to describe “those frequently synthetic and commodified musical styles subsumed under that description by various music industries” (Cottrell, 2010, p. 22), a usage of the term that fails to acknowledge the enormous diversity of the music cultures and genres it encompasses (Cottrell, p. 16; Nettl, 2010, pp. 33-53 and Schippers, 2010, pp. 17-28 both explore the term *world music* at length). Erllmann observes that the producers of the “global culture of commodities” rely on diversity as their main source of raw material, “and thus, the ideology of global culture is animated by a certain cannibalism” (1993, p. 9). The commodification of music has moved ethnomusicological research into new domains, illuminating the complexity of issues of piracy, appropriation, and exploitation, but also the potential for mass dissemination and access to music that may potentially profit musicians, communities, and the viability of “small” music genres (Cottrell, 2010; Taylor, 1997). Evidently, commodification of music, like broader processes of globalisation, can be both beneficial and detrimental to sustainability.

One model capturing the nature of the relationships between the local and the global, and between globalisation and culture, is that by Appadurai (1996). He proposed that the global presence of mass media together with the mass migration of people have largely effected a “deterritorialisation” and the profusion of “diasporic public spheres.” The instability brought about by this process has allowed for the creation of new individual and collective cultural identities. In grasping these unstable, unfixed worlds, Appadurai’s five “-scapes” (ethnoscape, mediascape, technoscape, financescape, and ideoscape) are an apparatus for assessing “the new global cultural economy [which] has to be seen as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order that cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models” (1996, p. 33), but rather requires alternative notions of space.

Mass media technologies have massively intensified the processes of globalisation, and therefore often figure prominently in theories (like Appadurai’s)
about the nexus between globalisation, culture, and sustainability. Even almost two decades ago, the colossal presence of the mass media was already implicit in what seemed to some to be “the undisputable fact of a complete commodification and industrialization of musical production in areas hitherto untouched by capitalist transformation, together with the unprecedented acceleration of transnational movements of people, goods, and ideas” (Erlmann, 1993, p. 4). These processes also bring with them the risk of misuse and misappropriation, which can manifest even in relation to well-meant cultural safeguarding initiatives (as when documentation efforts “unwittingly led to the unauthorized commercial exploitation of culturally sensitive materials”; World Intellectual Property Organisation, 2010, ‘Community Cultural Documentation’ section).

The role of the media in the dissemination of music continues to escalate, and to effect what Blaukopf once termed a “musical revolution” (1990, pp. 125-126). Mass media dissemination shapes music genres in various ways, such as when musicians begin to incorporate technology encountered in the recording studio into their musical practice, or when song texts are changed to comply with the non-localised, non-politicised demands of an international audience. The term *mediaisation* was coined to describe these and the many other processes of change undergone by *mediated* (mass-media-distributed) music (see Malm, 1993, pp. 340, 344-347). For sustainability, mediaisation (like globalisation) is a double-edged sword: on the one hand, it enables local music genres to compete and perhaps survive in the media environment, but it also means that they run the risk of “being sucked into the transculturation process and losing their specific properties, ending up as a component in some ‘world music’ style” (Malm, 1993, p. 347).

Believing that the mass media is the main force of musical change, Romero argues that efforts to preserve and promote music genres should evaluate the mass media phenomenon closely (1992, p. 206). In the worst instances, he believes, those media can act “as the ultimate factor in cultural disintegration” within “a socioeconomic reality which is already hostile to the continuity of local traditions” (p. 195). But in the best instances, where the mass media embrace local music genres, they can support and even drive revitalisation by sending a strong ideological message about the value of the music: to outsiders, perhaps merely by stint of being given “airtime”; to insiders, by being the object of regard from modern urban society. The mass media are therefore “not only the predators of musical traditions that they are generally thought to be, but are a dynamic channel used by popular organizations to reaffirm their local and
regional cultural identities against the dominant official culture” (Romero, 1992, p. 200). In this way, by helping confirm identity and encouraging pride in the culture, the media can serve as a valuable vehicle for promoting and celebrating “small” music genres.

The various and multifaceted tensions between the local and the global in relation to the dynamics of musical diversity have led several researchers to attempt to develop frameworks delineating measures to promote that diversity, or at least to counteract perceived homogenisation. One way to support musical diversity, proposed by Malm, is to support the transition of genres into contemporary society: by creating new venues and live performance contexts; by subsidising records and videos with local forms of music and making sure local production facilities exist; by ensuring national radio and TV stations can produce their own music programs; by reinforcing direct cross-national networks between “small countries and enthusiasts cultivating specific musical traditions”; and by using cost-effective mass media technology to produce educational materials (1992, pp. 225-226). Like the models posited by Appadurai and Mundy, these measures heavily reflect the perceived importance of the role of the media and industry in cultural sustainability.

Mundy’s three-tiered approach (2001) argues that the international level has the biggest role to play in protecting or promoting diversity. At this level, Mundy proposes, musical considerations should take precedence over commercial ones in international regulatory frameworks. Organisations that influence decisions at this level should promote freedom of musicians and music across borders, ensure that technology facilitates access to music rather than controlling choice, and make certain that copyright and other forms of intellectual property rights primarily benefit the creators of music. At the next level down, coalitions of countries such as the EU or ASEAN (which Mundy refers to as the regional level, but which I and others refer to as transnational) play a key role in promoting musical diversity through the ways they represent music. At this level, diversity might be supported by channelling moneys for cultural development or investing in relevant regional (transnational) enterprises. Finally, national strategies for musical diversity should centre on underpinning and strengthening infrastructure, such as by investing sufficiently in music education and music tourism, by promoting local musicians nationally and internationally, and by creating the general climate for a healthy music sector (Mundy, 2001).

Notably absent from this model of musical diversity are the roles of the sub-national and local levels, or for that matter the level of Slobin’s “subcultures”:
neighbourhoods, voluntary associations, family, and other micro-units of belonging and bonding (1993). Grassroots rather than top-down initiatives towards cultural sustainability are often the most effective, and the involvement of community itself is vital (Galla, 2008; Hayward, 2005). Thus, although musical diversity only manifests at the macro-level, initiatives to promote musical diversity are fundamentally dependent on the efficacy of operations at these lower levels, where the future of a music genre is ultimately decided. Yet local efforts to sustain cultural expressions are not infrequently at least partly reliant on resources and support from higher levels. For this reason, Graves believes “if cultures are to be conserved, rather than aggressively commodified, we will need to develop new mechanisms for funnelling resources to the grassroots level, where it is needed the most” (2005, p. 107).

Some ethnomusicologists have expressed doubt about the benefits of cultural and/or musical diversity for social cohesion, particularly at the level of nation-states. Arnold cheerfully affirms that “because of their far-reaching popularity and influence”, Hindi film songs “succeeded in minimising India’s musical diversity” (1988, p. 187). She claims that the process of homogenisation was valuable in its contribution to building a national consensus. Niles remarks that one of the challenges facing Papua New Guinea as a nation “is finding a way to enable the great diversity of cultural activities to continue while developing a sense of national unity” (1994, pp. 89-90). On the other hand, much of the literature (e.g. Béhague, 2003; Bilby, 1999; Campbell, et al., 2005; Ramnarine, 2003, Schippers, 2010a) presents the opinion that cultural diversity per se is no threat to social harmony or local or national identity; indeed, it can underpin and strengthen them. Letts (2006), for example, argues that musical diversity can potentially contribute not only to individual and community identity, but also to peace, while Ragland illustrates the point:

While politicians and economists argue the positive and negative effects of decades of Mexican migration into the U.S., the study of mariachi music offers a lesson in cooperation and collaborative exchange that transcends political borders and fears that immigrants are a threat to American culture. (2007, pp. 151-152)

The various frameworks, concepts, and theories described in this section relating to globalisation, cultural and musical diversity, and sustainability do not always offer conclusive resolutions to the challenging issues they raise, but they do provide a foundation for better understanding some of the complexities.
b) Musical transculturation and change

Theories relating to musical transculturation, as well as the synergetic oppositions between tradition and innovation, purism and syncretism, and continuity and change, have featured prominently in ethnomusicological research over the past several decades (e.g. Kartomi, 1981; Kartomi & Blum, 1994; Malm, 1992; Nettl, 1978; Ramnarine, 2003; Romero, 1992; Stokes, 2004). Conceptual models relating to them can inform our understanding of the dynamics of musical vitality and sustainability in various ways – for example, by elucidating the impact on music cultures of the complex forces of globalisation (which are intimately connected with processes of musical change and transculturation). Expedited by the rise of mass media, information technology, international travel and tourism, and shifting populations, transculturation and change have sometimes led to the renaissance or revitalisation of “small” music genres; on the other hand, processes of cross-cultural contact have sometimes been seen to effect local or even global musical homogenisation.

Rather than acculturation (see Merriam, 1964, p. 303), the term transculturation is arguably preferable to describe the transformational processes resulting from contact between music cultures, for a variety of reasons; not least, the moot implication by the term acculturation that there exists such a thing as an “unacculturated” or untainted music (Kartomi, 1981, pp. 230-233). This is especially true in the current global environment, in which local identities are typically complex and hybridity is the norm rather than the exception (Frith, 2000). In the last decades, the concept of transculturation has brought a new perspective to the ethnomusicological understanding of musical change (S. Pettan, personal interview, 30 July 2010), in some ways legitimising in the eyes of scholars the emergence of new from old in music genres. Yet so far, ethnomusicologists have largely brought only their own perceptions of change to the research table, “learning little and not having much to say about the perception of musical change in the various societies of the world” (Nettl, 2005, p. 289).

Several ethnomusicologists have explored and explained the myriad possible results of, and responses to, the processes of transculturation, and particularly non-Western responses to Western music (e.g. Kartomi, 1981; Malm, 1993; Nettl, 1978; Nettl, 2005, pp. 272-290; Nettl 2010, p. 117). Of music cultures (rather than the genres that comprise them), Nettl describes a number of possible responses to cross-cultural contact, including abandonment of the music culture, its impoverishment or reduction (abandonment of certain components), isolated preservation (“relegation, as it were, to a museum”; 2005, p. 439), diversification of styles within segments of repertoires, and
syncretism, the common process of developing mixed or hybrid styles (2005, pp. 436-441). Nettl also observes the sustaining mechanisms sometimes inherent in westernisation, a term he uses to refer to the process of traditional music acquiring traits central to Western music, and in modernisation, whereby that music is repositioned in Western-derived social contexts (2010, p. 117).

Malm’s typology of the processes and effects of cross-cultural contact on musical genres takes into account the mechanisms of the music industry (1993). He identifies four possible situations: contact can bring about exchange of ideas and convergent creations (cultural exchange), or it might result in one culture imposing its values on the other (cultural dominance). Cultural dominance may additionally entail the transfer of money or resources from the subordinate to the dominating cultural group, such as when record companies take money rightly owed to artists (cultural imperialism). Finally, contact could result in the combinations of musical styles within the sphere of industry, a phenomenon resulting from the growth of transnational corporations in the field of culture and their global marketing networks (transculturation, though Malm’s use of the term is different from Kartomi’s). These processes may affect sustainability of local music genres in different ways, both advantageously (which is perhaps most likely in the case of exchange) and detrimentally (e.g. imperialism).

One limitation to these kinds of typologies of the processes and outcomes of contact between cultures is the assumption that one society equates with “one music” – that each society has a discrete, unified musical identity. Ramnarine believes that taking such a model as a point of departure “lead[s] us to making conceptual moves in the wrong direction – resulting in ideas about cultures meeting and mixing in ways that reproduce tropes of cultural difference and projects of mapping music onto people and places” (2007, pp. 30-31). She argues for a paradigm shift in which analytical models of musical “cultures” encountering each other do not equate a society with a music.

If we nevertheless accept as an imperfect starting-point the equation of community and music culture, some possible outcomes of transculturation as described by Kartomi, Nettl, and Malm appear potentially favourable to the sustainability of one or even both of the cultures in contact. One example might be nativistic revival, where a subordinate culture becomes aware of its own neglect of its music and makes efforts to revitalise it (Kartomi, 1981). But it is often hard to argue in black and white that any given response to transculturation is wholly good or bad for cultural vitality or viability. Rejection of an impinging culture (for any number of possible reasons, from
political to ideological), for example, may on the one hand have the effect of protecting the music of the subordinate culture, but on the other could indicate its ideological denunciation of innovation or change. In some cases, that in turn may auger ill for sustainability, if adaptability to a fast-changing global environment is a precondition for survival. Romero argues: “resistance to change, . . . rather than assuring their continuity, has caused indigenous musical traditions to slowly become extinct” (1992, p. 194).

If cultural traditions should and do naturally change, approaches to music sustainability need not only to take into account what are often referred to as “authentic” and “traditional” musical practices, but also how those practices are situated within changing, contemporary contexts. In Erlmann’s words, “How do we account for the fact that we can no longer meaningfully talk about the music of a West African village without taking into consideration the corporate strategies of Sony, U.S. domestic policy and the price of oil?” (1993, p. 4). Drummond puts it plainly:

Culture is a living, organic thing; it’s not something which you can put in a museum and say, ‘There we are, everything’s fine, we’ve put your culture in a museum, now you can relax.’ The help that we give in terms of preserving the past and tradition of a culture is often very useful, but it’s no use unless it’s given back to the culture to use, so that members of the culture can learn how to use that and renew their own culture in their own way. Cultures don’t stand still; they can’t live in the past all the time. (in QCRC, 2008, 0:26-0:58)

One possible approach to changing contexts and functions for musical traditions is to explore possibilities for recontextualisation and innovation, if the community should wish. Sethi invites consideration of a particular example:

For millennia in India, women have gone to the well, and they have invented many songs to lessen the drudgery of carrying a water pot. . . . Now, there's a tap in the back yard. . . . So the songs will die. . . . Well, these things have always been dying. They've always been changing. What should concern us is how the expressive need and energy so delicately enshrined in the women's songs can now find a new vehicle for communication. What kind of environment can we build that will enable creativity to flower? What is replacing that which must go? What do we want to preserve, and how and for whom would we preserve it?

(2001, p. 85)

In light of these considerations, the Culturally Engaged Research and Facilitation approach to applied research developed by Hayward, Crowdy, and others offers a
summative response both to the issues of purism and change. This approach advocates “preserv[ing] and promot[ing] traditional cultures simultaneously with their development. The emphasis here is not so much on a purist ‘freezing’ and protection of traditional cultures as a maintenance of the old along with the new” (Hayward, 2005, pp. 55-56). These complex issues of purism and authenticity are raised again in the next section, in relation to music revivals.

Theoretical frameworks elucidating the dynamics of musical change and contact potentially serve as important foundations for developing efforts towards musical sustainability. As Romero argues, every effort to preserve and disseminate traditional music cultures across the world needs to be grounded not only on a thorough diagnosis of situation of the culture in question, but also “on a well-assessed knowledge of the main trends of musical change of that musical culture. A set of priorities should also then be prepared in complex cases in which the trends of musical change are many and diverse” (1992, p. 204). Frameworks such as those described in this section may be used to clarify reasons for shifts in the vitality of a genre in a given context. In this way, they may facilitate the development of initiatives supporting music sustainability that take into account the realities of changing environments and cross-cultural exchange.

c) Music revivals

Music revivals may be defined as “social movements which strive to ‘restore’ a musical system believed to be disappearing or completely relegated to the past for the benefit of contemporary society . . . [with an] overt cultural and political agenda expressed by the revivalists themselves” (Livingston, 1999, p. 66). Little in this definition distinguishes revivals from most efforts towards music sustainability, especially if “revivalists” is understood to refer to either insiders or outsiders to the community in question. But Livingston also identifies these two goals of revival movements: “(1) to serve as cultural opposition and as an alternative to mainstream culture, and (2) to improve existing culture through the values based on historical value and authenticity expressed by revivalists” (1999, p. 66). Current global efforts in music safeguarding (as conceived by UNESCO, for example) and music sustainability (as conceived within applied ethnomusicology; e.g. Titon, 2009c) encompass decidedly more outward-looking and broader objectives than these two, including the promotion of cultural diversity and strengthening of individual and collective cultural identity. Furthermore, safeguarding or sustainability initiatives at large are by no means defined by an emphasis on
authenticity ("the centrepiece of music revivals, around which all else is secondary"); Livingston, 1999, p. 74).

Along with issues of musical change and transculturation, those of authenticity and tradition are often at the crux of theories of musical revivals. The very concept of tradition is notoriously difficult to define, both at a general level and with regard to specific music genres (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 41-47). If authenticity as a construct may be considered a keystone of revivals, as Livingston and others suggest, it is paradoxical that revival movements characteristically incorporate the continuous transformation of the tradition (however defined). Many revivalists “assert that they’re bolstering a declining musical tradition. But rather than encourage continuity, musical revivals recast the music – and culture – they refer to. They are actually musical transformations, a kind of reinvention” (Feintuch, 1993, p. 184).

The concept of invented tradition (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983) is regularly invoked by scholars with regard to the vitality or viability of intangible cultural heritage, and specifically musical heritage (e.g. Johnson, 2006; Smith, 1994, p. 189; Stokes, 2004, p. 60). Johnson (2006), for example, describes an instance where the demands of tourist consumerism stimulated one Okinawan community to showcase an invented tradition of its musical practice. Invented tradition relates in ways to the idea of restored behaviour (from the anthropology of performance), whereby “the original ‘truth’ or ‘source’ of the behaviours may be lost, ignored, or contradicted – even while this truth or source is apparently being honored and observed” (Schechner, 1985, p. 35; see also Johnson, 2006, p. 69). A general musical example is the use of reclaimed genres in certain ceremonial or public events.

Referring to the Korean intangible cultural heritage preservation system, Howard captures some of the key issues around tradition, authenticity and change:

Within [that] schema, tradition is defined as moving, but in reality, this is only the public face of something more complex that mixes preservation with promotion. Critics question the reality of what is proposed: who defines what is original or authentic, and how can the prescribed form of an art and craft be based, simply and unchangingly, on the oldest version known at the time of designation? Surely, critics say, tradition, itself an increasingly problematic concept, constantly develops and evolves, reflecting social change, the evolution or importation of new cultural forms, and the desires and ambitions of those who practice it. Certainly, the parameters of a tradition are difficult to fix,
as terms such as ‘traditionesque’ (Killick 2003) or the assertion that an art or craft is a Hobsbawmian ‘invented tradition’ indicate. (2006, p. 173)

In relation to musical vitality and viability, these discourses around the tensions between musical authenticity and the perceived oppositional processes of the invention, reinvention, and transformation of tradition raise several key questions. What should be maintained of an endangered music genre – the tradition as it is now? Or should sustainability efforts permit, even encourage, continual change in a genre? Feintuch’s pragmatic approach to change in folk music is one I adopt in relation to potential accusations of “purism” being inherent in the concept of music sustainability:

Rather than castigate folk music revivalists as if they had somehow corrupted what does not belong to them, as some folklorists have tended to do, it seems to me that we should understand folk music revivals as transformations . . . . Such a view could help us locate folk music revivals where they belong, among the many emergent aspects of culture that also carry the banner of tradition. (1993, p. 192)

One way in which revivals may be important to ethnomusicological theory on sustainability is by drawing attention to the difficulty of making judgements about the likely trajectory of a music genre. Before the revival of the Sámi joik in the northern west regions of north Europe, for example, that tradition may have seemed doomed due to political suppression and prohibitions against its performance, but its fortunes then changed:

When it went through the revival process in the 1970s, it became a wide-spread musical practice again – and so wide-spread that it is now the chief marker of Sámi indigenous identity, and the joik underpins a lot of musical expression in that region. So if I were working in the 1970s, I might have said this is a tradition which is on its way out, but in 2010 I can see that it’s not on its way out at all. (T. Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011)

Another aspect of music revival theory that may inform music sustainability is the influence of the outsider on the revival process (T. Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011), a phenomenon noted by many, including Livingston (1999) and Baumann (1996).

Particular case studies of music revivals and their attendant concepts and constructs hold considerable potential to inform theory on music sustainability, by providing insights into the dynamics of continuity, change, and the viability of music genres in the contemporary global environment. Research on folk revival movements of
the 1960s to 1980s, including those in Hungary (Frigyesi, 1996) and Finland (Ramnarine, 2003), as well as the revivals of Mexican mariachi (Sheehy, 2006), Afroperuvian music (León, 2007), and the more recent resurgence in the 1990s of Serbian folk music (Jovanović, 2005), however, display considerable differences between them. These differences underscore the difficulty of constructing a general theory of revivals that embrace complex and diverse musical worlds. In Feintuch’s words, “musical revivals are not one thing” (2006, p. 1).

One way in which these specific cases of music revivals may inform approaches to music sustainability is by pointing to differences between a vibrant genre and its weaker progenitor. Table 2.1, for example, presents folk revivalists’ perceptions of the differences between Finnish folk music in its former and revived manifestations. (These revivalists’ perception of the “tradition / tradition and innovation” difference is particularly interesting – and questionable – in light of the above discussions about the definition of tradition and notions of authenticity and change). Although generalisation is risky – it is improbable that all music genres with “new folk” characteristics are more likely to be vital or viable than those with “folk” ones – insights like these from research into the mechanisms of music revivals may provide groundwork for better understanding the dynamics of vitality and viability in specific cases.

**Table 2.1 Folk revivalists’ perceptions of difference between “folk” and “new folk” music (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 50)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLK</th>
<th>NEW FOLK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective composition</td>
<td>Collective and individual composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral transmission</td>
<td>Oral, written and recorded transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Tradition and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (local)</td>
<td>Rural and urban (international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Preserved” music</td>
<td>“Preserved” and “new” music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the challenges, several ethnomusicologists have attempted to develop a general theory of folk music revivals since seminal research on the topic was conducted in the early- to mid-1990s (Baumann, 1996; Rosenberg, 1993b; Slobin, 1993). In constructing his model of revivals, for example, Ronström draws on Slobin’s tripartite notion of a micro level (villages, smaller regions), a regional level (parts of nations, nations, or groups of nations, like Scandinavia), and the wider transregional level. He theorises:
What we call ‘revival’ is often the fact that a local repertoire or genre has become visible at a higher level. Indeed, raised visibility at higher levels might even be the main aim of the revival. Thus, a shift in visibility is an effect of revival, but also one way by which we can ascertain that revival is occurring at all. (1996, p. 12)

If it is true that the raised visibility of a music genre precipitates or reflects its increased vitality and viability, this model could be used to help gauge the success of efforts to strengthen a music genre, albeit only broadly.

Recalling Feintuch’s dictum that “music revivals are not one thing,” Livingston proposes a theoretical model that allows for the uniqueness of each. According to this model, certain ingredients of the musical revival “recipe” are core, while others are “up to individual discretion.” The six basic ingredients are these:

1. an individual or small group of “core revivalists”
2. revival informants and/or original sources (e.g. historical sound recordings)
3. a revivalist ideology and discourse
4. a group of followers which form the basis of a revivalists community
5. revivalist activities
6. non-profit and/or commercial enterprises catering to the revivalist market.

(Livingston, 1999, p. 69)

Livingston is careful to clarify that this model is descriptive, not prescriptive. These six basic ingredients cannot therefore be read as partial or full prerequisites for the successful maintenance or revitalisation of endangered music genres, and efforts to support musical viability should not necessarily aim to recreate them. Their primary interest to music sustainability researchers lies in the fact that they have featured as characteristics of the revival of weak music genres, and thus may simply indicate issues to consider in developing approaches towards music sustainability – considerations relating, for example, to the role of the community (1, 4), issues of documentation and resources (2), ideologies and constructs surrounding the genre (3), and the mechanisms of the music industry (6).

One final comment should be made here, relating to a dearth of focused research on the role of notation and transcription in music revivals, or in vitality and viability in general. Nettl observes that transcriptions, like recordings, can act as a form of preservation – though transcriptions undergo far more filtering than recordings, and also require musicianship, whereas recordings might be made by amateurs without any scholarly intent or musical knowledge (2005, p. 165). Notation is sometimes given
passing reference in research on music revivals; Feintuch, for example, briefly observes that two Northumbrian piping tune books (published in 1936 and 1970) had the effect of “centering the revival’s repertoire,” and that because of the common attitude among performers that the tunes must be played as written, the editors of these two books have played a major role in defining the tradition (1993, p. 188). General scholarship on transcription and notation provides a good basis for understanding the potential impact of these phenomena on the trajectory of music genres (e.g. Cook, 1998, pp. 48-69; Ellingson, 1992a, 1992b; and Nettl, 2005, pp. 294-297), but it remains a relatively under-researched domain.

d) Ecological models for sustainability

Research into the dynamics of globalisation, music genres and musical diversity was preceded by investigations into the effects of globalisation on biological species, biodiversity, and the natural environment. The analogy has its limitations: humans can be “bimusical” but not “bi-species”; they acquire music not genetically but culturally; and as Rammarine is careful to observe, a key distinction between the environmental sustainability discourse and the music sustainability one is this:

When we’re thinking about environmental sustainability, the kinds of concerns there are about the long-term future of humans – whereas with musical sustainability we’re not necessarily thinking about the long-term future of humans, we’re thinking about particular musical practices and whether or not they should continue. . . . It’s not really the place of the researcher to make a judgement about these things, and in that respect I think there’s a crucial difference about the sustainability discourses in different fields. (personal interview, 16 March 2011)

Yet the parallels that do exist are brought into relief by the frequency with which ecology, ecosystems, and the environment is invoked in the ethnomusicological literature. The invocations run the gamut from loose metaphor to more concrete theory. Letts mentions the ecosystem analogy in passing with regard to musical diversity (2006, pp. 9-10); Hayward perceives parallels between (applied) ethnomusicological research and his own work as a “kind of low-scale green activist” (in QCRC, 2008); Stubington (1987) draws on an environmental analogy to distinguish between the “preservation” (documentation) and “conservation” (revitalisation) of music genres; Cottrell refers to risk of ethnomusicologists “upsetting the delicate eco-systems that sustain fragile traditions”, and even of effecting a kind of “mass-mediated musical Darwinism” (2011,
Taking a cue from the indigenous concern with the circumstances of performance, I would like to suggest that a useful approach to the dynamics of Hindustani music is to view it ecologically. Music, in this sense, is interpreted as “intricately interrelated to societies; as a commodity sold, purchased and consumed; as an artefact – probably the most important one in most cases – of a culture; in short, as anything but pure, abstract and self-contained” (Archer 1964:28). (Neuman, 1980, p. 203)

In addition to the music itself, Neuman identifies four primary components of music cultures that might form the basis for an ecology of music: “the producers of music, the consumers of music, the context of music events, and the technology of music production and reproduction” (1980, p. 203). In describing broad sets of factors that affect sustainable ecologies for music, this type of model shares characteristics with the Five Domains of Music Sustainability in Contemporary Contexts (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 180-181). Neither framework seeks to quantify levels of vitality, or to suggest appropriate remedial action for situations of endangerment. Rather, each offers a conceptual foundation for considering musical vitality and viability that takes into account the range of local and global sociological, economic, and political factors impacting upon each and every music genre. In this way, both represent a conceptual move towards adopting an ecological model of music diversity and sustainability.

With regard to the links between human cultures and natural ecosystems, investigations into biocultural diversity further our understanding of the wider ecosystems in which music is situated (Maffï, 2005, p. 602). This relatively new field of study is based on the principle that biological, cultural, and linguistic diversity are interrelated and co-dependent within a complex socio-ecological system (Maffï, 2005, p. 602). In its report Links Between Biological and Cultural Diversity, UNESCO points out that since research on biocultural diversity clarifies the interrelatedness of cultural and biological diversity, it holds implications for approaches to maintenance and revitalisation in both areas (2008, p. 8). This encompasses both language and music.

Reflecting one aspect of these studies in biocultural diversity, some ethnomusicological studies acknowledge the links between an environment and the musical (and non-musical) concepts, behaviour and sounds of its inhabitants. Ramnarine (2009), for example, explores acoustic environments, ecologies, and epistemologies in relation to the musical and political lives of the Sámi on the Arctic
fringes of Europe. Feld’s landmark book *Sound and sentiment: Birds, weeping, poetics, and song in Kaluli expression* (1990) explores the integral role of sound in the epistemologies of the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea. These links between an environment and the music of the people who live in it can also directly impact on the viability of a genre: within the last three or four decades, the “tiger-capturing” music of Minangkabau, West Sumatra has almost disappeared, because of the scarcity of tigers themselves – in turn, a result of illegal logging of the forests in the area (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010).

With regard to specific cases of musical endangerment in their wider sociocultural contexts, various descriptive studies provide insight. In addition to Neuman’s study of the vicissitudes of Hindustani music in a fast-changing modern India (1980), Sanyal and Widdess (2004) examine the atrophy and subsequent recontextualisation of Indian *dhrupad*; Norton (2005, 2008) does the same for north Vietnamese *ca trù*; and within his musical ethnography Moyle (2007) assesses the future of the music of Takū. While the discipline of ethnomusicology has largely comprised investigation of the interaction between music and its environment, particularly since the 1970s (Nettl, 2003, p. 300), and while the likenesses between musical and ecological frameworks have not gone unnoticed in the last decades by ethnomusicologists, research into musical diversity and sustainability is only now beginning to draw more extensively upon ecology-based models. Only recently have Titon and others (e.g. in Titon’s edited volume, 2009c) explored more generalised ecological theories of musical endangerment and sustainability that take into account the complex interplay between music genres, cultures at large, and broader socio-political and socioeconomic circumstances in the globalised world described by Malm, Appadurai, and others.

In a recent volume of *The World of Music* (Titon, 2009c), ecological models for sustainability are employed to inform issues as wide-ranging as cultural and musical rights and ownership, the circulation and conservation of music, the internal vitality of music cultures and the social organization of their music-making, music education and transmission, the roles of community scholars and practitioners, intangible cultural heritage, tourism, and the creative economy, preservation versus revitalization, partnerships among culture workers and community leaders, and good stewardship of musical resources. (Titon, 2009a, p. 5)
One specific way ecological models for sustainability may help further efforts to support musical vitality and viability is in relation to advocacy, which as argued later in this chapter (Section 2.2e) is currently somewhat deficient in nature and degree. Titon, for example, draws on the species conservation analogy to argue that music conservation is important on utilitarian and ethical grounds (2009a, p. 6). The present lack of widespread awareness (among the public as well as governments and other policy-making bodies) of the threat to cultural and musical heritage, which contrasts starkly with the far-reaching awareness of environmental concerns, means that ecology-based advocacy arguments may represent a particularly valuable contribution to the area of music sustainability. Without strong justification, efforts to maintain and revitalise music genres run the risk of being equated with earlier “salvage ethnomusicology,” now largely discredited for being romanticised, paternalistic, and hegemonic (e.g. Myers, 1992, p. 26; Wong in QCRC, 2008, 2:22-2:42).

Another useful conceptual parallel from ecology comes from the “deep ecology” movement, which moves away from notions of environmental management in favour of stewardship:

Today’s ecosystem managers (conservation ecologists) distinguish their best practices from earlier conservationists, realizing that to be effective, their management must be holistic and adaptive, supportive rather than controlling, and promote stewardship in collaboration with local experts who have a direct stake in the outcome. (Titon, 2009a, p. 11)

Titon believes a firmer concept of stewardship in relation to musical ecosystems “offers the most promising path toward sustainability in musical cultures today” (p. 11). The field of applied ethnomusicology seems to support this view, where the principles of the “First Voice” (Galla, 2008), equality, and reciprocity are paramount, and decisions in relation to cultural expressions are made in integral connection with the needs and wishes of their custodians. Stewardship is only one of several principles from the “new conservation ecology” that may find resonance with approaches to musical sustainability, others including notions of diversity, limits to growth, and interconnectedness (Titon, 2009b).

The benefits of taking ecological models into account in relation to maintaining and revitalising music, then, appear substantial, with considerable potential for future research. Ecology frameworks may inform further development of a model of musical diversity that defines with greater clarity what constitutes sustainable musical environments, indicates how to gauge their health, helps identify the broader
socioeconomic challenges faced by endangered music genres, points to methods that may resolve those challenges, and helps anticipate future outcomes of actions (and inactions). In this way, current ecological models represent valuable groundwork for our growing understanding of musical sustainability.

2.2 Practical approaches

A survey of practical approaches to supporting the vitality and viability of music genres yields a wide array of initiatives, conceived, funded, and steered by a variety of players at all levels from the local to the international. The diversity of approaches defies neat classification, but taking loose inspiration from the elements of a minor but well-constructed strategy of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of that region (Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador, n.d.), they might be grouped into five clusters (see Table 2.2). Although some initiatives span across two or more clusters, this five-part taxonomy – documentation and preservation; recognition and celebration; transmission and dissemination; policy and enterprise, and co-ordinating mechanisms – forms a useful framework for considering the range of practical approaches to maintaining and revitalising music genres and music cultures.

a) Documentation and preservation

Identifying, documenting and preserving endangered music genres

Of all practical approaches supporting sustainable endangered music genres, documentation is almost certainly the most extensive – perhaps a result of the ethnomusicological emphasis on that activity through the history of the discipline. Hundreds of organisations and projects are centrally involved with documenting and archiving local music genres, some of them with a specific goal to preserve these cultural expressions for posterity. Some ethnomusicologists believe that when it comes to supporting sustainable music genres, documentation and archiving is “all we can do”: to “keep the knowledge so that future composers and dance choreologists, for example, can go back, and they can find some recordings of what it used to be like, so that that can influence the future, and they can have some confidence that that was what their ancestors did” (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010). By documenting, researchers can play an important role in helping perpetuate music genres.
Table 2.2 Taxonomy of practical approaches to supporting music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Documentation and preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Federal Cylinder Project; PARADISEC archive; DELEMAN archive network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Recognition and celebration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Living National Treasures systems, UNESCO’s Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, community cultural festivals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Transmission and dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Kantele Project in Finland, Cambodian Living Arts, Revival of Afghan Music project, Playing for Change Foundation schools projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>Policy and enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>UNESCO Declarations / Conventions on cultural heritage and diversity; governmental music broadcasting and copyright laws; sustainable tourism and cultural heritage management enterprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster 5</th>
<th>Coordinating and evaluation mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>UNESCO’s Kit on Intangible Cultural Heritage; International Network for Cultural Diversity; Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To draw again on the example of the joik:

There are numerous examples of researchers in the early 20th century . . . who were recording, notating Sámi joik traditions, and at that time they thought that they were recording something which was disappearing. And almost 100 years later, their work is now being consulted not just by other researchers, but also by the musicians who are seeking to reconstruct things that maybe have been slightly lost, or to become more familiar with traditions that they feel they should be familiar with. (T. Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011)

Some scholars harbour equivocal views about the benefit of documentation for the vitality of endangered traditions, or about the role of documentation in “preservation” efforts:

If we are indeed to preserve something about music, we must find ways also of preserving and recording the concept part of the model [Merriam's sound-
behaviour-concept model of music]; this seems to me to be in fact more urgent ethnomusicology than the continuing preservation of the musical artifact alone. If I am justified in being generally critical of the role of preservation in the ethnomusicology of the past, it is because it has often failed to recognize that there is much more to music than the piece. (Nettl, 2005, p. 171)

Echoing these concerns and adding others besides, Ellis argued in the early 1990s that for the continued transmission of seriously endangered Central Australian songs, documentation is one of the most potentially dangerous activities:

Documentation of present-day performances can enable us to learn about the music and mythic map of the Dreaming but cannot record the spiritual essence of it. Further than this, these documents often create serious intercultural conflicts because the ownership of the songs can no longer be maintained in the traditional way, and their documented form can actually cause cultural disintegration. Such documents are useless in terms of regenerating the traditions in areas where breakdown of old practices has caused loss of music and language. (1992, p. 259)

A further concern with audio- or video- documentation in particular is that recordings have sometimes come to be regarded by communities as definitive representations of a genre, precluding scope for creativity and re-interpretation (e.g. Ellis, 1992, p. 268; Livingston, 1999, p. 75). With regard to documentation in written form, Aubert cites the case of the once-banned Ottoman genre fasıl, which survived largely due to musicological transcriptions made in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; but referring to current “academicism that blights most contemporary interpretations,” he observes: “We can see that having the writing as an exclusive recourse is not sufficient to preserve all the flavour and fluidity of an aesthetics so intimately connected with principles of an oral tradition” (2007, pp. 72-73).

Most researchers agree that documentation alone is not sufficient for the continuation of a vibrant, living tradition. Yet as already described in relation to music revivals, there sometimes exists a direct link between the documentation of a music genre and its continuity in living form, suggesting an important role for documentation in both preservation and revitalisation (Grant, 2010). Documentation, for example, can play a role in promoting both public and community knowledge and awareness of the significance of a music genre. Thus, although the vision of the National Recording Project for Indigenous Performance in Australia is “to systematically record and
document the unique and endangered performance traditions of Indigenous Australia” (Corn, 2011, ‘Vision’ section, para. 1), it ultimately “hopes to aid Indigenous communities in sustaining cultural survival by stimulating lifelong interest in performance traditions through its serial recording and documentation initiatives, and the collections that it will deposit in local repositories for perpetual community access” (Marett, et al., 2005, p. 88).

In music revivals, historical recordings are often used as the basis for formulating repertoire, stylistic features, and history of a tradition (Livingston, 1999, p. 71); notated music may serve some of the same roles, as in the case of the Northumbrian piping revival (see Section 2.1c). Karpeles described an instance from her fieldwork on folk songs in the southern Appalachians:

The bearers of the tradition, who had put aside their songs because they felt them to be no longer in the fashion, have had their confidence restored by hearing them over the radio and on gramophone records, and by seeing them in print. This was exemplified by a singer in North Carolina who said: “When I forget Mother’s songs, I know I have only to look at Cecil Sharp’s book, and they will come back to me just exactly right.” (1973, p. 101)

Historical recordings may also nourish the revival process. Recordings made by Hemetek over 30 years ago in Stinatz, Austria, “really are becoming important now for the people in this village, because most of the singers have died in the meantime”; musicians are turning to these recordings to find new ways of musical expression based on the tradition (U. Hemetek, personal interview, 22 July 2010). Norton recommends that as a part of the ongoing strategy to revitalise the endangered north Vietnamese genre ca trù, historical recordings be used to inform contemporary understanding, performance and transmission of it (2009, June, p. 215).

Sound archives are integral to effective documentation, serving the functions of “collecting, storing, maintaining, cataloguing, documenting, publishing and making available recordings of music traditions as they are now for the benefit of musicians, scholars and other interested people in the future” (Stubington, 1987, p. 9). Umbrella networks have been created as hubs, such as Smithsonian Global Sounds (which also functions as a digital educational resource; Smithsonian Institution, 2010); the pan-European meta-archive DISMARC (Discovering Music Archives), encompassing over 30,000 audio recordings; and DELEMAN (Digital Endangered Languages and Musics Archives Network), which brings together over twenty prominent regional and international archives including the Archive of Maori and Pacific Music (AMPM)
housed at the University of Auckland, the *Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures* (PARADISEC), and the *Endangered Languages Archive* (ELAR) of the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Program in the UK. Nettl gives an overview of the role of archives like these in musical preservation throughout the history of ethnomusicology (2005, pp. 161-171).

Ethnomusicologists continue working to counteract procedural flaws in documentation and archiving processes, recognising that high-quality sustainable data and metadata are crucial for accessibility and dissemination. Most major projects in Western countries (like the *National Recording Project* and *Sustainable Futures*) are now routinely accompanied by extensive guidelines for ensuring that processes of recording and collecting data and metadata meet international archival standards. Recent research has aided the move towards sustainable fieldwork data and their interface with archives and digital repositories, as well as concepts surrounding “best practice” (e.g. Barwick & Thieberger, 2006; Fargion, 2009; Seeger & Chaudhuri, 2004). Nevertheless, from region to region and archive to archive, the processes of collecting, cataloguing, classifying, indexing, storing and preserving materials all remain variable in quality and nature, with national and international standards relating to access and use of recordings being particularly erratically implemented and monitored. This has understandably lead to ethical concerns among some communities and scholars about misappropriation and misuse of materials (see Ellis, 1992, for one example).

Beyond the challenges of achieving “best practice” in documentation and archiving, the efficacy of efforts may be further jeopardised by factors outside the immediate control of researchers and communities. Technology changes at a rate so rapid as to make it difficult to keep pace. Recent computer software may be expensive, or high-quality recording gear may require training to operate. Equipment required for play-back of recordings quickly becomes obsolete, leading either to those recordings falling out of the public realm, or significant infrastructure requirements in terms of personnel, time, and funds to enable the transfer of copies to more recent formats. Storage discs, hard drives, reels, and tapes are subject to loss, damage, and deterioration, and like copying, the restoration of recordings is often a costly and time-consuming procedure (e.g. Barwick & Thieberger, 2006). All these factors need to be taken into account in sustainability projects with documentation at their core.

Internationally, researchers and fieldworkers are increasingly recognising the value and importance of ensuring that communities themselves have access to documentation, for example by depositing recordings in local or locally accessible
archives. Aside from the ethical reasons, facilitating access in this way sometimes has the intended or incidental effects of renewing interest in a genre, strengthening pride in it, stimulating memories of it, or forming the basis for further cultural reclamation projects. These were all outcomes, for example, of The Federal Cylinder Project, which repatriated some early wax cylinder recordings of songs and narratives of American Indian communities (Gray, 1996).

An even more collaborative approach to documentation provides community members with training in the skills required to undertake the documentation of their own traditions. This approach builds capacity within the local community, minimises outsider bias in documentation, and maximises community ownership of the process and outcomes, among other benefits. Self-determination was one rationale behind the UNESCO project Ethiopia: Traditional Music, Dance and Instruments, which aimed “to train a generation of local ethnomusicologists to collect and archive Ethiopia’s diverse musics,” including by establishing ethnomusicology courses at the University of Addis Ababa in 2005 (UNESCO / Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2006). Benefits of this type of collaborative approach notwithstanding, at times it proves challenging, not least due to the sometimes strikingly dissimilar aims of researchers and communities in documenting (e.g. Berez & Holton, 2006).

Online technologies are increasingly being used to store documentation and to disseminate the outcomes of documentation projects to the community and other interested parties. The Plateau Music Project (formerly the Tibetan Endangered Music Project), a grassroots cultural preservation program based in Xining City, China, is representative of some possible modes of dissemination and repatriation of the outcomes of music documentation (Bum & Roche, 2009). It makes available video clips on YouTube, prints and distributes written information in the local language to local communities, lodges recordings with international archives like PARADISEC, and has established links with the larger project Digital Himalaya, which itself is developing digital collection, storage and distribution strategies for music, songs, and other oral traditions from that region (Digital Himalaya, 2010).

Repatriation of old recordings raises issues relating to community ownership, protection of works, and protection of knowledge. When efforts to maintain or revitalise a music genre intend to disseminate recordings widely, concerns about copyright, economic rights, protection of works, protection of knowledge, and performers’ rights may become acute. There are often compelling arguments to make recordings available beyond academic circles and even sometimes beyond the communities themselves. But
if, as Romero believes, researchers should apply “imaginative strategies of commercialization and distribution of ethnographic records and film/videos” and draw on the mass media as the “principal means for reaching a wide audience” (1992, p. 206), the desire to promote information about situations of musical endangerment to as wide a public as possible needs to be balanced against ethical considerations, foregrounding the wishes of the community itself.

This first category of practical approaches to sustaining music genres also encompasses the very identification of genres in need of support. As yet, there exists no standardised, replicable tool that helps communities or researchers to identify situations and degrees of musical endangerment. Support mechanisms are therefore typically developed on a single-solution or reactive basis. Although the endangered status of some genres is obvious (as, arguably, in the case of many indigenous genres in Australia, Canada, the USA, and elsewhere), the endangerment of other seriously threatened genres may not be as patent or may simply fail to attract research interest, increasing the risk that their communities will be deprived of access to support. In addition, the lack of a way to identify and assess endangerment arguably inhibits the development of effective support mechanisms, since assessing factors that are contributing to endangerment would help establish focus and priorities for action. It also renders it difficult or impossible to accurately gauge the efficacy of any maintenance or revitalisation initiatives that are implemented. This lack of a systematic tool to identify and assess instances of musical endangerment therefore represents a critical gap in both theory and practice of ways to support endangered music genres.

b) Recognition and celebration

encouraging the celebration of endangered music genres at all levels from local to international, and recognising, supporting, and encouraging musicians and music practices

Of all approaches to strengthening musical vitality that encourage the celebration of music, festivals serve as perhaps the best example. Since the 1920s, festivals have often played an important role in revival movements (Rosenberg, 1993a, p. 6) and examples of festivals strengthening the vitality of musical traditions are scattered throughout the revival literature. By forming a new performance context for Indian dhrupad from the mid-1970s, for example, festivals were a central catalyst in the revitalisation of that genre (Sanyal & Widdess, 2004, pp. 280-281). Livingston’s description of why festivals
and competitions are fundamental to revival movements may hold true for approaches towards music sustainability too:

These events are crucial to the revivalist community because revivalists meet each other face-to-face to share repertoire and playing techniques, to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of artists within the tradition, to actively learn and experience the revivalist ethos and aesthetic code at work, and to socialize among other ‘insiders’. These events are fundamental to a revival’s success for they supplement what can be learned from recordings and books with lived experiences and direct human contact. (1999, p. 73)

For indigenous peoples in particular, festivals represent strategic spaces to recognise, celebrate, and renew their cultural traditions. Festivals have been lauded as “one of the few consistently positive spaces for Indigenous communities to forge and assert a more constructive view of themselves, both inter-generationally and as part of a drive for recognition and respect as distinct cultures in various local, national and international contexts” (Phipps, 2009, p. 30). By inspiring an indigenous community to identify more strongly with its musical heritage, or by confirming the value of the tradition in other ways (fiscally, for example), even non-substantive community events can benefit musical vitality and viability well beyond the duration of the event. On the other hand, it is also possible for the effect of these one-off events to last no longer than the events themselves. This depends a great deal on the level of community engagement, commitment, and ownership of the event.

With the rise of the mass media, festivals can be “truly global in scope; drawing self-consciously on the contemporary global communications networks of cultural diasporas, tourism and the media, strengthening their presence in the context of global rights-based institutions in the process” (Phipps, 2009, p. 30). As in the case of Cape Breton fiddling in Canada in the 1970s, raised public interest in a “small” music genre may bring increased demand for it, and this in turn may pressure the media to allot it greater importance (Feintuch, 2006, p. 6). Another example of the role of the media in recognising and celebrating musical heritage is the range of competitions celebrating traditional music skills and practices, such as these three in China: the *Television Contest of Erhu, Pipa, Dizi, and Guzheng*, the *National Folk Instrumental Music Television Contest*, and the *Chinese Folk Song Competition* held as part of the Nanning International Folk Song Festival. In many countries around the world, contests such as these often hold significant prestige, and success in them can aid not only the career of a
competing musician, but also potentially boost interest in the musical traditions they represent.

Festivals, competitions, and media promotion are not always wholly positive for the health of a genre or its associated musical practices. Essentially a facet of the global music industry, the phenomenon of the “festivalization of world music” (Bohlman, 2002, p. 137) has left residual effect on many genres, including their homogenisation or standardisation. In the case of dhrupad, “festivalisation” has arguably encouraged the growth of the genre as a “parallel culture,” rather than its integration into the mainstream: audiences are mainly local, and the festivals (and their embedded competitions) receive minimal press or national media coverage (Sanyal & Widdess, 2004, p. 281). Ellis voices further ethical concerns about the competitive nature of some festivals and their impact on communities (1992, p. 278). Overcoming these challenges may be difficult and will depend on the situation at hand, but as with most sustainability initiatives, it seems likely that odds of success will grow with a high level of community involvement in the festival process and product from the beginning.

The borders are sometimes vague between approaches to sustainability that recognise, support, and encourage music at a local level, and those that also work at a wider provincial, national or international sphere. The Australian Aboriginal Garma Festival is one example, vigorously upholding local ownership while expanding to an event of national scope, and therefore now representing “an intercultural gathering of national political, cultural and academic significance, and, simultaneously, a very local gathering of Yolngu clans on Yolngu land for Yolngu purposes” (Phipps, 2009, p. 38). Another instance is found in the revitalisation of ca trù, where the establishment in the early 1990s of the local Hanoi Ca Trù Club and performing ensemble played a role in stimulating initiatives recognising and celebrating the genre at national and international levels; the raised profile of ca trù has fed back to surge local interest and engagement in the genre.

UNESCO may be considered the primary driver of safeguarding approaches that recognise and promote endangered music and music practices at once locally and at a national or international level. From 2001, for example, the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity paid homage to manifestations of cultural heritage in order to encourage local communities to protect them, and to raise awareness among local structures, national governments, and the wider public about intangible cultural heritage. While not without its problems (discussed further later this section, and in Section 2.2d), the Masterpieces program was
successful in promoting awareness of the issues, creating a favourable environment for the drafting and ratification of the 2003 Convention on safeguarding, and instigating a “surge in scholarly reflection” on intangible heritage programs (Seeger, 2009, pp. 114-115). This program was superseded in 2008 by the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, which now contains over 160 entries. Another UNESCO list identifies Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding; inscription on it typically escalates the local, national and international profiles of the heritage in question, in addition to committing the relevant State Party to undertake certain safeguarding activities.

One particularly salient example of an initiative operating simultaneously at a local and a higher level is the Living National Treasures (sometimes Living Human Treasures or Intangible National Treasures) system that operates in several countries, originating in Japan in the 1950s. These schemes identify, support, and celebrate individuals who hold the highest skills in an aspect of the cultural heritage of a people. They aim to persuade artists to continue and expand their artistic practice and pass their skills on to the younger generations, and to encourage younger people to “devote their lives to learning the skills and techniques of the identified cultural manifestations by holding out to them the possibility of future recognition and support, and national or international fame, if they are able to achieve the necessary level of excellence” (UNESCO Section of Intangible Heritage / Korean National Commission for UNESCO, 2002, p. 20).

Like festivals, competitions, and media promotion, these high-profile methods of recognising and celebrating music and musicians have attracted criticism for their equivocal impact on the community (and cultural form) in question (see L. Smith & Akagawa, 2009, in relation to issues of intangible heritage at large). Wang, for example, observes that the Taiwanese Ministry of Education Heritage Award for outstanding traditional musicians, implemented in 1985, “not only created a sense of competition among musicians and groups but also enhanced the reliance of musicians on scholars or other cultural bureaucrats as their mediators and patrons”; in 1994, the award was discontinued (2003, pp. 117-120). UNESCO’s Masterpieces scheme has set a platform for some nation-states to manifest nationalist sentiment, by reifying the link between their nation-state and a cultural tradition, to the exclusion of cultural forms that are found across state borders (Seeger, 2009, pp. 121, 124-125). Titon argues that the same scheme suffered from a lack of satisfactory implementation mechanisms, and a focus on the “masterpieces” themselves, over and above consideration of the persons who
produce and sustain them, or their wider music-cultural ecosystems (2009b, p. 129). Thus, while “top-down” initiatives have proven an ability to promote prestige, recognise musical skill and knowledge, and celebrate and support musicians and music practices, they run the risk of being undermined by a complex set of issues, including a lack of grassroots understanding, resources, control, and ownership that typically characterises approaches developed and implemented at the community level.

c) Transmission and dissemination

encouraging and supporting the transmission and dissemination of musical skills, knowledge and practices

The ways in which initiatives relating to transmission (from person to person) and dissemination (from place to place) can help maintain or revitalise a music genre are perhaps best explicated by reference to specific cases. One such initiative emanates from Thailand, where Thai classical music met with a revival due to the efforts of a local academic who introduced music schools into local shopping malls (Wong, in QCRC, 2008, 6:47-8:23). Another is the music schools set up in African villages by the Playing for Change Foundation, a non-governmental organisation devoted to creating positive social change through music education. Supported by this foundation, the Kirina Music School in Mali opened in October 2010, with one aim of helping local people “preserve and share their musical traditions, which have been slowly disappearing due to lack of teaching resources” (Playing for Change, 2011, para. 3). Music education and the renewal of transmission processes also lie at the centre of the Revival of Afghan Music project, launched in 2009 by the Afghanistan National Institute of Music. By training young musicians, who (it is hoped) will eventually go on to become teachers and music educators themselves, the project aims to help rebuild and revive Afghan musical traditions (Afghanistan National Institute of Music, 2009).

An interesting model of a transmission-based approach to music sustainability is the Cambodian Living Arts program, which supports “16 master musicians and nearly 300 students and assistant teachers to develop skills and relationships that will enable them to generate income and develop as leaders, while also helping to preserve and celebrate their heritage” (Cambodian Living Arts, 2007; ‘Projects’ section). Working collaboratively with those involved, the program provides master musicians with a wage, instruments, teaching space, and basic healthcare. For students, it provides musical instruments, public school stipends, and a limited number of university-level
scholarships, and a few years ago it opened its first teaching and learning centre in Phnom Penh. This transmission-based model holds some parallels with certain music apprenticeship schemes in the United States, funded by arts agencies as a form of “intervention” in cultural sustainability, in which younger members of an arts community learn from respected elders (Titon, 2009a, p. 13).

In Southeast Asia, where Tan believes changing values and attitudes to tradition and modernity among young people is leading to the disappearance of traditional music (2008, p. 70), education may play an important role in music sustainability. Tan describes how a project in Malaysia, in which youths were given training in local music traditions which they then performed, stimulated interest in traditional music both among participants and among the wider community (pp. 75, 79). With regard to the link to musical sustainability, she writes that such community-based music and heritage conservation programs . . . have empowered young people and the community to transcend ethnic barriers and take courage to speak for themselves. Empowerment ensures that musical traditions will be conserved in their traditional socio-cultural contexts of performance, rather than in the archives. (2008, p. 81)

Another example of a transmission-based revitalisation initiative from this region emanates from Vietnam, where in 2002, Ford Foundation funded a two-month program that enabled interested musicians from several northern provinces to learn the endangered genre ca trù. Following these classes, many participants began teaching the genre themselves, leading to the establishment of ca trù “clubs,” which then acted as infrastructure for teaching, learning, and performing (see Đặng, 2008, pp. 535-536).

The Kantele Project is another striking example of a music sustainability initiative centring on transmission processes. It was initiated in 1982 by the Folk Music Institute in Kaustinen in response to the low prestige and profile of the Finnish national instrument. By introducing the kantele into the music syllabus of all comprehensive schools, the project successfully raised the instrument’s national public profile, and set a precedent for the introduction in 1983 of folk music into higher education (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 64). Ramnarine attributes the project’s success to the endeavours of certain individuals, as well as “to the provision of instruments, teaching materials, and training for teachers – made available because of the value that the state continues to accord to folk music” (2003, p. 64).

In general, practical approaches to maintaining and revitalising music genres that centre on the transmission and dissemination are represented in the literature by
specific instances such as these. In describing a scheme with transmission at its core, Graves (2005, pp. 137-139) is one of the few scholars to abstract the key elements in reviving the transmission of an endangered genre. The music in question is traditional English Northumberland *ceilidh* dance tunes. Their revitalisation began a couple of decades ago, when a leading exponent of the tradition rightly recognised that the genre could be given a new lease by engaging local school students with it, and through them, the wider community. From those modest beginnings the organisation FolkWorks was established, under whose auspices teaching resources were created and disseminated, master artists brought into schools to work with student ensembles, and summer music camps organised for teens and adults. Some of the young adults involved in these programs became interested in a career in folk performance, and eventually toured nationally. FolkWorks implemented a series of training workshops for school teachers, and in due course every school in Northumberland had a trained teacher able to offer basic instruction in the tradition. Graves generalises the whole process in this way:

The basic components form an elegant circle: exposure of students to traditional artistry in the classroom results in community performance opportunities; these inspire the most interested and talented students to pursue extracurricular training; the best of these are given professional performance opportunities and are brought back for teacher training institutes; the teachers bring their new knowledge into their classrooms; and the cycle begins anew. (2005, p. 139)

This precedent has served as a model for a similar enterprise in Portland (Maine) in the United States. One noteworthy feature of it is that, like the Kantele Project in Finland, it too illustrates the value of committed individuals in efforts towards musical vitality and viability.

From another angle, the field of Cultural Diversity in Music Education (CDIME) and the informal international network of this name may also hold theoretical insights into practical transmission-based approaches to sustainability. With a focus on pedagogy, it investigates best ways to disseminate knowledge and practice about the world’s music cultures in a range of formal and non-formal educational settings (e.g. Campbell, et al., 2005). The very practice of cultural diversity in music education may aid the vitality of endangered music genres, which may feasibly find a new lease of life through transmission in different times and places. Children or youth learning in schools, for example, may “start playing with and exploring the possibilities, . . . and expanding or in some way varying the tradition, . . . and actually give credence to a more inventive nature of the genre” (P. Campbell, personal interview, 4 March 2010).
Although research in the field of CDIME deals predominantly with transmission that occurs outside of the community whose music is being taught – sometimes with vastly different aims and in vastly different circumstances from transmission within its culture of origin – the field still holds potential to inform the understanding (and practice) of the dynamics of music transmission across contexts and cultures (cf. Schippers, 2010a, pp. 124-127). (An example of how it might do so is offered in Chapter 3.1.) Some of the approaches to maintaining and revitalising music genres that encourage the transmission and dissemination of musical heritage and skills are spectacularly successful, like those described by Graves and Ramnarine. Others are far less so. Taiwanese state-funded nanguan training courses in elementary and junior high schools cultivated some grass-roots appreciation and skills in the genre, but they also created tension among nanguan musicians over who would be involved in the program, how much they would be paid, and appropriate teaching methods (Wang, 2003, pp. 123-124). A number of scholars have also tabled various risks in introducing a music genre into an institution (e.g. Cohen, 2009; Schippers, 2009, p. 200). Campbell identifies some of these with regard to the introduction of Mexican Mariachi into schools in the USA:

Schools have systems, schools have bells, schools have timelines, when you're out of school you don't typically do what you did at school, and so we have probably a diminishing of the repertoire. . . . By way of oral lore, we find out that . . . [teachers] go to workshops and they trade off a canon of ten working songs and Mariachi becomes just that. So Mariachi becomes less rich . . . . It makes you wonder: was there more before it ended in the institution? (personal interview, 4 March 2010)

With this in mind, and despite some theoretical foundations from the field of CDIME, successful transmission-based sustainability initiatives represent promising but still under-researched prototypes for developing effective transmission-based initiatives to support musical sustainability across other situations of endangerment.

d) Policy and enterprise

protecting and promoting endangered music genres through legal measures, and through industry and cultural enterprise

This section examines legal measures, policy instruments, and industry and enterprise initiatives that explicitly or implicitly serve to protect or promote music genres and
music-makers. Policies and regulations protecting and promoting music genres do not always relate directly to them; laws relating to media, education, and copyright, for example, can all affect musical vitality. These types of measures function chiefly at the national or transnational levels. National-level policies and regulations are largely dependent on the ideologies of those in power, and so vacillate from era to governmental era, and from country to country.

Blaukopf (1990, 1992) gives a number of examples of possible legal or contractual policy measures that may help protect “small” music genres – not least by raising funds for archiving, documentation, research, training professional musicians, or revitalisation initiatives. Media consumption could be taxed, he suggests, for example by implementing license fees for television or radio ownership. Phonographic companies and broadcasting bodies could be encouraged to make voluntary payments for their use of traditional music. Royalties could be payable upon use of folklore for economically gainful purposes, and those royalties in turn could be earmarked for cultural preservation or promotion purposes. Broadcasting policies could allocate a percentage of airtime to local music, thereby encouraging and celebrating local music and musicians as well as providing a platform for its performance. Levies on blank cassettes could be used to compensate the authors of musical works for any lack of rightful remuneration due to piracy. Folklore could be copyrighted, meaning that the copyright is vested in the community.

In some countries, measures like these have been at least partly effective in protecting local music, such as in India, where All India Radio has played a significant role in preserving and promoting the Indian classical tradition (Neuman, 1980). In other cases (including in a number of sub-Saharan African countries), policies do not exist, are inadequately reinforced, or are perversely implemented (Letts, 2006, p. 61). Stobart’s case study of music production and piracy in Bolivia explores the multifaceted nature of the challenges (2010).

At the international or transnational level, various declarations, conventions, and recommendations form tools of reference through which nation-states can take steps to protect their cultural heritage in spite of – or along with – mechanisms that promote it within a global market economy. These instruments form a foundation on which stakeholders, from local community members to national governments, may develop practical approaches to strengthen cultural (including musical) sustainability. The high profile of instruments like the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO, 2001b), the Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage

These instruments are supported by the efforts of non-governmental bodies such as the United-States-based organisation Future of Music, whose mission, through education, research, and advocacy, is “to ensure a diverse musical culture where artists flourish, are compensated fairly for their work, and where fans can find the music they want” (2010, para. 1). Other examples include Freemuse, which campaigns against unreasonable censorship and for the freedom of musical expression in all countries (2009), and the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), which aims to establish an appropriate relation between intellectual property rights and protecting traditional musical expressions. Responding to a call for guidance from Indigenous organisations, archives, and cultural researchers, WIPO (through its Creative Heritage Project) develops and maintains guidelines, codes of practice, protocols, and other resources for dealing with intellectual property issues that arise when archiving, documenting, recording, digitising, and disseminating intangible cultural heritage. It also describes best practice and management of intellectual property in relation to festivals, which, as described earlier, hold some risk of adversely affecting local music genres (World Intellectual Property Organisation, 2010).

The effect of national and international policy initiatives on local musics can be equivocal. While years of state intervention from 1980 brought Taiwanese *nanguan* increased visibility, it also arguably contributed to a compromise of the integrity of its musicians, as well as the “commodification, vulgarization, and theatricalization” of the music itself – and this quite aside from the overall failure of state intervention to solve problems of transmission (Wang, 2003, p. 152). The UNESCO strategy of proclaiming cultural “Masterpieces,” too, has sometimes had unintended and damaging outcomes. The proclamation in 2001 of Bolivia’s Oruro Carnival as a UNESCO *Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, for example, exacerbated conflict about the origins, ownership, and appropriation by Peruvians of Bolivian music and dance expressions (Stobart, 2010, p. 45). China’s successful nomination of *khöömei* (throat singing) to UNESCO’s *Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* caused contention among some artists and officials in Mongolia, who argued the tradition is Mongolian, not Chinese (Higgins, 2011).
Although the *Masterpieces* scheme did call international attention to the need to support intangible cultural heritage, the action plans resulting from the inscriptions to the *Masterpieces* list were sometimes so misconceived that “if they had been applied it might have been worse than if they weren’t”; often there were insufficient financial means to implement them in any case, resulting in local-level disillusionment about the scheme (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011). In Croatia, certain proclaimed intangible masterpieces (not only musical ones) subsequently became “like a national park” where “you’re not supposed to change anything” (S. Pettan, personal interview, 30 July 2010). Rammarine sees the merit in recognising and valuing music through such schemes, but warns:

An ethnomusicologist can then fall into the traps of the local contestations, because by selecting one particular tradition that’s recommended to a formal body such as UNESCO as an example of something which should be safeguarded, inevitably other traditions are not going to be presented. And then there’d be all sorts of internal social political reasons why one tradition might be privileged over another – all kinds of relation dynamics that go on to determine what is going to represent the nation in a particular context in the safeguarding process. (personal interview, 16 March 2011)

Two further equivocal cases are that of the Royal Ballet of Cambodia, where the UNESCO proclamation “entered local politics and worked against innovation, originality and development of new repertoire within the Ballet company” (Titon, 2009b, p. 127); and that of Chinese *guqin*, in which case the proclamation ushered in a series of events which pushed aside the very tradition it wished to support, unwittingly helping to establish the music in a virtuosic, professional, presentational performance for the concert hall, which was contrary to the UNESCO proclamation’s characterization of the music’s heritage as an endangered, contemplative, amateur chamber music for the home. (Titon, 2009b, p. 127)

While there continues to be extensive theorisation, deconstruction and critique of UNESCO’s approach to cultural heritage and its safeguarding (e.g. a recent volume edited by Smith & Akagawa, 2009), ways to avoid (or even just accurately predict) the unanticipated ill-effects of well-intended initiatives like the *Masterpieces* scheme have been the subject of only limited ethnomusicological investigation. To date, there is still no systematic evaluative process in place for the *Masterpieces* scheme, and any
understanding of the effects of the scheme on the local communities involved remains anecdotal and piecemeal (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011).

Endangered music genres are nowadays in a situation where they must contend with “the undisputable fact of a complete commodification and industrialization of musical production in areas hitherto untouched by capitalist transformation” (Erlmann, 1993, p. 4). In contrast with Malm’s belief that it is almost impossible for national governments to influence the mass media through policies or recommendations (1992, p. 225), Romero considers the mass media “the realm, par excellence, in which well-intentioned cultural policies could produce a positive effect” on endangered musical traditions (1992, pp. 191-192). He believes, for example: “If in Peru the process of musical extinction is in some way being counteracted, it is because Indigenous and mestizo music is being featured on commercial discs” (p. 204).

This raises the issue of enterprise, whether in conjunction with policy or separate from it, and its role in strengthening the vitality of music genres. Cultural tourism, cultural entrepreneurship and businesses, cultural export strategies, and cultural enterprises as a part of economic development initiatives are just a few of the many possible links between enterprise and musical vitality and viability. Some types of enterprise seem to be an integral and fundamental characteristic of music revivals, pointing to their possible role in viability or vitality. According to Livingston, one feature most music revivals have in common is

the emergence of a revival industry, by which I mean non-profit and/or commercial enterprise catering to the revivalist market consisting of concert and festival promotions, sales of recordings, newsletters, pedagogical publications, and instruments and supplies. Although many revivalists are embarrassed to admit this aspect of their movement given their general distrust of the commercial market and its massifying tendencies, it is an ethnographic fact. Indeed I would argue that it would be difficult for any revival to exist for more than a few years without entering into this phase. (1999, p. 79)

If Romero and Livingston are right, the role of enterprise may be an important consideration in furthering practical approaches to sustaining endangered music genres.

Vigilance should be exercised, though. As Graves warns (2005, p. 88), powerful links sometimes obtain between the protection and the exploitation of cultural heritage. Among approaches aiming to raise the vitality of endangered music genres, perhaps nowhere is the threat of exploitation more real than in those mechanisms in which profitable enterprise and industry play a central role. In some ways, cultural
homogenisation is an advantage for multinational companies, for whom fewer consumer tastes means easier product and market development. Strategies “intended to buffer cultural heritage often result in consequences that are ruled by the model of the marketplace rather than the ecosphere” (Graves, 2005, pp. 88-89).

Recognising this danger, some government and non-government policy or other mechanisms have been developed to support communities protect and promote their cultural heritage in connection with enterprise. In 2006, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador made the development of cultural enterprise “while remaining sensitive to existing community practices” a key goal in its efforts to preserve intangible cultural heritage (Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador, n.d., pp. 14-15). Another example is the Stepping Stones for Tourism program developed in collaboration with the Australian Government Department of Environment and Heritage, Aboriginal Tourism Australia, and Tourism NT (Stepwise Heritage and Tourism, 2008), which guides Australian Indigenous communities in developing and managing tourism that is sustainable for both themselves and their cultural heritage.

e) Coordinating and evaluation mechanisms

monitoring, evaluating, coordinating and carrying forward the goals and objectives of sustaining endangered music genres

Mechanisms that coordinate approaches efforts in music sustainability may operate at a community, regional, national, or international level, and be carried out by a range of players, from the individual through to supra-national bodies (see Figure 2.1). Some community-level initiatives have been described earlier in this chapter, such as festivals and educational projects. A generalised example is when a local institution or school takes it upon itself to help maintain or revitalise a music genre, perhaps by running local festivals or performance events, purchasing musical instruments, or providing music tuition to individuals or groups. At a provincial, regional or national level, co-ordinating strategies are well represented by the efforts of cultural institutions such as the China Intangible Cultural Heritage Protection Center, an organisation committed to promoting the cause of Chinese intangible cultural heritage through research, education, promotion, and co-ordinating mechanisms, or the more local Chengdu Intangible Cultural Heritage Protection Center in Sichuan, China.

At an international level, UNESCO is the leading player in co-ordinating mechanisms. It represents a high-profile, well-established, and respected structure for
Key players in supporting vibrant and viable music genres

**Community-based institutions**, formal or informal, that engage in some way with the cause of vibrant music genres, such as by driving grassroots-level cultural revitalisation efforts or by advocating to government, media, or the public.

**Training institutes/organisations**, whose role in supporting musical viability may be explicit (as in the Revival of Afghan Music project at the Afghanistan National Institute of Music) or implicit (as in the promotion of cultural diversity in music education at the World Music and Dance Centre, Rotterdam).

**Research institutes**, which may drive research or documentation projects, run grant programs, engage in public advocacy, and provide publication and conference platforms. An example is the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (accountable to, but independent from, government).

**Non-government organisations** whose remit in whole or part is to strengthen the vitality of cultural (or musical) heritage. These may operate on a local, regional, national, or international level. A prominent example of the latter is UNESCO (in particular, its Intangible Cultural Heritage division).

**Foundations** and other funding bodies that identify cultural support as a part or whole of their mission, such as the Christensen Fund. Lack of politically accountability means that foundations can be more flexible and take more risks when dispersing funds.

**Profitable enterprises** in whose interests it may be to protect or promote cultural expressions, such as those wishing to offset their impact on a minority or indigenous culture (e.g. mining companies), or those that profit from vital and viable cultures (e.g. cultural tourism businesses).

**Local and national governments**, especially through their cultural and education policies, and their attitudes to indigenous and minority peoples. Government bodies may also disperse funding for cultural projects.

__Key individuals include community members, cultural activists, educators, researchers, business owners, philanthropists, policy-makers, and politicians__

promoting the diversity and vitality of cultures of the world, with proven ability to influence key decisions and actions in relation to sustainability and safeguarding. Its core aims in regard to intangible heritage are advocacy, acting as a clearing-house for the dissemination and sharing of knowledge and information, setting standards and forging international agreements, and helping Member States implement national safeguarding measures such as ongoing inventories of cultural heritage, appropriate policies, and competent legal, financial, and administrative measures (UNESCO, 2010). Despite its high profile, UNESCO’s approaches to safeguarding have not escaped criticism. Some of the expressed concerns are raised later in this section.
Among UNESCO’s mechanisms relating to safeguarding, one of the most significant is the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, the first UNESCO treaty specifically underscoring the importance of such heritage. Initiatives to facilitate the implementation of the Convention among States Parties continue to be developed. In 2009, for example, UNESCO released a downloadable Kit on Intangible Cultural Heritage, “a basic reference and practical instrument for promoting and ensuring an effective understanding of intangible cultural heritage and the 2003 Convention by governments, communities, experts, concerned UN agencies, NGOs and interested individuals” (UNESCO, 2010, ‘Publications and Documentation’ section). Also that year, UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage selected three safeguarding projects, programs and activities that it believed best reflect the aims and principles of the 2003 Convention, hoping that such a “register of good practices” would raise public awareness of the value of intangible heritage and the need to safeguard it (UNESCO, 2010, ‘Intangible Heritage Lists’ section).

A multitude of international and transnational non-government organisations have been established to further UNESCO’s goal to protect cultural heritage, founded on its principles or operating under its auspices. The Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU), established in the 1970s, is one example. It organises training courses for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, hosts conferences around issues relating to the 2003 Convention, and runs the International Contest for Better Practices in Community Intangible Cultural Heritage Revitalization (Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO, 2010). ACCU is largely subsidised by the Japanese government, and at times its continued existence has been at risk of discontinuation due to budget cuts (van Zanten, 2009, p. 42).

Especially if the principles of UNESCO’s declarations and conventions are incorporated into evolving international agreements (like those on free trade or intellectual property), they hold promise to form a conduit by which “small” music genres may be kept viable. Yet UNESCO’s safeguarding strategies can bring sometimes unforeseen and unwanted consequences, as described earlier this chapter in relation to the Living National Treasures and Masterpieces schemes. Titon puts this down to its very “remoteness” and a lack of “sufficient ongoing, on-the-ground connections (partnerships)” with cultural heritage workers and the culture-bearing communities themselves (2009b, p. 124); within the context of these schemes, the pivotal role of the community in safeguarding its own heritage has been problematised.
at some length (e.g. Blake, 2009, and others in that volume). Concern has been expressed too that experts in the relevant field do not have greater agency in moving forward UNESCO’s goals:

The 2003 UNESCO convention is now clearly dominated by politicians who quite often take a nationalist viewpoint. This is not always beneficial to safeguarding living culture in our world. Cultural policies are complicated and expertise is very much needed.

Safeguarding is not a question of putting items of ICH on lists. We need to develop cultural strategies that work properly, based on ‘best practices’ in safeguarding. (van Zanten, 2009, p. 42)

A range of international bodies serve as networks for policy makers and other stakeholders to explore and exchange views and information on promoting cultural heritage and cultural diversity. The International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD), dedicated to countering the homogenising effects of globalisation on cultural heritage, brings together culture-bearers, local communities, cultural institutions, researchers, and industry workers to promote cultural diversity and build international support for its cause (International Network for Cultural Diversity, 2008). The International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity, which facilitates cooperation and the development of common positions and actions between nations, played a role in developing the 2007 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity, 2010). The International Network on Cultural Policy serves as an informal hub where national cultural ministers can discuss topical cultural policy issues and develop strategies to promote cultural diversity (International Network on Cultural Policy, 2008), and the International Network of Lawyers for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions is an independent association dedicated to providing legal counsel to civil society stakeholders and nation-states on issues relating to the implementation, evaluation and interpretation of that same 2007 Convention (International Network of Lawyers for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2010).

Compared with these extensive international projects and networks coordinating and implementing the goals of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, those relating to music specifically are relatively meagre. Peak international music bodies such as the International Music Council (IMC) and the International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM; both with official relations with UNESCO), the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM), and the International Society for Music Education (ISME)
have some, but limited, engagement with the cause of musical diversity and music sustainability. While IMC-commissioned reports by Mundy (2001) and Letts (2006) offer useful suggestions for developing ways to support the diversity, vitality and viability of music genres and music cultures, many remain unrealised.

Research partnerships relating to music sustainability (such as IMC’s with *Sustainable Futures*), formal statements highlighting the need to support endangered traditions (such as the ICTM Australia-New Zealand Regional Committee’s statement about the urgent situation of Australian Indigenous music and dance; Bendrups, 2011), and international conferences and events where sustainability is a theme (such as the 2010 symposium of ICTM’s Applied Ethnomusicology Study Group) all demonstrate the ideological support of these peak organisations for the issues, but the administrative structure and financial resources that would enable them to play a more active part in co-ordinating approaches to sustainability are lacking. Thus, most ways in which these peak bodies might help improve and standardise administrative, ethical, legal, financial, and practical matters relating to music sustainability – say by establishing guidelines and protocols for best practice, developing advocacy pitches, lobbying governments and other relevant bodies, evaluating practical efforts, centralising information about potential funding sources, and creating networks for exchange of ideas and information – remain largely unrealised.

In particular, infrastructure in the form of hubs, gateways and forums to pool and share resources about ways to support endangered music genres and music cultures remains critically deficient. In the early 1990s, Blaukopf pleaded for the creation of a driving force behind the struggle for adequate legal policies, “a kind of lobby for traditional music. . . . if there is no such lobby, then certainly nothing useful will happen” (1990, p. 132). Around the same time, Malm argued that it was crucial to boost the informal international networks between music organisations and individual enthusiasts active at the national and local levels. These networks are today the most important agents for spreading music traditions that are not part of the commercial system. The enthusiasts and their networks are the only guarantee that at least some music traditions can live and develop according to conditions laid down by social, phsycological [sic] and physical needs and not only according to conditions laid down by the market. (1993, p. 351)

It seems that little progress has been made in the nearly two decades since then; this was also the time that Romero proposed that “international cooperation should be one of the
main strategies to be further explored by ethnomusicologists and cultural politicians in order to maximize their realm of action and effectiveness” (1992, p. 206).

Given the diversity of players in efforts to support music sustainability (as shown in Figure 2.1), including educational institutions, non-government organisations, and governments, as well as recording companies, media organisations, and other agents whose primary concern is not musical viability per se, the establishment of national and international networks that enable these players to pool resources and share knowledge, information, and experience seems crucial. Networks (such as that intended as an outcome of the Sustainable Futures project) could help further the conversation around best practice, facilitate the sharing of technical expertise relating to supporting sustainability, and help disseminate knowledge about methods and tools for supporting endangered music genres. They could serve to engage communities in making decisions about their music, and could help those in less developed regions to avoid the financial costs of reinventing approaches to sustainability that have already been tried and tested by wealthier countries. Importantly too, they represent a way to develop clear advocacy arguments relating to the need for efforts to protect or promote musical diversity and the viability of “small” music genres; these are critical not only to raise public awareness of the issues, but also that of government and non-government organisations at the national and international levels.

2.3 Conclusions

The appraisal of music sustainability in this chapter brings into relief the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps in current theory and practice. The key strengths may be summarised as follows:

- an understanding of, and some theoretical frameworks to describe, processes of transculturation, change, and revival of music genres, as well as theory on the relationship between globalisation and culture, including the equivocal effects of global markets on “small” music genres (Sections 2.1a-c);
- theoretical frameworks for understanding phenomena and processes of cultural, and specifically musical, diversity and ways to protect them, as well as growing discourse on ecological models for cultural and musical sustainability (Section 2.1d);
• extensive ethnomusicological experience and relatively well-funded initiatives of documentation and archiving, with procedural flaws being addressed through “best practice” (Section 2.2a);

• keen awareness of ethical issues inherent in maintaining or revitalising endangered music genres (particularly but not exclusively in relation to documenting and archiving), especially the importance of the principles of equality, collaboration, and reciprocity espoused by applied ethnomusicology (Section 2.2a and ff.);

• specific instances of the ability of certain approaches supporting music at local, national, and international levels to increase the vitality and viability of music genres (e.g. festivals, transmission-based projects, and policy measures; Section 2.2c);

• extensive non-music-specific co-ordinating and evaluating mechanisms for safeguarding and sustainability, administered or driven by organisations like UNESCO, WIPO, and INCD (Section 2.2e).

Another strength, which becomes apparent when viewing this chapter as a whole, is the ideological readiness of researchers, certain organisations, and other stakeholders to engage with research and applied efforts in music sustainability, as evidenced by a growing body of research and a range of practical initiatives in the area.

As is evident from the discussion in this chapter, some challenges to supporting music sustainability lie outside the immediate control of researchers or communities. Examples include the often-limited availability of substantive funding and resources for practical initiatives; political or legislative forces that override efforts to sustain “small” music genres, such as unfavourable governmental attitudes to minority cultural expressions; and the equivocal impact on music genres of mass media, enterprise, and commercial ventures. While an understanding of these situations and processes is crucial to developing appropriate theory and practice of music sustainability, they are probably factors that maintenance or revitalisation efforts will need to take into account, rather than focussing on overcoming them.

Several other shortcomings to current approaches supporting viable and vibrant music genres are, however, eminently surmountable. The most critical gaps and weaknesses of current theory and practice relating to music sustainability may be summarised as follows:

• limited well-developed arguments advocating the need for efforts to maintain or revitalise “small” music genres (Sections 2.1d and 2.2e);
• the lack of a systematic, standardised, method to identify and assess situations of musical endangerment (cf. Section 2.2a);

• limited knowledge-base on best ways to maintain and revitalise endangered music genres, despite the considerable success of specific approaches (for example, transmission-centred initiatives; Section 2.2c);

• limited critical theoretical reflection on the possible effects of practical strategies intending to support music sustainability (e.g. policies, festivals, institutionalisation, international instruments), despite recurring instances of equivocal and unexpected outcomes (Section 2.2d); and

• limited music-specific measures that monitor, evaluate, coordinate or carry forward the goals and objectives of sustaining and promoting endangered music genres (Section 2.2e).

Before I investigate (in Chapter 4) whether the field of language maintenance might inform ways to repair these key shortcomings, language and music need to be assessed for similarities and differences in relation to factors that affect their sustainability. This is the aim of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
BUILDING A COMPARATIVE FRAMEWORK

Theories in language revitalization can bring new light to understanding music revitalization among indigenous minorities if we examine the differences and similarities while developing theories more appropriate to music revitalization. (Saurman, 2010, Section 9.5)

This chapter aims to systematically identify the synergies and disconnects between language and music in relation to factors in their vitality and viability. By investigating in some depth the synergies between language and music sustainability, this chapter represents the next step in laying the groundwork for identifying ways in which language maintenance might be accommodated within the theory and practice of music sustainability. By investigating the disconnects, it indicates where caution might be exercised when transferring approaches from language maintenance to music.

The discussion is structured according to the Five Domains of Musical Sustainability in Contemporary Contexts (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 180-181), developed in the context of Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures. Each section is prefaced by the verbatim précis of the respective domain as it occurs in Schippers’ framework.

3.1 Domain 1: Systems of learning music

Systems of learning are central to the sustainability of most music cultures. This domain assesses balances between informal and formal training, notation-based and aural learning, holistic and analytical approaches, and emphasis on tangible and less tangible aspects of musicking. It explores contemporary developments in learning and teaching (from master-disciple relationships to systems based on technology/the world wide web), and how non-musical activities, philosophies and approaches intersect with learning and teaching. These issues play a key role from the level of community initiatives to the highest level of institutionalised professional training. (Schippers, 2010a, p. 180)

For both languages and musical traditions, learning and teaching (implicit or explicit) are cornerstones of sustainability. Without them, inter-generational transmission does not take place, spelling the decline and eventual disappearance of the cultural heritage in question. Beyond this broadest similarity lies a range of more nuanced likenesses between language and music in relation to their transmission, as well as some significant disconnects.

1 A version of this chapter first appeared as the article: Grant, C. (2011). Key factors in the sustainability of language and music: A comparative study. Musicology Australia 33(1), 95-113.
Care is needed when drawing analogies between music transmission models and those for language transmission, in the context of endangerment. The apparent likeness, for example, between the master-disciple system of learning music (perhaps best known in its centuries-old Indian manifestation guru-śisyā-paramparā; Schippers, 2007) and the master-apprentice model of language learning (Hinton, 2002) is misleading. The language master-apprentice model is explicitly a safeguarding tool, implemented only where vitality is weak and viability in question, whereas for certain music genres it is the primary method of intergenerational transmission. This points to one divergence between language and music in relation to sustainability: in a characteristic vital and vibrant linguistic environment, in contrast with some musical ones, language transmission never takes place principally between two people alone.

According to a model from the area of Cultural Diversity in Music Education, the music learning process (within or outside of its culture of origin) may be viewed from the perspective of three continua: the analytic/holistic, the written/aural, and the tangible/intangible (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 124-127). Each of these three factors pertains in processes of language transmission too. Like music, languages can be learnt analytically (for example, with an explicit focus on grammar; Hale, 2001) or via more intuitive approaches, such as full immersion (cf. Reyhner, 2003). Second, tangible aspects of learning/teaching music like technique and repertoire, and intangible ones like creativity and expression, also have their equivalences in language learning/teaching, which can focus on good pronunciation and syntactical accuracy (for example), or emphasise fluency and natural expression. Third, the explicit or implicit emphasis in language learning may either be on reading and writing (literacy), or on listening and speaking (as in most childhood language learning, and in the method known as the communicative approach; Brumfit & Johnson, 1979).

With regard to this written/aural continuum, linguists generally agree that literacy is vital for successful language revitalisation (Walsh, 2002, p. 17), not least because of its value in facilitating transmission: it vastly expands the range of learning resources that can be employed, can act as a memory aide to expedite learning, and enables transmission across otherwise prohibitive distances of time and space. For music, “literacy” (ability to read notation) can likewise serve all these functions in transmission processes. The concept of literacy in a language or music genre is of course meaningless without the existence of a means to write it down (orthography/notation). Researchers are well aware of the downsides of relying on written forms in transmission processes, one of which is the undesired standardisation
of traditions (cf. Chapter 2.2a). For sustainability of both languages and music, the distinction between descriptive and prescriptive orthographies (that is, for music, between transcription and notation) (Ellingson, 1992a, p. 157) helps distinguish between the roles of orthography in transmission and in documentation.

Although a written form is no guarantee of viability, a lack of orthography may in some instances hasten the decline of an endangered language or music genre (though it should also be noted that some genres, such as those with a basis in improvisation, cannot be notated because of their very nature). This is perhaps especially true since orally transmitted art forms and languages tend to be more variable in structure and content than those transmitted through written form (cf. Ong, 1982, pp. 57-68). Tellingly, most endangered languages are orally-transmitted ones (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998, p. 34). Despite the ambivalence of some linguists about the value of orthography for language viability (e.g. Dixon, 1997, p. 82; Seifart, 1998), many researchers believe that writing systems are an advantage in the sustainability stakes, whether for music (notation is “an eminently useful tool for ensuring sustainability for complex musical structures;” Schippers, 2010a, p. 67) or for languages:

Communities with long-standing written traditions may be in a stronger position to hold on to a language despite reduced numbers of speakers, and certainly are in a stronger position for revitalizing a language which may in part need to be reconstructed on the basis of written records. (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998, p. 34)

Although the analytic/holistic, written/aural, and tangible/intangible continua themselves are relevant in the cases of both language and music, there may be wide divergences between language and music in how they are characteristically positioned along the continua within a learning context. Typically, for example, children learn their parents’ language in the home, orally, holistically, largely through imitation, and without conscious intent. For this reason, much of the literature from language endangerment and maintenance places weight on intergenerational transmission between parents and children as the primary factor in viability (e.g. Fishman, 1991). Some music genres may be learnt in a similar way (nursery songs, for example). But beyond the home, proficiency in music-making may also be typically primarily learnt in any number of other social contexts within a community: from a master or teacher, during social community gatherings, at rituals and ceremonies, or in an institutional environment. This greater variation in primary “domains” of music learning/teaching, and the corresponding difference in transmission approaches, holds implications for developing appropriate mechanisms towards sustainability.
Another consideration in the sustainability of both language and music is the role of new media and learning and teaching; in recent years, these have featured increasingly in transmission processes. Audio- and video-technologies enable learning from a spatial or temporal distance (Hinton, 2001); mini-disc recorders and similar devices enable reinforcement of a lesson, and can compensate for less time spent with a teacher (like “having the guru in one’s pocket”; in Schippers, 2007, p. 127); CDs, DVDs, interactive multimedia resources and the internet act as learning stimuli or even surrogate teachers (Giacon & Nathan, 2009; Taff, 1997; Warschauer, Donaghy, & Kuamoyecto, 1997). Yet there are disadvantages to using technology as a tool in language and music transmission. Aside from equipment being expensive, not always readily available, and requiring some training to use, technology may detract or distract from face-to-face methods of learning and teaching, which are often the most effective (see Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998, pp. 70-71; Hinton, 2001). Also, for music, reliance on recordings (like the reliance on notation discussed above) arguably does little to improve a learner’s ability to improvise, a central skill in some musical traditions (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 72).

Like linguistic skills, musical ones may also be absorbed at a young age without formal tuition, through continual exposure. Tunstill (1987, p. 122) comments that “for the Pitjantjatjara, the acquisition of musical skills is as unproblematic as the acquisition of speech”; Dunbar-Hall recounts the following conversation with a composer, performer, and teacher of Balinese gamelan (T), who describes his early experiences of music learning:

S: When you started learning, when you were a child – how did you learn?
T: Just by listening, because in my village there is a gamelan ensemble and my father is the drummer. Everyday I follow my father to practise gamelan, and I try, but no teacher, I just try to learn and I just hear the technique, how the people play and I see and hear and I practice . . . I just watch and hear . . . if a grandfather is a musician, maybe anaknya (‘his child’) is a musician . . .
S: so it could be dalam keluarga? (within the family?)
T: dalam keluarga, ya
S: bisa dengar dan . . . (you could hear and . . .)
T: bisa kakeknya mengajar . . . bapaknya mengajar . . . (your grandfather could teach . . . your father could teach). (Dunbar-Hall & Adnyana, 2004, p. 148)

Particularly in such instances of “tacit knowledge,” where musical skills and knowledge are acquired “by immersion in the everyday music and musical practices of one’s social
context” (Green, 2001, p. 22), the declining vitality of a genre within a society (for whatever reason) is likely to hold attendant repercussions for its transmission, and the risk is that this may mean a downward spiral for vitality. For languages, this is also true: whatever the initial impulse for a loss of speakers, the less a language is heard within a community, the less it is learnt, and the less spoken.

Another factor in music and language viability is the issue of good teaching (however defined), whether implicit or explicit. Musical or linguistic competence does not necessarily translate into ability to teach well. Linguists have noted that the unlikelihood of recalling the process of learning a first language can make it difficult for native speakers to teach their language in a formal way without training (for example, Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998, p. 83). If music learning is explicit and continues beyond early childhood years, a music learner may be more likely to recall that learning process than the process of learning a mother tongue, yet still there is no guarantee that good teaching skills will result. For both language and music, teaching skills of culture-bearers may be a variable in the viability of a tradition. This is especially true when a language or music genre is endangered, since in that case explicit teaching may adopt a greater role in transmission processes. In fact, as languages become endangered, the processes of their transmission can begin to converge with those typical of some music genres (whether endangered or not): they become more formally and explicitly taught. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect that the transmission processes of endangered languages and music genres hold greater synergies than in situations of linguistic vitality.

The five-domain framework that lends this chapter its structure does not explicitly attend to the various processes via which music comes into existence, yet compositional or creational mechanisms are certainly a factor in musical vitality. This is evidenced by the case of Tongan lakalaka (choreographed sung speeches), where the atrophy of knowledge about compositional techniques has contributed to the current impoverished situation where existing repertory is re-used rather than new repertory created (Kaeppler, 2004, December, p. 4). Composition as a deliberate and planned procedure is only one means by which new music comes into being; a process of improvisation is another, and yet another is supernatural beings or dreams investing individuals with songs (e.g. Marett, 2005; Merriam, 1964, pp. 166-167). Not infrequently, music creation occurs simultaneously with its transmission (or indeed, the two are one and the same), meaning that this issue is well placed in this Systems of
Learning domain. Language, by contrast, is generally not perceived to be “created” or “composed,” and so these issues do not play a parallel role in linguistic sustainability. Finally, this first domain of the five-domain framework acknowledges the role of non-musical activities, philosophies and approaches in systems of learning music. Here, the synergy with language learning is strong. Events such as ritual social gatherings at community houses, and the ideologies surrounding them, can provide children (and adults) with important opportunities to learn their (endangered) linguistic or musical heritage. Philosophies and approaches located externally to the culture can also directly affect systems of learning language and music, and therefore sustainability. Within the Australian context, this is saliently and unfavourably manifest in the hegemonic governmental attitude to bilingual education in the Northern Territory, which for some Aboriginal communities presents a considerable danger to linguistic, and wider cultural (including musical), viability.

### 3.2 Domain 2: Musicians and communities

This domain examines the role and position of musicians and the basis of the tradition within the community. It looks at the everyday realities in the existence of creative musicians, including the role of technology, media, and travel, and issues of remuneration through performances, teaching, portfolio careers, community support, tenured employment, freelancing, and non-musical activities. Cross-cultural influences and the role of the diaspora are also examined, as well as the interaction between musicians within the community. (Schippers, 2010a, p. 180)

The positioning of a music genre within a society is a multifaceted phenomenon, and one which has, in many ways, defined ethnomusicological research for decades (see, for example, Merriam’s seminal work *The anthropology of music*, 1964). It embraces broad issues as such as the social function of music within a community, its interrelation with non-musical aspects of community life, and its economic basis in society. All of these issues interrelate with the sustainability of a genre.

In recent years, for example, music-making for profit has in some cultures arguably overtaken music-making for pleasure, and Mundy believes the “consumer boom in listening” has even effected a decline of actual music-making in some communities (2001, p. 10), meaning fewer or less proficient musicians. Tongan *lakalaka* illustrates another kind of connection between the viability of a music genre and its positioning in society: the in-depth cultural knowledge needed to compose poetry for it has been lost, and children are not taught relevant cultural traditions, aesthetics, or history as a core part of their school education (Kaeppler, 2004, December, p. 3). A similar situation has arisen surrounding bardic singing in Aceh:
“You have to have a very good knowledge of Acehnese culture and language to be able to do it, and a lot of people are learning Indonesian now and their knowledge of Acehnese itself is not as good” (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010). These kinds of issues of social positioning hold less relevance to language sustainability, since language generally forms the basis for day-to-day communication in a society rather than serving discrete aesthetic, diversional, ritual, or other functions.

If the position of “musician” in a society is a specialist role, carries high status, or is viewed as requiring talent (Merriam, 1964, pp. 67, 123-144), then these things may be powerful aids to vitality or viability of a music genre (and conversely, a shift to low status may jeopardise viability). A case in point is the Western “pop idol” phenomenon, where musicians’ prestige, talent, and status are key instigators of disproportionately high media attention, public enthusiasm, and financial backing. By contrast, in a healthy linguistic environment, speakers hold no unique social function: within any one speech-community (in contrast to the prestige of speaking one language or dialect over another, which certainly obtains), speaking that language is not perceived as specialist, or a talent or skill, and is considered neither of high or low prestige. Therefore, the various issues encompassed by this domain such as remuneration, inter-personal interaction, and the role of technology, media and travel are unlikely to play as explicit a role in being a speaker of a language as in being a musician: for language speakers, these things are likely to be integral to day-to-day living.

From an anthropological standpoint, Merriam proposes that even in those non-literate cultures where music is an integral part of daily life, musicians hold a distinct specialist role within the community (1964, pp. 123-125). In view of this specialist role, musicians are often rewarded by society in some way that makes a real contribution to their living, whether through monetary remuneration, emoluments, or gifts. Withdrawal of such recompense can play a role in the decline of a musical tradition, as demonstrated by the attrition in the mid-twentieth century of the Indian classical genre dhrupad, whose musicians faced financial hardship due to loss of royal patronage (Dutta, 1999, ‘Guru-Shishya Parampara of Oral Teaching’ section). By contrast, remuneration for language speakers in a healthy linguistic context is atypical (though exceptions include language teachers, artistic language-users like bards and poets, and translators/interpreters). In this way, this domain embodies a key disconnect between music and language in relation to sustainability.

These and various other complexities of inter-personal relations may adversely affect the viability of both languages and music genres, especially when they are already
endangered. Within certain indigenous cultures, for instance, internal laws governing cultural ownership enforce that only those who “own” song corpuses have the right to sing them (or to “give” them away); when those people are few, possibilities for transmission may be limited. In one instance, an Australian Indigenous elder decided to pass on secret-sacred men’s business to a non-initiated female researcher, reckoning, “Well, it either dies with me, or I pass it on to [her]” (M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010). Taboos or restrictions sometimes exist about revealing one’s knowledge of certain cultural practices to “insiders” (see for example Evans, 2001, p. 250, for language; Moyle, 1997, p. 78, for music) or “outsiders,” like researchers. Internal “avoidance relationships” which proscribe interaction between certain kin are another variable in sustainability; Abley (2003) and Evans (2001) both cite poignant instances where such taboos have forbidden a fluent speaker to communicate in an endangered language with its other few remaining speakers. While they vary in type, then, issues of interpersonal relations are also factors in the viability of both language and music.

Even more important in this regard than interpersonal relations, though, are intercultural ones. In an era when “cross-fertilisation no longer depends on the serendipity of travel or chance encounter[,] it can be at the touch of a button” (Mundy, 2001, p. 14), both musical and linguistic exchange is the rule rather than the exception. The myriad and complex possible results and responses to cross-cultural contact on music described in Chapter 2.1b – revitalisation, preservation, cross-fertilisation, and impoverishment or abandonment of parts of the repertoire, among others – have direct parallels with the possible outcomes of languages in contact (Thomason, 2001). Kartomi even explicitly suggests that “the early stages of musical transculturation may resemble the initial stages of linguistic syncretism” (1981, p. 242), and Graves refers to a process of creolisation when cultures come into contact, noting that the term is borrowed from linguistics (2005, p. 55).

A further possible outcome of contact between music cultures – Kartomi’s “pluralistic coexistence of musics” (1981, p. 237) – incorporates notions of bi- or poly-musicality (Hood, 1960; Nettl, 1994, pp. 171-172), which are paralleled in the language world by bilingualism and polylingualism. These phenomena imply that, for both languages and music,

one might suggest that it is not a matter of either-or: *either* you keep your mother tongue and can function within your own community but remain isolated from the larger society whose majority language you do not speak, *or* you learn the majority language and get access to the larger society, but lose your mother
tongue and what can be accessed through it. In other words, it is not a case of subtractive, but rather one of additive, language learning (Lambert 1975; Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, 2000). (Maffi, 2003, p. 71)

Nettl, though, doubts the possibility of unbounded “additive” learning for music, assuming instead the notion of a maximum and roughly unchanging amount of “musical energy” within a culture:

As Western music came into the lives of other of the world’s peoples, they had to find ways of maintaining their older tradition with reduced energy, and this might mean a reduction in the number of people, or the amount of time, or the number of genres, styles, instruments henceforth devoted to it. (2005, p. 437; see also 1978, p. 129)

This must also have its analogue in language: there is only so much linguistic communication that can be carried out in a community! According to Nettl, a complete embrace of a dominant music culture concurrently with the complete maintenance of its own music culture is absent as a response to (or result of) transculturation; this gives rise to his hypothesis that “addition to the musical culture of a society requires adjustments in the tradition already present” (1978, p. 129). For this reason, dominant languages and music genres often do encroach on minority ones, and recognition of this fact is a key instigator of purist attitudes within some music- and speech-communities. In turn, these attitudes affect sustainability in various ways (see Domain 3: Contexts and constructs).

In an individual, language loss or atrophy is always replaced by another language (barring aberrant circumstances like speech impairment), and at a community level, it always involves contact between at least two speech communities (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998, p. 27). This reality is alluded to by the term language shift, which underscores the move from one language to another. The term music shift has been adopted by at least one ethnomusicologist (Coulter, 2007), but is arguably less apposite than its linguistic counterpart: attrition of music-making skills or practice (whether in an individual or within a community) is not necessarily concomitant with that genre being replaced (or displaced) by another. As lifestyles changed, entire corpuses of Maori paddling songs and food-bearing songs gradually died out, not as a cause or effect of “music shift,” but rather due to loss of function (McLean, 1996, p. 276).

The diaspora may play a decisive role in the future of endangered cultural expressions, both linguistic and musical. The portability of music means it can be (and often is) retained and practised in diasporic spaces (Ramnarine, 2007, p. 13), and in this
way, “small” music genres “can be kept alive by an international network of specialized performers spread out sometimes quite haphazardly around the world” (Malm, 1993, p. 350). In the dramatic case of the Polynesian atoll Takū, at imminent peril of being engulfed by rising seawaters, the autochthonous context is likely to disappear altogether, and the future of both language and music will be entirely in the hands of the diaspora (Moyle, 2007). In this era of globalisation, where musical dissemination across the world is possible almost instantaneously, music has the ability to migrate even without human carriers (Nettl, 2010, p. 193).

Both musical and linguistic diasporic traditions often develop independently of their indigenous context – sometimes changing more rapidly as a result of the displacement and contact with other influences (e.g. Wang, 2003, p. 112), but sometimes more conservatively, due to preserved values and importance placed by the diaspora on continuing the true “tradition.” Aubert cites two cases in point: French provincial songs of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries survive in Quebec and Louisiana but not in France; and several genres among the Indian community of Trinidad, including seasonal chants linked to agricultural rituals, are now extinct in India but have been preserved intact in the Caribbean (2007, p. 74).

3.3 Domain 3: Contexts and constructs

This domain assesses the social and cultural contexts of musical traditions. It examines the realities of and the attitudes to recontextualisation, cross-cultural influences, authenticity and context, and explicit and implicit approaches to cultural diversity resulting from travel, migration or media, as well as obstacles such as poverty, prejudice, racism, stigma, restrictive religious attitudes, and issues of appropriation. It also looks at the underlying values and attitudes (constructs) steering musical directions. These include musical tastes, aesthetics, cosmologies, socially and individually constructed identities, gender issues, as well as (perceived) prestige, which is often underestimated as a factor in musical survival. (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 180-181)

Functions of speech and music differ, and therefore, so do their contexts. Typical language contexts include the home, the community, schools, workplaces, rituals and ceremonies, the media, government, law, and social services. Music is unlikely to be situated in some of these spaces; it is primarily found in community contexts (see Nettl, 2005, pp. 244-258, for an in-depth exploration of the uses and functions of music). By definition, music genres used in limited contexts have limited vitality, but not necessarily limited viability: Christmas carols are rarely heard for ten or eleven months of the year, but the genre seems unlikely to vanish any time soon. A language too can be viable even if it is not found across the full extent of possible contexts. Latin is a striking example: it is still the official language of the papal edicts and bulls, Catholic
Roman Rites, and an entire city-state, centuries after it was ever learnt by children in the home as a mother tongue.

A notable point of disjuncture between contexts for language and music is that often, the latter entails the concept of performance (in the sense of an individual musician’s or group’s rendering or interpretation of a work, perhaps publicly, and perhaps in front of an audience) whereas communicative language contexts typically do not. Whether music is performed as part of a ritual, an informal community gathering, or a gala opera evening, a performance event is frequently a driving force behind music-making, even if in many cases performance is “merely the residue of a process of far-reaching community involvement; preparations for the big ceremony can carry more content than their actualization as performance” (Graves, 2005, p. 63). This concept of performance also brings into relief a dichotomy between performer and audience, and in some ways and contexts, the role of the audience may be at least as important in issues of sustainability as that of the performer (see Domain 5: Media and the music industry).

The shifting functions of music in recent years due to new ways of life have resulted in disappearing socio-cultural contexts for some genres of music, such as for the Maori paddling songs mentioned earlier (McLean, 1996), the songs sung by women in India to lessen the drudgery of carrying water to wells (“now, there’s a tap in the back yard”; Sethi, 2001, p. 85), or the Mongolian string fiddle culture morin khurr, whose decline resulted from the shift from nomadic life to urban settlement of Mongolian herding communities (UNESCO, 2009b). Other genres have successfully found new environments. Ramnarine describes various new urban performance contexts for Finnish folk music, including the striking and highly formalised situation of an examinationwithin the Sibelius Academy’s Department of Folk Music, a context that clearly departs radically from the traditional (2003, pp. 81-83).

In one way, then, a sustainable music genre is arguably one with the ability to reposition itself in new contexts and adapt to new social functions, and broadly, speaking, the same can be said of languages. The vocabulary of the Aboriginal language Kaurna (probably last spoken on a daily basis in the 1860s) required some overhaul as it began to be taught within a school context in the late twentieth century. Learners and speakers developed new words (for example, for computer, telephone, and to read), devised a base-10 number system to enable counting into the millions, and coined expressions for sporting contexts and classroom use, such as “Empty the rubbish bin!” (Amery, 2002, p. 7). For both music genres and languages, then, it seems that not only
are contexts themselves essential for viability, but so too is the ability to reposition, should those contexts shift radically or disappear altogether.

One issue addressed in this domain of the five-domain framework, but which in reality extends across and beyond all its domains, is community values and attitudes: towards the music genre itself, as well as towards learning and teaching methods, appropriate contexts, innovation and change in the tradition, and the use of media and technology, as well as more general community attitudes such as to cultural diversity, gender roles, aesthetics, and a host of other non-musical factors. For languages too, community constructs have considerable bearing on vitality and viability (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998). For external influences to enter a linguistic or musical tradition, culture-bearers must accept and adopt them; for a language or music genre to successfully adopt new functions, the community must be ideologically in favour of the change; for a language or music genre to successfully adapt to a changing sociocultural milieu, its carriers need to hold certain attitudes to “authenticity” and “tradition.”

While the complex web of constructs that impact on the vitality and viability of languages and music cannot all be addressed at length here, two must be singled out as critical: first, a community’s attitudes to the tradition itself (that is, the prestige of a language or music genre in the eyes of its own community); and second, the community’s attitudes and receptivity to innovation and change. Regarding the latter, “mixed-up” Australian Aboriginal language is sometimes rejected by community members, “who want either the old language or English and nothing else in between” (Thieberger, 2002, p. 324). Such an attitude could potentially break intergenerational transmission (and is one which linguist Walsh believes is, in the context of endangered languages, “completely potty”; personal interview, 8 April 2010). A musical analogue is quoted by Neuman, represented in this response of a highly respected master to an enquiry about the possible demise of the Indian instrument *surbahār*:

You think that the ustads want to keep surbahars to themselves. It is wrong to think in that way. We do want to teach, but who is going to learn? It is such a big science, and if anybody asks for it and we give it then it would be like playing *vīnā* [the *bīn*] in front of a water-buffalo, so we only play for those who understand. (1980, p. 49)

A considerably more pragmatic attitude to change is that of one Finnish folk musician who, in response to an interview question about change in the tradition, replied simply: “Before it was like that and now it is like this” (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 213). Attitudes to broader cultural change also interplay with music and linguistic
vitality and viability: the strength and uniqueness of the music culture of Takū are probably at least partially attributable to that community’s ideological opposition to Christian missionary activity on the atoll – opposition that ended in practice, if not in principle, only in 1999 (Moyle, 2007, pp. 3-4). On the other hand, the local Balinese community, living in what is one of most heavily touristic areas in the world, has implemented various mechanisms that aim to balance tradition and innovation, mechanisms that strive to “protect their culture from the ravages of the international tourist trade while simultaneously taking full advantage of their economic opportunity” (Graves, 2005, p. 102).

One of the many instances of perceptions of prestige affecting musical viability is found in the Finnish kantele. Before the Finnish folk music revival of the late 1960s the kantele was “seriously encumbered by prejudice, misplaced reverence and uncalled-for ridicule” (the words of Finnish musicologist Laitinen, reported in Ramnarine, 2003, p. 64) – and this despite its being widely perceived as the “national” instrument. The Indian sarangi still retains “the stigma of its ‘brothel identity’,” and it is partly because of this association that transmission processes are weak; “sons [of sarangi players] are learning to become tabla-players and soloists, or are being directed out of the music profession entirely. The sarangi is not taught in music institutions, and it may very well become extinct in another generation (Deshpande 1971:18; Neuman 1977)” (Neuman, 1980, p. 207). Prestige is inextricably linked to aspects of other domains of the five-domain framework, such as media attention and government policy. The raised status of the Welsh language during the 1970s and 1980s and the simultaneous retardation of its decline are both seen to be at least partly the result of the implementation of various policies, legislation, and media initiatives around that time. These initiatives include two Welsh Language Acts, the launch of a Welsh language television station, and the establishment of a Welsh Language Board (Welsh Assembly Government, 2003).

Closely related but not identical to the matter of prestige is the question: do community members want their language or a particular music genre to survive, and if so, in what form? Ambivalence towards revitalisation efforts is reflected in Stiles’ experience of community language revitalisation programs across four different cultures:

All of the communities in these four programs experienced community objections to a program that taught the native tongue so seriously. Elders objected to the writing of the language (Cree and Hualapai); elders and parents feared teaching the children a language other than English because of past
oppression for use of their native language (all programs); parents as non-speakers doubted the ability of their children to achieve fluency; and teachers were convinced the languages were unsuitable for academic endeavors. (Stiles, 1997, p. 257)

Paradoxically, there have also been instances where community members were in principle supportive of revitalisation, but were unwilling to sacrifice effort or time to that end, thereby employing what Walsh calls “avoidance strategies” (2002, p. 8).

Of course, a community consists of individuals who do not necessarily hold cohesive ideas about their language or music, or the maintenance thereof. In certain language revitalisation efforts in North America, “there are individuals who are working their heats out to try and relearn their languages et cetera; there are other people [within the same community] who couldn’t care less; and there are others who actively discourage it because their particular view is . . . that it’s a bad thing to keep that language going” (P. Austin, personal interview, 16 June 2010). These multifaceted constructs of culture-bearers can be critical factors in the sustainability of both languages and music genres.

Although not made explicit by the five-domain framework, the constructs of significant outsiders – governments, policy-makers, fieldworkers, researchers and other power-bearers – also affect the sustainability of both languages and music genres, in at least three ways: by influencing the community’s own attitudes towards their heritage; by making manifest these constructs and values in rules and regulations that affect the culture, whether favourably or unfavourably (see Domain 4: Infrastructure and regulations); and by promoting to other outsiders their own values and attitudes in relation to the culture, for example through academic, media or advocacy platforms. Hemetek observes that not all researchers, for example, recognise the phenomenon of transculturation as worthy of study – there are those that “would not do any research on the diasporic or immigrant communities because this is not the ‘real’ music” (personal interview, 22 July 2010).

A specific illustration the role of outsiders in musical vitality is found in the revival of dhrupad, which was at least partly instigated when French scholar Alain Danielou “revealed” this as the ‘true’ tradition of Indian music” and invited its musicians to perform abroad, thereby significantly raising the prestige of the genre (Schippers, 2009, p. 202). Another example is the efforts of the organisation Cultures in Harmony to change one particular gender-based musical construct: their website promotes the fact that “in Konya, Turkey, where the whirling dervish ceremony
originated, [Cultures in Harmony] negotiated the inclusion of women in the group of musicians accompanying the ceremony for the first time in its 700-year history” (Cultures in Harmony, 2009; ‘Six keys: promote democratic values’ section). Interventionist attitudes and practices like this may be beneficial to sustainability in some instances, but in others may have the opposite effect, or generate unexpected consequences. The literature on language maintenance is thick with instances of unforeseen results of intervention (e.g. NeSmith, 2009, for Hawaiian; Spolsky, 2005, for Hebrew).

This domain of the five-domain framework also encompasses the impact on sustainability of attitudinal obstacles such as cultural prejudice, racism, stigma, restrictive religious attitudes, and issues of appropriation. (It also refers to poverty, which I would argue is better placed within in next domain along with other non-attitudinal factors in sustainability, like war, civil unrest, and persecution.) Impinging on the totality of a culture, these attitudinal obstacles can affect its language as well as music: witness the fact that as late as the 1970s, the indigenous Sámi language was banned in some schools in Finland as the devil’s language, and at least ten people are recorded as having been executed for singing the traditional Sámi joik (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 182). Despotistic or totalitarian regimes may be particularly hostile towards musicians (more than language-speakers), because of their explicit and unique role as carriers of culture, as in the heinous era of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia in the 1970s, and the recent and ongoing years of Taliban repression and war in Afghanistan. The international organisation Freemuse (Freedom of Musical Expression) works against conditions like these, advocating human rights for musicians and composers (2009). Certain other non-governmental organisations advocate for freedom of cultural expression at large, sometimes with a significant focus on the rights of people to speak their heritage language (e.g. the United States-based organisation Cultural Survival).

Censorship of cultural expression is not always so insidious, or so obvious, as in cases of tyranny and despotism. For centuries, well-meaning evangelical missionary activities have explicitly and implicitly censored indigenous cultures the world over, separating children from their parents, disconnecting them from their culture, and denying them their heritage language and songs, thereby causing vast damage to cultural, linguistic, and musical viability. Censorship of quite another kind is the self-imposed censorship of a community on its own music-making or language use. Whether conducive or obstructive to sustainability, this kind of censorship is almost always
inextricably connected to ideologies (of kinship, gender, ownership, authenticity, transmission of tradition, and so on).

3.4 Domain 4: Infrastructure and regulations

This domain primarily relates to the ‘hardware’ of music: places to perform, compose, practise and learn, all of which are essential for music to survive, as well virtual spaces for creation, collaboration, learning, and dissemination. Other aspects included in this domain are the availability and/or manufacturing of instruments and other tangible resources. It also examines the extent to which regulations are conducive or obstructive to a blossoming musical heritage, including artists’ rights, copyright laws, sound restrictions, laws limiting artistic expression, and challenging circumstances such as obstacles that can arise from totalitarian regimes, persecution, civil unrest, war or the displacement of music or people. (Schippers, 2010a, p. 181)

Infrastructure requirements for making music and for speaking a language differ considerably, both in degree and nature. Unlike much music-making, speaking a language generally does not call for specific locations, instruments, or other tangible resources in order to “create” or “perform” it. (Exceptions include some ceremonial or performative forms of language, which may be site-specific, and formal language learning contexts, which may employ a dedicated space). Also, primarily due to the interrelatedness of the World Wide Web and the commercialisation of music (see Domain 5: Media and the music industry), virtual spaces are pivotal in sustainability of music genres, but not of languages (their potential or actual role in language transmission notwithstanding). At this level of infrastructure, then – tangible resources and places to create, perform, practice, and learn music – the parallels between language sustainability and music sustainability are limited.

A broader level of infrastructure, though, potentially affects both a community’s language and its music inasmuch as it influences all aspects of life, including health, education opportunities, presence of technology and media, and perceptions of social and cultural identity. Infrastructure both relies on and is affected by economic circumstance, which is a key force in the sustainability of both languages (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998) and music genres (Letts, 2006). In fact, for music, it is so crucial that it should arguably be added to the list of “challenging circumstances” identified in this domain of the framework as potentially obstructing music sustainability. This, however, brings to light another disjunction between language and music: the economic factors at play in musicians’ (and audiences’) lives, combined with the tangible resources often required to make music, mean that the impact of poverty on music sustainability is likely to be greater and more direct than on the sustainability of a language. Indeed,
poverty may not in the least threaten the viability or vitality of a language (witness Bengali, spoken by well over 200 million speakers in Bangladesh and eastern India).

Like a lack of broad community infrastructure, other disadvantageous circumstances ("totalitarian regimes, persecution, civil unrest, war or the displacement of music or people") may affect both language and music sustainability, simply inasmuch as these circumstances affect the totality of a culture. The immediate peril of rising seawaters means that the atoll Takū (within Papua New Guinea political territory) is currently experiencing displacement of both music and people (Moyle, 2007), doubtless holding ramifications for both its linguistic and musical traditions, along with its cultural heritage at large. In Aceh, Sumatra, years of war (ending in 2005) significantly impeded the level of artistic energy in the population, which was “diverted to other things” (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010). The effect of challenging social circumstances on musical vitality and viability are not always adverse, however: the fact that no foreigners were allowed into certain communities in central Aceh for some decades during the war meant that these communities were better able to maintain their musical traditions, due to their isolation and a lack of foreign influence (M. Kartomi, personal interview, 21 October 2010).

This domain also deals with the role of regulations and policies in sustainability. At a local and regional level as well as at the level of nation-states, regulations often embody the attitudes to culture of governments, who are therefore key players in language and music sustainability. Artists’ rights, intellectual property and copyright laws, and sound restrictions are all examples of regulations, normally government-imposed, affecting musicians and composers. Policies and laws impacting language-use and language-speakers differ in nature from these, but are just as critical to sustainability: among many others they include laws relating to bilingual school education, to the use of minority languages in the workplace and the media, and to the provision of translation services in matters of social services. Government policies that significantly affect musical or linguistic sustainability (positively or negatively) do not necessarily directly refer to music or language or even culture, but may instead relate primarily to education, immigration, ethnic discrimination, broadcasting, intellectual property, new media, e-commerce, and international free trade agreements, among other things (see Letts, 2006).

Over the past two or three decades, various international declarations have brought increased prominence to the importance of human, language, and cultural rights, and also to duties of government and other bodies to honour them. Among them
are the *Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights* (Assembly of the World Conference on Linguistic Rights, 1996), the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* (UNESCO, 2005a), and the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (United Nations High Commission for Human Rights, 2007). Although no declaration centres exclusively on music, the heightened awareness of cultural rights matters brought about by international tools like these have lately made significant in-roads to protecting and promoting both linguistic and musical heritage.

### 3.5 Domain 5: Media and the music industry

This domain addresses large-scale dissemination and commercial aspects of music. Most musicians and musical styles depend in one way or another on the music industry for their survival. Over the past 100 years, the distribution of music has increasingly involved recordings, radio, television and internet (e.g. Podcasts, YouTube, MySpace). At the same time, many acoustic and live forms of delivery have changed under the influence of internal and external factors, leading to a wealth of new performance formats. This domain examines the ever-changing modes of distributing, publicising, and supporting music, including the role of audiences (including consumers of recorded product), patrons, sponsors, funding bodies and governments who ‘buy’ or ‘buy into’ artistic product. (Schippers, 2010a, p. 181)

The cuter the animal, it seems, the more likely it is to be earmarked for “rescuing”; advocates for any endangered species of insect would be hard pressed to gain the degree of publicity – or funding – as for the panda. Metaphorical license aside, it is interesting to draw the analogy with endangered music genres. The fate of unaccompanied Australian Aboriginal ceremonial songs performed by untrained voices and lasting half a minute may well fail to garner wide public attention, whereas the energy and rhythmic impulse of Cuban *son* holds high entertainment value by most standards. Entertainment value equates with commercial potential, which in turn helps the promotion and celebration of the music genre in question. An extension of the species metaphor to music genres and languages themselves is also telling. The enormity of the global music industry and the comparative paucity of commercial income generated by languages support the speculation that in the public perception, music is “cuter” than language, arguably giving it a significant advantage in the endangerment stakes.

This domain, then, represents perhaps the most significant disjunction between language and music in relation to issues of vitality and viability – namely, their contrasting potential as a commodity. Mundy even believes (perhaps naively) that “the best way to keep a small musical culture alive is to make it popular with a large enough number of people to make it a profitable profession for its exponents” (2001, p. 11). The commercial potential of music seems to hold particular promise for the sustainability of “small” music genres (as outlined in Chapter 2.1a). Several examples attest to this
possibility. The “enormous revival” in the past four or five years of the lute-like Malian ngoni, for example, has been attributed to two recently-released albums by artist Bassekou Kouyaté that enjoyed acclaim both within Mali and internationally (Durán, 2011, p. 250-251).

Although size and dispersal of speaker population are variables in language viability too (Carnie, 1996), those variables lack real potential to be mitigated by any such thing as a language “industry.” Languages do not depend on global commerce per se for their vitality or viability, and it is hard to imagine a form of language that “does away with time and place,” as Erlmann (questionably) believes world music does (1993, p. 12). It is true that a sustainable language needs to be a “profitable” enterprise for its speakers, but not necessarily fiscally: much more often it simply serves as the most efficient way to communicate (or it might “profit” speakers by expanding employment options, for example, or by acting as a marker of identity).

Mass media (those “that are designed to reach, and actually do reach ‘mass audiences’ – audiences larger than a live performance would reach”; Christensen, 1992, p. 121) are powerful mechanisms in the viability of “small” music genres, especially given their nexus with the music industry (as described in Chapter 2.1a). Romero believes they are the most important forces of musical change, and critical to the sustainability of music genres (1992, pp. 191-192). Media attention and inattention, especially on television and radio, can be pivotal in the vitality and viability endangered languages too (as in the case of Welsh), even given the lack of a language “industry” as such.

As one example of a mass medium, the internet provides insight into the powerful influence of media on cultural sustainability, both positive and negative. More than languages, the role of virtual spaces is pivotal to music sustainability, primarily due to their potential to reach mass audiences. Whether or not their use by individuals is fiscally stimulated, online tools like YouTube, MySpace, and iTunes have proven extremely effective ways to disseminate and distribute music, including small or endangered genres that may otherwise not have a voice in a regional or global environment. A delightful example of how technology and the internet can work together to give voice to the music of minority cultures is found in one blogged video clip showing a young Peruvian folk singer in colourful traditional costume, dancing and singing a huaylarsh to the following words:

How are you little friend, I want you to give me your email.

Come on pretty faced friend, I want to get to know you better.
See that I feel very in love, only through internet love.
I think I am very much in love, give me your affection through internet.

(Global Voices, 2009)

Alongside the questions this clip raises about shifting social functions of music, changing contexts, and tradition versus innovation, it also illustrates how technology and the internet can help promote the music of minorities. But, woes of “internet love” aside, the sometimes uneasy relationship between the World Wide Web and the dynamics of cultural sustainability mean that the internet is not always the superlative tool for promoting endangered cultural expressions it may at first appear. Among several other concerns is the fact that it creates an immediate power distance between culture-bearer and consumer. As Bohlman observes, “pronouncements by media experts about the ubiquity of CDs, Internet, and the transnational recording industry notwithstanding, not everyone in the world has equal access to the technologies of world music, and most people in the world have no access” (2002, p. 133). A decade on, though a greater proportion of the world’s population has some level of access to the internet, inequities remain.

These access-related power inequities are of ethical concern in relation to endangered languages too, a fact expressed in UNESCO’s Draft recommendation on the promotion and use of multilingualism and universal access to cyberspace (UNESCO, 2001a). Linguists have noted the two sides to the sustainability coin:

The Internet paradoxically facilitates both language diversity and language domination. . . . Far from being a panacea for the very real threats to language diversity in the modern world, technology may well be playing an important role in diminishing real language diversity by supporting a more limited, essentially Eurocentric language pluralism. (Tonkin & Reagan, 2003, p. 7)

Parallel concerns arise in relation to other mass media, such as television and radio.

Just as mass media are not always wholly favourable to the sustainability of music genres, neither is the music industry itself. Aside from the considerable challenges to sustainability sometimes brought about by cross-cultural contact (which are multiplied infinitely by global music commerce), the music industry carries systemic anomalies that can fail musicians (as well as publishers, agents, recording companies, and composers). Some of these were described in Chapter 2.1a. Piracy is a prime example: by depriving copyright holders of their profits, Mundy argues, it sometimes relegates music-making to an unsustainable livelihood (2001, p. 13). Industry-related concerns like this do not affect languages or language-speakers to
anywhere near the same degree as musicians, though copyright, ownership, and intellectual property issues can and do arise with regard to appropriation of endangered languages by outsiders (Walsh, 2002, p. 7).

Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer write of a “legitimate fear” within one indigenous society of language-related materials being “appropriated, exploited, trivialised and desecrated by outsiders, and this fear has led many elders in the direction of secrecy” (1998, p. 91). Because of its wide commercial potential, music appropriation is an even greater danger than the appropriation or exploitation of language. Music sustainability may be implicated in various ways, for example if culture-bearers’ fear of exploitation leads to reluctance to engage with initiatives supporting viability (like documentation). The concern is not always located outside of the community, either: viability is also jeopardised when communities themselves begin to “sell off” cultural heritage to outsiders, sometimes at the expense of maintaining it within the community and transmitting it to next generations.

This leads to the area of music tourism, a niche that has boomed in recent decades. Local music is promoted regionally, nationally, and internationally as a tourist drawcard, and music tours that offer “authentic” and sometimes participatory music experiences from Argentinean tango to West African drumming to Chinese opera are a growing phenomenon (Gibson & Connell, 2005). In an insightful overview of the paradoxes involved in re-presenting “traditional” music genres on the stage, Aubert offers the specific example of an ensemble from Kerala undergoing “a series of subtraction operations” in preparation for staged performances in Europe of tantric ritual music from Malabar, India: they trimmed the space and time requirements of the ritual, filtered out any aspects that would induce a feeling of voyeurism or discomfort in the audience (like trance and animal sacrifice), reduced the requirements and expectations of interaction with the audience, and generally de-ritualised the whole experience (2007, pp. 29-31).

At some point the question must arise whether the staged version of the genre could even be called by the same name. While changes of this nature occur regularly in the ‘natural’ development of music genres across the world, shows and performances like these that have been shaped for visitors or outsiders are not always gainful for sustainability (cf. Kartomi & Blum, 1994, p. 260). Tourism that instigates repackaged, devoid-of-context, exoticised culture can have “a high impact, socially and economically, on small-scale societies and communities. While the advantages may be
short-term economic ones, the disadvantages are of a social nature and usually long
term” (Langton, 1994, p. 20).

These important considerations for the sustainability of music genres are
negligible in the case of languages, which are unlikely to be tailored to outsiders’ tastes
for economic reasons. Yet there are certain ways in which tourism can benefit both
endangered languages and endangered music genres. A little ironically, it seems that
endangerment is one attribute of a language that can excite tourism, bringing it
recognition and celebration (as in the case of the Norman language, celebrated in La
Fête Nouormande; Johnson, 2005, pp. 74-75). Musical vitality too can be strengthened
through tourism, as the festival phenomenon has proven: the establishment in 1968 of
the Kaustinen Festival of Folk Music helped raise the national profile of Finnish folk
music after a time of neglect (Ramnarine, 2003, pp. 134-146), and as described in
Chapter 2.2b, festivals were a central catalyst in the revival of Indian dhrupad from the
mid-1970s (Widdess, 1994).

3.6 Conclusions

The foregoing discussion points to both considerable synergies and considerable
disconnects between languages and music genres in relation to factors that impact upon
their vitality and viability. Table 3.1, in effect a précis of this chapter, synthesises these
synergies and disconnects into a comparative framework. Like the chapter itself, the
framework is structured according to the Five Domains of Musical Sustainability in
Contemporary Contexts (Schippers, 2010a, pp. 180-181). It indicates an approximate
level of synergy of each domain with issues of language sustainability (very high / high
/moderate / low / very low). Admittedly this is a crude system, not least because certain
aspects of a domain may hold high synergy while other aspects of the same domain may
significantly disconnect. It proves useful, however, in representing the broader key
findings of the chapter.

Based on the discussion in this chapter, core synergies between language and
music in relation to their sustainability include the dynamics of their transmission
(Domain 1), the interplay between the vitality of a language or music genre and the
social and cultural constructs and attitudes that surround it (Domain 3), and the impact
of economic and political circumstances (including policies and regulations) (Domain
4). This raises a number of questions: are there language-based transmission initiatives,
like the successful Maori kōhanga reo (“language nests”; King 2001), that might hold
### Table 3.1 Comparative framework: Key synergies and disconnects between music and language in relation to their sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1. Systems of learning music.</th>
<th>Level of synergy: very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNERGIES:</strong> Like music, the sustainability of languages is dependent on systems of learning and teaching, as well as related issues such as teacher training. As for music, approaches to language-learning can be situated along various continua, such as the written-aural and the analytic-holistic. New technologies and developments in teaching and learning languages are often linked with sustainability, in that they relate to effective transmission. Non-linguistic factors intersect with learning and teaching languages, as non-musical ones do for music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS:</strong> Typical contexts for language learning differ from those for learning music, though as a language becomes endangered its transmission process may more closely resemble that of some music genres. Everyday communicative language is generally not perceived to be 'created' or 'composed' in the same way as music is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNERGIES:</strong> Interpersonal and intercultural contact and the dynamics of a community moving from using one language to another are critical factors in language sustainability, as for music. The diaspora also potentially plays a role in language sustainability, as it may (perhaps even more so) for music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS:</strong> The different social role of language and language-speakers compared with music and musicians means that many issues in this domain (including social positioning, remuneration, and career paths) disconnect with language sustainability issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3. Contexts &amp; constructs.</th>
<th>Level of synergy: very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNERGIES:</strong> For language as for music, sociocultural functions and contexts and the capacity to adapt to changes in them are critical for sustainability. Attitudes to tradition/innovation, recontextualisation, cross-cultural contact, and context affect language and music sustainability, as do constructs surrounding specific languages and music genres, such as prestige. Also playing a part in language and music sustainability are the broader attitudes of a community, such as those relating to cultural diversity, identity, and gender roles (which for example may be the root of obstacles like stigma and prejudice). The constructs of significant outsiders impact in important ways on both language and music sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS:</strong> Typical everyday language contexts are broader than those of music, and do not generally entail the notion of 'performance'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 4. Infrastructure &amp; regulations.</th>
<th>Level of synergy: high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNERGIES:</strong> As for music, political and economic circumstances (censorship, prejudice, persecution, war, poverty, population displacement) as well as levels of community infrastructure can greatly affect language viability. Policies and regulations imposed from either within or outside of the community can have enormous bearing on language and music sustainability alike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS:</strong> Speakers of a language generally require fewer tangible resources than musicians to 'perform' or 'create' their language, being unreliant for example on instruments or specific performances sites. Virtual (internet-based) infrastructure is less critical to the sustainability of languages than to that of music genres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 5. Media &amp; the music industry.</th>
<th>Level of synergy: low/very low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNERGIES:</strong> The sustainability of languages (particularly when endangered) and of music genres are both closely connected with attitudes of the media (especially television and radio). Both are sometimes also linked to the impact of tourists and others who in some way ‘buy into’ language use or music-making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS:</strong> Language and music have vastly contrasting potential as a commodity. As a rule, languages do not depend on an industry per se for their vitality or viability, and for this reason, industry-related issues in music sustainability such as dissemination and distribution, as well as challenges such as piracy, intellectual property issues, appropriation and exploitation, technological access, and the sometimes equivocal effect of tourism on cultural sustainability are lesser concerns in language sustainability, though they can play a role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resonance with potential (or actual) music-specific initiatives towards sustainability (Domain 1)? How might tried and tested ways of raising the prestige of an endangered language within a community help inform similar situations for music (Domain 3)? To what extent could language-related precedents indicate possible effects of policies and regulations on the vitality of music within a culture or community (Domain 4)?

The disconnects between language and music discussed in this chapter suggest where language maintenance strategies are unlikely to be amenable to adaptation for music. Initiatives, for example, that aim to expand the domains of use of an endangered language – from the school to the community to the workplace, legal, and government spheres (see Fishman, 1991) – may be only indirectly relevant for music genres, if at all (Domain 3). Conversely, there are likely to be effective ways to support music sustainability that will lack precedent in language maintenance: most obviously, those engaging industry and commerce as a promotional mechanism (Domain 5).

It might be observed that not all domains of the Comparative Framework are likely to affect the sustainability of music (or language) equally. This is true both for specific cases of musical endangerment as well as at a general level, though there appears to be little consensus in the literature regarding which aspects are the most critical overall. Ellis, for example, believes that “the most serious impediment to the preservation of traditional music in some living form . . . is likely to be the dominant society’s belief that music is a useless form of communication” (1992, p. 275) – a factor of Domain 3: Contexts and constructs. Romero, on the other hand, argues that the mass media (Domain 5: Media and the music industry) is “usually considered the main force of musical change” (1992, p. 200), and for this reason can act as “the ultimate factor in cultural disintegration” (p. 195). Further research investigating the relative importance to sustainability of each domain would progress understanding of the dynamics of music sustainability, but may only become possible as ethnomusicology attains a better grasp of those dynamics in a range of specific contexts.

In addition to being affected by the issues relating to the five domains, the sustainability of both languages and music genres is also linked to issues relating specifically to maintenance and revitalisation, such as the extent, quality, and overall efficacy of current or past efforts to support viability, and the degree and quality of existing documentation and archiving. Another key issue is the sometimes profound effect of maintenance efforts themselves on communities and their cultural expressions (instanced several times in Chapter 2 with regard to music). Beyond their intended outcomes, maintenance efforts can influence sustainability in a variety of ways, for
example via the prestige that is sometimes created around a music genre or language as a direct result of the interests and efforts of “outsiders” to protect or promote it.

I have already argued that an understanding of the synergies and disconnects between language and music in relation to their sustainability is needed in order to gauge the ways and extent to which language maintenance strategies may inform ways to support the viability of music genres. In this way, the *Comparative Framework* represents necessary groundwork for the following chapter, which explores how recourse to the field of language maintenance may help address the weaknesses and limitations of current theory and practice of music sustainability (as identified in Chapter 2). By affording the extensive experience and discourse of this field a place within ethnomusicological investigations into issues of musical vitality and viability, Chapter 4 embodies the central purpose of this research.
CHAPTER FOUR

LEARNING FROM LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE:
DEVELOPING THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MUSIC
SUSTAINABILITY

I think it obvious *that* ethnomusicology can learn from linguistics, just as it can learn from musicology, anthropology, aesthetics, philosophy, human biology, and physics. The real question is *what* ethnomusicology can learn from linguistics. (Feld, 1974, p. 212; my italics)

This chapter investigates how, and to what extent, the field of language maintenance might help repair weaknesses and gaps in current approaches to music sustainability. It takes as point of departure the five key requirements identified in Chapter 2:

1. the need for a systematic, standardised, and replicable method to identify and measure musical endangerment;
2. the need to further development advocacy for efforts to maintain and revitalise endangered music genres;
3. the need to improve the knowledge-base on optimal ways to maintain and revitalise endangered music genres;
4. the need for critical theoretical reflection on the possible effects of practical strategies intending to support music sustainability, especially given recurring instances of equivocal or unexpected outcomes; and
5. the need to develop music-specific structures that monitor, evaluate, coordinate or carry forward the goals and objectives of music sustainability.

Taking into account the synergies and disconnects between languages and music genres in relation to sustainability (as identified in the Comparative Framework of Chapter 3), in this chapter I consider each of these five points in turn, examining how theory and experience from the field of language maintenance may be able to inform each.

---

2 Parts of this chapter draw on sections of my article: Grant, C. (2012, in press). Rethinking safeguarding: Objections and responses to protecting and promoting endangered musical heritage. *Ethnomusicology Forum* (accepted for publication 13 March 2011). In particular, Section 4.2 includes a précis of my argument from that article; Section 4.3(2) draws from its “The problem of purism” section; and Section 4.4 draws from “The problem of inefficacy” section.
4.1 Identifying and assessing musical endangerment

While research (especially in the field of intangible cultural heritage) has helped identify the manifold causes of musical endangerment (see Chapter 1.1), it remains unclear what actually constitutes endangerment – how it might be recognised, defined, or measured. Here the field of language maintenance proves highly informative in two ways. First, it points to some of the complexities of identifying and assessing degrees of endangerment; and second, it presents a variety of tools used by linguists to assess language endangerment, some of which may serve as prototypes for developing similar tools for music.

Defining what constitutes language endangerment has proven a difficult and contentious task. Consider one of the seemingly simplest gauges for the vitality of a language: the number of speakers it has. Should only fluent speakers be counted (or for music genres, only accomplished musicians)? What counts as a fluent speaker (accomplished musician)? What does speaker (performer / musician) even mean (cf. Blacking’s exploration, 1973, of how the concept of musician differs greatly from culture to culture)? Should those terms refer to competence or deed (consider a master musician who no longer performs, or a speaker who no longer uses her mother tongue)? Where to draw the line between a language and its dialects (between one music genre and another)? These questions aside, the speaker-number figures linguists have chosen to indicate vitality are wildly divergent in any case: Garza-Cuarón and Lastra (1991) declare the vitality threshold to be 500 speakers (for Mexican languages), while Krauss (1992) cites 100,000 as a “safe” number in general, with less than 10,000 speakers indicating endangerment. Other researchers regard as imperilled some languages with a substantial speaker population, such as Catalan, with over 11 million speakers (cf. Walsh, 2005, p. 294). These considerations from language maintenance (described by Tonkin, 2003; Wurm, 1998, p. 192, and others) suggest to ethnomusicologists that measuring vitality will be no easy task. Perhaps more helpfully, they also indicate some specific challenges ethnomusicologists are likely to encounter, and in some cases point to possible solutions.

For languages, no single factor sufficiently indicates vitality. Although critical speaker mass (however defined) may in some circumstances serve as a convenient proxy, it cannot be used as the sole determining factor in the strength of a language. Many Australian Aboriginal languages may never have had more than a relatively small speaker population (under 1,000) but remained stable for millennia until a few generations, even decades, ago (Abley, 2003, p. 10; Romaine, 2007, p. 122). Likewise,
the “number of musicians” of a genre (however defined) is an inadequate measure of musical vitality: a genre may find itself in peril even if there are many musicians (consider the potential immediate impact of unfavourable new political circumstances, such as the repressive regimes described in Chapter 3.3).

In developing ways to identify and assess endangerment, linguists have therefore taken a holistic approach: language vitality assessment tools almost always try to account for the multitude of linguistic and non-linguistic factors at play. Intergenerational transmission is often considered to be the most critical factor (Fishman, 1991, 2001; UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003), but many other variables are also taken into account, including the official status of the language (Romaine, 2007); community literacy (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998); and the geographical concentration of the speaker population, its location relative to a dominant culture, its economic base, and the language’s prestige relative to surrounding languages (Landweer, 1998, pp. 66-70). As the Comparative Framework shows, many of these factors also affect the vitality and viability of music genres, warranting similarly holistic approaches to identifying and assessing musical vitality.

In spite of the complexities, a number of typologies and classifications of language endangerment exist, including by Schmidt (for use with Australian Aboriginal languages; 1990), Dixon (1991, p. 237), Fishman (1991), Kinkade (for indigenous Canadian contexts; 1991, pp. 160-163), Edwards (1992), Wurm (1998, p. 192), McConvell and Thieberger (2001), UNESCO (2003b), and Lewis and Simons (2010). The most common kind of typology positions any given language into one of about five or six categories, ranging from safe (or viable or strong) to extinct (see Figure 4.1 for one example). Endangered languages are those falling in between, often subdivided into categories like moderately endangered, severely endangered, and moribund. These classes are typically distinguished from each other by variables such as the strength (or weakness) of social contexts and functions, proportion of the population speaking the language, degree of threat from more dominant languages, and/or strength of intergenerational transmission. It is not difficult to conceive of classification systems whereby music genres are positioned along similar graded scales (nor is it difficult to imagine the academic consternation any such system or set of descriptors would generate! Concerns about these kinds of typologies are raised later in this section, and at length in the following chapter).

Probably the most significant international tool to assess language vitality and viability is UNESCO’s Language Vitality and Endangerment (2003b), presented in full
Figure 4.1 Graded typology of language viability (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages, 2003, pp. 9-10)

- **Safe (5):** The language is spoken by *all generations*. There is no sign of linguistic threat from any other language, and the intergenerational transmission of the language seems uninterrupted.

- **Stable yet threatened (5):** The language is spoken in most contexts by all generations with unbroken intergenerational transmission, yet multilingualism in the native language and one or more dominant language(s) has usurped certain important communication contexts. Note that multilingualism alone is not necessarily a threat to languages.

- **Unsafe (4):** Most but not all children or families of a particular community speak their language as their first language, but it may be restricted to specific social domains (such as at home where children interact with their parents and grandparents).

- **Definitively endangered (3):** The language is no longer being learned as the mother tongue by children in the home. The youngest speakers are thus of the *parental generation*. At this stage, parents may still speak their language to their children, but their children do not typically respond in the language.

- **Severely endangered (2):** The language is spoken only by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may still understand the language, they typically do not speak it to their children.

- **Critically endangered (1):** The youngest speakers are in the *great-grandparental generation*, and the language is not used for everyday interactions. These older people often remember only part of the language but do not use it, since there may not be anyone to speak with.

- **Extinct (0):** There is no one who can speak or remember the language.

as Appendix C. It identifies nine factors in language vitality, and provides a quantitative way to measure each (such as the graded numeric scale in Figure 4.1, the first of the factors of this framework, which relates to intergenerational transmission). For any language, the measurements of these nine factors, taken as a set, indicate its vitality. The framework has found widespread use, including in the preparation of the most recent edition of UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger* (Moseley, 2009; see also Grenoble & Whaley, 2006, p. 4, who note that the framework “ha[s] been endorsed by a relatively large group of linguists from around the world”). Again it is possible to conceive of a comparable methodology for assessing musical endangerment, whereby a number of factors are identified as contributors to vitality; where each of those factors can be quantified and qualified; and where their summative assessment indicates the level of vitality of any given music genre. (It is this very kind of methodology I attempt to develop in the next chapter.)
Like many other graded-scale typologies of language endangerment, UNESCO’s *Language Vitality and Endangerment* takes inspiration from Fishman’s seminal *Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale*, or “GIDS” (Fishman, 1991, 2001), which assesses the degree of disruption to the intergenerational transmission of a language. GIDS identifies eight stages of endangerment, and suggests interventions to reverse language shift at each stage. At the most critical stage of endangerment, for example, Fishman recommends reassembling the vestiges of the language from elderly speakers and teaching them to demographically unconcentrated adults. For lower levels of endangerment, he suggests trying to expand the functions of the language in workplaces, higher education, government, and the mass media. Of any typology of language endangerment, GIDS has probably provoked the most discourse within the linguistic literature (e.g. Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Reyhner, Cantoni, St. Clair, & Parsons Yazzie, 1999; Walsh, 2002). A number of modifications and adaptations have been proposed, both generally (e.g. Hinton, 2003; Lewis & Simons, 2010; McKay, 1996) and in specific contexts (such as for Australian Indigenous languages, in Lo Bianco & Rhydwen, 2001).

At least one ethnomusicologist has recognised the potential for GIDS to be adapted for music: as part of his doctoral research, Coulter modified the tool in order to assess the vitality and viability of the music genres of the indigenous Alamblak people in Papua New Guinea’s lowland Sepik region. His adaptation resulted in a five-stage *Graded Music Shift Scale* (GMSS) (2007, p. 214). Inspired by Lewis and Simons’ “Expanded GIDS” (2010), Coulter subsequently modified and expanded his GMSS to ten levels (2010). While problematic in certain details (such as the implied correspondence between *language shift* and *music shift*, which the *Comparative Framework* reveals is tenuous; cf. Chapter 3.2), Coulter’s two incarnations of GMSS represent rare attempts to adapt a language vitality framework for music.

Other kinds of tools for assessing language vitality often seem to trade off the simplicity of graded classifications for more complicated but fine-grained assessments. Edwards’ typology presents a nuanced matrix of 33 macro- and micro-variables that affect the vitality of minority languages, including geographical, historical, political, sociological, educational, economic, and linguistic factors (1992, pp. 49-50). His framework is taken up and modified by Grenoble and Whaley (1998), who argue the case for a hierarchy among the variables. Adopting another approach altogether, McConvell and Thieberger (2001, p. 56) tentatively propose a quantitative language endangerment index for use within an Australian context, calculated as the ratio of the
percentage of speakers in the 0-19 age group to that of the 20-39 age group; if the index is less than or equal to 1, the language may be called endangered. Maybe due to their pedantry, or the specificity of the information required to undertake the assessment, these tools have stimulated less interest or use among linguists (and communities) than the various graded classification systems – a consideration for those wishing to develop well-utilised tools assessing music vitality and endangerment.

Just like the complex task they aim to undertake, these various tools to measure language vitality are by no means unproblematic. In some ways, any one tool is bound to cater only inadequately for the multitude of dynamic, complex sociolinguistic situations found across the globe. Some linguists have expressed “considerable reluctance” at having to “force languages into the procrustean bed fashioned in the GIDS workshop” (Walsh, 2009, p. 134) or into the moulds of other frameworks. Austin believes that in carrying out assessments, linguists have sometimes “paid too little attention to individual differences, differences between the performance, the behaviour, the characteristics, the usages of individuals,” tending instead to “want to lump people into groups of classes so that they can process the quantitative data” (personal interview, 16 June 2010). He argues for “a much more subtle, qualitative analysis of the particularities of individual contexts and situations, and individuals – individual speakers, individual performers” (personal interview, 16 June 2010). Appraisals of the usability, accuracy, and generalisability of UNESCO’s *Language Vitality and Endangerment* in particular have led to a number of criticisms and suggestions for improvement. Especially notable is the study by Lewis (2006), which (among other aims) sets out to pinpoint the theoretical flaws of the framework by subjecting 100 languages to analysis in terms of its nine factors. UNESCO continues to invite expert review of the framework (J. Sallabank, personal communication, 22 April 2011).

Despite the criticisms, these various assessment tools have been crucial in advancing theory and practice of language maintenance and revitalisation. Their use goes well beyond merely diagnosing situations of language endangerment: they have also helped clarify the factors contributing to endangerment in specific contexts; helped indicate the urgency for maintenance or revitalisation strategies; helped guide and focus priorities for those strategies; and helped direct funding and resources to languages in most need (for example, in the context of Australia's National Indigenous Languages Survey, for which UNESCO's framework was employed; Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2005). Assessment frameworks may also be used diachronically to assess changes in the vitality of languages over time (for
example, by comparing the data presented in the sixteen editions of *Ethnologue* since 1951). This capacity to assess change in vitality over time is important. It assists researchers and communities to better forecast the likely short- or medium-term trajectory of a given language; but perhaps even more crucially, it represents a way to systematically evaluate the efficacy of any maintenance strategies that are implemented. This possibility for evaluation vastly increases the likelihood that maintenance strategies will be systematically improved over time.

All these usages of language vitality assessment tools have potential parallels for music. Such a tool could help identify genres in danger – a necessary capability in order to determine the extent of global musical endangerment. It could also help us understand factors contributing to the endangerment of those genres, develop and evaluate appropriate response strategies, and monitor and better predict changes in their vitality. The task of trying to develop a framework suited to evaluating any music genre is formidable, just as it is for languages. Yet despite the challenges and likely imperfections of any such framework, precedent from language maintenance presents a strong case for developing such a tool.

### 4.2 Developing advocacy for music sustainability

Arguments promoting the importance of music both generally and within communities (and to a somewhat lesser extent, arguments promoting the importance of a diversity of musics) are relatively well represented in the academic literature. Indeed, five of them serve as a rationale for this dissertation (see Chapter 1.2). Sometimes these kinds of arguments emerge in the public sphere too – to help promote multicultural festivals, for example, or to validate culturally diverse school music programs. They typically incite little or no opposition; in most Western societies at least, advocacy *against* vibrant and diverse musical communities is anomalous.

The type of advocacy I refer to in this section is both more contentious and complex: it relates to the need for intercession in the endangerment of music genres. Advocacy for this cause comprises two main components: a) promoting awareness of the fact that certain music genres are in danger (or may become so, without action); and b) justifying the need for concerted action (arguably the more difficult of the two). I discuss each of these components in turn, relating them to relevant language advocacy arguments.
**a) Promoting awareness**

A number of linguists believe that communicating with the public about the vitality and viability of languages is a fundamental part of language maintenance efforts (e.g. Austin, 2008, pp. 92, 97-98; Crystal, 2000, pp. 66-67, 96-101). Public awareness about language endangerment and its repercussions increases the likelihood that key stakeholders in language viability – endangered-language speakers themselves, as well as policy-makers, funding bodies, journalists, and the media – will be more receptive and sympathetic to the cause. In turn, this may facilitate program implementation, policy changes, or securing funding. For similar reasons, promoting awareness of *musical* endangerment is likely to be an important part of music sustainability strategies (and may even form a strategy in its own right): the groundswell of public understanding created by advocacy efforts has the potential to influence political and social action, resulting in change favourable to musical vitality and viability.

In the context of raising awareness of language endangerment, some of the most valuable data are the various striking statistics that indicate the extent of the problem: the total number of languages spoken across the world (6,909 according to the latest edition of Ethnologue; Lewis, 2009) and the proportion of these at risk of extinction (about half by the year 2100; Krauss, 1992, p. 6); their population distribution (96% of the world’s population speaks 4% of its languages, so 96% of the world’s linguistic diversity is maintained by only 4% of its population; Austin, 2008, p. 81); the rate of decline in linguistic diversity (20% over the period 1970-2005; Harmon & Loh, 2010), and the rate of language “death” (about one every fortnight; Crystal, 2000, p. 19). Concrete data like these have proven immensely valuable in driving home to policy-makers, funding bodies, and the general public the need for urgent action to support endangered languages. They are frequently cited in media reportage (e.g. Agricultural Innovations, 2008, 8 May, 0:45-0:56 ff.), public seminars and events (e.g. Davis, 2003, 4:13-4:14), and materials and publications for non-specialist (e.g. Austin, 2008) and non-academic (e.g. Abley, 2003) audiences. In this way, they have been instrumental in securing support and funding for endangered languages.

By contrast, extensive data like these do not yet exist for music endangerment. Even figures on the number of music genres in the world are hard to come by in the literature – although the immense difficulty of arriving at even an approximate number is clear. There exists no authoritative map plotting the distribution of the world’s music genres, such as is presented for languages in *Ethnologue* (Lewis, 2009), nor any wide-scale data on their vitality, such as in UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in
Danger (Moseley, 2009). Nor is there any way to measure global changes or trends in musical diversity or vitality, such as the quantitative *Index of Linguistic Diversity* recently developed by Terralingua (Harmon & Loh, 2010; Terralingua, 2011a). Compared with linguists, then, ethnomusicologists currently have a far smaller stockpile of information to draw from when promoting awareness of endangerment. Further research on the extent of global musical endangerment is therefore urgently needed; anecdotal accounts or incidental studies are unlikely to build a sufficiently strong case for action. Precedent from language maintenance (e.g. Lewis, 2009; Moseley, 2009) suggests that such a vast task may be achieved via the collaboration of a number of experienced researchers with strong community and academic networks within their region of expertise. Preliminary studies may focus on particular regions or particular types of communities (e.g. indigenous ones).

For languages, a number of specific projects have proven relatively successful in raising public awareness of endangerment. One is UNESCO’s annual *International Mother Language Day* on February 21, which aims (among other things) to promote linguistic diversity. While an *International Music Day* exists (proclaimed by the International Music Council), its remit is more to promote music in all sections of society, rather than to advocate for issues of music endangerment and sustainability, or global musical diversity (cf. UNESCO, 2007). Another salient example of a language-related public advocacy project is the annual *Endangered Languages Week* run by the *Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project* at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London; academic papers run alongside talks, displays, discussions, debates, films, and workshops for the general public, most of them free of charge (Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project, 2011, ‘Endangered languages week’ section). Given that music arguably has greater ability to capture public and media attention than languages (*Comparative Framework* 3.5), comparable initiatives like an annual “*Endangered Music Cultures Week*” or “*International Day of Local Music Cultures*” could be highly successful in promoting awareness of music endangerment.

**b) Advocating action**

Linguists are continually called upon to state and defend their role in issues of language viability. Non-specialists (like funding agencies and journalists) have sometimes responded dubiously to linguists’ calls to protect linguistic diversity. One cynical reaction is: “Naturally you linguists want to keep all those languages around, as a kind of artificial zoo at public expense, just so you can study them” (in Krauss, 1998, p. 109).
One response from linguists – and ethnomusicologists too – to these kinds of concerns about a researcher profiting (career-wise or otherwise) from working with more marginalised communities is to espouse and ensure reciprocity and partnership in all aspects of the research, and to remain alert to the risk (Galla, 2008).

Another adverse reaction linguists sometimes encounter in response to their work is: “Surely one language is better, more harmonious?” (cf. Davis, 2003, 4:14-4:29). Given that most people enjoy and recognise the value of a diversity of musics, ethnomusicologists are less likely to encounter this sentiment in their work (though a hierarchy of music cultures exists in the minds of many, often with Western classical music at the top). Probably more likely is general indifference within majority groups that music genres of certain communities are atrophying, often to be replaced by other (often Western-influenced) genres. One possible way to counteract this indifference is to promulgate the various arguments that articulate the personal and social value of music genres, several of which were presented in Chapter 1 as the rationales for this dissertation.

Perhaps more challenging and complex than these kinds of publicly-voiced concerns about language or music sustainability efforts are those raised by people with an expert understanding of the issues: researchers and activists themselves, and the communities with whom they work. For languages, philosophical and practical concerns about maintenance and revitalisation have sparked vehement debate among scholars, fieldworkers, culture-bearers, and other stakeholders. Four key issues recur in the language maintenance literature, each with relevance to music sustainability (Grant, in press). First, some linguists deem efforts to sustain languages or music genres to be interfering with their natural processes of growth, change, and decline – and therefore neither wise nor ethical (a little redolent of *Jurassic Park*). Second are the concerns about the purism embodied by the very notion of sustaining an endangered tradition: what is it that should be sustained? How can natural processes of change be reconciled with the ideology of sustainability?

Third, activism in the fate of a language or music genre carries the risk of researcher interventionism in a community; while issues of researcher-community power balances have long been discussed in ethnomusicology, that discipline has not always considered the unique issues generated by contexts of musical endangerment. Finally, endangered-language activists have faced repeated accusations that maintenance strategies simply don’t work, or that they too frequently entail unanticipated or equivocal outcomes. The discourse in the language maintenance
literature surrounding each of these concerns represents an invaluable resource for ethnomusicologists, who might draw on the various linguistic rejoinders to these arguments to construct firmer theoretical, philosophical, and ethical bases on which to ground their own work on music sustainability.

Thus, if advocating to the public about activism in music sustainability is important, advocating within the discipline of ethnomusicology is at least as much so. While the vast majority of sociolinguists are aware of the situation and extent of language endangerment – after all, an entire sub-field of their discipline has developed around it – the same cannot yet be said of ethnomusicologists, whose training often comprises ethnographic work within one or two communities, and from whom the bigger picture can sometimes disappear from view. Many linguists believe that awareness and action within their discipline is crucial (particularly, but not only, for the documentation of endangered languages; e.g. Dorian, 1994, p. 799; Walsh, 2010, p. 29). Dixon accuses linguists of “errors of attitude” (1997, p. 137) with regard to their apparent apathy to the global predicament of languages. He reasons:

If every linguistics student (and faculty member) in the world today worked on just one language that is in need of study, the prospects for full documentation of endangered languages (before they fade away) would be rosy. I doubt if one linguist in twenty is doing this. (p. 137)

If these beliefs are indicative, ethnomusicologists’ awareness of the need for music sustainability efforts, and their engaged commitment to that end, will be imperative to the success of those efforts. Some recent advances in this regard are promising, such as the Australia-New Zealand ICTM Regional Committee’s formal statement highlighting the need for urgent support of the many highly endangered Indigenous Australian music and dance traditions (Bendrups, 2011, p. 32). However, widespread commitment within the discipline is unlikely to gain traction until such time as ethnomusicologists better understand the extent and nature of musical endangerment, hence the necessity of conducting further research in the area.

In addition to advocacy directed towards experts and towards the general public, linguists have noted the importance of a third kind: that which targets endangered-language communities themselves. This “internal advocacy” has mostly centred on raising community awareness about the options for influencing the trajectory of the language. It differs significantly in nature and approach from advocating to “outsiders,” and I address it in Section 4.3 as a language maintenance strategy in its own right.
4.3 Developing maintenance and revitalisation strategies

In Chapter 2.2c, transmission-based approaches to boosting the vitality and viability of music genres were identified as promising but under-researched pathways to supporting music sustainability. Certain successful transmission-based approaches to language maintenance potentially represent models that could be adapted for use with music. One example is language nests, cultural and language immersion centres for young children, operating in New Zealand (Spolsky, 2003) and Hawai’i (NeSmith, 2009) since the early 1980s, and which continue to be adapted for use in other contexts (including recently in Mexico; Bojórquez, 2010, pp. 111-112). Another are the master-apprentice programs developed in California in the early 1990s, which pair an older native speaker of an endangered language with a younger learner, and focus on oral transmission in a non-formal learning situation (Hinton, 1997; these language programs differ fundamentally from the master-apprentice methods of transmission common to some music genres, as discussed in Chapter 3.1). Other types of endangered-language immersion programs with slightly different approaches have also proven at least partially successful (see Hale, 2001). Careful reference to the Comparative Framework, in conjunction with an assessment of the kinds of music genres that may be appropriately transmitted in these ways, would clarify the extent to which transmission-based language maintenance initiatives may serve as prototypes for transmission-based initiatives that support music sustainability.

Transmission-based approaches to supporting music sustainability are only one kind of approach; Chapter 2.2 also described initiatives that focus on documentation and preservation; recognition and celebration; policy and enterprise; and coordinating and evaluating mechanisms. Across all of these areas, language maintenance provides a raft of possible models for developing music-specific sustainability strategies. Yet for music as for languages, the success of a strategy in one context is no reliable indicator that it will work in others. There can be no one-size-fits-all remedy for endangerment, “no single recipe” (S. Pettan, personal interview, 30 July 2010). Each situation is unique, and each strategy must take into account the degree and causes of endangerment, socioeconomic and political circumstances, the attitudes and aspirations of the community concerned, and the human, financial and material resources at hand (Grant, in press).

For this reason, rather than exploring how particular language maintenance strategies (like language nests or apprentice programs) might be adapted for use with endangered music genres, in this section I instead draw on language maintenance theory...
to propose and describe a broader set of circumstances in which any chosen strategy is likely to be successful. In this way, the theory I present remains relevant to the diverse global situations of musical endangerment. Such theory is arguably needed in order to develop consistently effective approaches to supporting endangered music genres, tailored to, and appropriate for, local conditions. I therefore leave aside an investigation of ways to adapt, for music, specific language maintenance strategies, and instead highly recommend this as a topic for further research.

Research into specific language maintenance initiatives can generate understanding of the factors influencing their success, and this understanding may, in turn, be able to inform theory on music sustainability. Take the Hebrew language revival, for example – arguably one of the most successful. Linguists have identified a number of factors favourable to that revitalisation effort, including the fact that Hebrew was already extensively documented (cf. the Hebrew bible); that the language was considered prestigious; that anyone had the right to speak it (lack of ownership); that loanwords and foreign words were borrowed freely without adverse connotations (lack of a purist ideology); and that it could be revived anywhere, not only in its place of origin (lack of place restriction) (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011). Given the similarities between music and language viability with regard to issues of documentation (cf. Comparative Framework, Chapter 3.1), prestige (3.3), ownership (3.2), authenticity and purism (3.3), and the role of the diaspora (3.2), the case of Hebrew holds promise to yield useful theoretical insights for music sustainability. Similarly, analyses of other language revitalisations hold potential to yield further insights.

For ethnomusicologists, one highly valuable resource from language maintenance is linguists’ analyses of the optimal conditions in which an endangered language is most likely to gain ground (or in which maintenance strategies are most likely to succeed). A number of linguists have attempted to theorise those factors that “turn up so frequently that they could be recognized as postulates for a theory of language revitalization” (Crystal, 2000, p. 130). By way of example, Figure 4.2 presents three such lists, each framed slightly differently, by Yamamoto (1998), Crystal (2000), and Walsh (2010).

The Comparative Framework helps identify which of those factors linguists commonly believe affect the success of language maintenance strategies are also likely to affect the efficacy of strategies supporting music sustainability. Areas of overlap include the role of training and teacher-training in transmission (Comparative Framework, Chapter 3.1), prestige (3.3), community commitment to sustainability
Figure 4.2 Desirable conditions for language maintenance: three theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine factors that “help maintain and promote the small languages” (Yamamoto, 1998, p. 114):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the existence of a dominant culture in favour of linguistic diversity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a strong sense of ethnic identity within the endangered community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the promotion of educational programs about the endangered language and culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the creation of bilingual/bicultural school programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the training of native speakers as teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the involvement of the speech community as a whole;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the creation of language materials that are easy to use;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the development of written literature, both traditional and new;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the creation and strengthening of the environments in which the language must be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six conditions under which “an endangered language will progress” (Crystal, 2000, pp. 130-143):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. its speakers increase their prestige within the dominant community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. its speakers increase their wealth relative to the dominant community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. its speakers increase their legitimate power in the eyes of the dominant community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. its speakers have a strong presence in the educational system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. its speakers can write their language down;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. its speakers can make use of electronic technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A “wish-list” for language revitalisation programs (Walsh, 2010, pp. 26-32):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. cultural awareness, and acknowledgement of the language-culture connection, within the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. community cohesion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. community control of the revitalisation process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. acknowledgement that language is only one part of the revitalisation process and that other cultural activities need to be integrated into that process too;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a sizeable knowledge base and access to information on the language;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. access to linguistic expertise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. recognition of the fallacy of the claim that learning the language will be easier for a person of the same ethnic background, and that teachers must also be of that ethnic group (‘overcoming the genetic fallacy’);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. foregrounding oracy over the ‘easier’ option, literacy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. appropriate use of technology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. trained teachers of the language;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. sustained commitment from Elders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. a regional support network;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. willingness to draw on existing resources from elsewhere and adapt them to the local situation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. funding (useful, but not an essential ingredient for success);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ability to address problems but not be overwhelmed by them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

strategies (3.3), and broader socioeconomic circumstances (3.4). The framework also indicates some of the probable differences in these conditions, relating to the role of orthography in sustainability (3.1), the social functions of language and music within a community (3.2), the infrastructural requirements for music-making versus language-speaking (3.4), and the role of the media and (music) industry in sustainability (3.5).

Ethnomusicologists have not yet made a sustained effort to consolidate an experience-base from which to empirically compile a list of favourable conditions for music sustainability, like those proposed for languages in Figure 4.2. Through careful
recourse to the *Comparative Framework*, however, linguistic understandings of desirable conditions for language maintenance strategies signal several probable desirable conditions for music sustainability strategies. Below, I propose a tentative list of six of the most likely desirable conditions for strategies supporting music sustainability, positioning them against precedent (or lack thereof) from the field of language maintenance. Over time, further research and empirical evidence will lead to refinements to this list. As other conditions prove advantageous, they may be added too.

### 1) the support of the community as a whole

For both music and language, the role of the community in sustainability strategies is critical, and multifaceted. The attitude of a language’s own speaker community towards it may be the most crucial factor in the success of language maintenance efforts (UNESCO, 2011, ‘What can be done to save a language from disappearing?’ section), and the *Comparative Framework* identified the attitude of the community (narrowly defined as the community of practice, rather than the wider society in which a music genre is located) as being critical to the sustainability of music genres too (Chapter 3.3). Even if a community’s attitude to a language or music genre is favourable, this does not necessarily always convert into sustained, active commitment to maintaining or revitalising it; “unspoken but deep doubts, fears and anxieties about traditional language and culture may actually mean that people are not willing to become personally involved” (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006, p. 48). Commitment to the cause, then, in addition to a favourable community attitude to the tradition in question, is a highly desirable precondition for the success of music sustainability strategies, as it is for language strategies.

The field of language maintenance confirms that it is essential for community members to have (and to *feel* they have) control over maintenance projects and processes. Aside from the ethical imperative, training community members themselves to implement maintenance projects or engaging them in other ways throughout the process has improved outcomes, as well as saving time and generating a sense of community ownership (Berez & Holton, 2006, pp. 73-74). One important role of the outsider may be to alert communities to the possibilities for maintenance. Walsh describes how, in his work with certain Australian Aboriginal communities, the community attitude towards the future of their language changed “in about ten minutes” from pessimism to “boundless optimism” when alerted to the various possibilities for revitalisation (personal interview, 8 April 2010; see also P. Austin, personal interview,
16 June 2010). This is likely to hold true for music sustainability initiatives too: for their success, the community has to care, “or at least be talked to enough so that they understand. They may have given up; they may say, ‘I don’t care any more,’ but you may find that underneath that statement of not caring there’s actually something else going on” (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011). For both music and languages, community agreement about how to approach maintenance is also important; in Walsh’s experience, “if the community cannot reach consensus most of the time then the success of the language revitalization programme will be put in jeopardy” (2010, p. 28).

2) the ideological willingness of the community to explore new pathways for the genre
It is eminently likely that a community ideology of purism or insistence on authenticity may adversely affect the viability of endangered music genres (Grant, in press, ‘The problem of purism’ section). The converse is certainly the case: an open approach to exploring new possibilities has boosted the vitality of a number of genres, as demonstrated in the cases of Finnish “new” folk music (Ramnarine, 2003, p. 70), the “reinvention” of Mexican mariachi (Sheehy, 2006, pp. 79-89), and the revival, modernisation, and social recontextualisation of Hungarian folk music (Frigyesi, 1996, p. 54), among many other examples. Like music genres, languages too need to be permitted to adapt to new contexts to survive (Comparative Framework 3.3). One striking example is the Australian Aboriginal language Kaurna, where a flexible community attitude has allowed the language to adapt in accordance with the demands of new contexts and functions (Amery, 2002, p. 7).

Many linguists therefore agree that a purist community ideology often (but not always) adversely affects the sustainability of an endangered language, by denying it the processes of innovation and change that normally feature in living, vital languages (e.g. Thieberger, 2002, p. 324; Walsh, 2005, p. 303; see also M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010). For successful maintenance strategies, then, it is arguably preferable that communities adopt an approach which recognises that endangered cultural expressions are situated within inevitably changing environments, and which gives them the resilience to cope with shifting contexts by embracing, rather than resisting, change. Whether of music or language, community approaches to sustainability might not only aim to preserve the past, but to allow adaptation to the changing environment in ways consistent with the naturally dynamic expression of cultural traditions over time. The issue of a community’s willingness to traverse new pathways will be explored at more
length in Chapter 6 specifically in relation to Vietnamese ca trù, where authenticity and upholding the true “tradition” are key points of debate and dispute.

3) recognition in the wider social context of the value of musical/cultural expressions
Although the lists of desirable preconditions for language maintenance in Figure 4.2 only refer indirectly, or not at all, to the favourable wider social positioning of languages, this factor is demonstrably critical to the success of language maintenance strategies. The impact of socioeconomic and political circumstances on the viability of both languages and music genres was confirmed in the Comparative Framework (3.3), with favourable circumstances likely to vastly increase the chances of success of maintenance strategies. Consider the unfeasibility of implementing maintenance strategies in repressive political regimes or situations of extreme poverty, versus situations where a rich diversity of vibrant cultural expressions is extensively supported through policy, regulations, funding, and research.

Feasibly, the wider context may not be given greater due in the lists in Figure 4.2 because it is one of the most difficult to influence – in some cases, impossible. This is one reason why Walsh believes that Crystal’s six conditions (Figure 4.2) over-reach the requirements for language revitalisation, at least in the Aboriginal Australian context: he argues that some of them are simply not realistic (for example, that Aboriginal-language speakers will increase their wealth relative to the dominant community, or their prestige within it, at least in the near future; Walsh, 2010, pp. 24-25). Despite the difficulty of influencing this condition, I nevertheless include it here as a probable important factor in the success of music sustainability strategies.

4) adequate resources for learning, teaching, rehearsing and performing
Not represented in the language-related lists in Figure 4.2, this fourth favourable condition for music sustainability strategies develops from a finding of the Comparative Framework (3.4): that tangible resources and infrastructure play a more critical role in the vitality of music genres than of languages. Particularly on the topic of resources for creating, rehearsing and performing, the language maintenance literature is not overly informative, since language production in its normal communicative function does not typically entail these notions (Comparative Framework 3.3).

More helpful is the substantial research and experience from language maintenance that relates to the role and use of learning and teaching resources in endangerment contexts. Since endangered languages often rely on formal learning and
teaching for their transmission (*Comparative Framework* 3.1), endangered-language communities and linguists have invested much time and effort into developing resources and materials specifically for use in these situations of endangerment (e.g. Hinton & Hale, 2001). Learning and teaching materials like these may not exist at all for music genres that are traditionally orally transmitted. In cases of endangerment, the vitality of those genres may be boosted if community members have ready access to a range of high-quality learning materials. Learning and teaching resources for endangered languages may be useful in stimulating ideas for music-related learning materials for use specifically in contexts of endangerment (cf. *Comparative Framework* 3.1). Investigation of this possibility is recommended as a topic for further enquiry.

5) the means for the community to access and utilise electronic technology

Like the previous condition, this condition emanates from the *Comparative Framework* (3.5) rather than from language maintenance theory itself: specifically, from its finding that media (including, particularly, electronic technology) play a far more critical role in the sustainability of music genres than of languages. While some aspects of the role of technology in music sustainability will therefore need to be researched independently from language maintenance precedent, theory and practice relating to the use of technology in language maintenance may still be relevant to music in a number of ways. Language maintenance may indicate ways to expand and improve the use of electronic technology in archiving and documentation practices, provide precedents for establishing technology-related policy that supports endangered cultural expressions (cf. for example, UNESCO’s recommendation on multilingualism in cyberspace, 2001a), and more generally point to some of the challenges and risks involved in using technology in situations of cultural endangerment, or in maintenance and revitalisation efforts (e.g. Walsh, 2005, pp. 300-301).

Perhaps most importantly, through the models of specific successful projects, language maintenance demonstrates possible ways to employ technology in music sustainability strategies. There are hundreds of examples. Three notable ones are *FirstVoices*, a suite of online tools and services designed to support Canadian Aboriginal communities to archive, learn, teach, and revitalise their languages (First People’s Cultural Foundation, 2010); *Nitti Ngapartji*, the Pitjantjatjara language and learning website (Ngapartji Ngapartji, 2011); and the computer-assisted Hawaiian-language learning project *Leoki* (see Warschauer, et al., 1997). Successful initiatives like these not only demonstrate the value of electronic technology in situations of the
endangerment of cultural expressions, but also indicate concrete ways in which it may be employed. In conjunction with the *Comparative Framework*, this is another recommended field for further investigation.

**6) a knowledge-base and access to documentation on the genre**

Walsh’s “wish-list” of desirable conditions for language maintenance includes “a sizeable knowledge base and access to information on the language” (2010, p. 26; see Figure 4.2), since attempts to revitalise may clearly be impeded by a lack of information about a language. For music too, the extent of available information may determine the success of maintenance strategies, and so a sizeable knowledge-base and access to documentation on the genre is a desirable precondition for music sustainability strategies too. In underscoring the importance of a knowledge-base in strategies to counter endangerment, linguists have theorised about the role of written documentation in maintenance efforts (Crystal and Yamamoto both table the importance of the written language in maintenance strategies; cf. Figure 4.2). Language maintenance also points to the unique functions and uses of a knowledge-base in endangerment contexts, which may differ from those in contexts of cultural vitality. Consider, for example, the ethical imperative that “materials elicited from communities must be made quickly available and be capable of supporting language strengthening (Grinevald, 2003)” (Nathan, 2006, p. 62).

For both endangered languages and endangered music genres, documentation and revitalisation are intimately connected, and may be seen as two sides of a coin rather than separate or mutually exclusive activities (Grant, 2010). Documentation has proven essential in sustaining and revitalising certain traditions that may otherwise have been lost. Ethnomusicologists are already well familiar with the relationships between documentation and music revivals (cf. Chapter 2.1c), and in several recorded instances, the repatriation of archival recordings has renewed a community’s interest and practice of a tradition (Chapter 2.2a). It is possible that documentation and archiving may play an even more important role for music than for languages:

> I think it’s very hard to not have a language and then recover it through a written grammar and with no native speakers around, [harder] than it might be to take advantage of the musical tradition and then improvise – you can change a musical tradition and base it on an earlier form, but you can’t really do that with a language. So I think probably archives are going to be even more useful in
actually stimulating musical growth and continuity than the language ones are. (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011)

4.4 Reflecting on aims and outcomes of strategies

While the often-unanticipated outcomes of practical strategies intending to support music sustainability is a recurrent theme in the literature (Chapter 2.2 described a number of examples, particularly in relation to festivals and top-down interventions), ethnomusicological enquiry offers little by way of critical theoretical reflection on appropriate responses to this situation. Should communities and researchers try a different approach? Redefine the aims of sustainability projects? Accept some randomness of outcomes? Abandon them altogether? Discourse within the field of language maintenance raises all these questions; it also offers a number of answers that may hold relevance for efforts towards music sustainability.

On balance, attitudes about the efficacy of language maintenance strategies to restore languages to full use tend towards despondence. Pronouncements of endangered languages as a “hopeless cause” (Newman, 1998, 2003) reverberate through the literature. With regard to Irish, a language often paraded as a failed maintenance attempt, McCloskey writes: “The smell of failure has hung around the ‘revival’ movement like a corrosive fog for decades” (2001, p. 43). The raft of recurrent problems with Australian Aboriginal language maintenance programs has led to the abandonment of several of them; problems include obstructive government policy, a lack of skills and resources, community criticism, inadequate or mismanaged funding, lack of long-term planning, “tokenism” in the content and organisation of programs, and a lack of communication between communities involved in maintenance activities (Amery, 2002; Schmidt, 1990, pp. 82-101). The top-down Eurocentric nature of some language maintenance programs is no help. Contending that “an honest evaluation of most language revitalization efforts to date will show that they have failed” (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006, p. ix), some linguists arrive at the conclusion: “What, then, is the solution for dying and endangered languages? I’m sad to admit that I’m not sure that there is one” (Carnie, 1996, p. 112).

Evidently, ensuring the viability of a music genre is no easy task either – though it may be argued that the odds of successfully sustaining a music genre are higher than of a language, because of music’s greater ability to recontextualise (Comparative Framework, Chapter 3.2) and its significantly greater commercial potential (3.5). It is
certainly possible to halt or even reverse the decline of a music genre. In the early twentieth century the popularity of Korean *p’ansori* (“epic storytelling through song”) began to dwindle, but post-1964, when it was declared Korea's Important Intangible Cultural Property No. 5, “its fortunes were reversed, and its audience grew once more” (Howard, 2006, p. xii). In Thailand, the academic Sugree Charoensook of Mahidol University, Bangkok, set up music schools for Thai (and Western) classical music in shopping malls. Wong observes that the Thai classical music tradition was considered in danger of dying out, but its fortune “was turned right around by [Charoensook] recognising the fact that there was a new population ready to engage with it in a very different way” (in QCRC, 2008, pp. 6-7). The case of Vietnamese *ca trù* is a third example, explored at length in Chapter 6.

The track record for languages is not all bad, either. Perhaps foremost among the success stories is Hebrew, for some the only unmitigated example of revitalisation (Nahir, 1998; Spolsky & Shohamy, 2001). In certain domains, the Welsh language has gained strength (Office for National Statistics UK, 2004), partly due to bilingual education programs and increased political and cultural awareness of the language. Language loss has been also arrested in the case of Maori in New Zealand, though full intergenerational transmission is yet to be restored (Spolsky, 2003, p. 571). Speaker numbers of the indigenous Hawaiian language have grown since the 1970s, when various revitalisation strategies were implemented, including language immersion schools (Hinton & Hale, 2001, pp. 129-178). Abley (2003, pp. 233-239), Austin (2006), Fishman (1991, p. 288), and Thieberger (2002, pp. 318-319) explore other examples.

Despite these successes, purposeful language maintenance strategies cannot always claim full credit for revitalisation. With regard to the revival in recent years of the Manx culture and language, certain political, economic, and social forces having nothing to do with planned revitalisation initiatives may have been just as crucial to changing the fortunes of the culture (Wilson, 2008). Even the revival of the Hebrew language happened with little deliberate planning, and some scholars believe it would not have been nearly as successful without a remarkable confluence of socio-political factors that would be impossible to deliberately recreate in the case of other endangered languages (Nahir, 1998).

Music genres too display a sometimes surprising ability to revitalise themselves: after over a decade of near-inutile official recognition and financial support for the Korean folk genre *p’ungmul* (“a familiar, yet declining age-old rural practice”), four South Korean percussionists, later named SamulNori, accomplished its revitalisation
“almost literally overnight” (Hesselink, 2004, pp. 405, 408). Two neo-African popular music genres, Creole kawina and Ndjuka Maroon aleke, underwent an unplanned “sudden revitalization” in Suriname in the late 1980s to early 1990s (Bilby, 1999, p. 267). The revitalisation of rural folk songs in Serbian towns in the 1990s has been described as “a spontaneous, intuitive response” to newer genres and to the suppression of traditional music (Jovanović, 2005, p. 39). In these (and similar) cases, the role of the mass media and the world music market is often of considerable importance.

Relatively often, the results of language maintenance strategies have been unanticipated (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2155). In the case of the Hawaiian language, the limited interaction between native speakers and the increasing number of second-language speakers, coupled with the fact that most educators of the language were not native speakers, played a role in the unanticipated development of a new language that has been labelled “neo-Hawaiian” (NeSmith, 2009, p. 3). The revitalisation of Hebrew has resulted in not only quite a different language, but also an unexpected cost in terms of loss of other languages (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2163). A number of music sustainability strategies have also resulted in unexpected outcomes; several of these were tabled in Chapter 2.2.

On the other hand, the unanticipated results of maintenance strategies can be positive as well as negative. Although a description and revitalisation project with the endangered Yan-nhaŋu language of Eastern Arnhem Land failed to produce any more speakers, the researchers argue that the benefits of the project have been plenty, including a raised profile of the language within the community, substantial documentation, improved confidence in asserting links between language and traditional sites and practices, and increased academic research and publications resulting in heightened awareness of the existence of the Yan-nhaŋu people as a distinct group (Bowern & James, 2010, p. 367).

Still wider benefits may result from efforts that support the viability of languages:

A small investment in language revitalization could yield very significant dividends. Language revival can result in the saving of vast amounts of money and resources going into housing, social services and health intervention to little effect. A small investment into language revitalization can make an enormous difference to society. Public health can benefit from language intervention. (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011, p. 123)
These observations are arguably potentially true for music too, which also has intimate links to individual and community identity and social cohesion. The utilitarian spin-off effects of strategies supporting music sustainability within a community may therefore be considerable.

For these reasons, in the case of both languages and music genres, even token revitalisation may be a wholly acceptable outcome of sustainability strategies. For some languages (like Australian Aboriginal Kaurna, where written records have been the only knowledge-base for reconstructing the language), a “formulaic approach” has been adopted: an inventory of phrases, expressions, and functional language has been re-installed into the community in appropriate contexts, such as welcome-to-country speeches, opening speeches for town events or art galleries, and at funerals (Amery, 2002). Some linguists object to equating this with a living language: “If the only words of Wiyot that you use are yes and no, and only in a particular semiceremonial context, this is no longer a language, any more than musicians are speaking Italian when they say andante and fortissimo” (Dalby, 2003, pp. 250-251). Others linguists argue that when formulaic usage benefits the community, it constitutes success:

You put that much investment into language revitalisation and the dividends will be ten, fifty, a hundred-fold. Because what happens is you get Indigenous people whose lives are literally turned around, where instead of being totally dysfunctional, they feel good about themselves, they’ve regained their identity. So to shock people, I say, “Look, I don’t care whether they only know ten words and they ‘mispronounce’ the whole lot of them; if the effect has been to take a dysfunctional person . . . [and] move from that to a person who’s living a good family life and likes himself and stuff, well I don’t care what it looks like, how authentic it is, or anything else – that’s the way to go.” (M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010)

In brief, music sustainability strategies may or may not end up restoring endangered music genres to their “original” contexts, regaining lost repertoire, or fully reviving skills and technical expertise in musicians. They may or may not stimulate new directions for a genre, such as new repertoire, styles, contexts, functions, and techniques. It should be remembered that fully reactivating the former vitality of a music genre may in fact be at variance with the community’s priorities, which may lie rather within areas such as sociocultural identity, intrinsic worth and self-esteem, or links with heritage (cf. Schmidt, 1990, p. 107; Thieberger, 2002, pp. 319-320, in relation to languages). This is perhaps especially true of disenfranchised communities,
where cultural expressions are often the lynchpin of individual and community identity. Hence Walsh’s striking statement: “Even ‘failure’ in language revitalisation is worthwhile!” (2002, p. 22).

Experience from language maintenance therefore indicates that music sustainability efforts should not be judged solely on the criterion of increasing the long-term viability of a genre, but also on wider economic, social, and political outcomes. Linguist Sallabank suggests that ethnomusicologists and linguists alike should engage in “prior ideological clarification” (after Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998, pp. 62-63) of the goals of strategies: “Are you trying to get everybody speaking again, or everybody singing? Or will you be satisfied with a few symbolic bits? Or somewhere in between? What is this language or music going to look like in the future?” (personal interview, 17 June 2010).

Already, certain music sustainability strategies embrace broader objectives that benefit the individuals and community under study. Ahmad Sarmast, the director of the *Revival of Afghan Music* project, hopes that that initiative will not only help revive traditional Afghan musical instruments and forms, but also destroyed lives; half of all places at the project’s Afghanistan National Institute of Music are reserved for disadvantaged and underprivileged children (Afghanistan National Institute of Music, 2009). For Vietnamese *ca trù*, the ultimate purpose of implementing sustainability strategies may also be something more, or other, than ensuring the viability of the genre for its own sake: its reclamation may, for example, play a role in establishing “a future in which pre-revolutionary traditions and sentiments have a respected place in a rapidly changing, ‘modern’, Vietnam” (Norton, 2005, p. 50). These sentiments embody a broad and open-minded perspective on aims and outcomes for music sustainability strategies.

### 4.5 Developing co-ordinating mechanisms

Tackling the problem of endangered music genres in a co-ordinated way promises to optimise the outcomes of efforts towards sustainability. During a conference assessing the 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* (held at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, June 1999), one delegate observed:

I see here a lot of foot soldiers, most of us winning a battle here or losing one there – yet painfully conscious that we are actually losing the war. What concerns me is that even as we win or lose our little battles, we are nowhere near
evolving a game plan for the war. Is there a general in our army? An SOS number to call? (Sethi, 2001, p. 86)

Language maintenance can help develop a game plan, by offering a range of conceptual prototypes for mechanisms to help monitor, evaluate and co-ordinate efforts supporting music sustainability. Some of these mechanisms already exist in some form or other; they include umbrella organisations, centralised funding agencies, registers of best practice, research databases, and resource hubs where stakeholders exchange ideas and pool resources. Some language-related co-ordinating measures may also provide pre-existing infrastructure on which music-specific co-ordinating mechanisms may be built. Both these possibilities – conceptual prototypes and pre-existing infrastructure – are explored in this section.

For both linguists and endangered-language communities, the means to share and disseminate knowledge and expertise about successful language maintenance efforts has proven highly useful. Online open-access “registers of good practice,” for instance, stimulate ideas about possible ways to approach sustainability, provide exemplars of projects, indicate common pitfalls, and offer hands-on solutions. One such register has been developed by E-MELD (Electronic Metastructure for Endangered Languages Data), a project that aims to formulate and promote good practices in digitising data on endangered languages, to demonstrate those practices via an online “showroom,” and to communicate with the research community about standards and recommendations (Boynton, Moran, Aristar, & Aristar-Dry, 2006; E-MELD, 2005). UNESCO’s effort to establish a more general Register of Good Practices in Language Preservation remains realised, though a rationale, call for submissions, and submission form are accessible online (UNESCO, 2005b). A freely-accessible repository of music-specific “good practices” is a projected outcome of the Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures project, which may benefit by referring to these language-specific precedents (as well as those for cultural heritage at large, such as UNESCO’s Register of Good Safeguarding Practices referred to in Chapter 2.2e).

Sharing ideas and experiences relating to music sustainability may be as simple as establishing an online vehicle for the purpose. The Endangered Languages and Cultures blog is one example, a moderated online platform for advancing scholarly enquiry into the endangerment and maintenance of languages and cultures (PARADISEC, 2011). A select group of regular bloggers (mostly linguists) and their invited guests contribute to a broad-ranging dialogue on documentation, fieldwork, technology, education, projects, resources, and other issues relating to endangered
languages and cultures. Presently, few posts deal specifically with issues of music endangerment or sustainability, despite the fact that the topic fits directly within the remit of the blog. The blog’s infrastructure could be immediately utilised by those working with endangered music genres; an added benefit of capitalising on this pre-existing resource is the potential it creates for cross-disciplinary language-music discourse on sustainability issues.

Another important aspect of co-ordinating approaches to music sustainability is finding ways to disseminate, assess, compare, and review relevant research. One of the first tasks to this end will be to gather information on past and current studies of endangered music genres, and where possible, to make those studies easily accessible in a centralised location for scholarly inspection, reflection and critique. One precedent from linguistics is the online database of language endangerment levels compiled by researchers at the World Oral Literature Project (affiliated with the University of Cambridge; World Oral Literature Project, 2010). The data are assembled from *Ethnologue*, UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger*, and from the work of an individual researcher (conservation biologist William Sutherland). The database also cross-references to collections, recordings, and documentation of oral literature across the world, and for each language, to other referenced and frequently-updated online sources. In this way, the database represents a tool that centralises research on language endangerment. As these data grow for music, an equivalent music-specific tool will be increasingly called for.

A centralised resource network could serve as a means to share tools like this, as well as other resources, ideas, research outcomes, project outcomes, and practical experiences surrounding issues of music endangerment and sustainability. Seeger believes that establishing a resource network may be the most important next step in advancing efforts to support music sustainability (personal interview, 22 March 2011). Establishing a network that operates at the international level would ensure the widest scope for both access and input to the network. The project *Sustainable Futures* intends to realise such a network as one of its outcomes.

Several language precedents exist for international resource networks on endangerment and sustainability, including the incipient Consortium for Training in Language Documentation and Conservation (launched early 2012), which aims to foster networking and collaboration across the world among those involved in issues of training (Consortium on Training in Language Documentation and Conservation, 2012), and the better-established Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity (RNLD), which
aims to advance the sustainability of indigenous languages. RNLD, founded in Australia in 2004, is a particularly successful international resource network. An active e-list is a vehicle for energetic discourse between network members. The network’s website itself is a centralised source of information about grants, projects, media reportage, conferences and events, training opportunities, relevant blogs and lists, links and online resources, policy matters, and opportunities for activism and advocacy relating to language endangerment and maintenance (Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity, 2011). The following list of possible objectives for a comparable “Resource Network for Music Sustainability” takes inspiration from the missions of RNLD and the Consortium, as presented on their respective websites:

- to construct a clearinghouse of resources and materials relating to music endangerment and sustainability, accessible to researchers, communities, and other stakeholders across the world;
- to provide an international forum for sharing approaches and methods in initiatives that support music sustainability, including advice on technology;
- to facilitate and foster discussion about the objectives and outcomes of projects currently being developed and implemented;
- to identify and share successful practices;
- to encourage partnerships and collaborations between researchers, governments, non-government organisations, businesses and communities of varied backgrounds and expertise;
- to promote relevant activities and projects, and to organise informal gatherings for community activists, researchers, and others interested in music sustainability; and
- to take into account a wide variety of perspectives and approaches by bringing together stakeholders from communities, institutes, universities, cultural centres, government, and elsewhere.

In addition to a resource network for sharing resources, experiences and knowledge about music sustainability, there is also a need for an international organisation supporting endangered music genres at a more general and public level – one that operates outside of the interests of any particular group, and is accessible to anyone. Drawing on the discussions in Chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation, Figure 4.3formulates an exemplar statement of purpose for such an organisation – an imaginary “Foundation for Music Sustainability” – modelled on the manifestos of two prominent
Figure 4.3 Exemplar statement of purpose for an organisation supporting music sustainability, based on models from language maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation for Music Sustainability: Statement of Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation for Music Sustainability</strong> is an autonomous international non-profit organisation committed to supporting the vitality and viability of music genres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. **Foundation for Music Sustainability recognises:**

1. that music in all its diversity is a fundamental part of the world’s intangible cultural heritage;
2. that many music genres around the world, especially those of indigenous and minority peoples, are under threat (a concern reflected in the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage); and
3. that the decline or loss of music genres within a community potentially holds wider repercussions both within and beyond that community, for example in terms of individual and community identity and social cohesion.

B. **Foundation for Music Sustainability declares:**

1. that music constitutes an important and unique expression of culture within human societies, and that expressing culture is a basic human right;
2. that communities should have the right of self-determination with regard to their music and its future; and
3. that such decisions should be freely made with due regard for economic, social, cultural, community, and humanitarian considerations.

C. **Therefore, Foundation for Music Sustainability undertakes:**

1. to raise awareness of endangered music genres through all available means, both within and outside the communities where those genres are located;
2. to support the transmission and performance of endangered music genres where appropriate, prioritising the right of communities to self-determination;
3. to increase participation and promote autonomy of communities themselves in all aspects of music sustainability efforts, through training, mentoring, resource sharing, networking, and advocacy;
4. to forge partnerships in and across communities, between culture-bearers, fieldworkers, researchers, non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders, in relation to issues of music sustainability;
5. to establish ethical and other principles to guide fieldworkers, researchers, and communities in their activities supporting music sustainability;
6. to monitor policies and practices affecting music-making and musicians, and to seek to influence the appropriate authorities where necessary;
7. to support research and documentation of endangered music genres, by providing or indicating avenues for training, financial assistance, or disseminating outcomes;
8. to assemble and make available information that facilitates supporting the sustainability of music genres;
9. to raise greater public awareness of the importance of music sustainability and the need for strategies that support it; and
10. to disseminate information on all the above activities as widely as possible, at all levels from the local to the international.

International organisations that support endangered languages: Terralingua (2011b) and Foundation for Endangered Languages (2011, ‘Manifesto’ section).
Such an organisation could help effect a co-ordinated approach to supporting music sustainability that engages not only with specific communities, but also with governments, non-government organisations, funding bodies, the wider public to advocate for the importance of vibrant and viable music cultures, and to develop strategies which further that goal. A resource network, discussed above, may form one part of this organisation (see C6 and C7 in Figure 4.3). In 2009, the Musical Futures Foundation was set up with many of the purposes in Figure 4.3 in mind (H. Schippers, personal communication, 15 June 2011), though currently its public presence is limited to defining its intention to raise and distribute seed money to fund community-driven sustainability initiatives (QCRC, 2011, ‘Musical Futures Foundation’ section).

For languages, efforts to carry forward the goals and objectives of maintenance efforts are largely reliant on grants; funding bodies therefore play a key role in those efforts. Significant funding bodies include the Foundation of Endangered Languages (based in the UK), the Endangered Languages Fund (USA), and the Dokumentation der Bedrohte Sprachen [“Documentation of endangered languages”] project of the Volkswagen Stiftung (Germany). A particularly notable funding source is the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London (2011), which provides substantial annual research grants for the documentation of endangered languages across the world. The project also comprises an archiving initiative and an academic training program (including postgraduate courses in endangered-language description, documentation, and field linguists). Although a comparable initiative is probably beyond the immediate sights of music sustainability – it was a £20 million donation from a charitable fund that led, in 2002, to the establishment of the Hans Rausing project – current ways of funding language maintenance projects indicate possible ways to manage funding of music sustainability projects in the future.

4.6 Conclusions

The discussion in this chapter points to five main ways in which language maintenance may help repair key gaps in current theory and practice of music sustainability. First, a range of tools from language maintenance may represent models for identifying and measuring music vitality, including UNESCO’s Language Vitality Framework (Section 4.1). The development of a similar tool would permit the systematic identification and assessment of situations of musical endangerment across the range of global contexts.
Second, advocacy efforts relating to music sustainability may usefully draw on advocacy approaches and arguments for language maintenance (4.2). I suggested that one key requirement for effective public advocacy will be a firm understanding of the extent of musical endangerment globally, and that further ethnomusicological investigation in this area is therefore warranted. Precedent from language maintenance suggests how this research might be carried out (namely, through the collaborative efforts of experienced ethnomusicologists across the world with strong regional expertise and networks). Another requirement for effective public advocacy is awareness among ethnomusicologists of the central issues in music endangerment. For this reason, as knowledge about the extent of music endangerment grows, so too should the need for consolidated response be promoted within the discipline – for example through training and educational opportunities, conferences and workshops, and published research.

Third, in Section 4.3, I argued that understanding preconditions for the success of language maintenance strategies is likely to advance our understanding of best ways to support endangered music genres, and suggested that music-related strategies should be continually reviewed in order to refine understanding of desirable preconditions for their success. Fourth, in exploring how linguists approach the dilemmas of inefficacy or unexpected outcomes of language maintenance strategies, I suggested that their perspectives may guide ethnomusicologists in defining realistic aims and outcomes of music sustainability strategies (4.4). The objectives and success of music sustainability strategies might be defined not, or not only, in terms of securing the viability of the genre in question but also in wider social, political, and economic terms.

Finally, I described a number of co-ordinating mechanisms for language maintenance, and how they may represent potentially valuable prototypes and infrastructure for music-specific co-ordinating mechanisms (4.5). Two specific examples served to illustrate, relating to a music-specific resource network on sustainability, and to a non-profit international organisation to support the goals and objectives of music sustainability efforts. Overall, then, to some degree, language maintenance holds potential to inform all five issues in music sustainability under consideration in this chapter.

This brings to a close Part I of this dissertation, which has identified key areas in music sustainability that require developing (Chapter 2) and some ways in which recourse to language maintenance may help do so (Chapters 3 and 4). In Part II, I develop a tool that permits systematic identification and assessment of situations of
musical endangerment. For reasons presented earlier this chapter (4.1), I believe this currently represents the most pressing undertaking in matters of music sustainability. Chapter 5 develops and presents the tool, and Chapter 6 applies it to gauge the vitality of a specific music genre.
In 2002-2003, UNESCO invited an international group of expert linguists to develop a framework for determining the vitality of a language, in order to assist in policy development, identifying needs, and implementing appropriate maintenance measures. This UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages subsequently elaborated the landmark concept paper *Language Vitality and Endangerment* (2003, already briefly described in Chapter 4.2). *Language Vitality and Endangerment* presents nine factors contributing to the degree of vitality of any language. Each factor is measured qualitatively (against the best-fitting description) and qualitatively (against a 6-grade numeric scale, or in real numbers). In this way, UNESCO proposes, these nine factors taken collectively can indicate the level of vitality of any language:

1. Intergenerational language transmission
2. Absolute number of speakers (measured in real numbers)
3. Proportion of speakers within the total population
4. Trends in existing language domains
5. Response to new domains and media
6. Materials for language education and literacy
7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official status and use
8. Community members’ attitudes towards their own language

It is this seminal tool (presented in full as Appendix C) that I take in this chapter as the basis for developing a comparable tool for identifying and assessing music endangerment, the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework* (MVEF). In Chapter 2.2a I argued that the lack of a systematic way to identify and assess endangerment is a major gap in current approaches to music sustainability, since such a tool is important for at least three reasons: 1) to enable diagnosis of situations of music endangerment, and to determine the urgency to implement initiatives towards sustainability; 2) to ensure the right remedial action is taken, since assessing the factors causing endangerment will help establish focus and priorities for action; and 3) so that the
efficacy of any efforts to maintain or revitalise the music genre may be subsequently evaluated in a consistent way. For these reasons, this chapter develops a tool to identify and assess the vitality and endangerment of music cultures.

The decision to adopt the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment framework as foundation has several grounds: its development and endorsement by a group of esteemed experts in the field; its use in national and international spheres; its relative currency; and its association with, and use by, the high-profile international organisation UNESCO. This includes the consideration that a model for music vitality closely aligning with UNESCO’s ideology may find easier movement in the international arena than one based on a less profiled model, or one developed altogether independently.

5.1 Modifying the language framework

Before constructing a framework to assess music vitality and endangerment based on UNESCO’s model, several general points need to be made about necessary modifications to the language framework. The need for these modifications arises in part from the differences between language and music in relation to their vitality as identified in the Comparative Framework, and in part from certain inadequacies of the language framework. The modifications themselves include changes in terminology, an increased weight placed on assessing change, the introduction of a way to assess so-called emergent music genres, and some other minor adaptations.

a) Terminology

The process of adapting the Language Vitality and Endangerment framework for music obviously means changing some terminology entirely and redefining other terms. Most fundamentally, the term music genre needs defining (the Language Vitality and Endangerment framework does not offer a definition of language at all). Consistent with the rest of this dissertation, in the MVEF I use the term music genre to describe a discrete musical tradition or form, while music culture refers to a society’s total involvement with music, including sounds, concepts and social interactions (after Slobin & Titon, 1996).

To describe groups of people who share a language and sociolinguistic practices, the language vitality framework refers to speech communities. Music communities, though, is both a more oblique and problematic term: is such a community comprised only of musicians? Of audiences too? How does it relate to the idea of musicking
(Small, 1998) – of music as a social experience? How does it position cultures or groups of people that engage with several music genres (which is in fact the norm)? In developing the MVEF, I use the term *community*, which has the advantage of imprecision: as defined in Chapter 1.4, it may refer to a group of people who share their musical heritage by virtue of their common geographical, cultural or ethnic background, but it may also denote a “community of practice” (Wood & Judikis, 2002, p. 12): that is, in this case, a group of people bound together first and foremost by their musical practice and interests. This wider definition is necessary to encompass the range of groups who are the primary custodians or carriers of endangered music genres.

Upon the launch of the most recent edition of UNESCO’s *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger* (Moseley, 2009), its editor-in-chief received vitriolic correspondence from individuals who took offense at their heritage language being referred to as *extinct* (M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010). In addition to being potentially affronting to those individuals and communities who still identify with their heritage language, the term *extinct* arguably disallows the possibility of reclamation, reconstruction, or revival, which can be achieved – with sufficient documentation and community motivation – even in the case of a language with no remaining speakers. For these reasons, some linguists argue that *dormant* or *sleeping* may more appropriately describe languages whose last speaker has died. *Dormant* was adopted in the most recent edition of *Ethnologue* (Lewis, 2009), and the editors of a recent volume on Australia’s Indigenous languages were “rather insistent” that their contributing authors avoided terms like *moribund*, *dead*, and *extinct* (Hobson, Lowe, Poetsch, & Walsh, 2010, p. xxvii). Taking into account these reasonable arguments against these terms, but believing that *dormant* and *sleeping* may be too euphemistic terms to describe some non-vital, non-documented music genres (or for that matter, languages) without an identifying community, I have chosen to adopt the more neutral term *inactive* to refer to non-vital music genres.

**b) Assessing change**

If a language scores highly or relatively highly on many of the nine factors of the *Language Vitality and Endangerment* framework, but most factors show a downward trend in recent years, this in itself can be an important gauge of endangerment. Some linguists have expressed concerns about the tension between the dynamism of language use and the static nature of the framework (e.g. P. Austin, personal interview, 16 June 2010). For some factors of UNESCO’s framework (like “number of speakers”), a
measure that places primary importance on rate and direction of change would arguably better indicate vitality or endangerment. Considerations about the importance of change in assessing the vitality of music have led to my significantly modifying certain factors of the original language framework.

Four factors of the MVEF, then, place primary emphasis on diachronic assessment: the change in the number of proficient musicians (Factor 2); the change in number of people engaged with the genre (Factor 3); change in the genre itself and associated music practices (Factor 4); and change in its functions and performance contexts (Factor 5). Evaluated synchronically (that is, by the number of proficient musicians, the number of people engaged in the genre, the genre itself, and its performance functions and contexts), none of these factors represents a wholly legitimate gauge of vitality, and they all become particularly problematic when comparing two or more genres. A better indicator of vitality is the way they change over time.

By contrast, the other eight factors of the MVEF adopt a synchronic approach, although the change over time in these factors may also be relevant to vitality. A shift in community attitudes, for example, may reflect something about the vitality of a genre, as may any change in infrastructure or resources required for musical practices. But for each of these factors, it is the current situation which is even more crucial. The extent and quality of the existing documentation is more relevant to vitality and endangerment than a comparison of past documentation with present; current community attitudes and government policies even hold more sway than their shift; availability of performance resources now impacts more on vitality than how this has changed over time; and so on.

c) Assessing emergent genres

The majority of frameworks developed to assess language vitality, including GIDS and UNESCO’s Language Vitality and Endangerment, were developed to help assess the language situation of a community before any maintenance efforts began to take effect. Now that situations are more common where a language has already undergone some degree of revitalisation, a new set of circumstances are manifesting that are not adequately catered for by these schemata. Children who have learnt a revived language in school, for example, may begin to teach it to their parents, a situation which invalidates the premise that older generations teach younger ones (M. Walsh, personal interview, 8 April 2010). These so-called emergent languages therefore challenge the assumption that situations of endangerment must deteriorate inexorably; empirical
evidence now indicates that “the process of language loss does not inevitably have to progress unidirectionally toward extinction” (Krauss, 2007, p. 9). Krauss revises his earlier estimates of language moribundity and extinction to account for this fact, and Lewis and Simons’ (2010) modification and augmentation of Fishman’s GIDS is also partly in order to cater for emergent situations.

Although efforts to revitalise endangered music genres have not yet gained the same degree of momentum as efforts relating to endangered languages, there nevertheless also exist emergent music genres: genres that have undergone some degree of revitalisation, whether due to “spontaneous” revivals (as described in Chapter 2.1c) or engineered sustainability initiatives. Any of the music genres that have been inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (UNESCO, 2010, ‘Urgent Safeguarding List’ section), for example, may be classified as an emergent genre: not by virtue of the recognition in this way of their precarious viability, but for the international prominence and recognition gained by inscription, the resulting funding and resources, and the positive community attitudes towards the genre demonstrated by its (required) support of the nomination. As efforts to support endangered music genres build momentum, more emergent situations will arise.

For these reasons, a framework to assess music vitality should also be developed from the perspective of revitalisation as well as endangerment, to ensure it is equipped to deal with the sometimes atypical circumstances presented by emergent genres. Given the emphasis in the MVEF on change over time, which can thereby signal the increasing vitality of emergent genres, the only other significant modification needed to make the MVEF appropriate for emergent situations is to Factor 1: Intergenerational transmission (see below).

d) Other modifications

The first six factors of UNESCO language framework are identified as “major evaluative factors of vitality”; the remaining three deal with community, government, and outsider attitudes, and issues of documentation. Yet as described in Chapter 3.3, attitudes and constructs are often crucial, even determining, in the vitality of music genres. For this reason, the factors relating to attitudes are still grouped together in the MVEF, but are not relegated to a secondary role in vitality: the division between “major evaluative factors” and other factors is removed in the MVEF.

One drawback of the UNESCO language framework is that some of the scales fuse more than one assessment criterion within a single grade description, thereby
increasing the possibility that any particular description will only partly “fit” with a
given circumstance (see Lewis, 2006). In developing an equivalent framework for
music I have attempted to tease out any disparate components of the scales, in most
cases by simplifying the grade descriptions. The fact remains that for certain music
genres, the graded descriptions may remain incongruous. If none of the descriptions for
a particular factor adequately describe a genre, those descriptions should be adapted as
necessary to fit the particular situation at hand, and the specific purpose of the
assessment itself. The grade descriptions provided in this chapter may therefore be
viewed as examples only; approaching them in this way will help avoid strained or
artificial classification, though may limit comparability. In certain cases, the grade
descriptions might be better dispensed with altogether, and only a numerical grade
selected as an indicator of vitality (0 [non-vital] to 5 [vital]). In the rare case that a
factor itself is inapplicable to the music genre in question, or is not a valid indicator of
its vitality, it may be omitted altogether. In short, the MVEF should not be adhered to
dogmatically, but rather remain subservient to human judgement and discernment.

Neither should the MVEF be regarded as a closed framework. With ongoing
developments and shifts in the nexus between music genres and societies, it is possible –
probable, even – that the key factors in vitality and viability will change too. A
retrospective stance illustrates the point: if a music vitality framework like the MVEF
had been developed a hundred years ago, mass media and industry may not have
featured at all. In a useful analogy, Walsh described how 19th-century natural scientists,
recognising that platypuses and echidnas fitted no existing classification of animal,
created the category monotremes . . . . they recognised that they had an animal
that didn’t fit the existing classification. And I’m saying there are languages that
don’t fit the existing GIDS or UNESCO classifications. So don’t think of that as
a problem for the language, any more than: well, we’d better blame the echidnas
because they’re just a bloody nuisance to the theory. You have to absorb these
language situations into an enriched theory which actually describes the
situation [at hand]. (personal interview, 8 April 2010)

Thus, although the twelve MVEF factors may represent a useful system for thinking
about the viability of music genres in the current milieu, the framework should be
revisited on an ongoing basis and revised as necessary.
5.2 Building a new framework for music

Drawing on the synergies and disconnects between language and music in relation to their sustainability as identified in the *Comparative Framework*, the rest of this chapter uses UNESCO’s structure as a foundation on which to build a tool to assess musical vitality and endangerment, the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework*. As in the language framework, intergenerational transmission is Factor 1, since it can be used in isolation as an indicative measure of musical vitality or endangerment. All diachronic factors come next (Factors 2-5), followed by one factor assessing response to media and industry (Factor 6) and two assessing resources for music practices (Factors 7-8). The next three factors relate to attitudes (Factors 9-11) and the final factor assesses documentation (Factor 12).

**Factor 1: Intergenerational transmission**

The *Comparative Framework* (3.1) identified intergenerational transmission as a key indicator of both musical and linguistic vitality. Yet not all music genres are typically learnt by children, or even by all members of a community, and music is not typically present in the variety of domains in which languages are found within a community (such as in the workplace or in commerce). The scale for this factor of UNESCO’s framework therefore requires considerable adaptation in order to make it applicable to music. Given that for some music genres it might be atypical or even taboo for children to learn the genre, for example, I have changed the language framework’s references to children, parent generation, and grandparent generation to youngest appropriate generation, middle generations, and older generations respectively. Also, the notion of “use” in the language vitality framework (as in “the language is used by all ages”) has been supplanted with that of “performance,” in the broadest sense of music-making of the genre in question, without necessarily implying something formal or public.

In most situations, the youngest generation (in an unbroken chain of intergenerational transmission) that retains proficiency can be taken to indicate strength of intergenerational transmission, as in Table 5.1a. However, in emergent situations where a music genre is undergoing revitalisation, intergenerational transmission may have been broken, perhaps resulting in circumstances where the oldest generation teaches the youngest, skipping the middle generation altogether; the youngest generation may even begin to teach middle and older generations. Lewis and Simons (2010) suggest that for these emergent situations the measurement of vitality should be the oldest generation, in an unbroken intergenerational chain, that is once again
proficient. Vitality is not achieved until all generations are again performing the genre and transmitting it from older to younger generations. Adopting this notion, Table 5.1b offers an alternative grade assessment for this factor that should be used in emergent situations. (Note that a “Grade 0 – inactive” would be meaningless here, since by definition this assessment is to be applied to genres that are being revitalised.)

Table 5.1a Grade descriptions to assess Factor 1: Intergenerational transmission for non-emergent music genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Intergenerational transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre is performed by all appropriate ages and is transmitted intergenerationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The music genre is performed by all appropriate ages, but transmission to the youngest appropriate generation is weakening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The music genre is performed mostly by the middle generations and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The music genre is performed mostly by the older generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The music genre is performed only by the very elderly, and then only partially and infrequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There exists no performer of the music genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safe (5):** The music genre is performed by *all generations* appropriate to that genre. The intergenerational transmission of the music genre seems uninterrupted.

**Unsafe (4):** All appropriate generations perform the music genre, but transmission to the youngest appropriate generation is weakening.

**Definitively endangered (3):** The music genre is no longer being learned by the youngest appropriate generation. The youngest performers are thus typically of the *middle generations*. At this stage, performers may still transmit the music genre to the younger generation, but that younger generation does not typically engage with the genre.

**Severely endangered (2):** The music genre is performed mostly by *older generations*; while the middle generations may still remember the music, they typically do not perform it or transmit it to the younger generation.

**Critically endangered (1):** The youngest musicians are *very elderly*. These elderly people often remember only part of the repertoire and perform it only infrequently, if at all (since there may not be any remaining performance context for the genre).

**Inactive (0):** There is no one who can perform or remember the music genre.
Table 5.1b Grade descriptions to assess Factor 1: Intergenerational transmission for emergent music genres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Intergenerational transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre is performed by all appropriate ages and is transmitted intergenerationally in an unbroken chain from older to younger generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the oldest generation in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger and middle generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the middle generations in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the younger generations, but not by the middle generations. The older generations may or may not perform the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The music genre is performed mostly by the youngest appropriate generation, and then only partially and infrequently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Change in number of proficient musicians

In addition to the challenges of identifying and interpreting the number of musicians of a genre (outlined in Chapter 4.1), an adaptation for music of the language vitality factor “absolute numbers of speakers” needs to taken into account the very different roles of “musician” and “speaker” in a group (see Comparative Framework, 3.2). For some music genres, it may be typical for there to be only a handful of hereditary master musicians within the community, whereas for other genres (especially song), almost everyone in the community may participate. This means that considerable caution would need to be exercised in using absolute numbers as an indicator of musical vitality, and numbers would be an inappropriate indicator altogether of the comparative vitality of more than one music genre. This is not to say that absolute numbers are entirely discountable; “any community needs a critical mass of participants to maintain itself” (Graves, 2005, p. 34). Just as for speakers of a language, a small number of musicians means a music genre is much more vulnerable to attrition, as when musicians age and pass away.

With regard to the UNESCO framework, Lewis considers the measurement of this factor – a raw number – to be an anomaly, and suggests that the number “needs to be set in some sort of interpretive framework so that its contribution to the overall evaluation becomes more evident” (2006, p. 25). Especially given the added complexities of interpreting numerical indicators of musical vitality, this factor of the MVEF assesses the change in numbers of musicians over time. Such a diachronic assessment is arguably more accurately indicative of the vitality or endangerment status of a genre, and also enables meaningful comparison between genres. The period of five
to ten years has been chosen as the time frame to assess trends, although a series of assessments for longer (or shorter) periods of time will yield even more accurate data on trends in musical vitality. For some genres, a different timeframe may be chosen, according to the situation at hand and the purpose of the assessment.

In offering no definition of speaker, the Language Vitality and Endangerment leaves open the distinction between proficient, semi-proficient, and basic language skills, and between native and non-native speakers, potentially leading to substantial discrepancies in data. This factor of the MVEF suggests that only proficient musicians be taken into account; other musicians are accounted for in the next factor, which deals with the number of people engaged with the genre altogether. This raises the issue of the widely divergent notions of “proficiency” across genres and cultures. A folk-singer (for example) with low technical ability may be considered proficient on the basis of a thorough knowledge of repertoire, while for other (especially “classical”) genres, high technical skill may be the precondition for being considered accomplished. The meaning of “proficiency” should therefore be gauged from the perspective of the genre and of the community itself.

Table 5.2 suggests grade descriptions for assessing this factor. Those genres with no proficient musicians may be allocated a “Grade 0,” even in cases where this represents little or no change in the number of musicians over the timeframe being assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in number of proficient musicians in the past 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in numbers of proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 2: Change in number of proficient musicians in the past five to ten years

Factor 3: Change in number of people engaged with the genre

One of the factors of the language framework assesses the proportion of speakers within the total population of a group, however defined. Yet just as “absolute number of speakers” is not an appropriate indicator of the vitality of a music genre, assessing “proportion of musicians in relation to the total population of a group” is also problematic. In the most vital possible language environment, the proportion of speakers in relation to the total population will be 100%. For certain vital genres of
music, the proportion of musicians in a community might only be maximally 1 in 50, or even 1 in 500; this reflects the different social roles of the musician and the language-speaker (see Comparative Framework, 3.2). For other genres, such as certain song corpuses of indigenous groups that call for full community participation, the figure may be closer to 100%. Even the “proportion of people engaged with a music genre” is not ideal: there exist genres in which very few people within a given population engage, yet are still in a relatively strong position (Western classical opera in Europe being an interesting case in point).

A better indicator is the change in the number of people engaged with a music genre in relation to the total population of a group: that is, the change in number of those who partake in the music genre in any number of ways, whether through community music-making, learning, teaching, listening to recordings, attending performances, or “consuming” the music in other modes appropriate to the community and genre in question. One illustration of this is the recent concern (among some) about a weakening vitality of Western classical music in Europe (in contrast with opera, mentioned above): it is the decrease in the number of people engaged with that tradition (indicated by audience size, for example) – not the small proportion of musicians within the population, nor even a decrease in the number or proportion of its musicians per se – that has fuelled the concern.

Table 5.3 provides grade descriptions for this factor. As in Factor 2, five to ten years has been selected as the timeframe for assessment. Again, those genres with no musicians of any level may be allocated a “Grade 0,” even in cases where this represents little or no change in the number of people engaged with the genre.

**Table 5.3 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 3: Change in number of people engaged with the genre in the past five to ten years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in number of people engaged with the genre in the past 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 4: Change in the music and music practices**

How quickly a music genre changes, and the form that change adopts, can be critical indicators of the vitality of a music genre. The *Language Vitality and Endangerment*
framework does not offer a way to assess the rate and direction of change in a language, although arguably this is an important indicator of language vitality too.

It is not possible to make a blanket statement about whether change is beneficial or detrimental to the vitality of music genres: to say, that is, that fast change means a vital genre whereas slow change indicates lower vitality, or vice versa. This is wholly genre-dependent; rate of change in a music genre must always be considered in relation to the inherent values of the tradition. The musicians of Balinese gamelan kebyar believe that to keep that tradition static amounts to stagnation; old pieces are continually reformed and reconstructed and new ones constantly created. Change represents high vitality. Conversely, the sacred music of Balinese gamelan gong gede is considered best preserved unchanging: high importance is placed on retaining the “purity” of the tradition (Hood, 2010). In genres where this kind of aesthetic obtains, fast change may be representative of low vitality, for example as attempts are made to palliate the genre.

To gauge the degree to which change reflects increasing or decreasing vitality, the rate of change also needs to be positioned against its direction. For genres where “positive” change takes the form of new repertoire (for example), the community may consider other types of change – the introduction of technology or new media in performance, say, or a relaxing of traditional gender roles – to be inherently harmful. Other communities may embrace technological innovations, leading to an invigoration of the genre. In any two situations, then, the change itself may be identical but its implications for vitality may be opposite. Assessment of this factor must therefore be grounded in an understanding of the constructs surrounding the genre being assessed. Table 5.4 suggests grade descriptions for assessing this factor.

**Table 5.4 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 4: Pace and direction of change in the music and music practices in the past five to ten years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pace and direction of change in the music and music practices in the past five to ten years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change in the music and associated music practices reflect significantly increased strength of the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately increased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect little or no change in strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately decreased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect significantly decreased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect no or almost no strength.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 5: Change in performance contexts and functions**

In the language vitality framework, “Factor 5: Response to new domains and media” relates to the capability of a language to expand into new educational (school),
workplace, and community contexts, as well as broadcast media and online environments. For certain music genres, though, expansion into new contexts may be neither a desired nor appropriate shift. Some genres (like ritual music, for example) may be intimately bound with one specific context and function. The grade descriptions for this factor therefore emphasise the nature of change in performance context(s) rather than their quantity, as in the language framework.

For music genres, shifts in context often closely reflect or instigate shifts in social function, and so both are given weight in this factor of MVEF. (The issue of function is nowhere explicitly addressed in the Language Vitality and Endangerment framework, since the primary function of all languages is the same – that is, communicative.) It should be noted that the presence of two or more music cultures in one community is not necessarily a threat to either the context or function of music genres. In fact, a multiplicity of music cultures (as well as genres) within a community might nowadays be considered the norm, just as many languages may co-reside within a single community. A music genre need not be the main genre within a community for it to be vital, and musicians and other community members do not have to be “monomusical” (see Comparative Framework, 3.2).

Although the period of five to ten years may again prove a useful guide for assessing this factor, a diachronic assessment of performance contexts and functions is most important for the intermediate stages of change or stasis (Grades 3 and 4 of the scale below). When a music genre enters the critical state of being performed only in formulaic, non-typical contexts and functions (Grades 1 and 2), synchronic assessment begins to be of more relevance to evaluating vitality. These considerations are built into the grade descriptions for this scale (see Table 5.5).

**Integral contexts and functions (5):** The music genre is integral to the community (whether for entertainment, ritual, social, aesthetic, or other reasons), and is actively performed in all its typical contexts for all typical functions. There is no sign of displacement by any other music genre or music culture, or of displacement by any other form of media, entertainment, or pastime.

**Expanding contexts or functions (4):** Perhaps in response to changes in the environment, the music genre has expanded to new context(s) and function(s), and is performed regularly or semi-regularly.

**Static contexts and functions (3):** Although the music genre is performed regularly or semi-regularly (as per Grade 4), its context(s) and function(s) have
Table 5.5 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 5: Change in performance context(s) and function(s) in the past five to ten years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in performance context(s) and function(s) in the last 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>integral contexts and functions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre continues to be performed in one or more regular, well-established contexts and holds integral function(s) within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expanding contexts or functions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The music genre has expanded to new context(s) and function(s), and is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static contexts or functions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Context(s) and function(s) for the music genre have remained largely static, even in relation to changing environments. The genre is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulaic contexts and functions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The music genre is performed only in irregular formulaic contexts and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly limited formulaic contexts and functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The music genre is performed only on exceptional occasions in formulaic contexts and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The music genre is not performed in any context for any function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

remained largely static despite possible social, cultural, economic, or other changes to the environment that may affect the genre.

**Formulaic contexts and functions (2):** The music genre is performed only in irregular formulaic (atypical) contexts, such as at festivals celebrating or promoting the cultural heritage of the community. The music genre may also still be performed at locations and occasions when older members of the community have a chance to meet. Some or many people can recognise the genre but cannot perform it.

**Highly limited formulaic contexts and functions (1):** The genre is performed only on exceptional formulaic occasions.

**Inactive (0):** The music genre serves no social function, and is not performed at any place at any time.

**Factor 6: Response to mass media and the music industry**

Response to media and industry is a significantly greater indicator of vitality for music genres than for languages (Comparative Framework, 3.5), warranting the greater emphasis placed on it in the MVEF through the inclusion of this factor. In almost all cases, the mass media (including radio, television, and the internet) and the music industry have potential to substantially affect the vitality of a music genre. The way a genre responds to these entities – and vice versa – is a key factor in assessing endangerment.

For those genres where engagement with the media and industry is considered gainful for vitality, *robust* (Grade 5) may mean the music genre is a vibrant part of the
local, national and even international media and music industry (though the internet has eroded clear distinctions between these levels). For other genres, such as certain kinds of ritual music, robust will mean resilience against, or even resistance to, encroachment of mass media and the music industry. At the other end of the scale, an inability to cope (Grade 0) may be represented in some cases by a lack of engagement with the media or the music industry altogether, or by mass media and the music industry heavily encroaching on the genre. As with other factors of the MVEF, then, the grade descriptions for this factor in Table 5.6 need to acknowledge the different values across genres in relation to their response to, and engagement with, mass media and the music industry.

**Table 5.6 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 6: Response to mass media and the music industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Response to mass media and the music industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>robust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The genre displays significant strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The genre displays strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The genre displays an ability to cope in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The genre displays weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The genre displays significant weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to cope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The genre displays an inability to cope in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 7: Infrastructure and resources for music practices**

More than languages, music genres often demand infrastructure and resources for their creation, transmission, rehearsal, and performance, such as musical instruments, musical paraphernalia, technological equipment, and dedicated spaces for creating or performing (*Comparative Framework*, 3.4). In many cases, the unavailability or inaccessibility of these resources will jeopardise the vitality of the genre in question. This factor of the MVEF addresses this consideration, and also responds to one of the key differences between languages and music in relation to vitality: the concept of “creating” or “composing” music (*Comparative Framework*, 3.1).

This factor of the MVEF encompasses the impact on vitality of the quality and availability of learning and teaching resources for various ages and musical abilities, including song books, scores, pedagogical games, recordings, audio/video or minidisk recorders, online learning technologies, and multimedia resources. The existence, type,
extent, quality, and accessibility of these resources will all affect transmission processes, and therefore the vitality of the genre. Table 5.7 provides grade descriptions for assessing this factor.

**Table 5.7 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 7: Accessibility of infrastructure and resources for music practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of infrastructure and resources for music practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All infrastructure and resources required for creating, performing, rehearsing, and transmitting the music genre are easily available and accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All infrastructure and resources required for creating, performing, rehearsing, and transmitting the music genre are accessible, but not necessarily easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most but not all required infrastructure / resources are accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some but not all required infrastructure / resources are accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure / resources are only accessed with great difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure / resources are completely inaccessible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 8: Knowledge and skills for music practices**

Just as tangible resources and infrastructure are necessary for the vitality of many music genres, intangible resources are also often needed for creation, transmission, and performance. Examples include the sociocultural and musical knowledge and skill needed for the creation of new repertoire, the linguistic knowledge and ability needed for the creation of new song texts, and knowledge of systems and methods of transmission and pedagogy (as opposed to transmission itself, which is addressed under Factor 1). Where community members lack easy access to these intangible resources, the vitality of the genre may be threatened (see Comparative Framework, 3.4).

One clear example of the way systems of knowledge can affect the vitality of a genre comes from Bali, where at the beginning of the twentieth century, *gamelan gong gede* were eclipsed by the increasingly popular *gamelan kebyar* – except in the highlands, where a deeply ingrained social system of ritual domains called *banua* govern the musical associations who own and maintain these antique orchestras. Here orchestras are preserved largely because membership into these *banua* ritual domains is contingent upon reciprocal services between its members. Unlike lowland gamelan groups who own and operate their gamelan independently, highland groups stay loyal to their *banua* ritual networks. As a result few groups have abandoned their *gong gede*, resulting in the survival of this unique orchestra type. (Hood, 2010, p. 92)

Table 5.8 suggests grade descriptions for assessing this Factor 8.
Table 5.8 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 8: Accessibility of knowledge and skills for music practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of knowledge and skills for music practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The community holds all knowledge and skills required for creating, performing, and transmitting the music genre, and these are easily available and accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The community holds all required knowledge and skills, but these may not be easily available or accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The community holds most but not all required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The community holds only some of the required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The community holds only a little of the required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Required knowledge and skills are almost or completely absent in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 9: Governmental and institutional policies affecting music practices

Although – unlike languages – most music genres do not usually have an official status within a nation-state, governments and government bodies generally have explicit policies and/or implicit attitudes toward cultural heritage and the arts. Even if these do not refer directly to music and musical practices, they often deeply affect them (Comparative Framework, 3.4).

Because a government often has no specific music policy, in the grade descriptions for this factor (Table 5.9), I refer to “cultural expressions” rather than specifically to music. The terms on the left to describe each grade have been retained from the language framework, but adopt slightly different meanings with their new definitions (e.g. “differentiated support” refers here to attitudes and policies that distinguish between the unique needs of cultures or genres, and is therefore more favourable than “blanket support”).

Table 5.9 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 9: Official attitudes toward the music genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of support</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Official attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>differentiated support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre is supported through specific cultural policies developed and implemented in consultation with culture-bearers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blanket support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The genre is supported through overarching policies supporting cultural expressions, without differentiation and without consultation with culture-bearers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive assimilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No explicit policy exists for supporting (or hindering) diverse cultural expressions, such as the music genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active assimilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implicitly or explicitly, the government encourages the abandonment of ‘small’ or non-mainstream cultural expressions, for example by providing education only in the language and culture of the majority group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced assimilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government policy explicitly declares the majority group to represent the only recognised culture. ‘Small’ or non-mainstream cultural expressions are neither recognised nor supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Performance of the music genre is prohibited. It may be tolerated in private social contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor 10: Community members’ attitudes toward the genre**

Much of the literature about endangered languages emphasises that community members’ attitudes towards their language, including their commitment to revitalisation efforts, is a key factor in vitality (e.g. Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Grenoble & Whaley, 2006). A number of variables interact to form community attitudes towards language, including economic factors, the perceived prestige of the language, and literacy levels within the community (Grenoble & Whaley, 1998).

The strong parallels between constructs and attitudes towards languages and those towards music genres, and the effect of both on the vitality of the heritage in question, was established through the Comparative Framework (3.3) Just as with languages, members of a community are not usually neutral towards their musical expressions. They may take pride in a particular music genre, or they might be ashamed of it or view it as old-fashioned, with repercussions for its vitality. If community members view the music genre as representative of their cultural identity, but that identity is seen as a hindrance to economic mobility and integration into the majority society, they may harbour negative attitudes toward the genre. In some communities, there may be individuals or sub-groups whose attitudes and opinions about the music genre are more highly esteemed or influential, such as elders within indigenous communities. In assessing this factor (using the grade descriptions in Table 5.10), it is the balance of community support that needs to be gauged.

**Table 5.10 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 10: Community members’ attitudes toward the music genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Community members’ attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is very strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is moderate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No community members support the maintenance of the genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 11: Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the genre**

In addition to governmental and community attitudes, the attitudes of other relevant outsiders can also have a substantial impact on the vitality of a genre. Researchers, academics, fieldworkers, activists, commercial enterprises, funding bodies, and non-governmental organisations like UNESCO can all directly affect the vitality of a music genre, for example through their research, projects, lobbying and activism, and
revitalisation efforts. The impact may also be indirect, such as when the very interest of an esteemed outsider shifts the attitudes of the community itself (e.g. Norton, 2005, p. 49 for *ca trù*). A lack of interest in a music genre from those outsiders deemed “relevant” (e.g. commercial enterprises) may be detrimental to the vitality of the genre.

It cannot be assumed that outsider interest is always represents support of a genre. This is especially true of interest from profitable enterprises that place financial gain over and above the wishes of the community, but even academic interest may be insidious. In the early 1990s, for example, one veteran Chinese folk performance scholar claimed, “My basic aim in investigating folk beliefs is to eliminate their influence” (Jiang Bin, cited in McLaren, 2010, p. 32).

Table 5.11 provides grade descriptions for assessing this factor.

**Table 5.11 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 11: Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the music genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is very strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is moderate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is absent altogether, or attitudes to the genre are adverse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 12: Amount and quality of documentation**

UNESCO’s language vitality framework argues that in order to assess the urgency for documenting a language, the extent and quality of existing documentation needs to be known. Information about existing documentation, it suggests, helps speakers design efforts towards documentation and maintenance, as well as enabling linguists to formulate suitable projects on the language in collaboration with the community. The language framework combines several components within each grade description for this factor, assessing within a single grade the existence (and quality) of grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, everyday media as well as audio and video recordings.

Following Lewis’ recommendation to simplify and “unpack” these descriptions (2006, p. 27), for the MVEF I keep the grade descriptions for this factor general (see Table 5.12). For most music genres, extensive well-annotated high-quality audio and video recordings will represent the most important type of documentation. The amount and quality of recordings will often (but not always) be indicative of the amount and quality of other types of documentation, such as transcriptions / scores, books, and other written materials. In addition to comprehensiveness, accessibility, and availability of
metadata, appropriate archiving of documentation may also be considered an aspect of its quality.

The *Language Vitality and Endangerment* framework emphasises the importance of an orthography for the vitality of a language (see Factor 6: Materials for language education and literacy). The lack of an orthography inhibits the range of domains in which a language can be employed, therefore limiting its vitality with possible repercussions for viability, but the lack of a way to write down a music genre does not necessarily limit its vitality in the same way. A notation system for a music genre is therefore not as significant a factor in vitality as an orthography is for a language, and the MVEF places no special emphasis on it. Nevertheless, a notation system does represent an additional and sometimes more durable form of documentation than recordings, and may therefore be taken into account in assessing matters of documentation.

**Table 5.12 Grade descriptions to assess Factor 12: Documentation of the music genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of documentation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Documentation of the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superlative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abundant high-quality documentation exists in a range of formats, including audiovisual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate high-quality documentation exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate documentation exists in varying quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited documentation exists in varying quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Documentation is very limited or is of unusable quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Documentation is non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.3 Conclusions**

In sum, the following twelve factors affect the vitality of a music genre:

Factor 1. Intergenerational transmission
Factor 2. Change in number of proficient musicians
Factor 3. Change in number of people engaged with the genre
Factor 4. Change in the music and music practices
Factor 5. Change in performance contexts and functions
Factor 6. Response to mass media and the music industry
Factor 7. Infrastructure and resources for music practices
Factor 8. Knowledge and skills for music practices
Factor 9. Governmental policies affecting music practices
Factor 10. Community members’ attitudes toward the genre
Factor 11. Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the genre
Factor 12. Amount and quality of documentation

Just as with the language framework, the vitality of music genres cannot be gauged simply by adding the numbers from the scales, and it is recommended that such addition not be done. Also, it should be reiterated that these twelve factors, and the descriptions and scales for each, are only offered as guidelines, and should be adapted as befits the situation and purpose of the assessment. Under no circumstances should the framework be uncritically applied, as Walsh believes has sometimes regretfully been the case with UNESCO’s language framework (personal interview, 8 April 2010).

In addition to helping gauge not the vitality of a music genre, the MVEF can also indicate the areas where a genre is most in need of support. An MVEF evaluation may be carried out by a community to gauge its own musical vitality and determine an appropriate course of action if required, or it may be used by external bodies such as governments, non-government organisation, research institutions, cultural advocacy bodies, and funding agencies as a means to help inform policy decisions, to make sure resources and funds are directed where they are most viable, and to steer research and documentation efforts in collaboration with the community. These possibilities (and some of the challenges inherent in them) are discussed further in Chapter 7.2.

In addition to these uses of the framework, each of its twelve factors also may serve as an important tool for comparison between music genres. Comparing the vitality of genres (either within or across communities) has several functions, perhaps the most important being to help ascertain the relative severity of their endangerment. In conjunction with a careful consideration of community attitudes, as well as any other factors critical to revitalisation prospects of music genres, a comparative tool may help ensure that sustainability projects are implemented where they are most viable, and also that funding is appropriately channelled. Comparison of musical vitality could also serve to alert agencies to the situation of musical diversity at the regional, transregional and global levels, which in turn may inform development of national and international policy promoting that diversity.

In his assessment of 100 languages of the world according to UNESCO’s language vitality framework, Lewis found that to some extent, that framework “ask[s] some new questions and the existing data repositories don’t have the data, or have not organized their data in such a way that they can readily answer those questions” (2006, p. 23). With current knowledge, such a survey for music would probably be altogether unfeasible, since comprehensive data on the world’s music genres relating specifically to the factors of the MVEF is even less readily available. In some ways, this is not a bad
situation. If a tool such as the MVEF can be used from the current incipient stages of international research into music endangerment, complete and consistent data may be gathered from the start, facilitating the coordination, reporting, collation, and tracking of information on world-wide music endangerment.

In the next chapter I turn to a specific music genre, the emergent north-Vietnamese tradition of *ca trù*, in order to demonstrate how the MVEF might work in practice.
CHAPTER SIX

THE CASE OF CA TRÙ:
APPLYING THE MUSIC VITALITY AND ENDANGERMENT FRAMEWORK

This chapter demonstrates how the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework* (MVEF), developed in Chapter 5, works in practice: how it may be applied to assess musical vitality and viability. I first provide a short historical background to *ca trù*, followed by an outline of my methodology for the case study. The core of the chapter comprises an assessment of the vitality of *ca trù* according to the twelve factors of the MVEF, and the final section synthesises the findings.

6.1 Background to the genre

*Ca trù* is a chamber music genre of the majority Việt (Kinh) people in northern Vietnam. Nowadays, *ca trù* typically involves three musicians – a female singer, who also players a small bamboo slab (*phách*), a male player of the three-stringed lute (*đàn đáy*), and a beater of the “praise drum” (*trống chầu*; traditionally a knowledgeable member of the audience). Before the 1980s, the most common name for the genre was *hát â đào*; various other names exist, including *hát cô đầu*, *hát nhà tơ*, *hát nhà trò*, and *hát ca công* (Bùi T. H., 2008).

*Ca trù* was an established genre by the 15th century (Nguyễn, X. D., 2008, p. 16). Its performance contexts and functions shifted over time; each had its own repertoire of songs, and sometimes also dances. Historically, specific functions for *ca trù* included *hát thờ*, to worship the village guardian spirit, and to praise *ca trù*’s ancestors; *hát thi*, competitive singing within *ca trù* communities to recognise and honour the skill of their musicians; and *hát chơi*, for the entertainment of upper and middle classes in society including literati, mandarins, and noblemen. By the early 20th century, the three main contexts for *ca trù* were aristocratic homes for ceremonies and celebrations (where the genre was referred to as *hát cửa quyền*), at village communal houses and temples for worship or ceremony (*hát cửa đình*), and in private homes for entertainment (*hát chơi*) (Nguyễn P. T., 1991a, p. 12).

In the early 20th century, French colonisation of Vietnam brought increasing Westernisation, and an urban economy prospered. Many rurally-based *ca trù* singers moved to the cities, especially Hanoi, and here *hát chơi* performance opportunities flourished with the growth in “singing houses” – private homes, most often, made
available in the evening for the purpose. By the 1940s, however, these singing houses had become associated with opium-smoking and prostitution, not of ca trù singers themselves but of young women known as cô-dâu rượu, who served in the establishments. The reputation of ca trù soon shifted from an elite refined art to “an amusement pleasure of vulgar people and boors” (Lê, 2008, p. 282), and the growing moral questionability surrounding the genre was one reason for a government crackdown on its venues, leaving the musicians nowhere to perform. New public opinion of ca trù as a form of debauchery meant that musicians became ashamed to be associated with it (Lê, 2008, pp. 283-284). Decades of war from 1945 meant the destruction or closure of other performance venues for ca trù, especially the communal đình (temple-houses) (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008b, 6:47-7:03).

Social and economic upheaval after the 1945 August Revolution and the communists’ victory in the 1945-1954 Franco-Vietnamese war also played a role in the demise of the genre (Jähnichen, 2008, p. 161). The Cultural and Ideological Revolution (1954-1986, thus encompassing and extending beyond the era of Mao’s Cultural Revolution in China in the 1960s and 1970s) saw the rise of cải biên nhạc tộc dân (“neotraditional” music), which represented a government-approved way of managing Vietnam’s cultural image and giving voice to the revolutionary ideology. Many traditional genres were suppressed or banned during this era, including chầu văn (trance music), nhạc lễ (ritual music) and ca trù, all of which were seen to incorporate superstitious or backward practices (Arana, 1999, p. 120).

For all these reasons, ca trù was rarely performed from the 1950s to the late 1980s, and much musical knowledge was lost during this time (Norton, 2005, pp. 33, 35). The genre essentially had “no prestige, no money, no infrastructure, no training, no audience” (Schippers, 2009, p. 201). Musicians with thorough knowledge of the art no longer practiced it, leading Vietnamese musicologist Phạm Duy to believe by the mid-1970s that ca trù was almost extinct (1975, p. 100). Even though a recording made in 1976 of singer Quách Thị Hồ by expatriate musicologist Trần Văn Khê gained international recognition after Trần introduced the recordings to UNESCO’s International Music Council, Trần himself conceded in 1982 that the genre was one “whose beginnings lay in the 15th century, its golden age in the 19th, at the start of the
20th century took its first backward step, and is presently experiencing its end\(^3\) (cited in Jähnichen, 1997, p. 9).

In 1986, incited by an economic crisis and deteriorating standard of living, the Vietnamese Communist Party launched **đổi mới**, its renovation or reform policy that signalled the shift from a state-subsidised to a free-market economy, and increasing acceptance of international influences and trade (Norton, 2009, p. 5). In 1987, the Political Bureau’s Resolution Number 5 recognised freedom of artistic expression, at least for all artistic works that were “not anti-socialist, anti-Party and anti-government” (Lê, 1998, p. 113). In this way, **đổi mới** and the end of the Cultural and Ideological Revolution opened the way for the reappearance and revival of pre-revolutionary music genres, including **ca trù**. This situation led within a few years to the development of projects like the UNESCO-approved *Vietnamese Court Music Revitalization Plan* funded by Toyota Foundation, which aimed to revive former central-Vietnamese genres through documentation, education programs, and research (Osamu, 2001).

Thus it was that by the early 1990s, **ca trù** musicians who had not practiced their art for decades found themselves in an environment where it was possible to do so. In 1991, the first official state-supported **ca trù** club was established, the Hânội Ca Trù Club, which served for a time as one of the few places where musicians and listeners could meet and enjoy the genre. Several further voluntary, non-profit clubs were established in following years, in both urban and rural areas. Performances and training opportunities for musicians grew. Research interest also developed, and several local conferences on **ca trù** took place. In 2000, the First Open Ca Trù Hânội Festival was held, providing an opportunity for **ca trù** artists from Hânội and further afield to meet for the first time (Lê, 2008, pp. 289-294).

In the 2000s the spate of **ca trù** revitalisation initiatives continued to grow, from clubs, festivals, classes, and promotional activities to conferences, workshops, and research and documentation projects. In Vietnam, tradition is “no longer antithetical to the modern or in need of reform”; instead, it is now “being used to bolster national identity, which many cultural nationalists consider to be threatened by the forces of globalisation” (Norton, 2009, p. 21). Since the 1990s, **ca trù** has also increasingly represented a way of renegotiating Vietnam’s cultural history (Wettermark, 2010a) and remembering its idealised past (Norton, 2005). The government now recognises the value of traditional music genres – economic as well as ideological (see Jähnichen, 2003).

 Testament to this fact is that in 2009, backed by the Vietnamese Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, ca trù was officially inscribed on the list of UNESCO Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Urgent Need of Safeguarding. Nevertheless, opinions remain mixed about the future of ca trù. Some sources suggest hopefully that the genre has merely been “sleeping peacefully” for the last sixty years (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008a, 1:11:55-1:12:03); others deem that ca trù “is now disappearing” (Trần & Nguyen, 2007-2010, ‘Musical genres’ section, para. 1) or is even already “buried in the dust of time” (Nguyễn T. T., 2008, p. 308).

6.2 Undertaking the case study

While any of hundreds of music genres could be used to illustrate the practical applicability of the MVEF, the chequered history of ca trù would indicate that the genre might form an interesting case study in viability. Further to this consideration, ca trù was selected according to three criteria. The first was the availability of sufficient current source material relating to the vitality and viability of the genre; for ca trù, this was helped by the research and documentation that was undertaken to prepare for its recent nomination to UNESCO for recognition as endangered intangible cultural heritage, as well as the genre’s status as a case study for the project Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures.

The second criterion was that the genre be facing challenges in some way to its vitality or viability. Although the MVEF may be used to assess “strong” genres too, applying the framework to a weaker genre better demonstrates its intended purpose of assessing situations of musical endangerment. The third criterion was location in a politically stable environment, in order to facilitate the ethical conduct of the research, uphold the welfare of interviewees and researcher, and increase the possibility of collecting complete and truthful data (see Newman, 1998, pp. 16-17). (That said, I discuss in the body of this chapter the ways in which restricted expression within Vietnam about traditional national culture – especially the government’s role and track record in maintaining and promoting it – impact this case study.)

Data for this case study were gathered from three sources.

(1) Pre-existing published and unpublished written and audio-visual materials. Of these materials, perhaps most directly relevant to this research is the dossier submitted to UNESCO by the Vietnamese Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism in

---
2009, nominating ca trù for inscription onto UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List (hereafter referred to as the “UNESCO nomination file”). It includes an 18-page report on the current state of the genre (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009) and an hour-long video documentary (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008a). Also emanating from preparations for the nomination are two edited volumes on ca trù (Đặng, Phạm, & Hồ, 2008; Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, Vietnam National Academy of Music, & Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008). These sources should be understood in the context of the rise of heritage and identity politics in Vietnam over the past couple of decades (discussed in Factor 9 below), and with the consideration that one of their primary functions was to promote ca trù to local and foreign agents.

Other written sources I have drawn on include journal articles (e.g. Addiss, 1973; Norton, 2005; Schippers, 2009; Wettermark, 2010b, Jähnichen, 2011), academic dissertations (Jähnichen, 1997; Wettermark, 2010a), conference papers (Norton, 2010), and internet sites, though some web-based media articles proved unreliable. Useful contextual information about Vietnamese traditional and neo-traditional music and cultural history was also found in monographs, book chapters, articles, encyclopaedia entries and edited volumes (e.g. Arana, 1999; Nguyễn P. T., 1991a, 1991b; Nguyễn P. T. & Campbell, 1990; Norton, 2009; Phạm, 1975; Trần & Nguyen, 2007-2010).

(2) Semi-structured interviews.

Ten semi-structured interviews also form source material for this research (see Appendix A). Consultants consisted of ca trù musicians and Vietnamese and non-Vietnamese scholars with an expertise in either ca trù or Vietnamese traditional music. Seven of the interviews were conducted in 2007 and 2010 by either a chief investigator (Huib Schippers) or a research assistant (Esbjörn Wettermark) on the Sustainable Futures project. I conducted a further three interviews specifically for this chapter, including with Phạm Thị Huệ, leader of the ca trù group Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, who I had met in Brisbane in 2008 prior to the start of my research; we continued our conversation about ca trù from that time.

(3) Experiences and non-participant observation during a field visit to Hanoi.

While the availability of extensive pre-existing materials on the vitality and viability of ca trù obviated the need for my own extended fieldwork, experiences from my 18-day field visit to Hanoi (19 July – 4 August 2010) supplemented and helped triangulate the
data I gathered from interviews and written sources. I attended a rehearsal and two performances by Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, and met informally with several ca trù performers, students, and researchers. A month of intensive Vietnamese lessons before my trip enabled me to introduce myself and my research in the most basic of terms (conversations proper were either in English or informally translated). My visit also coincided with the Second Symposium of the Applied Ethnomusicology Study Group of the International Council for Traditional Music, during which several papers related to the viability of Vietnamese traditional music genres, or ca trù in particular.

In the last decade or so – the timeframe for assessment in this chapter – much published research on ca trù has either been written in, or translated into, English. All documentation for the 2009 nomination of ca trù to UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List was required to be in English or French (the working languages of the UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee); a considerable amount of recent scholarship on the genre has been associated in one way or other with the initiatives or enterprises of non-Vietnamese agencies, who mostly report on their projects in English (such as the Ford Foundation, Swedish International Development Agency, and Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre); and ca trù seems to have garnered somewhat greater research interest among “outsiders” than among Vietnamese scholars (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 30 July 2010). The bias on English-language published sources in this case study is therefore partly mitigated by these circumstances, as well as by the fact that several interviews drawn on here represent a Vietnamese perspective.

Since Phạm Thị Huệ was my primary direct link with the ca trù community, this chapter places some emphasis on her and her group Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long. Acknowledging that my assessment does not represent equally perspectives from all parts of the community, I suggest that this is not necessary a deficiency: Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long displays striking leadership in the ca trù revival, and in many ways illustrates important features of the current and shifting vitality of the genre. Nevertheless, further research on other parts of the ca trù community, particularly those in non-urban areas of northern Vietnam and in Hồ Chí Minh City, where some ca trù activity is also found, could bring more depth to a vitality and viability assessment. In-depth assessment of ca trù in these areas is, however, beyond the scope of this case study.
My role as researcher

Researchers are not detached from the processes they study. As ethnomusicologists engage with living music genres and the people who bear them, they become “unwittingly caught up in the processes and politics of transmission of tradition” (Shelemay, 1997, p. 197). Wettermark observes in his own postgraduate research on ca trù how he became implicated in the divisiveness of the ca trù community: by focusing on the Thăng Long group, he was viewed by some local scholars, community members, and media as taking sides in his research, espousing that club as representing the “right” ca trù (2010a, p. 3). Arana too describes how a frank conference presentation of her postgraduate research provoked fierce debate and discussion among local musicians and researchers about the place of neo-traditional music in contemporary Vietnam (1999).

The medium-term effect of my own research on the ca trù community is not easy to gauge. Through my interest in the genre, my (albeit brief) presence in the community, my talking and writing about ca trù in journal articles and conference presentations (Grant, 2011a, in press), and assisting members of the ca trù community in small ways (like contributing text in December 2010 – January 2011 to the English-language version of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long’s website), it is likely I am in some ways already “unwittingly caught up” in the “processes and politics of transmission of tradition.”

But I am also intentionally so. Embracing the spirit and principles of applied ethnomusicology, I hope this vitality assessment may stimulate further community- and national-level discourse on the sustainability of ca trù, and ultimately support the development of approaches towards a vital and viable genre. One step to this end was to make available my research findings to the Sustainable Futures project team, in March 2011, in the form of a case study report. In this way, my research may inform larger-scale considerations about how best to assist the ca trù community in making decisions about the future of the genre. It also fed into my preparation in June 2011 of an ultimately unsuccessful grant application to National Geographic’s Genographic Legacy Fund in collaboration with Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, in support of the project Ca Trù Vietnam described in Section 6.5 and 6.11.

In an essay on “insiders and outsiders” in ethnomusicological research, Nettl raises the concern of ethnocentrism, citing in particular the perception of certain Asian scholars and musicians that much research by Europeans and Americans is “thus flawed” (2005, p. 158). If this is a charge to which one must plead guilty or not, I plead guilty. The strictures of my MVEF framework, the parameters it measures, and the way
it measures them are no doubt markedly Western, markedly different from the way the local Vietnamese community might approach or perceive its own tradition. But I would also argue that the perspective I present in this chapter, while not “insider,” is nevertheless valid, even putting to one side any philosophical arguments to that end. My reasoning is pragmatic: as long as major international cultural organisations operate their support schemes principally on Western paradigms (and after all, it is the Western organisations with the most money), Eurocentric perspectives on endangered cultures will be important for those communities wishing to access the funding and support these organisations provide. By dint of their engagement with organisations like these (including UNESCO, Ford Foundation, and others), the ca trù community, or at least parts of it, has indicated that it is one such group. I am guilty of some ethnocentrism in fact, then, but considerably less so in feeling.

Throughout this chapter I include diacritics (where they are known) on Vietnamese names, places, and terms. All Vietnamese names are presented in the Vietnamese customary way, with the surname first. Translations of interviews from Vietnamese are acknowledged in-text and in Appendix A; translations from sources in German are my own.

6.3 MVEF assessment

This section addresses each of the twelve vitality factors of the Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework in turn, evaluating how ca trù is positioned against each. For factors that relate to change over time, the five to ten years to 2010 serves as the period for assessment. The suitability of this timeframe is confirmed by the shifts in the vitality of the genre over that decade, as well as the availability of data relating to the vitality and viability of ca trù during that time. Where possible, for each factor I also indicate the likely short-term (five- to ten-year) outlook for ca trù in relation to that factor.

**Factor 1: Intergenerational transmission**

This factor relates to the current strength of the transmission of ca trù from generation to generation. Before the decline of ca trù in the mid-twentieth century, learning ca trù had typically involved an apprenticeship of some years with a master-musician, often a relative (a common practice in many genres from Asia and elsewhere; cf., for example, Neuman, 1980; Schippers, 2007). This method of transmission was broken during the decades of suppression of ca trù from the mid-twentieth century. The current middle generation (aged c.30-60) therefore grew up by and large without the opportunity to
learn the genre in this way (though exceptions include instrumentalist Nguyễn Phan Khuê, b. 1962, and singer Nguyễn Thị Thúy Hồ, b. 1973, who both belong to a family with ca trù lineage; Đặng, 2008, pp. 489, 499).

Thus, from the time the ca trù revival began in the early 1990s, some elderly ca trù masters have transmitted the genre directly to their grandchildren (or, at least, young people of that generation), skipping the middle generation altogether. Master singers Quách Thị Hồ and Phó Thị Kim Đức both passed on the art directly to their grandchildren (Lê, 2008, pp. 293, 296), and in 2008 Nguyễn Thị Chúc described her four ca trù students as “including a paternal grandchild, a maternal grandchild, and a great grandchild” (in Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008b, 7:32-7:51). While the processes of transmission according to the old models of family lineage still exist, in the last two decades they have increasingly embraced anyone wishing to learn ca trù. Neither of two prominent middle-generation members of the ca trù community in Hanoi, for example, belongs to a family with ca trù lineage: both Lê Thị Bạch Vân (b. 1958) and Phạm Thị Huệ (b. 1973) learnt the genre in their adulthood.

Ca trù clubs currently represent the primary means for the intergenerational transmission of ca trù outside the traditional model of family apprenticeship. In 2002, a Ford Foundation grant enabled interested participants from several provinces to take intensive ca trù classes from members of the Thái Hà Ca Trù Club and singer Nguyễn Thị Chúc, over a 2-month period. Returning to their localities, many participants began teaching the genre and establishing their own ca trù clubs. By 2004, over twenty clubs had sprung up across the cities and provinces of northern Vietnam, adding to several already in existence (see Đặng, 2008, pp. 535-536) – a striking success for Ford Foundation’s limited investment. The clubs continue to act as infrastructure for workshops, performances, and training, particularly for young people from the ages of around 10 to 25. Since the establishment in 2006 of the Thăng Long Ca Trù Club (which later changed its name to “Giáo Phường” for reasons described under Factor 7), for example, Nguyễn Phú Đệ (b. 1923) claims to have taught 30 singers and instrumentalists (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008b, 7:19-7:29) – a feat that would have been arguably impossible without the infrastructure of the club. As of mid-2010, the group had around 15 students (both singers and instrumentalists) aged between 9 and 32 (Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, 2010).

According to the UNESCO nomination file, by early 2009 around 180 young people were engaged in learning ca trù from elderly musicians at these and similar clubs across northern Vietnam (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p.
In Hanoi, the most prominent clubs are currently the Thai Ha Ca Trù Club (formerly the Thai Ha Ca Trù Ensemble) established by Nguyen Van Mui, which engages with training initiatives but remains a family-based group; Giao Phuong Ca Trù Thang Long run by Pham Thi Huệ, which holds weekly activities and frequent performances; and the Hanoi Ca Trù Club led by Le Thi Bach Van, which gives monthly performances and youth classes. The latter was the first of its kind, established in 1991 explicitly to promote viability of the genre: “All was aimed at restoring this art” (Le, 2008, p. 288).

Emanating from the 2009 inscription of ca trù onto UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List are extensive plans to consolidate its intergenerational transmission processes, including through further intensive classes. The UNESCO nomination file expresses the expectation that “after three years folk artists will hand down their whole art resources to the youth” (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 2). Despite these high ambitions, there remain several challenges to re-establishing intergenerational transmission of the genre. Foremost, perhaps, is the fact that the ill health of master-musicians, many in their 80s and 90s, disallows many of them to teach or perform. Another challenge to transmission is the preservation of pre-revolutionary conventions relating to it, which are now less viable due to the lack of proficient master-musicians. For traditional musician and teacher at the National Academy of Music Pham Thi Huệ, for example, a lack of familial connection to ca trù and the lasting custom that each master hands down the art to only one student brought her significant difficulties finding a willing teacher. She waited four years before finally securing one in 2005 (personal interview, 7 May 2009). A third impediment to intergenerational transmission has been the residual association of the genre with immoral habits in the minds of some elderly masters (see Bui T. H., personal interview with E. Wettermark; 25 June 2010; Anisensel, 2008, p. 38).

For ca trù, this first factor of the MVEF needs to be assessed using the grade system for emergent genres (genres that have undergone some degree of revitalisation), presented in Table 6.1. Grade 2 most closely represents the current situation for ca trù: although there are some middle-generation learners, the genre is being re-established primarily among young people aged from around 10 to their early 20s, through the institution of the clubs. In general, these young people are not yet teaching members of the middle or older generations, and so the intergenerational transmission chain still remains broken (in both directions: old to young, and young to old).
Table 6.1 Intergenerational transmission of ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Intergenerational transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre is performed by all appropriate ages and is transmitted intergenerationally in an unbroken chain from older to younger generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the oldest generation in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger and middle generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the middle generations in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The music genre is being re-established among the younger generations, but not by the middle generations. The older generations may or may not perform the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The music genre is performed mostly by the youngest appropriate generation, and then only partially and infrequently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Change in number of proficient musicians

This factor assesses the change in the number of proficient ca trù musicians over the last five to ten years. Standards of proficiency are a point of contention within the ca trù community; high levels of knowledge and technical skill are required before a musician is considered accomplished. In the UNESCO nomination file, attributions of “proficient” seem to be largely reserved for elderly artists who learnt the genre through traditional transmission processes of apprenticeship during the pre-revolutionary era. According to that file, in 2005 there were 21 such ca trù musicians – 17 singers and four instrumentalists, most aged in their 80s and 90s (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 2-3). Some have since died, and others become too infirm to perform or teach. Recent research has revealed several further elderly ca trù masters who are able to transmit the heritage (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 13), but on balance the change in number of these proficient musicians (so-defined) in the past five to ten years is small.

Ca trù is not an easy genre to master. Phạm Thị Huệ recalls her first encounter with it in the early 1990s: “I couldn’t understand the words, I couldn’t understand the music, and also the rhythm. [I felt it was] complex, too complex for me, and I never thought that I can study [this] music” (personal interview, 7 May 2009). According to researcher Defrance, learning the ca trù melodies does require “a long and very difficult technical apprenticeship” (2008, p. 37). Vietnamese musicologist Bùi Trọng Hiền believes that to sing ca trù well needs at least five to seven years of continuous study (personal interview with E. Wettermark; 25 June 2010), and Addiss wrote that ca trù “is expected to take ten years of study at a minimum; the best performers have given
several decades of their lives to the art” (1973, p. 31). Based on these reckonings (and
the probability that many of the elderly master-musicians will die during the next
decade), the expectation expressed in the UNESCO nomination file that the number of
heritage practitioners of ca trù will double in the five years from 2009 (Ministry of
Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 2) seems ambitious, if “heritage
practitioners” is taken to mean musicians with high levels of skill and knowledge.

From these considerations, Grade 3 (“little or no change in numbers of proficient
musicians”) best describes the situation for ca trù (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 Change in number of proficient musicians of ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in number of proficient musicians in the past 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in numbers of proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No proficient musicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3: Change in number of people engaged with the genre

This factor assesses the change in the number of people involved with ca trù in the last
five to ten years, whether by joining a club, taking lessons, attending rehearsals or
performances, or “consuming” ca trù in other ways.

In the decade 2001-2010, new ca trù clubs, classes, festivals, workshops,
recordings, and public performances all provided new ways for people to engage with
ca trù, and the number of people engaged with the genre grew significantly. Festivals
(including the Hanoi Ca Trù Festival in 2000, a National Ca Trù Festival in 2005,
National Ca Trù Show Night in 2006, and a National Ca Trù singing contest in 2007;
Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 7) have drawn the
attention and interest not only of the ca trù community but also to some extent of the
public, and classes have been organised with the aim not to create proficient musicians,
but rather “to popularise ca trù” (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam,
2009, p. 9). Many of these initiatives have targeted the transmission of knowledge
(rather than high-level skills) to children and youth. Phạm Thị Huệ believes this is a
vital way forward for preserving or revitalising ca trù, because it ensures a future
audience for the genre:

First thing I think is with the children now from 4 to 10 years, because when
they grow up, if we teach them how to listen to ca trù music, inside they will
know about [that] music. When they grow up they can be the listeners. (personal interview with H. Schippers, 14 January 2007)

*Ca trù* clubs continue to represent the primary mechanism through which the public may become involved in learning, or learning about, the genre. Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, founded (as the Thăng Long Ca Trù Club) by Phạm Thị Huệ with elderly artists Nguyễn Thị Chúc and Nguyễn Phú Đẹ, is one of the most dynamic this regard. In mid 2010 its members delivered a six-week extracurricular course for 15 students at FPT University in Hanoi (a finance- and technology-focused institution), with the aim to teach students how to appreciate *ca trù* as audience members (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 29 July 2010). For around two years (2008-2010) the club ran free weekly audience appreciation classes, and now continues its commitment to audience education in other ways, such as by holding regular open rehearsals and including an educational aspect to its concerts. At one of the audience appreciation classes in December 2009, researcher Esbjörn Wettermark took the opportunity to talk to Thang,

a young man who works at a bank in Hanoi. He said that he wanted to learn to appreciate *ca trù* because he saw it as a symbol of Hanoi, and wanted to be able to show his friends, from other parts of Vietnam, that part of Hanoian culture. Thang has no intention of learning to play *ca trù* himself, other than beating the *trong chau* [praise drum], and at home he prefers to listen to Vietnamese pop music. (2010b, pp. 76-77)

*Ca trù* remains a niche interest in Vietnam: the vast majority of Vietnamese people have only a superficial knowledge of it (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010). Yet even over the three years 2007-2010, Wettermark noted a marked change in the audience of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, “the present audience being much younger, and bigger, than the audience I encountered at my first performance in 2007” (2010a, p. 36). In addition to the significant increase in the number of people engaged with *ca trù* over the past five to ten years (indicating Grade 5 for this factor; see Table 6.3), optimism is also warranted for the future. Initiatives emanating from inscription to UNESCO’s *Urgent Safeguarding List* – including further regional and national festivals, and a plan to “disseminate and popularise” *ca trù* in high schools and universities by building extra-curricular activities, organising talks at schools, and producing *ca trù*-related resources suitable for those students (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 9-10) – may further grow the number of people engaged with the genre.
Table 6.3 Change in number of people engaged with ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in number of people engaged with the genre in the past 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No people engaged with the genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 4: Change in the music and music practices**

This factor assesses change in *ca trù* over the five- to ten-year period to 2010 in three main loci: the repertoire itself; teaching and learning practices; and performance practices. A discussion of the changes in performance contexts and functions is reserved for the next factor of the MVEF, and the knowledge and skills needed for the creation, transmission and performance of *ca trù* is dealt with in Factor 8. The teaching-and-learning element of this factor is closely related to Factor 1, which assessed the level of intergenerational transmission taking place for *ca trù*; this factor incorporates an assessment of change in its transmission and transmission practices over time.

With regard to repertoire, *ca trù* is considered “closed”: its musical melodies or “forms” (*thể*) are seen as fixed in number – though knowledge of many of them have been lost, as described in Factor 8 – so the dearth of newly-composed *thể* in the last decade does not represent stagnation (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010). Recent change in the *ca trù* repertoire has primarily manifested through new song texts (with concomitant adjustments to the *thể* to cater for the tonal inflections of the Vietnamese language). Many of these have been written in the free poetic form *hát nói*. In the last few years, new *hát nói* have been especially written for specific contemporary events; a striking example is *Chào Ông Bill Gates* (“To Mr. Bill Gates”), a *ca trù hát nói* composed on the occasion of Gates’ visit to Vietnam (N. Nguyễn, 2008, pp. 218-220). Newly-composed song texts hold greater potential to “speak” to people than pre-revolution texts, which may not readily resonate with the younger generations in modern Vietnam (Nguyễn Q. T., 2008, pp. 120-122).

With regard to methods of learning and teaching *ca trù*, the greatest change in recent times is certainly the continued growth of the club phenomenon, which represents a “great innovation” (Đặng, 2008, p. 539) – enabling, for example, several students to be taught simultaneously. In other ways, changes to transmission processes over the past decade have been relatively modest. Learning remains primarily aural,
although some teachers have devised new pedagogical systems to facilitate and expedite
the process (see Factor 12), and recording technology is now sometimes used for the
same reasons (Schippers, 2009, p. 200).

During the decline of ca trù following the decades from 1945, many
mechanisms for the transmission and performance of ca trù dissolved. One example is
the pre-revolutionary expectation that musically talented members of families with ca
trù lineage would continue the practice (Phó T. K. D., personal interview with E.
Wettermark; 5 July 2010); another is the social structures that allowed ca trù artists to
live off the income from their performances. Mechanisms for systematic transmission
and performance of ca trù have not yet been fully restored, though some efforts are
being made to reclaim them. Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, for example, has
revived the pre-revolutionary tradition of a graduation (mở xiêm áo) ceremony for
students who, after three or four years of training, have reached a certain level of
proficiency. Graduands are then permitted to teach in the club. In this way, with a
growing number of teachers, in coming years the club hopes to be able to accept a
growing number of students (Phạm T. H., personal interview, 7 May 2009).

Ca trù has not yet penetrated the conservatory environment, though moves to
that end have been made. As a musician and teacher working across the two contexts,
Phạm Thị Huệ expresses concern about the different systems of transmission within and
outside of the conservatorium, including the institutional preference for teaching
through notation and the pressure on students who are required to take many subjects
(personal interview, 9 May 2009). She declined an offer to teach đàn đáy at the National
Academy of Music as she felt it was “an attempt by the academy to make ca trù into just
another part of the revolutionary academy repertoire and hence tak[e] away its
emotional and personal essence” (Wettermark, 2010a, p. 35). It is difficult to judge
whether the institutionalisation of ca trù would serve its viability well or ill. On the one
hand, the institution would likely provide a more secure platform for teaching than
clubs, with their minimal non-substantive funding and relatively limited resources. On
the other, as Phạm clearly perceives, institutionalisation has the power to transform
“once-vibrant living traditions into static repertoires” (Schippers, 2009, p. 200). These
issues of the role music institutions play in musical transmissions are far wider, and
deeper, than the case of ca trù (for one perspective on the issues, see Cohen, 2009).

Recent changes to ca trù performance practices have been more diverse,
perhaps, than those to either repertoire or transmission processes. In 2010, a DVD was
released (Norton, 2010) of music performed by Dai Lam Minh, “a contemporary and
expanded *ca trù* ensemble” situating piano, electric guitar, and electric bass alongside the *đàn đáy*, percussion, and female singers (Olsen, 2011, p. 260). On the matter of innovation and experimentation in performance practices, Phạm believes it important to “keep the ways the musicians were doing in the past and at the same time create something new to make the audience understand and like *ca trù*” (in Wettermark, 2010b, p. 75).

The fourth anniversary performance of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long in Hanoi in July 2010 (at which I was present) indicates some of the new directions of the genre. Phạm and one of her younger female students performed on the *đàn đáy*, an instrument traditionally played by men. Some *ca trù* pieces featured four to six alternating solo singers, rather than the single soloist associated with *ca trù* since the early 20th century. Several *ca trù* pieces involved an expanded instrumental ensemble; others were accompanied by a reconstruction of *ca trù* dances; and yet others were from the *bát âm* repertoire, a ceremonial instrumental genre historically associated with *hát cửa đình*.

It remains to be seen whether on balance the recent changes to repertoire, transmission processes, and performance practices auger well for the longer-term viability of *ca trù*. The modest changes in repertoire (especially new song texts) and transmission processes (especially the infrastructure of the clubs) over the last five to ten years, along with the innovations in performance practices during this time, may be seen to indicate the genre’s ability to adapt to the changing reality of modern Vietnam, thereby indicating a moderate increase in the strength of the genre over this time (Grade 4 in Table 6.4).

### Table 6.4 Change in the music and music practices of *ca trù*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pace and direction of change in the music and associated music practices in the last 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect significantly increased strength of the genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately increased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect little or no change in strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately decreased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect significantly decreased strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect no or almost no strength.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 5: Change in performance contexts and functions**

This factor looks at the changes in the social functions and performance contexts of *ca trù*, with emphasis on the five to ten years to 2010.
In 2005, the Hanoi Ca Trù Club was the only organisation that regularly gave ca trù performances in Hanoi (Norton, 2005, p. 34). By 2010, the opportunities to hear ca trù publicly had grown considerably, with several clubs offering regular or semi-regular small-scale performances in venues ranging from private homes to đinh (village communal houses). Schippers encountered a performance “in a small record shop where the displays were covered with black cloth to create the atmosphere of a performance space, with low tables and cushions for the audience to evoke traditional settings” (2009, p. 201). In October 2011, Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long officially launched the ongoing concert series “Ca trù comes back”, comprising performances at a traditional-style house in the old quarter of Hanoi every evening of the week (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 3 October 2011).

Ca trù clubs are also occasionally hired to perform at anniversary celebrations, longevity celebrations, or commemorations to honour ancestors, filling another modern socioeconomic niche for the genre (Văn, 2008, p.193; E. Wettermark, personal interview, 19 July 2010). Hát thờ (worship singing for the ancestors of ca trù) still takes place in certain communities (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 12), and in recent years certain clubs in Hanoi, Lơ Khê, and Cờ Đạm have made efforts to re-establish hát cửa đinh in village communal houses (Văn, 2008, pp. 193-194).

Ca trù is also increasingly finding a place within larger co-ordinated events such as festivals, competitions, and conferences. Urban and village-based festivals in particular (such as the 2005 National Ca Trù Festival in Hà Tĩnh and Hanoi) have recently formed a new context for the hát chơi repertoire (Văn, 2008, p. 193). A ca trù competition held in Hải Dương city in 2007 drew the participation of up to twenty ca trù clubs, and the Hanoi Opera House has served as the venue for more than one ca trù-related event, including the National Ca Trù Night in June 2006, in the context of an international conference on ca trù (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008a, 1:16:52-1:17:45). Recontextualisations like these (as well as through commercial recordings and the internet; see Factor 5) inevitably raise questions about authenticity, tradition, and innovation – issues discussed at more length in other factors of the MVEF (especially Factors 4 and 10), and more generally in earlier chapters of this dissertation.

Another significant recent trend in context and function for ca trù is the expansion into the tourist market, though these ventures have not always been successful. In mid-2009 the Thăng Long Ca Trù Theatre was founded at the Museum of Vietnam Revolution by 28-year-old businesswoman Nguyen Lan Huong, in her belief
that Hà Nội’s ca trù clubs were not attractive to foreigners (VietnamNet Bridge, 2009, para. 2). For a time the museum doubled both as the venue for the group’s daily performances and an exhibition space where visitors could learn more about ca trù through photos, documents, and artefacts. I heard during my field visit in mid-2010 that the Theatre may have closed down; by early 2011 its website had not been updated with new events or news items for over six months, and my attempts at contact (via their over-quota web-mailbox and by email) were unsuccessful. By July 2011, their website URL was defunct. Another (apparently) short-lived tourist-related enterprise was the nightly performances given by the Giáo Phương Ca Trù Thăng Long in early 2010 in a restaurant in Hà Nội; this venture was discontinued at least partly due to leader Phạm Thị Huệ’s discomfort at restaurant patrons eating and talking during the performances (personal communication, 29 July 2010). In late 2010, the club began giving weekly Saturday-evening performances for a local and tourist audience in a temple in Hà Nội’s central Hoàn Kiếm district (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 28 November, 2010).

The expansion of ca trù’s engagement with tourism may be further signalled by a proposal for the enterprise Ca Trù Vietnam: Bringing one of the great chamber music traditions to international audiences, a proposal developed with support from Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre for funding by Norfund (Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries). The project aspires to re-establish hát chơi in a commercially viable “ca trù house” in the old quarter of Hà Nội, with the “high-end of cultural tourism to Vietnam” as its primary market (QCRC, 2010, para. 1).

It seems probable that the expansion of ca trù into new performance contexts and functions, and the reclamation of some of its former ones, will continue in the immediate future. One initiative associated with the UNESCO inscription aims to restore eighteen communal houses for hát chơi and hát thơ, and in the decade to 2020 there are plans to restore several other tangible spaces for ca trù performance, including worshipping houses, a palace, and a temple (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 2, 9-10). If the tourist-related initiatives described above gain momentum, the tourist industry may represent an important new locus of performance contexts and functions of ca trù in coming years.

Overall, then, performance contexts and functions for ca trù increased over the decade to 2010, warranting Grade 4 in Table 6.5. The genre is now performed in a range of contexts and for a range of functions; public performances are more frequent than five or ten years ago, though outside of Hà Nội they remain “sporadic and infrequent” (Norton, 2009, June).
Table 6.5 Change in the performance contexts and functions for ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Change in performance context(s) and function(s) in the last 5 to 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>integral contexts and functions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre continues to be performed in one or more regular, well-established contexts and holds integral function(s) within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expanding contexts or functions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The music genre has expanded to new context(s) and function(s), and is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static contexts or functions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Context(s) and function(s) for the music genre have remained largely static, even in relation to changing environments. The genre is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulaic contexts and functions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The music genre is performed only in irregular formulaic contexts and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly limited formulaic contexts and functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The music genre is performed only on exceptional occasions in formulaic contexts and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The music genre is not performed in any context for any function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 6: Response to mass media and the music industry**

This factor examines the way ca trù engages with and responds to the music industry and mass media – especially print media, radio, television, and internet – from the local to international levels. The genre’s response to the tourist industry also falls under this factor.

Over the last decade or so ca trù has increasingly been profiled in the local and national television, radio, magazines, newspapers, and the music industry. Norton refers to an “explosion” in the number of media articles, recordings, and television documentaries on ca trù (2005, p. 49), though he is “extremely critical” about the latter, believing they do little to increase general understanding of the genre (personal interview, 26 July 2010). His own research on ca trù has been profiled through Vietnam Television’s (VTV) documentary *A Westerner Loves our Music*, aired on Vietnamese television several times since 1999 (2005, p. 49). Media cameras were plenty during the fourth anniversary performance of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long (see Figure 6.1); ducking out for a breath from the hot and crowded đình during the evening performance, I was an easy target for an interviewer and cameraman from a local English-language television station: “What do you think about ca trù music? Would you like to hear more ca trù?” (Hà nội, 22 July 2010). In recent years English-language media like VietNamNet, Look at Vietnam, and the Hanoi Times have published dozens of articles on ca trù.
Several commercial ca trù recordings exist, including by members of the Thái Hà Ca Trù Club (e.g. *Ca Trù: The Music of North Vietnam*; Nimbus CD NI5626, 2001 and *Vietnam: Vocal Music from the Northern Plains*; VDE Gallo CD1207, 2006) and a compilation by Nguyễn Thị Chúc, Lê Thị Bạch Vân and Nguyễn Phú Đức (*Ty Bà hành ca trù*; Studio Thăng Long Audio Visual 67/VHTT, 2005). While some of these labels are well distributed, the CDs in question remain in a niche market and are not always readily available, even within Vietnam. Trying my luck in a street of CD-DVD stores on my field visit to Hanoi, I emerged from five stores with a total of two ca trù CDs (only after invariably being initially led to the shops’ cartoon sections – a combined result, I suspect, of my imperfect pronunciation and the improbability of my request). From appearance, both these CDs were illegally copied; the Vietnamese music industry involves a good deal of “boot-legging” (making and distribution of unauthorised, unofficial, or illegal recordings) (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010).

Some ca trù clubs are beginning to actively engage with the tourist industry, particularly in Hanoi (as described in Factor 5); this engagement is still in experimental stages, and is the cause of divided views within the community. Audience members at Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long’s fourth anniversary performance on 22 July 2010 were invited to mark down and submit their “favourite tunes” for the evening, with a
view to helping future planning of performances. A risk in changing *ca trù* performances based on such data is that it may conform the genre to a tourist taste, homogenising its style and repertoire (a danger identified in relation to Xoan singing, another traditional Vietnamese music genre; see Tan, 2010, p. 164). Expressing concern about “cheapening” the genre in this way, folklorist Tô Ngọc Thanh believes that *ca trù*’s engagement with tourism may in any case find itself restricted due to the “difficult-to-understand” nature of the genre (personal interview with H. Schippers, 31 July 2010). *Ca trù* arguably “remains an art independent of mass consumption, requiring a certain integrative knowledge” (Jähnichen, 2011, p. 152).

At the international level, the internet is almost certainly the most powerful medium for the dissemination and promotion of *ca trù*. In 2010, a broadcast on Public Radio International’s news magazine *The World* featured *ca trù* in popular terms (“*ca trù* songs are often full of pathos and longing about life and love, kind of like ancient Vietnamese blues”) (Magistad, 2010, 0:56-1:04); it was aired on over 200 radio stations in the United States and subsequently podcast. Perhaps the best testament to the power of the internet to promote *ca trù* is the “Ca Trù Thăng Long” Facebook page, which as of January 2012 had been “liked” by an astonishing 5,200-plus people. The group also maintains its own YouTube channel (Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, 2012a) and an extensive website (Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, 2012b) with information on upcoming events, past performances, photos, and audio and video clips from their performances. Members of at least two *ca trù* clubs have also travelled and performed abroad (the Thái Hà group to the UK, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Japan, and Switzerland; Văn, 2008, p. 200; and members of the Thăng Long Ca Trù group to Sweden and Australia), where they have been profiled in local press and media.

Beyond those challenges described above, other circumstances also place some strain on *ca trù*’s engagement with media and industry. Wide-spread access to information and communication technology in Vietnam since the country’s entry into a market economy in the late 1980s has created conditions for a young and curious public to enjoy a wide variety of mass-mediated music, but this has also been viewed as a “big barrier and a challenge to Ca trù art” (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 6), perhaps exacerbated by the fact that *ca trù* is “largely an acquired taste” offering “little satisfaction to listeners who cannot understand the poetry” (Miller, 2008, p. 192). Also, *ca trù* has struggled at times to retain a positive representation in the media. One particular instance of bad press was the reportage over a conflict that emerged in 2009 between the leaders of the Thăng Long Ca Trù Club (later Giáo
Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long) and the Thăng Long Ca Trù Theatre over the similarity in names (e.g. Nguyễn Y., 2009).

On balance, though, ca trù demonstrates relatively constructive interaction with a range of mass media at the local and national levels; it has some representation in the music industry through commercial recordings and the internet; and its engagement with the tourist market is small and experimental, but growing. Grade 3 represents the most appropriate grade level for this factor, indicating the ability of ca trù to cope in its engagement with, and response to, the media and music industry (see Table 6.6).

Table 6.6 Response of ca trù to mass media and the music industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Response to mass media and the music industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>robust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The genre displays significant strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The genre displays strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The genre displays an ability to cope in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The genre displays weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The genre displays significant weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to cope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The genre displays an inability to cope in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 7: Infrastructure and resources for music practices

This factor relates to the current infrastructure and tangible resources for the transmission and performance of ca trù, including professional opportunities and financial support for musicians.

One recent aim of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long has been to enable ca trù musicians to make a living from their art – a difficult mission, since like most clubs it receives no governmental support, and so paying its musicians is difficult or impossible. To this end, in 2010 the club changed its name from Thăng Long Ca Trù Club to Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, referring to the pre-revolutionary social organisation of ca trù family lines into guilds (giáo phường) that managed processes of transmission and performance, set tenets for maintaining good social relations among its members, and attended to their professional interests and living conditions (Bùi T. H., 2008). For the group,

the meaning in giáo phường is to care about the old masters who cannot go and perform themselves anymore, the younger musicians, who can earn money by their singing, should give back some of that money to their masters and in turn
the old masters can stay at home and teach children how to play and sing, and in this way they will develop a very tight relationship with their students. (Phạm T. H., in Wettermark, 2010b, p. 80; see also Bui, 2008, p. 76)

Acting on this ethos, Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long returns some of the profits of its concerts to its elderly master-artists Nguyễn Thị Chức and Nguyễn Phú Đệ (Wettermark, 2010b, p. 80). The conferral of State titles of honour like “People’s Artist” is also an infrastructural mechanism in support of master-artists, though as yet this scheme seems to have made little real headway to this end (a circumstance discussed more under Factor 9).

While the 60-odd ca trù clubs (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 13) currently represent the primary infrastructure for teaching and learning ca trù, many operate without the substantive funding that would, in many cases, facilitate their sustainability. In early 2011, the leader of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long described to me the financial status of the group as “terrible” (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 1 February 2011). Bùi believes those clubs without family association are particularly at risk of “breaking” without sufficient funds (personal interview with E. Wettermark, 25 June 2010). Although the clubs may be a “great innovation” for ca trù,

there has been so far no one who can think of the way to maintain activities of the clubs, to obtain the funds to support the clubs’ operation and learning of the members, and to work out the schedule and the target for the members to learn.

The questions have not found the answers. (Đặng, 2008, p. 539)

Further, the quality of the clubs remains variable, and, unconnected by any guild-like system, they remain relatively isolated entities with limited exchange of experience and ideas (Nguyễn T. T., 2008, p. 306).

Potentially exacerbating the inadequacies of the club system is a lack of public and institutional recognition and support of musicians trained outside institutional contexts: “Only graduates of the conservatory system have access to the resources needed to promote their careers, including publicity, a venue to perform, and money for costumes and equipment” (Bùi T. H., in Arana, 1999, p. 120). Ca trù students are obliged to earn an income in other ways, leaving little time for learning the genre; many of them are also consumed with the demands of learning Western or other Vietnamese traditional genres in the conservatory environment. A lack of ensuing professional and commercial opportunities also leaves minimal incentive for people to learn ca trù (Norton, 2005, p. 35). For these reasons, as well as the limited teaching and learning
materials for *ca trù*, the genre’s absence in the school education system, and a lack of the “preferential regulations and policies” that might attract students to a non-lucrative profession as *ca trù* artists (Nguyễn T. T., 2008, p. 307; see also Nguyễn N., 2008, p. 218), the present educational-training model for *ca trù* arguably remains deficient.

Access to tangible resources has also sometimes presented a challenge for *ca trù*. In particular, appropriate performance and rehearsal venues have proven difficult for some clubs to secure at reasonable cost. Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long is one example; time and again the club’s rehearsal spaces have become unavailable, and finding new venues has sometimes been a considerable challenge. For periods at a time the club has resorted to using the private homes of its members or their relatives or friends for rehearsals and performances (Phạm T. H., personal interview, 9 May 2009). Along with finances, performance space was a key factor in the dissolution after a year or two of *Am Sac Viet*, a group set up by a member of the Ca Trù Thai Ha Ensemble:

She [*ca trù* singer Nguyễn Thúy Hoa] got a space in the old quarter of Hanoi, a small space, and she was trying essentially to reconstruct *hát chơi* – to get twenty people in [each performance]. . . . She didn’t charge for anything and it essentially ran out of steam after a while, for financial reasons, and just the space wasn’t available any more. (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010)

In his examination report for the UNESCO nomination file, Norton observes that the difficulties *ca trù* clubs have had in finding appropriate venues for performance and training have hampered their efforts to teach and perform (2009, June, p. 215).

Access to musical instruments is another consideration in the vitality of *ca trù*. Jähnichen’s observations on the *đàn đáy* (1997, p. 291)⁴ remain largely true over a decade later: the instrument is relatively expensive, perhaps prohibitively so for some people living in rural areas, and instrument-makers are relatively few (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010). In 2008, a single *đàn đáy* in the house of an 85-year-old musician in Văn Vật village was the only remaining instrument in Nghệ An province (Nguyễn N. N., 2008, p. 232). Đặng recounts a poignant episode from his fieldwork preparing the UNESCO nomination file, during which he encountered an elderly *đàn dáy* player (b. 1923) in Bán Thạch village whose instrument had been taken from him some time earlier by another musician:

Since then he became the instrumentalist without the instrument. In the talk with us, when he was in high spirit[s], he played the instrument with his mouth. . . .

---

⁴ “Es ist auch wichtig anzumerken, dass die Laute *đàn đáy* schon immer ein relative teures Instrument war und noch immer ist. Es gibt nur wenige Instrumentenbauer, die in der Lage sind, ein in jeder Beziehung brauchbares Instrument herzustellen.”
When we said goodbye to him, he still asked us: ‘if you meet Mr. Lê Thanh B. please tell him to pay me back the instrument.’ (Đặng, 2008, pp. 494-495)

The inscription of *ca trù* on the UNESCO safeguarding list brings hope of improved infrastructure and resources in coming years, with various measures planned to support musical practices, including restoration of venues for *ca trù* performance. The various tourist and music industry ventures described in Factor 5, if they gain momentum, may also help make professionalism for *ca trù* musicians a more achievable goal. Nevertheless, infrastructure mechanisms for professionalism and transmission are still weak and lack substantive funding, and some of the tangible resources needed for rehearsing and transmitting *ca trù* (especially rehearsal venues and in rural areas, *đàn đáy* instruments) remain very difficult for some sectors of the *ca trù* community to access (Grade 1 in Table 6.7).

**Table 6.7 Infrastructure and resources for *ca trù***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of infrastructure and resources for music practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All infrastructure and resources required for creating, performing, rehearsing, and transmitting the music genre are easily available and accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All infrastructure and resources required for creating, performing, rehearsing, and transmitting the music genre are accessible, but not necessarily easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most but not all required infrastructure / resources are accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some but not all required infrastructure / resources are accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure / resources are only accessed with great difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure / resources are completely inaccessible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 8: Knowledge and skills for music practices**

This factor relates to the existence, extent, accessibility and availability of the sociocultural and musical knowledge and skills required for creating, transmitting, and performing *ca trù* – in particular, how these interrelate with knowledge of the *ca trù* repertoire, composition of new song texts, and pedagogical systems.

Relative to the repertoire of *ca trù* in the era before 1945, knowledge within the *ca trù* community of the repertoire is considerably depleted. Quantitative data on the number of *thể* (“forms” or melodies) varies, with figures ranging from 11 or 12 extant *thể* out of an entire repertoire of 46 (Đỗ and Đỗ, 1962, in Norton, 1996, p. 40) to 16 out of a total of 65 *thể* (Jähnichen, 1997, p. 334), or about 20 of 56 (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 1, 13). Precise figures are unimportant; what is clear is that the current knowledge of the full repertoire is considerably limited, though some parts of it continue to be “rediscovered through living memory of old musicians” (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010). Knowledge of the dances that
once accompanied hát cửa đình (in the village communal houses) and hát thờ also remains partial and weak (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 5); some of what does remain has been used as the basis for reconstructing some of the dances.

The composition of new song texts notwithstanding (see Factor 4), “large obstacles” exist for ca trù poets, musicians, and audiences in relation to the knowledge of texts (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 6). While hát nói composition is relatively common, few people have the skills to compose ca trù texts in other stricter and more elaborate poetic patterns. The hán nôm script in which ca trù texts were formerly written employs words or phrases that are difficult for modern-day native speakers to understand. Phạm reflects on the sometimes vague understanding of texts: “With ca trù music, sometimes I ask [my teachers] for the meaning of a song, sometimes they remember. Sometimes they know the meaning of the song – not each word exactly but the [overall] meaning” (personal interview with H. Schippers, 17 January 2007).

For ca trù especially, musical knowledge and skills are not only demanded of performers, learners and teachers, but also the audience, whose appreciation and involvement with a performance (for example by playing the praise drum) relies on an ability to understand the music and poetry. The contemporary audience typically has a limited understanding of ca trù; Jähnichen even believes that for the future of the genre, “the most dangerous development seems to be the growing incompetence of the audience” (2011, p. 170), which leads to changed musical practices and meanings. The drum, for example, is nowadays no longer performed by a quan viên cầm châu – an audience member with a high social position, mastery in the hán nôm script, and thorough knowledge of text, music and repertoire – but rather by a member of the ensemble (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 4). Some ca trù musicians believe audience education, particularly about how to play the drum, may be an important way forward for vitality of the genre. Master-artist Nguyễn Thị Chúc suggests:

Teach the audience how to play the drum. When the people can sing in the right way . . . in ca trù music, the audience will like it much, but if they sing in the wrong way, then the audience will not like it. Because when they understand about ca trù music, they know how it’s different. And when [the audience] understands about poem, about rhythm, about how to play the drum, then they

In this belief, Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long places considerable emphasis on educating the audience. Among other initiatives to this end (like the free audience education classes described in Factor 3), it encourages audience participation during its performances, for example by playing the praise drum or adopting the historical practice of throwing wooden *trù* (“tally cards”) into a metal bowl to signal enjoyment of the performance.

Theoretical knowledge of *ca trù* is limited, but this does not represent a radical change from the pre-revolutionary era. Since at least the mid-20th century, knowledge of the five *cung* (“modes”) used in *ca trù* has not been made explicit through research or transmission processes, and so the current lack of conscious knowledge of them does not necessarily signal weakening vitality (Norton, 2005, p. 37). Phạm Thị Huệ observes the lack of explicit theory in the pedagogy of her teachers; she believes that making known a theory of *ca trù* may be beneficial for the genre (personal interview with H. Schippers, 14 January 2007).

In sum, the *ca trù* community has access to only some of the knowledge and skills that would indicate a fully vital genre (Grade 2 in Table 6.8). Specifically, knowledge of the repertoire is depleted, the skills needed for the creation of a diversity of song texts are rare, and audiences lack close acquaintance with the genre.

**Table 6.8 Knowledge and skills for music practices of *ca trù***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of knowledge and skills for music practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The community holds all knowledge and skills required for creating, performing, and transmitting the music genre, and these are easily available and accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The community holds all required knowledge and skills, but these may not be easily available or accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The community holds most but not all required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The community holds only some of the required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The community holds only a little of the required knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Required knowledge and skills are almost or completely absent in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 9: Governmental and institutional policies affecting music practices**

This factor assesses the impact of current government and institutional policies and attitudes relating to Vietnamese cultural heritage, traditional music genres, and *ca trù* in particular.

The Law on Cultural Heritage (National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, 2001) was the first explicit legal framework in Vietnam that articulated the
responsibilities of the government, institutions, and individuals in protecting and promoting intangible cultural heritage. Around the same time as the Law was implemented, the attitudes of Vietnamese governmental bodies to ca trù began to shift: from “no interest at all” in the mid-1990s to moderate or strong ideological support of the genre by the mid-2000s (B. Norton, personal interview, 26 July 2010). In the UNESCO nomination file for ca trù, the Law on Cultural Heritage is invoked as the foundation on which communities, local authorities, and government agencies should construct and execute strategies towards safeguarding the genre (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 10).

In 2005 Vietnam ratified the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, providing a further scaffold for efforts to protect and promote traditional Vietnamese music. Both pre- and post-ratification, several traditional genres were inscribed onto UNESCO’s list of Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Urgent Need of Safeguarding, including the court music of Huế (2003), the space of Central Highland’s gong culture (2005), and quan họ folk songs (2009). Ca trù was successfully inscribed in late 2009; further nominations to the List (e.g. for hat xoan and tài tìe) are already underway. Norton argues that this demonstrated governmental concern for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is inextricably linked with political ideology, propelled on the one hand by a concern for national identity, and on the other by an anxiety about the erosion of Vietnamese tradition due to the forces of globalisation (2010; see also Arana, 1999, p. 140 and Jähnichen, 2011, p. 149).

Various government and institutional bodies, operating both at a national level and within provinces that regard ca trù as a part of local heritage, support and nurture the genre in various ways: providing finance for buying instruments and equipment, creating performance opportunities through cultural activities and festivals, and encouraging the foundation of clubs and groups, for example (as Bùi Thị Phấn describes of Hưng Yên province; 2008, p. 174). The central governmental body responsible for developing and implementing strategies to support ca trù and other forms of intangible cultural heritage is the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (formerly the Ministry of Culture and Information). The national Ministry is represented at the provincial level by Departments of Culture, Sports and Tourism. The Vietnamese Institute for Musicology supports the Ministry in its strategies and initiatives for ca trù and other traditional genres.
Other agencies that have engaged with ca trù through documentation, research, or activism include the Vietnamese Institute for Hán-Nôm Studies, the Vietnam Cultural Heritage Association, and the Association of Vietnamese Folklorists. The latter is responsible for conferring the title “Master of Folklore” on highly skilled ca trù artists (nghệ nhân). By the time of the nomination of ca trù to UNESCO in 2009, no less than 19 artists had been honoured in this way (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 11), in theory providing national recognition, financial assistance, material support, and other preferences to encourage and enable those artists to perpetuate their art and transmit their skills to the younger generation. However, some members of the ca trù community remain sceptical that these awards hold any real value for the master-artists on whom they are conferred (Bùi T. H., personal interview with E. Wettermark, 25 June 2010).

In spite of what seems to be extensive government support of ca trù, several causes of disquiet surround its involvement in the genre. One is the lack of deep government understanding about best ways to approach protecting and promoting Vietnamese traditional music genres, including ca trù (a politically sensitive concern raised by more than one interviewee in this research). Trần Văn Khê underlines the necessity for effective policy measures to support traditional Vietnamese music, for example by helping traditional musicians earn their own living (personal interview with H. Schippers, 20 January 2007). Another cause of concern relates to the extent of governmental consultation with the ca trù community about safeguarding approaches (B. Norton, personal interview, 27 July 2010), despite heavy rhetoric in the UNESCO nomination file about the government’s close community consultation (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 7, 11-12).

The impact of the very inscription of ca trù onto UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List has also been brought into question. In relation to ca trù, Norton (2010) identifies a number of “thorny issues” concerning the unintended consequences of such top-down cultural heritage policy and plans: issues about ownership, control, and stewardship of the tradition, which sometimes fuel tensions and rivalry within the community (12:46-13:17); the fact that tradition is being reinvented “in a way that is designed to impress Vietnamese and international audiences of the value of ca trù as world heritage” (12:16-12:31); the concomitant risk that “deep appreciation” of the genre could be overshadowed by an emphasis on it as a Vietnamese cultural symbol (14:00-14:15); and in turn, the risk that this emphasis on cultural identity could “overshadow different points of view, which potentially limits the proliferation of
diverse approaches to revival” (12:31-12:46). The potentially harmful effect on music genres of international proclamations like UNESCO’s is a real concern, and one that has been noted both generally (for example by Titon, 2009b) and in relation to other specific genres (e.g. Wang, 2003).

The limited freedom of expression in Vietnam in relation to traditional music practices, safeguarding mechanisms, and the quality and nature of government intervention should also be raised here; the restrictiveness was mentioned to me as a matter of concern by at least one local musician during my field visit in 2010. An incident reported in the local media in relation to the traditional folk song genre quan họ indicates how this situation might impact on safeguarding approaches: in late 2009, researcher and employee of the Vietnam Culture and Art Institute Bùi Trọng Hiền was sanctioned for publicly expressing his belief that quan họ was becoming increasingly commercialised, and that the few remaining quan họ artists were viewed as “‘natural resources’ to be exploited by the quan họ society.” His view was “severely opposed” by officials from his Institute and those from the provincial Bắc Ninh Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, who dispatched to the national cultural ministry a request that Bùi be disciplined and compelled to publicly apologise to quan họ artists for offence caused by his comments (VietNamNet/Dat Viet, 2009).

Overall, governmental and institutional attitudes are presently ideologically favourable towards traditional (pre-revolutionary) Vietnamese music genres like ca trù:

As with many other cultural traditions that were condemned in Party documents and by officials during the revolutionary period, ca trù is no longer at odds with Party policy but is instead being aligned with it. Ca trù is increasingly being promoted as a cultural activity that contributes to the Party’s aim of developing Vietnamese culture, which is “rich in national colour” (đam đa ban sắc dân tộc). (Norton, 2005, p. 48)

Yet the policies that flow from that ideological support seems to be largely founded on an overarching aspiration to consolidate a national identity rather than concern about each music genre and its community, and manifest by and large without meaningful community consultation or significant policy differentiation between genres. Grade 4 best describes this situation (see Table 6.9).
Table 6.9 Governmental and institutional attitudes towards ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of support</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Official attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>differentiated support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The music genre is supported through specific cultural policies developed and implemented in consultation with culture-bearers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blanket support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The genre is supported through overarching policies supporting cultural expressions, without differentiation and without consultation with culture-bearers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive assimilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No explicit policy exists for supporting (or hindering) diverse cultural expressions, such as the music genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active assimilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implicitly or explicitly, the government encourages the abandonment of ‘small’ or non-mainstream cultural expressions, for example by providing education only in the language and culture of the majority group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced assimilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government policy explicitly declares the majority group to represent the only recognised culture. ‘Small’ or non-mainstream cultural expressions are neither recognised nor supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Performance of the music genre is prohibited. It may be tolerated in private social contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 10: Community members’ attitudes toward the genre

This factor relates to the attitudes toward ca trù of members of the ca trù community (in Wood and Judikis’ sense of a “community of practice”, 2002, p. 12). This community includes elderly masters, younger professional musicians, teachers and students, as well as audience members and locally-based researchers.

In many revival movements, individuals play a critical role in driving revitalisation initiatives and stimulating wider interest in the genre (Livingston, 1999, p. 69), and ca trù is no exception. Two current leading forces in the ca trù revival are Lê Thị Bạch Vân, scholar, singer, and founding leader of the Hanoi Ca Trù Club, who completed her masters degree on ca trù in 2004 (Đặng, 2008, p. 498); and Phạm Thị Huệ, who, above and beyond her role teaching tỳ bà at the National Academy of Music, invests considerable time and effort managing Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long, liaising with academic and industry stakeholders, and actively generating media interest in ca trù. While Lê, Phạm, and others have personally contributed enormously to reviving ca trù, the central role of individuals in driving grassroots-level initiatives raises questions about the medium- to long-term sustainability of these efforts.

In principle, many members of the ca trù community harbour strong and enthusiastic commitment to the maintenance and revitalisation of the genre. All communities where ca trù is found apparently committed their ideological support to the safeguarding measures entailed by the nomination to UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 11). According to the UNESCO nomination file, communities also called for a concrete
governmental policy to support ca trù master artists, the organisation of festivals to honour and promote the genre, the development of books and reference learning materials for ca trù, and “investment and guidance” from the ministries and local authorities to restore ca trù to former contexts (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 11). One of the examination reports for the UNESCO nomination file makes the observation that the number of ca trù musicians supporting the nomination is nearly identical with the number of ca trù musicians in general (International Council for Traditional Music, 2009, p. 226).

Despite the ideological commitment to the cause (perhaps also partly deriving from feelings of compulsion to comply with government decrees), community opinions about how ca trù should be perpetuated are by no means cohesive. The ideology of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long – that only through wide dissemination and publicity will the genre’s viability be secured – contrasts with (for example) that of the Thái Hà Ca Trù Club, which prefers to perpetuate the genre within its own close-knit family group. Quality is a major bone of contention, which may to some degree be attributed to rivalry and antagonism between the various ca trù groups (Wettermark, 2010b, pp. 81-82).

Many squabbles within the community appear petty, like the copyright conflict between the Thăng Long Ca Trù Theatre and Club described in Factor 6. Following a difficult interview, Wettermark’s translator suggested to him that the unwillingness of one ca trù musician to talk on record about how she learnt or taught ca trù may have been due to a “fear of others stealing her methods” (E. Wettermark, personal communication, 24 January 2010). Also trifling is the considerable criticism Phạm Thị Huệ has attracted for her quick transition from student to teacher, her playing the traditionally male đàn đáy, and the popularity of her club with the media (Wettermark, 2010b, p. 81). She has had her proficiency called into question by other ca trù artists on several occasions, including in a public manner at the Applied Ethnomusicology Study Group meeting of the ICTM in Hànội, 2010 (at which I was present), and her reinterpretation and reinstatement of terms like hát cửa đình and giáo phường has also proven provocative (Wettermark, 2010c). Arana positions the proneness of the ca trù community to “gossip, rumours and indignation” (Wettermark, 2010a, p. 6) within a wider political and social context in this way:

I found their attempts [musicians’ and music scholars’] to discredit other musicians and scholars to be revealing of how much is at stake: underlying the controversy about traditional music is a struggle for social, political, and
economic power and recognition, one that is directly related to the larger political and economic forces that have affected Vietnamese society. (1999, p. 109)

Authenticity is another key locus of debate and dispute (as is often the case in music preservation and revival; see Chapter 2.1c). Anxiety about preserving a “pure tradition” generates some conservative views on what is “authentic”. Nguyễn Thế Thanh, Director of the Thái Bình Culture and Information Department, calls for scholarly care to be taken “to accurately define original Ca trù tunes, to sort out borrowed ones, and to bravely reject the mixed tunes that have negative effects on Ca trù’s artistic quality” (2008, pp. 305-306). Nguyễn Quảng Tuân, member of the Scientific Council of the Centre of National Culture Research, believes the audience size for ca trù performances should be limited to “a small group, and they must be absolutely silent for co-enjoyment” (2008, p. 115). Folklorist Tô Ngọc Thanh, urging for retention of “the authenticity of the past,” laments the fact that some members of the ca trù community are composing new pieces: “Music ả đào is something stable; [a] stable form. If now you modify [it], in fact it damages” (personal interview with H. Schippers, 31 July 2010).

These kinds of views conflict with the approach of certain other sectors of the ca trù community, which are readier to experiment and adapt ca trù practices to suit contemporary Vietnamese audiences and society (see Factor 4). Phó Đức Phương, Deputy President of Vietnam Hanoi Composers Association, apparently holds a considerably flexible view on authenticity and tradition. A YouTube video of singer Ngọc Hạ performing his composition Tren Dinh Phu Van (“On the mountain peak full of cloud”) is an astonishingly eclectic mix of contemporary styles, theatrical dance, Tibetan chant, and ca trù, replete with backdrop and coloured lighting effects (Ngọc, 2011).

In general, community attitudes to ca trù and its revitalisation are in principle very strong, but the community is disempowered by its lack of solidarity. Overall, then, while ideological support for the maintenance of ca trù might be assigned a Grade 5, the splintering of community attitudes with respect to the genre and its future means that Grade 4 may more accurately represent the state of ca trù for this factor (see Table 6.10).
Table 6.10 Community members’ attitudes towards ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Community members’ attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is very strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is moderate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community support for the maintenance of the music genre is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No community members support the maintenance of the genre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 11: Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the genre**

This factor examines the attitudes to ca trù of researchers, academics, students, fieldworkers, commercial agencies, funding bodies, and non-governmental organisations located outside of the ca trù community, the way they interact and engage with the genre, and the effect this has on its vitality and viability. For purposes of this assessment, the focus lies on engagement with ca trù from outside Vietnam, given that Vietnamese-based association with the genre largely falls either under the realm of the ca trù community (Factor 10), or of government and institutions (Factor 9). For this reason too, this factor does not address UNESCO’s support of the genre, which is a direct consequence of community and government activism.

Individual foreign researchers have played a significant role in promoting and disseminating information about ca trù especially since the mid- to late-1990s, when Barley Norton (UK) completed a masters thesis on the genre (1996) and Gisa Jähnichen (Germany), a Habilitationsschrift (1997). Both these researchers subsequently served on the examination panel for the UNESCO nomination of ca trù (Jähnichen in the capacity of representative of the International Council for Traditional Music). In the last decade, several postgraduate research students have investigated ca trù, including Aliénor Anisensel (France), Esbjörn Wettermark (Sweden/UK), and Bretton Dimick (USA). Like American ethnomusicologist Stephen Addiss some decades earlier (who found the đàn đáy “a fascinating if difficult instrument”; 1973, p. 19), Anisensel (2008, p. 235), Jähnichen (1997, pp. 53-57), and Norton (1996) all learnt and performed ca trù during their research. The latter has recently described himself as adopting an “unashamedly interventionist stance” in the ca trù revival (2008, p. 188).

Expatriate musicologist Trần Văn Khê played an activist role at the start of the ca trù revival era in the early 1990s, convincing authorities “that hát â đào represents a vital part of Vietnamese culture, that it is appreciated abroad, and that it has an important role to play in present and future Vietnamese musical performance” (Addiss,
Trần Văn Khê also played a key role bringing *ca trù* to wider international attention in the 1970s (as described in Section 6.1), and acted as an advisor in the preparatory stages of the UNESCO nomination (Trần V. K., personal interview with H. Schippers, 20 January 2007). Other notable externally-based researchers of *ca trù* have included former president of the French Ethnology Association Yves Defrance (Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, 2008b, 5:20-5:25), and Huib Schippers, director of Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre, whose first encounters with *ca trù* in 2006 led to the genre being profiled as a case study on the *Sustainable Futures* research, and even partly inspired that entire project (personal communication, 27 January 2011).

At an organisational level, various funding agencies have gone some way in supporting the *ca trù* community to achieve their short- and medium-term goals in relation to the transmission and promulgation of the genre. From 2006, the Centre of Educational Exchange with Vietnam (Centre of Educational Exchange with Vietnam, n.d.) sponsored a two-year youth training program for *ca trù*; in 2009 the Odon Vallet Scholarship Fund (founded by the France-based *Rencontres du Vietnam*) granted ten scholarships to students of Giáo Phường Ca Trù Thăng Long to support their living expenses and music studies (Phạm T. H., personal communication, 23 December 2010); and the Ford Foundation sponsored both the 2002 *ca trù* transmission program (described under Factor 1) and the 2005 national *ca trù* festival (Trần V. K., 2008, p. 35). Back in 1996, Ford Foundation had established a grant scheme supporting documentation and preservation of Vietnamese cultural traditions (Ford Foundation Vietnam, n.d., p. 13), but as a result of the global economic downturn, it closed its operations in Vietnam, including the grant scheme, in 2009.

Two non-governmental organisations in particular display a level of commitment to *ca trù* that moves beyond financial support. Through its program *Supporting Vietnamese Culture for Sustainable Development*, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) has supported collaboration and exchange between Vietnam National Academy of Music / Vietnamese Institute for Musicology and the Malmö Academy of Music (University of Lund, Sweden), which has included international exchanges, research collaborations, workshops and classes, and promotional projects for *ca trù*. Another significant organisational interest in *ca trù* is that of Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre (QCRC), which is investigating *ca trù* as a major case study for its project *Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures*. *Sustainable Futures* demonstrates potential to yield real outcomes that may bolster the viability of *ca trù*: in August 2010, in consultation with members of the *ca trù*
community, QCRC put forward a funding proposal to Norfund (Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries) for Ca Trù Vietnam (mentioned in Factor 5), a Hanoi-based tourist enterprise which aims to “ensure the intergenerational transmission of the genre without continuing dependence on external funding or state support” (QCRC, 2010, August, para. 1). The outcome of the proposal is pending at the time of writing.

The attitudes to the genre of relevant outsiders – individuals, funding bodies, and research institutes and other non-government organisations – are generally positive. In a circular way, outside interest (both individual and organisational) has been a source of pride and curiosity for the ca trù community, stimulating local interest in the genre (see Norton, 2009, pp. 13-14). However, the number of organisations that have demonstrated genuine and ongoing commitment to the viability of the genre is still relatively small, and most funding is granted on a non-substantive basis. Potential remains for more, and better, outsider support. Taking this into account, ca trù may be assigned a Grade 4 for this factor (see Table 6.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Relevant outsiders’ attitudes toward the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is very strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is moderate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Support of the music genre by relevant outsiders is absent altogether, or attitudes to the genre are adverse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 12: Amount and quality of documentation**

This factor relates to the extent and quality of documentation and research on ca trù, including written materials and recordings, as well as the accessibility of archived materials. As a form of documentation, the issue of notation is also addressed here.

The groundswell of interest in ca trù since the early 2000s and the intention to nominate ca trù to UNESCO’s Urgent Safeguarding List led to a flurry of documentation and research initiatives on the genre. Recent research into ca trù has drawn on temple engravings, epitaphs, family annals, stele, poetry compilations, instruments, guild contracts and photographs to try to reconstruct a history of the genre (e.g. Dinh, 2008; Nguyễn T. L., 2008; Trần T. K. A., 2008). In collaboration with researchers, provincial cultural government departments, and the local communities where ca trù exists, the Vietnamese Institute for Musicology now compiles and manages an annual inventory of ca trù heritage (including artists, dances, ca trù
activities, “vestiges,” objects, and written documentation). Đặng, Phạm and Hồ list 70 books, articles, and other resources relating to ca trù held at the library of the Institute in Hanoi (2008, pp. 657-662).

Nevertheless, knowledge about the history, repertoire, and musical practices of ca trù from the era before economic reform in the late 1980s remains relatively limited. Associated dance forms are poorly documented, and many of them have been lost altogether (notwithstanding some limited reconstruction based on the existing documentation). Some published research attempts a comprehensive account of aspects of existing knowledge, like Vũ Nhật Thăng’s musicological “grammar” of ca trù and itemisation and classification of its repertoire (2008). Some knowledge of the historical anecdotes and legends surrounding ca trù enrich understanding of the genre (outlined, for example, in Nguyễn X. D., 2008, pp. 13-14, 25-26). Archival ca trù recordings exist from as long ago as 1935 (Norton, 2005, p. 53), though in the early 1970s Addiss observed that the only one available was half an LP he himself made (1973, p. 28), and in the late 1990s Jähnichen lamented the lack of access to ca trù recordings older than 30 years (1997, p. 101).

Aside from the shortcomings of the historical documentation available on ca trù, researchers have also expressed concern over the imprecision and inaccuracy of recent research on the genre. Nguyễn Thụy Loan calls for great care when basing research on existing documentation, and even suggests a reappraisal of sources (2008, p. 280). She singles (p. 279) out the dubious quality of research in two ca trù issues of the Vietnamese Institute for Musicology Bulletin (2005a, 2005b), volumes that Wettermark describes as “at the best vague but in many cases contradictory and at times next to incomprehensible” (2010a, p. 24). Nguyễn pleads:

A person can be wrong. Many people can be wrong. However, in capacity of a government’s research organization, the Bulletin, and the Special issues on Ca trù of an Institute majoring in music researches, they should try to minimize the untrue informations [sic]. [This] is because when a national-level Institute gives information in such above special issues, many researchers will think that those have been appraised and are reliable informations. As a result, it will be good if those given informations are correct and vice versa. (2008, p. 280)

The very volume in which Nguyễn’s paper is published (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, et al., 2008) arguably exemplifies her concerns about the quality of documentation on ca trù. Many of its papers lack reference lists; important information such as the names of musicians in photographs is missing (e.g. pp. 160,
163-4); and the English translation is often unclear or dubious (witness one author’s hope that \(ca \text{ trù}\) be recognised as “immaterial heritage”; 2008, p. 242).

According to Norton, the only “indigenous” written notation for \(ca \text{ trù}\) is the characters (and their roman-script equivalents) for the vocal mnemonic system that exists for the \(đàn đáy\), as well as a verbal mnemonic system for the drum strokes; both are used in teaching (1996, p. 44). Although \(ca \text{ trù}\) remains orally transmitted, several musicians and scholars have devised or explored ways to notate it, most to a pedagogical end, like \(ca \text{ trù}\) singer Phó Thị Kim Đức – “so in the future if we need to teach we have something” (Phó T. K. D., personal interview with E. Wettermark, 5 July 2010). Phạm Thị Huệ found sol-fa notation of \(ca \text{ trù}\) helpful in her own learning (personal interview with H. Schippers, 17 January 2007). Both Norton and Addiss employ an adaptation of Western staff notation in their musical analyses (Addiss, 1992; Norton, 1996, 2005), and in collaboration with \(ca \text{ trù}\) musicians, Jähnichen worked out her own system of notation for practical and pedagogical purposes\(^5\) (1997, pp. 334-335). No standardised way to notate \(ca \text{ trù}\) exists, and no single system has been used to document the repertoire.

Plans to document what remains of \(ca \text{ trù}\) are extensive. The UNESCO nomination file states an ambition to audio and video-record “30 different musical forms of singing and 8 dances in \(ca \text{ trù}\) performed by 12 senior folk artists from 14 cities and provinces” in the coming years (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 7). Funds will also be put towards researching and publishing resources on \(ca \text{ trù}\) (2010-2015), including educational textbooks, musicological analyses, translation of prior research, a collection of \(ca \text{ trù}\) songs, and a DVD (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, pp. 7-8). It is intended that with the support of the Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, the collecting and systemising of materials will be completed within five years of the nomination (Ministry of Culture Sports and Tourism of Vietnam, 2009, p. 2).

In short, while the situation seems poised to improve in the short-term future, current documentation of \(ca \text{ trù}\) is of variable quality, and relative to the complete repertoire, history, and social practices of \(ca \text{ trù}\), its quantity is limited (Grade 2 in Table 6.12).

\(^5\) “Diese Notationsweise ist während der Feldforschungen von April bis Juni 1995 vor Ort mit den Musikern ausgewertet und für praktische und pädagogische Zwecke brauchbar befunden worden.”
Table 6.12 Amount and quality of documentation of ca trù

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of documentation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Documentation of the music genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superlative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abundant high-quality documentation exists in a range of formats, including audiovisual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate high-quality documentation exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate documentation exists in varying quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited documentation exists in varying quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Documentation is very limited or is of unusable quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Documentation is non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Conclusions

Overall, this case study assessment of *ca trù* according to the Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework (MVEF) points to a genre very strong in some ways, but that remains considerably weak in others. Figure 6.2 synthesises the findings of this chapter. From it, several conclusions may be drawn.

According to the MVEF assessment, *ca trù* performs well or very well in six out of the twelve factors in the vitality of a music genre. A very strong factor in its vitality is the change in the proportion of people engaged with it in recent years. *Ca trù* also displays strength in its development of new performance contexts, functions, and music practices over the last decade or so, and through the changes in the music itself. The attitudes held towards it – by government and institutions, by outsiders, and by its own community – are also generally positive for its vitality.

While *ca trù* displays moderate vitality through its response to media and industry and through the change in number of proficient musicians in the past five to ten years, it rates relatively poorly in three further factors: the strength of its intergenerational transmission; the accessibility of required knowledge and skills for creating, learning, teaching, and performing; and the amount and quality of its documentation. The single factor for which *ca trù* rated very poorly relates to the availability and accessibility of infrastructure and tangible resources. On no factor was *ca trù* completely non-vital.

Approaches suggested by researchers, officials, and activists to boost the vitality and viability of *ca trù* diverge vastly in nature, from those directed towards better organisation and management of *ca trù* activities, to greater media and public profiling of the genre, annual festivals, further research, supportive governmental regulations and policies, and professional music education and training (e.g. T. T. Nguyễn, 2008, pp. 306-307; Norton, 1996, pp. 91-92; Văn, 2008, pp. 209-210). It stands to reason (though it should not be uncritically assumed) that current and planned sustainability initiatives
Figure 6.2 Summative assessment of ca trù according to the Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework
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might most appropriately target the factors in musical vitality where the genre is weakest (that is, Factors 1, 7, 8, and 12). It is beyond my intention here to determine whether, or to what extent, this is currently the case, though this could be relatively easily done by cross-mapping the aims of those sustainability initiatives against the twelve factors of the MVEF, and inspecting the correlation.

The primary purpose of this chapter has been to demonstrate how the MVEF might work in practice, and to uncover some of the challenges of applying a pre-existing evaluative tool onto a distinct sociocultural, economic, and political environment. Although it by no means explores all the nuanced dynamics of ca trù, this case study underscores how the vitality of the genre interrelates in complex ways with modern-day realities in Vietnam. In the concluding chapter to this dissertation, I reflect in more general terms on the process of mapping these case study data onto the twelve pre-existing factors of the MVEF, and suggest in more depth how assessments like the one presented in this chapter might provide a knowledge-base on which may be built appropriate strategies supporting the sustainability of music genres like ca trù.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

In some ways, the prospects for fostering vibrant, viable music genres do not appear especially encouraging. Despite the extent of the threat to intangible expressions of culture across the world, public awareness of music endangerment remains limited, meaning that ideological and practical support for sustainability initiatives is not as readily available as it might otherwise be. Scholarly understanding of the issues, though growing, is incipient. The evidence presented in Chapter 1 of this dissertation suggests that meanwhile, many music genres, like many languages, continue to undergo rapid decline. Some of them are already lost altogether, despite (or sometimes without) their communities’ efforts to maintain them. The fast-changing global environment continues to present constant challenges and threats to the sustainability of particular music genres, and efforts to support them.

On the other hand, there are many indications that a positive shift is afoot. The body of research on music sustainability is growing, redolent of the surge of research into language endangerment and maintenance in the early 1990s. Local projects and initiatives are demonstrably bolstering the vitality of specific music genres around the world. Importantly too, many ethnomusicologists are keenly aware of the urgent need to actively support communities to keep their music strong. In a recent post to the Society for Ethnomusicology e-list, one scholar observed: “There are countless cultural traditions around the world – and close to home – that are dying with each passing minute. Let us agree to get ‘out there’ and do our part to keep them alive” (H. Chami, SEM List-Serv post, 12 June 2011). Another list member directly responded: “If there’s anything we have lost sight of, perhaps it is just this” (J. Cohen, SEM List-Serv post, 15 June 2011).

The role of ethnomusicologists in music sustainability has run as a recurring, but often implicit, theme through this dissertation. One of the key dilemmas facing ethnomusicologists in relation to sustainability seems to be how to resolve the tension (real or perceived) between local and global approaches. On the one hand, it makes sense for researchers to foreground the local in their work on music sustainability, since arguably “we can only really be knowledgeable about those places in which we’re doing our research. . . . Those are the spaces where there might be potential for us as researchers to be concerned about what’s challenging the musical environment” (T.
Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011). If this is so, ethnomusicologists engaging in the cause of music sustainability “can only really operate at a community level, because that enables close contact and really responding to what any particular musician wants at a particular moment in time. But we can’t think globally about musical sustainability, at least not very easily” (T. Ramnarine, personal interview, 16 March 2011).

On the other hand, a strong case can be made for ethnomusicologists to approach sustainability from a wider perspective than the local. The issue of limited human and financial resources for sustainability efforts has arisen at several points in this research, including the unlikelihood of ethnomusicologists being able to work with each and every endangered-music community that wishes for, and might benefit from, outsider support. The problem of resources is compounded by the fact that it is marginalised and disadvantaged communities that are most likely to be facing cultural pressures, yet also most likely to lack the resources or knowledge to be able to take matters into their own hands. The Australian context is an egregious example, where the few remaining Aboriginal ceremonial traditions are “so critically endangered that they will possibly not survive for more than another generation or two” (Marett, 2010, p. 253). The combination of these two factors – the extent of the problem and the limited resources available to remedy it – leads Kartomi to believe that, at the wide-scale at least, “sustainability is just too hard, because there’s too few of us to do it” (personal interview, 21 October 2010).

This is only true in the most general sense, however, and it does not mean that nothing can or should be done to support endangered music genres. One argument that runs as a thread through this research is that a strategic, co-ordinated approach to sustainability efforts may maximise outcomes. Rather than working on a reactive basis, adopting a proactive, co-ordinated approach to sustainability is more likely to strengthen the collective visibility and impact of locally-based efforts, while minimising the adverse effect of limited resources. In this way, sustainability efforts may be carried forward simultaneously at the grassroots and the wider regional, transnational, or even international levels. Various possibilities for communicating widely the experiences gained from grassroots initiatives, for collaborating and sharing ideas, and for supporting “good practice” in music sustainability initiatives have been explored in this dissertation, such as the ethical guidelines and models, research hubs, and resource networks raised in Chapter 4. Some of these arise again in the recommendations for action later in this chapter. In this way, this research points to the benefit of a new,
integrated approach to music sustainability that holds the greatest promise for the future of endangered music genres.

7.1 Research outcomes

In this research, I propose a number of specific ways in which language maintenance has the potential to inform efforts to support music sustainability. From this overarching aim arose the four key objectives of the research, restated below verbatim from Chapter 1. In this section I summarise how the research has achieved these four objectives.

Objective 1: To identify and appraise the range of current theory and practice relating to the vitality and viability of music genres.

In this section I summarise how the research has achieved these four objectives.

In Chapter 2, four main themes were identified relating to theory of music sustainability: globalisation and musical diversity, musical transculturation and change, music revivals, and ecological models for sustainability. I also described a range of practical sustainability initiatives, grouped into five categories: documentation and preservation, recognition and celebration, transmission and dissemination, policy and enterprise, and co-ordinating and evaluating mechanisms.

In the discussion, I proposed that the field of music sustainability displays a number of strengths at both the theoretical and practical levels. Theoretical frameworks exist to describe processes of musical transculturation, change, and revival, as well as musical diversity and the effect of globalisation on “small” music genres. Ecological models give insight into the dynamics of cultural sustainability. Ethical principles in undertaking applied ethnomusicological research are keenly understood and foregrounded within the discipline. Recent projects on music sustainability signal a disciplinary readiness to actively engage with the issues. A number of successful strategies hold promise to inform future sustainability efforts (particularly in relation to documentation and archiving, festivals, and transmission). Finally, a number of non-music-specific mechanisms help co-ordinate and monitor sustainability efforts, such as UNESCO’s various schemes in support of safeguarding cultural heritage.

The discussion in Chapter 2 also identified five areas of current theory and practice of music sustainability that would benefit substantially from further development: 1) the need for a systematic way to identify and assess endangerment; 2) the need to develop advocacy arguments for music sustainability efforts; 3) the need to develop understanding of effective approaches to maintenance and revitalisation; 4) the
need to critically reflect on possible unexpected or equivocal outcomes of sustainability efforts; and 5) the need to develop music-specific measures that co-ordinate and carry forward music sustainability efforts. Many of these areas already have some basis in the ethnomusicological literature and practice. I also suggested in Chapter 2 that an understanding of the threats to the viability of specific music genres would be crucial in order to develop appropriate and feasible sustainability strategies for those genres. These threats include some that are likely to fall beyond the immediate control of researchers or communities, such as the potentially adverse impact on community music practices of mass media or commercial enterprises, overpowering political or legislative forces, and limited funding and resources for cultural maintenance initiatives.

Objective 2: To identify the similarities and differences between music and languages in relation to their vitality and viability.

Founded on a careful analysis of the synergies and disjunctions between languages and music in relation to factors in their vitality and viability, Chapter 3 resulted in a Comparative Framework relating the two (summarised in Table 3.1). The framework revealed many parallels between language and music in relation to their vitality and viability. A close relationship obtains, for example, between the vitality of both a music genre and a language and the attitudes of the community towards it. For both languages and music, the effect of socioeconomic and political circumstances on vitality can be substantial, and sustainability efforts themselves can sometimes have a profound impact on their vitality (whether adverse or beneficial). Language and music also share certain core characteristics in relation to the processes of their transmission.

The Comparative Framework also highlighted a number of areas where language maintenance is less likely to be able to appositely inform research into music sustainability. Considerable differences between the sustainability of languages and music genres include the social functions each serves, the social contexts within which each is typically located, and the role of industry and commerce in their vitality. These dissimilarities needed to be taken into account throughout this research, since, as Nettl has observed:

Uncritical attempts to use methods from linguistics at random on music often fail; the similarities between music and language are important, but the two differ in essence and at many levels. . . . [T]aking what is helpful . . . and leaving what is not seems more hopeful than the insistence on analogy. (2005, pp. 310-311)
By identifying the similarities and disconnects between language and music sustainability, the *Comparative Framework* forms the foundation for understanding the theoretical and pragmatic ways in which language maintenance may – and probably cannot – inform approaches to maintaining and revitalising music genres.

**Objective 3: To propose some ways in which theoretical and practical approaches to language maintenance and revitalisation may help repair the key gaps and weaknesses of current approaches for music.**

In Chapter 4, I proposed a number of concrete ways in which theory and practice of language maintenance may help inform ways to address a number of key gaps and weaknesses of current approaches to music sustainability (as identified in Chapter 2). First, a range of tools from language maintenance were explored that might serve as models for assessing music endangerment, including UNESCO’s *Language Vitality and Endangerment* framework. Second, I presented a number of approaches to (and arguments from) advocacy for language maintenance, and suggested how recourse to these may be useful for music sustainability. Third, I offered some examples of linguists’ theories about successful language maintenance strategies, argued that further development of theory by ethnomusicologists would refine knowledge about the desirable preconditions for successful music sustainability strategies, and proposed some likely preconditions based on theory from language maintenance. Fourth, I explored how linguists approach the dilemmas of the inefficacy and unexpected outcomes of language maintenance strategies, and suggested that their approaches may help ethnomusicologists define realistic aims and outcomes of music sustainability strategies. Finally, I argued that specific co-ordinating mechanisms for language maintenance represent potentially valuable prototypes and infrastructure for music-specific co-ordinating mechanisms. Language maintenance thus demonstrated potential to inform all five issues in music sustainability under consideration in that chapter.

The discussion in Chapter 4 also indicated that ethnomusicology might benefit not only from dialogue with the theoretical, philosophical, and practical experience of linguists, but also from the ethical discourse surrounding language maintenance. Ethical issues presenting to the researcher in the “endangered” field, the critical role of outsider constructs in sustainability efforts, the array of attitudes to tradition and authenticity, and perspectives on the various “failures” and unexpected outcomes of language maintenance activities all provide roadmaps for those working to support music sustainability. Also instructive is the vigour and commitment of linguists (and culture-
bearers themselves) in the face of the significant challenges – suggesting that efforts to sustain endangered music genres might need to be approached with a similar “pessimism of the intellect and optimism of the will” (to echo Gramsci’s famous words; 1929 / 1989, p. 159).

**Objective 4: To provide a concrete example of how theory from the field of language maintenance could be adapted for use with music.**

Part II of this dissertation developed and illustrated a methodology for assessing musical vitality, based on an existing methodology for assessing language vitality. It therefore provides a concrete example of how language maintenance theory may be adapted for use with music. The *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework* (MVEF) presented in Chapter 5 represents the first systematic, fully replicable means of identifying and assessing the vitality of any music genre. Assessing a genre according to the twelve factors of the MVEF leads to an understanding of its overall vitality, as well as specific factors that may be contributing to its endangerment. Deploying this single methodology will enable vitality comparisons to be made between genres, which until now have been difficult or even impossible. For the first time, the MVEF also provides a way to measure trends in music vitality over time. In these ways, it represents a significant contribution to research into ways to sustain endangered music genres.

In Chapter 6, I employed the MVEF to assess the level of vitality of a specific music genre, Vietnamese *ca trù*, by appraising its strength against each of the MVEF’s twelve factors. While the nuanced representation of the vitality of *ca trù* generated by the case study indicates strong potential for employing the MVEF in other contexts, the process of applying a single evaluative framework to a diversity of cultural, social, economic, political, and geographic circumstances is likely to generate challenges. With this in mind, specific recommendations for further implementing the MVEF are made in the next section.

### 7.2 Recommendations for action

This section makes six recommendations for future efforts in the field of music sustainability. I have already argued that despite the existence of many local projects aiming to support the vitality of specific music genres, the limited co-ordinated response to musical endangerment heightens the risk of reinventing the wheel, with a concomitant waste of energy, knowledge, and resources. For this reason, these
suggestions emphasise consolidated response to musical endangerment, and particularly creating synergies between stakeholders across the world (including communities themselves).

All six recommendations flow directly from the discussion in Chapter 4, which examined ways in which the field of language maintenance may help progress music sustainability efforts (and in that way represents the core of this dissertation). Distilling that discussion into a set of recommendations results in a possible line of action for supporting efforts in the area of music sustainability. The first recommendation (see below) has already been realised in Part II of this dissertation; systematically implementing the others over the next five years would seem a worthwhile investment in the cause of endangered music genres. These are the recommendations:

1. **Develop a tool**, building on current knowledge of factors in music sustainability, that permits systematic identification and assessment of situations of musical endangerment, suitable for use across the range of global contexts. The need for such a tool was established in Chapter 4.1: it could help identify endangered genres, help determine the extent of global musical endangerment, increase knowledge of the factors contributing to endangerment, enable appropriate response strategies to be developed and evaluated, and enable better monitoring of changes in vitality. Part II of this dissertation represents one possible realisation of this recommendation: the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework*, developed in Chapter 5 and illustrated in Chapter 6.

2. **Undertake a scoping study** to advance knowledge of the extent of musical endangerment globally (using a vitality assessment tool like the MVEF, and a methodology such as the survey-questionnaire provided in Appendix E), realised with the input of experienced ethnomusicologists with strong regional expertise and networks. This recommendation arises from Chapter 4.2a, where it was noted that existing knowledge about music endangerment remains relatively piecemeal.

3. **Implement a public advocacy initiative** on a continuing basis, with the aim of promoting general awareness of the extent, causes, and consequences of musical endangerment. In Chapter 4.2a, I argued that public awareness and support for the cause of music sustainability will play an important role in the success of efforts to counter endangerment.
4. Within the discipline of ethnomusicology, **promote the need for consolidated response** to the situation of musical endangerment, for example through training and education, conferences, workshops, and published research. This recommendation stems from Chapter 4.2b, where I argued that scholarly action and activism has been a critical part of language maintenance successes, and that the same is likely to hold for music.

5. **Establish a music-specific resource network** to act as an international hub for knowledge and resources about strategies and approaches that support endangered music genres. This initiative is already in development as a part of the *Sustainable Futures* project, and a number of resource networks relating to cultural and linguistic sustainability already exist. In Chapter 4.5, I proposed that a music-specific resource network would help maximise effective use of energy, resources, and experience in music sustainability.

6. **Develop an independent, international non-profit foundation** to support the sustainability of endangered music genres, building on and consolidating (for music) the work already carried out in this area by organisations such as UNESCO. This recommendation stems from Chapter 4.5, where I argued that a music-specific body for sustainability could serve to monitor, evaluate, co-ordinate and carry forward music sustainability efforts at an international level.

These recommendations flow into each other; in fact, all six could be implemented progressively. Figure 7.1 represents only one of several possible orders of implementation. While some steps logically precede others, the final two steps may be reasonably reversed, for example; Recommendations 3 and 4 may be undertaken simultaneously; and the resource network (Recommendation 5) could be set up at any time. As each step is implemented, its processes and outcomes will inform approaches to implementing later steps. I wish to comment at more length specifically on Recommendation 2, partly because it is the next step for implementation; but also because Part II of this dissertation raised certain fundamental questions relating to it, but did not explicitly address them. Recommendation 2 suggests undertaking a scoping study on musical endangerment, using an assessment tool like the MVEF.
Figure 7.1. Example flowchart of recommendations arising from the research

1. **Develop a tool** for identifying music endangerment

2. **Undertake a scoping study** on the extent of music endangerment

3. **Implement a public advocacy initiative** to promote general awareness

4. **Promote the need for consolidated response** among ethnomusicologists

5. **Establish a music-specific resource network** on sustainability

6. **Develop an independent, international non-profit foundation**
   to support music sustainability

As described in Chapter 5, the MVEF is based on the UNESCO *Language Vitality and Endangerment* framework. In order to collect data using that framework, UNESCO developed it into questionnaire format (UNESCO, 2009c), which linguists took into the field and fill out in collaboration with community members. While data obtained in this way have progressed understanding of the extent and severity of global language endangerment (informing updates to UNESCO’s landmark *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger of Disappearing*, for example), linguists have expressed various reservations about it. One criticism is that questionnaire format does not reveal the true complexity of a situation, ignoring (for example) that respondents’ own claims about their language reflect “the ideological and political positions that players in the language game are playing” (P. Austin, personal interview, 16 June 2010). Another is that a questionnaire format risks people over- or under-estimating their own language skills or usage (P. Austin, personal interview, 16 June 2010). A third potential concern (raised by...
Ramnarine in relation to music) is that it will be difficult for outsiders to gauge the changes in vitality of a music genre based on data gathered at any one point in time:

I think it’s very difficult for a researcher to enter a music scene at a particular moment and then talk about whether or not it needs to be sustained, or what the situation of the tradition is – because researchers don’t necessarily have that longer-term perspective . . . . [W]hat you determine might be happening might not be what’s happening at all. (personal interview, 16 March 2011)

There are two possible responses to these concerns about method in undertaking vitality assessments. One is for a researcher to spend an extended period of time with a community to come to a thorough understanding of the situation at hand, including political and other non-cultural dimensions. Austin argues that what is needed is “really sound ethnography of the context, so that you can understand what’s happening and also what people think is happening, and what their political views are, what their ideological positions are” (personal interview, 16 June 2010). Sallabank concurs:

A lot depends on how you do a survey, on how well you do a survey. There’s this issue in documentary linguistics of what they call “FI-FO” linguistics: “fly-in, fly-out” linguists. My point of view would be you have to work with the community for a long time, and to do ethnographic work in order to get their confidence, to really know what’s happening with the language. If you take peoples’ reports, self-reports, other reports, at face value, you might not have an accurate [assessment]. (personal interview, 17 June 2010)

While long-term ethnographic work is perhaps most likely to yield accurate data on sustainability, a considerable disadvantage of this approach is that it demands the total and extended devotion of one researcher within a single community. Given the extent of cultural endangerment, the urgency to remedy it, and the limited human and financial resources to do so, this is a significant drawback. This again underscores the importance of collaboration, as well as of lobbying governments, funding agencies, and other stakeholders for support to undertake high-quality research on music sustainability.

In situations where a community wishes to engage in co-ordinated sustainability efforts but lacks a researcher to work with it, an alternative methodology may be to empower the community to undertake its own assessments of musical vitality, using a questionnaire as basis. The training that may be needed for communities to carry out assessments (and to ensure data are comparable across contexts) might be realised in a number of ways: by running local or regional workshops and/or providing online
guidance, for example. Building the capacity of communities to undertake their own music vitality assessments is likely to cost far less than the alternative of researchers carrying out extensive fieldwork within individual communities. It is also likely to expand the possible scope of research by obviating the need for scholarly expertise to gather data: “the musicians know better than anybody else what the issues that they’re facing are” (A. Seeger, personal interview, 22 March 2011). Perhaps most importantly of all, it prioritises the ethical principle of the “First Voice” (Galla, 2008), drawing on the community’s own human resources and skills to undertake the assessment.

In Recommendation 2 above, I proposed that such a scoping study assessing musical endangerment be realised with the involvement of experienced ethnomusicologists with strong regional expertise and networks. In relation to this community-driven methodology, the possible roles of ethnomusicologists include informing communities of the nature and extent of the study; acting as primary point of contact with (and between) communities; organising and facilitating community access to training and resources; and receiving back the questionnaire data, which would then feed back into the wider scoping study at a regional and eventually international level.

One of the challenges of carrying out a survey in this way (that is, where the community undertakes its own assessments) will be gauging and ensuring, as far as possible, the reliability of the responses. Even with careful instruction, communities are likely to interpret the questionnaire in different ways, and Austin’s point about answers harbouring political stances still pertains. To minimise anomalous responses and maximise the reliability of the survey, wherever possible it would be advisable for both communities and “outsiders” to carry out the questionnaire – outsiders (ethnomusicologists, anthropologists, or others with a deep knowledge of the social and cultural context) basing their responses on their understanding of the situation combined with data gathered through any other means (e.g. literature survey, participant observation, or interviews). This dual-survey method would be particularly important in the preliminary phases of a scoping study: the moderation it would permit between the data gathered by “insiders” and “outsiders” could help identify significant divergences between responses, and allow for subsequent adjustments to the survey methodology (such as training processes or the survey method itself), as necessary.

Bearing in mind these complex methodological considerations in undertaking a scoping study, Appendix E provides a possible adaptation for music of UNESCO’s questionnaire.
7.3 Recommendations for further research

According to Rice, developing ethnomusicological theory involves conversations – at a minimum, conversations among ethnomusicologists (2010, p. 106). He argues in favour of critically engaging with prior research, applying it in new ways, adapting, and expanding it, believing that “it is through conversations of this sort (theorizing in this manner, that is) that we build the intellectual capacity of ethnomusicology to make powerful, provocative, memorable, and insightful statements about the particular musical traditions we study and about music in general” (p. 106). It is in Rice’s spirit of sustained argumentation and interdisciplinary conversation that I wish my research to be positioned and understood, and suggest that future research into music sustainability consider also deploying a spirit of dialogue.

A number of specific recommendations for further research flow from the discussion in previous chapters. In Chapter 4.3, I briefly described certain language maintenance strategies that demonstrate high potential to act as models for specific music sustainability strategies, like language nests and master-apprentice programs. I argued that such models would need to be tailored to suit specific local conditions, and that a preliminary analysis of the possible ways to adapt these strategies for music is warranted. The Comparative Framework could assist in that analysis. This exercise would carry forward the outcomes of this present study, and may engender valuable new insights into ways to approach music sustainability.

In Chapter 4, I examined how language maintenance might advance five salient issues in music sustainability (namely, those identified in Chapter 2 as requiring particular consideration). Given the demonstrated relevance of language maintenance to these issues, it seems likely that language maintenance may be able to inform music sustainability in other ways too. Theoretical frameworks from language maintenance, for example, might help advance knowledge of the interrelationship between people’s music-related practices, beliefs, and ideologies (e.g. Spolsky, 2005, p. 2155); ecolinguistic models may help elucidate the relationship between music, people, and the natural environment; and experience from language maintenance may shed light on possible ways to negotiate political or social challenges when implementing maintenance strategies. These are just three examples chosen at random; further investigation of the possibilities is strongly indicated.

This research has examined only those potential efforts towards music sustainability that have precedent in language maintenance (successful or unsuccessful, direct or indirect). As such, it has explored only a sub-set of the possible ways forward
for supporting endangered music genres. Language maintenance is not the only field of study that may inform music sustainability, and future research might consider challenging other interdisciplinary boundaries. Rice observes that “ethnomusicologists often reference theory from outside the discipline for the authority and interdisciplinarity it appears to give to their work, but it is rarely the object of sustained argumentation” (2010, p. 101), and Pettan suggests that ethnomusicologists “should keep being open towards various disciplines for other concepts or ideas that can help us to work with more theoretical, more founded, bases” (personal interview, 30 July 2010).

From the preceding chapters, it seems that biocultural diversity and ecology are two fields of study holding particular promise to inform music sustainability. There may be high return on investment in examining these and other fields for their relevance to music sustainability.

As music-related investigations grow, ethnomusicological research into sustainability may reciprocally feed back to inform the field of language maintenance. In Chapter 2, for example, I suggested that substantial research already exists into the interactions between music genres and the mass media and industry. While the Comparative Framework underscored the fact that these entities play a more critical part in the sustainability of music than of languages, music-related research on this aspect of sustainability may signal their important functions in cultural, or specifically linguistic, sustainability. More generally, new applied strategies to support music sustainability may in turn lead to new perspectives on language maintenance efforts. This is another argument in favour of cultivating ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue between ethnomusicologists and linguists.

One final recommendation relates to neither language nor music directly. This research has demonstrated that language maintenance has strong potential to inform music-related efforts towards sustainability. It is therefore not unreasonable to suspect that with further research, language maintenance may be able to inform ways to sustain other cultural expressions too. Theatre, dance, ceremony, oral story-telling and other intangible cultural expressions all may benefit. Each of these expressions undoubtedly has unique characteristics with regard to the dynamics of their vitality and viability. Yet now that this research has set in motion an exchange of knowledge from language to music, the path is facilitated for expansion into exchanges of knowledge about sustainability across the range of intangible expressions of culture. These kinds of exchanges could advance knowledge of cultural sustainability at large, as well as
acknowledge and do justice to the interdependence of the manifold forms of intangible cultural expressions, described in Chapter 1.2.

Our track record in stewardship of cultures and cultural expressions has been less than ideal:

The truth is, the twentieth century three hundred years from now is not going to be remembered for its wars or its technological innovations, but rather as the era in which we stood by and either actively endorsed or passively accepted the massive destruction of both biological and cultural diversity on the planet. (Davis, 2003, 14:31-14:46)

If the twenty-first century is to signal a marked change, the time for action is now. Linguists and biocultural diversity researchers are fully aware of the urgency of counteracting endangerment, and recognise that “the need for more research in the future should not be a deterrent for taking action in the present” (Maffi & Woodley, 2010, p. 178). Since for many music genres the predicament is similarly pressing, it is desirable that the action-based recommendations of Section 7.3 be explored in tandem with, or even in advance of, the various avenues for research presented in this section.

I hope this research provides impetus for developing a new direction in music sustainability research: a direction that finds inspiration in drawing from outside of itself, in challenging and expanding its existing boundaries, and in continually reassessing what this implies for the music it aims to support. In this way, I hope this study might contribute to ethnomusicological action, driven by equitable and rewarding collaborations between communities and other stakeholders, that fully embraces the range of possibilities for maintaining and strengthening endangered music genres. I wish to close with the words of ethnomusicologist Pettan, reflecting on an applied ethnomusicology project with which he was involved: “It really made change, and for me it was one of the greatest pleasures of my work, because it was not research for the sake of research, but I could really see that it changed human conditions for the better” (personal interview, 30 July 2010). With similar sentiments, by helping communities and individuals reap the benefits that flow from vibrant musical expressions, I hope this research might ultimately – however modestly – help make a difference.
GLOSSARY

This glossary defines terms as I use them in this dissertation. In several cases, other definitions exist that conflict with the definition provided. Where a term is commonly employed in the literature in more than one way, or is particularly contentious, this is briefly noted.

Community: With regard to music, either a group of people who share their music culture (or a given music genre) by virtue of their common geographical, cultural or ethnic background; or a “community of practice” (Wood & Judikis, 2002, p. 12): a group of people bound together first and foremost by their musical practice and interests.

In general, “any group of individuals who share something, anything, in common, and consider themselves to have some allegiance to each other as a result” (Graves, 2005, p. 25); hence, music community and speech community.

Culture: “The set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or social group . . . it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs” (UNESCO, 2001b, introduction). Culture is socially transmitted (Smith, 2001, p. 96).

Social anthropologists, ethnomusicologists, and linguists have noted that cultures are partly theoretical constructs, since there are no “neatly bound and mutually exclusive bodies of thought and custom, perfectly shared by all who subscribe to them” (Cocks, 2006, p. 6).

Cultural diversity: “The manifold ways in which the cultures of groups and societies find expression. . . . Cultural diversity is made manifest not only through the varied ways in which the cultural heritage of humanity is expressed, augmented and transmitted through the variety of cultural expressions, but also through diverse modes of artistic creation, production, dissemination, distribution and enjoyment, whatever the means and technologies used” (UNESCO, 2005a, Article 4).

Documentation: Language documentation involves “collecting linguistic, socio-linguistic and cultural data, including audio, video and text materials to create a corpus which can then serve as a resource to be used [by] educators and others” (Austin, 2006, p. 8). By analogy, documentation of music
genres may be defined as collecting musical, socio-
musical and cultural data in a similar way and for a
similar purpose.

Among other things, documentation is an approach to,
and a facet of, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage
(UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.3).

**Endangered:**

Under threat of extinction (UNESCO, 2003b, p. 2); this
does not necessarily imply the inevitability of extinction.
Various frameworks attempt to identify and measure
endangerment of intangible cultural heritage, such as
UNESCO’s *Language Vitality and Endangerment
Framework* (2003b). For music genres, the *Five Domains
of Musical Sustainability in Contemporary Contexts*
(Schippers, 2010, pp. 180-181) forms a tool that broadly
indicates factors influencing vitality or endangerment,
though it does not provide a means to measure them.

**Globalisation:**

In this dissertation, “the intensification of worldwide
social relations which link distant localities in such a way
that local happenings are shaped by events occurring
many miles away and vice versa” (Giddens, 1990, p. 64).

**Indigenous:**

Refers to peoples “who have historical continuity with
pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that have
developed on their own territories, and who consider
themselves distinct from other sectors of society now
prevailing in those territories, or part of them. They form
at present non-dominant sectors of society and are
determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future
generations their ancestral territories, their ethnic identity,
as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in
accordance with their own cultural patterns, social
institutions and legal systems” (Convention on Biological
Diversity as in Cocks, 2006, p. 4).

In the context of this research, then, an *indigenous
language* is the ancestral (traditional/heritage) language of
an indigenous people; an *indigenous music culture* is the
ancestral music culture of an indigenous people. These
definitions have their challenges (for further discussion,
see Oviedo, Maffi, & Larsen, 2000; Reyhner, et al., 1999;
Reyhner & Lockard, 2009; Walsh, 2005; Wilcox & Duin,
1995). Walsh concedes that a “precise definition remains
elusive” (2005, p. 294).

**Intangible cultural heritage:** “The practices, representations, expressions, knowledge,
skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and
cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities,
groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part
of their cultural heritage” (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.1).
According to the UNESCO Convention, intangible cultural heritage is manifested in the following domains, among others: “(a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; (b) performing arts; (c) social practices, rituals and festive events; (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; (e) traditional craftsmanship” (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.2).

**Language maintenance:**

The standard umbrella term for efforts to maintain and revitalise languages (e.g. Bradley & Bradley, 2002; Edwards, 1992; Janse & Tol, 2003). Sometimes, the term is used to refer specifically to efforts directed towards languages still spoken by all or most members of a community, as opposed to efforts directed towards “weaker” languages (for which terms like *revitalisation*, *revival*, *restoration*, *renewal* or similar may be used) (Amery, 2002; Ash, Fermino, & Hale, 2001; Wurm, 1998).

In this document, unless specified otherwise, the term refers to the field of study that encompasses efforts to maintain and revitalise a language.

**Language shift:**

The process of an individual or a group moving from the use of one language to another (Crystal, 2000, p. 17). Romaine identifies *language shift* as occurring when one language intrudes on the territory of another, resulting in a loss of both speakers and domains in which a language is used (2007, p. 117).

**Linguistic diversity:**

In the context of this document (and in much of the literature on endangered languages and language maintenance), a plurality of languages. Nettle names this *linguistic diversity*, and identifies two further types of linguistic diversity: *phylogenetic diversity* (the variation in the number of lineages of languages), and *structural diversity* (variation in the structure of languages) (1999). See also *musical diversity*.

**Minority:**

A group of people “distinguishable from the dominant group for cultural, ethnic, social, religious, or economic reasons” (International Council for Traditional Music, 2009). Note that majority groups too may be custodians of endangered music genres and languages; also, that the term *minority* is sometimes statistically inaccurate (in the Navajo nation, for example, Navajos are in fact the numerical majority; McCarty, 2002).

A *minority language* is the language of a group “that is usually demographically smaller and often considered to
be of lesser socioeconomic status vis-à-vis its more demographically dominant or socio-politically more privileged neighbours (Batibo 1992, Mekacha 1996)” (Batibo, 2001, p. 323, note 3). By extension, a minority music culture may be defined as the music culture of such a group.

Rather than coining the parallel but potentially misleading term minority music genre to refer to a genre that is part of a minority music culture, I often loosely refer to “small” music genres, by virtue of their non-dominance (culturally, socially, demographically, or otherwise). Nettl describes these genres as “belonging to the weak end of power distribution” (2005, p. 168).

| Music culture: | A society’s total involvement with music, including sounds, concepts, social interactions, and materials (Cooley, 1997, p. 4, after Slobin & Titon, 1992). |
| Music genre: | A discrete musical tradition or form, such as ca trù of northern Vietnam, or the Yawulyu ceremonial songs of the Australian Aboriginal Warlpiri. Boundaries between one music genre and another can be difficult to define. The music culture of a people inevitably comprises more than a single music genre. |
| Musical diversity: | In keeping with the primary usage of the term by Letts (2006), a plurality of music genres. Other types of musical diversity exist (cf. Nettle’s tripartite definition of linguistic diversity, 1999, which may usefully be transferred to music). |
| Revitalisation: | Language revitalisation most commonly refers to efforts to halt or reverse language loss within a community (Hinton & Hale, 2001, p. 5); it is often contrasted with documentation, which primarily aims to collect, record, archive, or preserve it. At other times, the term is contrasted with maintenance, so that the latter refers to efforts directed towards relatively strong languages, while revitalisation refers to “weaker” languages. |
| Safeguarding: | “Measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the |
revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage” (UNESCO, 2003a, Article 2.3).

“Small” music genre: See Minority.

Sustainability: With regard to music, and in the context of this document, sustainability refers to the ability of a music genre to endure, without implying its preservation in an unchanging form.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW MATERIAL

This appendix contains materials relating to the interviews drawn on for this research. It comprises (1) metadata about the interviews, and (2) a list of sample interview questions.

A1. Interview metadata

These are the thirteen semi-structure interviews I conducted for this research (those marked with an asterisk related specifically to the Chapter 6 ca trà case study):

Campbell, Patricia. Personal interview. Brisbane, 4 March 2010.
Kartomi, Margaret. Personal interview. Melbourne, 22 October 2010.
Schrag, Brian. Personal interview. Hanoi, 30 July 2010.

The duration of these interviews ranged from approximately 30 minutes to 140 minutes. All interviewees consented to audio recordings being made of the interviews; some also agreed to make these recordings publicly available, for example through the Sustainable Futures digital repository (in development at the time of writing).

In addition to these interviews, the Chapter 6 ca trà case study drew on a further seven interviews conducted by other researchers for the project Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures:


Where consent was given, recordings of these interviews will also be made available, in due course, through the Sustainable Futures digital repository.

A2. Sample list of interview questions

A set of questions was prepared for each interview, which took into account the informant’s background in relation to the research. The questions were tailored according to the experiences and interests of each informant, for example through reference to specific research projects, practical initiatives, or publications. In several cases the prepared questions acted simply as a loose guide in directing the interview. What follows is a sample of some general interview questions, for both linguists and ethnomusicologists.

- Can you tell me about a specific language maintenance project you’ve been involved with? OR Can you tell me about a specific project you’ve been involved with that relates to a music genre facing challenges to its vitality or viability?
  - What were its aims (e.g. documentation / revitalisation / identification)?
  - What approach did it take (e.g. widening functions; creating contexts; furthering research)?
  - What mechanisms did it use (e.g. community events; resource development; surveys)?
  - How successful was it in achieving its aims?
  - Were there any things you would recommend be done differently?

- In general, what is your opinion on current approaches (at a global level) to supporting endangered languages? OR “small” music genres?
• How do you think those approaches could be improved?
  (e.g. further research / better frameworks / standardisation of practice / centralised resource networks / other)

• [For linguists:] Do you have any general comments or criticisms on the UNESCO Language Vitality Framework?
  (e.g. real-world relevance / ability to implement / suggestions for modification)

• [For linguists, and ethnomusicologists after introducing UNESCO’s Framework:] Do you think the UNESCO Language Vitality Framework, or aspects of it, might be adapted for use with other forms of cultural expression, like music?
  In which way(s) / why not?

• Are there any [other] ways in which the field of language maintenance might be informative for helping endangered music genres?
  (e.g. theoretical frameworks / practical experience / research)
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Ethical clearance (Human expedited review 1 / Human ER1) for this research was granted through Griffith University on 23 April 2009 (Protocol number QCM/04/09/HREC), and two minor amendments were approved during the course of the project. This research was conducted in full accordance with the approved protocol.

This appendix contains two informed consent packages, each consisting of an information sheet and a consent form: (1) for interviewees who spoke English as a native language, and (2) for interviewees who spoke English as a second or other language.
**Purpose**

The aim of this research is to assess how approaches for safeguarding endangered languages can inform safeguarding of endangered music cultures.

**Why this research is being conducted**

This research is part of a doctorate that is concerned with exploring how approaches to safeguarding languages might be able to inform best practice for safeguarding endangered music cultures. It links with the major five-year project *Sustainable futures for music cultures: Towards an ecology of musical diversity*, conducted by Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre in partnership with the Music Council of Australia and UNESCO-International Music Council.

**What you will be asked to do**

You will be asked to participate in an interview about your views or understanding of (an aspect of) the research topic. You may be asked about your experience with an endangered culture, your opinions about safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, aspects of your knowledge of a particular language or music culture, and other similar topics. The length of the interview will be agreed upon by you and the researcher.

**Why you have been selected**

You have been selected because you have expertise in safeguarding cultural heritage, knowledge of a music culture or a language that is endangered, or because you have other expertise that will inform the research. Ethnomusicologists, language safeguarding experts, fieldworkers, academics, representatives of non-government organisations, and other persons with expertise in the safeguarding of language, music, or intangible cultural heritage may be selected to participate in this project.

**Benefits**

Your participation in this research contributes to data that will eventually, it is hoped, inform best practice as to how to safeguard endangered music cultures. Individual benefits are minimal; however, your participation is invaluable, and appreciated.
Risks to you
Risks associated with participation in this project are minimal. The questions you will be asked will generally be non-contentious and will not touch on sensitive matters of cultural heritage. You may, however, decline to answer any question, or to request that your response to any question be treated confidentially. If you wish, you will have the option not to be identified in the final report.

Your confidentiality
If you agree, your interview will be audio- or video-recorded. The recording will be used for research purposes only, and will be destroyed once its contents are transcribed. Before any publication or dissemination of results of this research, text transcripts from your interview that will be used in the reports will be made available to you for checking and approval.

You will be identified in the research reports and publications. However, if for any reason you would prefer any or all of your comments to be kept confidential, your identity will not be revealed. All data will be securely stored within the Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre for a minimum of five years, and then destroyed. Computer access to all data will be restricted by password.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. Your decision to participate or not will not prejudice you in any way. If you do decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue your involvement at any time.

Questions and further information
I am happy to answer any questions you may have at this time. If you subsequently have any queries, please contact either the research team member Catherine Grant, or the primary investigator Huib Schippers. Contact details are on the front of this sheet.

The ethical conduct of this research
Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on (07) 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

Feedback
A two-page summary of the research outcomes will be sent to all participants upon completion of the research. This summary will include details of how to access more comprehensive research results, should you wish.

Privacy statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at www.gu.edu.au/ua/aa/vc/pp or telephone (07) 3735 5585.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Research team member
Catherine Grant
PhD Candidate
Queensland Conservatorium
Griffith University
Ph: (07) 3735 6345
Email: Catherine.Grant@griffith.edu.au

Primary investigator
Prof Huib Schippers
Director,
Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre
Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University
Ph: (07) 3735 6131
Email: H.Schippers@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet, and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will involve participation in an interview or consultation relating to the safeguarding of languages and/or music cultures;
- I consent to being identified in the research results (if yes, tick the box):
- I consent to my interview/consultation being recorded:
- I consent to the recording being made publicly available, after I check it:
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on (07) 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project; and
- I agree to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B2. Informed consent package – non-native English speakers

Strengthening the Vitality and Viability of Endangered Music Genres:
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INFORMATION SHEET

What I am doing in this research
In this research, I (Catherine Grant) am looking at ways to help to ‘safeguard’ (preserve and renew) endangered music cultures. I want to see how endangered languages are safeguarded, and how this might be able to be used to help music cultures.

Why I am doing this research
I am doing this research as part of my doctoral studies at Griffith University. My research is also a part of a bigger project at the Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre, called Sustainable futures for music cultures: Towards an ecology of musical diversity.

What I will ask you to do
I would like to ask you some questions about your music culture (and/or language), and about how it relates to my research. We can talk about how long the interview will be before we start.

Why I would like to talk with you
I would like to talk with you because you know about your music culture (and/or language), and maybe you have some ideas about why it is endangered, or how it can be helped.

Benefits
You will get an agreed honorarium payment for your time and any travel costs. Also, I hope that in the end, this project will help people and communities to help safeguard their music culture. I am very thankful that you would like to take part.

Risks to you
There are no big risks in taking part in this research. If I ask you something that you don’t want to answer, please just tell me. If you answer a question but don’t want me to use your name when I write about it in my research, that’s fine too.
Recording, using your name, and keeping information safe
If it’s ok with you, I would like to audio- or video-record our interview. If you want, I will only use the recording for my research, and I will destroy the recording after I write down what you say. But I would like to make the recording available for other people to listen to or watch, for example through putting it in archives, or giving presentations using it. If that’s ok with you, I’ll give you the recording to look at first. You can change your mind about making the recording available to other people any time until the end of my research (any time before February 2012).

If I want to use anything that you say in my reports at the end of the research, I will show it to you later (by email, for example). You can then say yes or no. In my research reports and publications, I will normally use your name, but if you don’t want me to, then I won’t. In this case, I will keep all of the information you give me in a safe place for five years, and then destroy it. On the computer, I will keep your information safe by using a password.

You can choose to be part of this research, or not
You do not have to take part in my research. If you decide not to, you won’t be affected in any way. Also, even after we start, you can decide you don’t want to take part any more.

Questions and more information
You are welcome to ask me any questions now. If you have any questions about my research after we finish, please contact me (Catherine Grant), or Huib Schippers. Our addresses, emails, and phone numbers are on the front of this sheet.

Ethical research
Griffith University follows guidelines (listed in National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research) about how to do ethical research. My project follows all these rules. If you have any worries or if you want to complain about how this research is run, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics on (07) 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

How you can find out about the results of the research
When I have finished this research, I will send you (for example, by email) a two-page summary of my research results. In this summary, I will also tell you how you can get more information about the research results, if you would like.

Privacy statement
As I do this research, I collect and use personal information about you. No-one else will be able to get this information unless you are asked first (sometimes, though, the government or other authority needs to have access to this information). The information you give might be used for other research, but your name will not be used. If you would like more information, please look at the University’s Privacy Plan at www.gu.edu.au/ua/aa/vc/pp or call (07) 3735 5585.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Research team member
Catherine Grant
PhD Candidate
Queensland Conservatorium
Griffith University
Ph: (07) 3735 6335
Email: Catherine.Grant@griffith.edu.au

Primary investigator
Prof Huib Schippers
Director,
Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre
Queensland Conservatorium Griffith University
Ph: (07) 3735 6131
Email: H.Schippers@griffith.edu.au

I have read and I understand the information sheet, and all of these things:

- I understand that if I take part in this research, I will be asked questions about my music culture and/or language, in an interview;

- It’s ok for the researcher to use my name in the research results (tick the box):

- It’s ok for the researcher to record my interview:

- It’s ok for the recording of my interview to be made available to anyone who is interested in it:

- I have answers to all my questions about the research;

- I understand that if I have any more questions later, I can contact the researchers;

- I understand the benefits and risks in taking part in this research;

- I understand that my I don’t have to take part in this research, and can leave any time;

- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on (07) 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any worries about the ethical conduct of the research; and

- I agree to take part in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This appendix comprises UNESCO’s document *Language Vitality and Endangerment* (2003), the framework that forms the basis for the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework* developed in Chapter 5 of this dissertation. The document can also be downloaded in PDF format directly from the *Intangible Cultural Heritage* section of UNESCO’s website: [http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf).
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Language Vitality and Endangerment

UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Section’s Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages

Language diversity is essential to the human heritage. Each and every language embodies the unique cultural wisdom of a people. The loss of any language is thus a loss for all humanity.

Though approximately six thousand languages still exist, many are under threat. There is an imperative need for language documentation, new policy initiatives, and new materials to enhance the vitality of these languages.

The cooperative efforts of language communities, language professionals, NGOs and governments will be indispensable in countering this threat. There is a pressing need to build support for language communities in their efforts to establish meaningful new roles for their endangered languages.

I speak my favourite language
because
that’s who I am.

We teach our children our favourite language,
because
we want them to know who they are.

(Christine Johnson, Tohono O’odham elder, American Indian Language Development Institute, June 2002)

---

1 This document was prepared by the UNESCO Ad hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (see Appendix 3 for the list of members who contributed to this paper). This document results from the work of many people (listed in Appendix 2) and has undergone many revisions. We acknowledge the support of the Japanese Education Ministry’s (MEXT, Monbu-kagakusho) Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim (Osahito Miyake, director) which was essential to the present document.

2 Throughout this document, the term language include sign language, and speech or endangered-language communities also refer also to sign language communities.
1. Preamble

A language is *endangered* when it is on a path toward extinction. Without adequate documentation, a language that is extinct can never be revived.

A language is in danger when its speakers cease to use it, use it in an increasingly reduced number of communicative domains, and cease to pass it on from one generation to the next. That is, there are no new speakers, adults or children.

About 97% of the world’s people speak about 4% of the world’s languages; and conversely, about 96% of the world’s languages are spoken by about 3% of the world’s people (Bernard 1996: 142). Most of the world’s language heterogeneity, then, is under the stewardship of a very small number of people.

Even languages with many thousands of speakers are no longer being acquired by children; at least 50% of the world’s more than six thousand languages are losing speakers. We estimate that, in most world regions, about 90% of the languages may be replaced by dominant languages by the end of the 21st century.

Language endangerment may be the result of *external* forces such as military, economic, religious, cultural, or educational subjugation, or it may be caused by *internal* forces, such as a community’s negative attitude towards its own language. Internal pressures often have their source in external ones, and both halt the intergenerational transmission of linguistic and cultural traditions. Many indigenous peoples, associating their disadvantaged social position with their culture, have come to believe that their languages are not worth retaining. They abandon their languages and cultures in hopes of overcoming discrimination, to secure a livelihood, and enhance social mobility, or to assimilate to the global marketplace.

The extinction of each language results in the irrecoverable loss of unique cultural, historical, and ecological knowledge. Each language is a unique expression of the human experience of the world. Thus, the knowledge of any single language may be the key to answering fundamental questions of the future. Every time a language dies, we have less evidence for understanding patterns in the structure and function of human language, human prehistory, and the maintenance of the world’s diverse ecosystems. Above all, speakers of these languages may experience the loss of their language as a loss of their original ethnic and cultural identity (Bernard 1992, Hale 1998).

Raising awareness about language loss and language diversity will only be successful when meaningful contemporary roles for minority languages can be established, for the requirements of modern life within the community as well as in national and international contexts. Meaningful contemporary roles include the use of these languages in everyday life, commerce, education, writing, the arts, and/or the media. Economic and political support by both local communities and national governments are needed to establish such roles.
There is an urgent need in almost all countries for more reliable information about the
situation of the minority languages as a basis for language support efforts at all levels.

II. Background

UNESCO’s Constitution includes the maintenance and perpetuation of language diversity
as a basic principle:

to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the
nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal
respect for justice, for the rule of law and for human rights and
fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world
without distinction of race, sex, language, religion, by the Charter of the
United Nations (UNESCO Constitution Article 1).

“Based on this principle, UNESCO has developed programs aimed at promoting
languages as instruments of education and culture, and as significant means through
which to participate in national life” (Noriko Aikawa, 2001: 13).

Among these programs was the project The Red Book of Languages in Danger of
Disappearing. The purpose of that project was:

1. to systematically gather information on endangered languages (including their
   status and the degree of urgency for undertaking research);
2. to strengthen research and the collection of materials relating to endangered
   languages for which little or no such activities have been undertaken to date, and
   that belong to a specific category such as language isolates, languages of special
   interest for typological and historical-comparative linguistics, and are in imminent
danger of extinction;
3. to undertake activities aiming to establish a world-wide project committee and a
   network of regional centres as focal points for large areas on the basis of existing
   contacts; and
4. to encourage publication of materials and the results of studies on endangered
   languages.

One crucial goal, however, is missing from the Red Book project – that is, to work with
the endangered-language communities toward language maintenance, development,
revitalization, and perpetuation. Any research in endangered language communities must
be reciprocal and collaborative. Reciprocity here entails researchers not only offering
their services as a quid pro quo for what they receive from the speech community, but
being more actively involved with the community in designing, implementing, and
evaluating their research projects.

At the 31st Session of the UNESCO General Conference (October 2001), the
unanimously-adopted Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity recognized a
relationship between biodiversity, cultural diversity, and linguistic diversity. UNESCO’s
action plan recommends that Member States, in conjunction with speaker communities, undertake steps to ensure:

1. sustaining the linguistic diversity of humanity and giving support to expression, creation, and dissemination of the greatest possible number of languages;
2. encouraging linguistic diversity at all levels of education, wherever possible, and fostering the learning of several languages from the youngest age;
3. incorporating, where appropriate, traditional pedagogies into the education process with a view to preserving and making full use of culturally-appropriate methods of communication and transmission of knowledge; and where permitted by speaker communities, encouraging universal access to information in the public domain through the global network, including promoting linguistic diversity in cyberspace.

III. Supporting Endangered Languages

3.1 The Role of the Speech Community

In all parts of the world, members of ethnolinguistic minorities are increasingly abandoning their native language in favour of another language, including in childrearing and formal education.

Among ethnolinguistic communities, a variety of opinions on the future prospects of their languages can be observed. Some speakers of endangered languages come to consider their own language backward and impractical. Such negative views are often directly related to the socioeconomic pressure of a dominant speech community. Other speakers of endangered languages, however, attempt to directly counter these threats to their language, and commit themselves to language stabilization and revitalization activities. These communities may establish environments such as daycare centers, schools, or at least classes in which their languages are exclusively spoken.

In the end, it is the speakers, not outsiders, who maintain or abandon languages. Still, if communities ask for support to reinforce their threatened languages, language specialists should make their skills available to and work with these ethnolinguistic minorities.

3.2 External Specialists and Speech Communities

External language specialists, primarily linguists, educators, and activists see their first task as documentation. This includes the collection, annotation, and analysis of data from endangered languages. The second task entails their active participation in educational programs. Speakers increasingly demand control over the terms and conditions that govern research; furthermore, they claim rights to the outcomes and future uses of the research.

Increasing numbers of people in ethnolinguistic minorities also make demands on research: first, they demand control over the terms and conditions that govern research;
second, they claim rights to the outcomes and future uses of the research. (They want, for example, the right to informed consent and to veto power, they want to know how results will benefit them, and they want to be able to determine how research results will be disseminated. But above all, they want an equal relationship with outside researchers and want to be actors in a process that is theirs, not someone else’s.)

3.3 What Can Be Done?

Just as speech community members react differently to language endangerment, so do linguists, educators, and activists to requests for assistance by speech communities. Such requests relate mainly to five essential areas for sustaining endangered languages:

1. **Basic linguistic and pedagogical training:** providing language teachers with training in basic linguistics, language teaching methods and techniques, curriculum development, and teaching materials development.

2. **Sustainable development in literacy and local documentation skills:** training local language workers to develop orthographies if needed, read, write, and analyse their own languages, and produce pedagogical materials. One of the effective strategies here is the establishment of local research centres, where speakers of endangered languages will be trained to study, document and archive their own language materials. Literacy is useful to the teaching and learning of such languages.

3. **Supporting and developing national language policy:** National language policies must support diversity, including endangered languages. More social scientists and humanists, and speakers of endangered languages themselves should be actively involved in the formulation of national language policies.

4. **Supporting and developing educational policy:** In the educational sector, a number of linguists are engaged in implementing increasingly popular mother tongue education programs. Since 1953 and especially in the past 15 years, UNESCO has been instrumental in this development through its policy statements. So-called mother tongue education, however, often does not refer to education in the ancestral languages of ethnolinguistic minorities (i.e. endangered languages), but rather to the teaching of these languages as school subjects. The most common educational model for teaching ethnolinguistic minority children in schools still uses locally or nationally dominant languages as media of instruction. Teaching exclusively in these languages supports their spread, at the expense of endangered languages. For example, fewer than 10% of the approximately 2000 African languages are currently used in teaching, and none of these 10% is an endangered language. We favour the inclusion of regional languages (often called “mother tongues”) in formal education, but not at the expense of ethnolinguistic minorities (The Hague Recommendations on the Educational Rights of National Minorities 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas 2006). A great deal of research shows that
acquiring bilingual capability need in no way diminish competence in the official language.

5. **Improving living conditions and respect for the human rights of speaker communities**: Language documenters, though not directly involved in economic and social development, can help governments identify overlooked populations. For example, national HIV/AIDS awareness or poverty-alleviation programs often do not consider minority communities, especially if they are illiterate. Linguists and educators can be vital mediators by supporting the communities in formulating claims about their linguistic and other human rights. Conversely, materials such as those on health care, community development, or language education produced for these marginalized communities require specialist input. Concepts and content need to be conveyed in a culturally meaningful way.

### 3.4 Linguistic Diversity and Ecodiversity

Among the 900 eco-regions of the world that WWF has mapped out, 238 (referred to as Global 200 Ecoregions) are found to be of the utmost importance for the maintenance of the world's ecological viability. Within these Global 200 Ecoregions, we find a vast number of ethno-linguistic groups. These are the peoples who have accumulated rich ecological knowledge in their long history of living in their environment.

Conservation biology needs to be paralleled by conservation linguistics. Researchers are exploring not just the parallels, but the links between the world's biodiversity and linguistic/cultural diversity, as well as the causes and consequences of diversity loss at all levels. This connection is significant in itself, because it suggests that the diversity of life is made up of diversity in nature, culture, and language. This has been called *biocultural diversity* by Luisa Maffi; and Michael Krauss has introduced the term *logosphere* to described the web linking the world's languages (analogous to *biosphere*, the web linking the world's ecosystems; Maffi, Krauss, and Yamamoto 2001: 74).

### 3.5 Salvage Documentation

A language that can no longer be maintained, perpetuated, or revitalized still merits the most complete documentation possible. This is because each language embodies unique cultural and ecological knowledge in it. It is also because languages are diverse. Documentation of such a language is important for several reasons: 1) it enriches the human intellectual property, 2) it presents a cultural perspective that may be new to our current knowledge, and 3) the process of documentation often helps the language resource person to re-activate the linguistic and cultural knowledge.
IV. Assessing Language Endangerment and Urgency for Documentation

4.1 A Caveat

No single factor alone can be used to assess a language’s vitality or its need for documentation. Language communities are complex and diverse; even assessing the number of actual speakers of a language is difficult. We identify six factors to evaluate a language’s vitality and state of endangerment, two factors to assess language attitudes, and one factor to evaluate the urgency for documentation. Taken together, these nine factors are especially useful for characterizing a language’s overall sociolinguistic situation.

4.2 Language Vitality Assessment

4.2.1 Major Evaluative Factors of Language Vitality

Below we explain the six major factors identified: 1) Intergenerational Language Transmission; 2) Absolute Number of Speakers; 3) Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population; 4) Trends in Existing Language Domains; 5) Response to New Domains and Media; and 6) Materials for Language Education and Literacy. Note that none of these factors should be used alone. A language that is ranked highly according to one criterion may deserve immediate and urgent attention due to other factors.

Factor 1: Intergenerational Language Transmission

The most commonly used factor in evaluating the vitality of a language is whether or not it is being transmitted from one generation to the next (Fishman 1991). Endangerment can be ranked on a continuum from stability to extinction. Even “safe” (below), however, does not guarantee language vitality, because at any time speakers may cease to pass on their language to the next generation. Six degrees of endangerment may be distinguished with regards to Intergenerational Language Transmission:

Safe (5): The language is spoken by all generations. There is no sign of linguistic threat from any other language, and the intergenerational transmission of the language seems uninterrupted.

Stable yet threatened (5-): The language is spoken in most contexts by all generations with unbroken intergenerational transmission, yet multilingualism in the native language and one or more dominant language(s) has usurped certain important communication contexts. Note that multilingualism alone is not necessarily a threat to languages.

Unsafe (4): Most but not all children or families of a particular community speak their language as their first language, but it may be restricted to specific social domains (such as at home where children interact with their parents and grandparents).
Definitely endangered (3): The language is no longer being learned as the mother tongue by children in the home. The youngest speakers are thus of the parental generation. At this stage, parents may still speak their language to their children, but their children do not typically respond in the language.

Severely endangered (2): The language is spoken only by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may still understand the language, they typically do not speak it to their children.

Critically endangered (1): The youngest speakers are in the great-grandparental generation, and the language is not used for everyday interactions. These older people often remember only part of the language but do not use it, since there may not be anyone to speak with.

Extinct (0): There is no one who can speak or remember the language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangernment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Speaker Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used by all ages, from children up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by very few speakers, of great-grandparental generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There exists no speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Absolute Number of Speakers

It is impossible to provide a valid interpretation of absolute numbers, but a small speech community is always at risk. A small population is much more vulnerable to decimation (e.g. by disease, warfare, or natural disaster) than a larger one. A small language group may also merge with a neighbouring group, losing its own language and culture.
Factor 3: Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population

The number of speakers in relation to the total population of a group is a significant indicator of language vitality, where “group” may refer to the ethnic, religious, regional, or national group with which the speaker community identifies. The following scale can be used to appraise degrees of endangerment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Proportion of Speakers Within the Total Reference Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nearly all speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A majority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A minority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None speak the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4: Trends in Existing Language Domains

Where, with whom, and the range of topics for which a language is used directly affects whether or not it will be transmitted to the next generation.

**Universal use (5):** The language of the ethnolinguistic group is the language of interaction, identity, thinking, creativity, and entertainment, and is actively used in all discourse domains for all purposes.

**Multilingual parity (4):** One or more dominant languages, rather than the language of the ethnolinguistic group, is/are the primary language(s) in most official domains: government, public offices, and educational institutions. The language in question, however, may well continue to be integral to a number of public domains, especially in traditional religious institutions, local stores, and those places where members of the community socialize. The coexistence of the dominant and non-dominant languages results in speakers’ using each language for a different function (diglossia), whereby the non-dominant language is used in informal and home contexts and the dominant language is used in official and public contexts. Speakers may consider the dominant language to be the language of social and economic opportunity. However, older members of the community may continue to use only their own minority language. Note that multilingualism, common throughout the world, does not necessarily lead to language loss.
Dwindling domains (3): The non-dominant language loses ground and, at home, parents begin to use the dominant language in their everyday interactions with their children, and children become semi-speakers of their own language (receptive bilinguals). Parents and older members of the community tend to be productively bilingual in the dominant and indigenous languages; they understand and speak both. Bilingual children may exist in families where the indigenous language is actively used.

Limited or formal domains (2): The non-dominant language is used only in highly formal domains, as especially in ritual and administration. The language may also still be used at the community centre, at festivals, and at ceremonial occasions where these older members of the community have a chance to meet. The limited domain may also include homes where grandparents and other older extended family members reside, and other traditional gathering places of the elderly. Many people can understand the language but cannot speak it.

Highly limited domain (1): The non-dominant language is used in very restricted domains at special occasions, usually by very few individuals in a community, e.g. ritual leaders on ceremonial occasions. Some other individuals may remember at least some of the language (rememberers).

Extinct (0): The language is not spoken at any place at any time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Domains and Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>universal use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all domains and for all functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multilingual parity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwindling domains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant language begins to penetrate even home domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited or formal domains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used in limited social domains and for several functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly limited domains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used only in a very restricted domains and for a very few functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The language is not used in any domain and for any function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that multilingualism is a fact of life in most areas of the world. Speakers do not have to be monolingual for their language to be vital. It is crucial that the indigenous language serve a meaningful function in culturally important domains.

Factor 5: Response to New Domains and Media

New areas for language use may emerge as community living conditions change. While some language communities do succeed in expanding their own language into the new domain, most do not. Schools, new work environments, new media, including broadcast media and the Internet, usually serve only to expand the scope and power of the dominant language at the expense of endangered languages. Although no existing domains of the endangered language may be lost, the use of the dominant language in the new domain has mesmerizing power, as with television.

If the communities do not meet the challenges of modernity with their language, it becomes increasingly irrelevant and stigmatized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>New Domains and Media Accepted by the Endangered Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robust/active</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used in most new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receptive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used in many domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used in some new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used only in a few new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The language is not used in any new domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type and use of these new domains will vary according to the local context. One example of the possible use of this criterion is: an endangered language enjoys one new domain, broadcast media, including radio and television, but only for a half-hour a week. Though the availability of these media gives the language a potentially high ranking, the extreme time limitation results in limited exposure to the language, which thus would rank only a 2 or 3. Inevitably, there will be different levels of achievement in different media.

In education, assigning criteria can be based on two dimensions: up to what level, and how broadly across the curriculum, the endangered language is used. An endangered language which is the medium of instruction for all courses and at all levels will rank much higher than an endangered language that is taught only one hour per week.
All new domains, be they in employment, education, or the media, must be considered together when assessing an endangered language community’s response.

Factor 6: Materials for Language Education and Literacy

Education in the language is essential for language vitality. There are language communities that maintain strong oral traditions, and some do not wish their language to be written. In other communities, literacy in their language is a source of pride. In general, however, literacy is directly linked with social and economic development. Needed are books and materials on all topics for various ages and language abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of Written Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is an established orthography, literacy tradition with grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and everyday media. Writing in the language is used in administration and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Written materials exist, and at school, children are developing literacy in the language. Writing in the language is not used in administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written materials exist, but they may only be useful for some members of the community; and for others, they may have a symbolic significance. Literacy education in the language is not a part of the school curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A practical orthography is known to the community and some material is being written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No orthography available to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.1 Language Attitudes and Policies

The maintenance, promotion, or abandonment of non-dominant languages may be dictated by the dominant linguistic culture, be it regional or national. The linguistic ideology of a state may inspire linguistic minorities to mobilize their populations toward the maintenance of their languages, or may force them to abandon them. These linguistic attitudes can be a powerful force both for promotion and loss of their languages.

Members of the dominant culture shape the ideological environment, propagating a value system in which their own language is seen as a positive asset, and believed to be a unifying symbol for the region or state. When several larger linguistic communities compete for the same political or social space, they may each have their own conflicting linguistic attitudes. This leads to the general perception that multiple languages cause divisiveness and are a threat to national unity. The fostering of a single dominant
language is one attempt to deal with this *real or merely perceived* threat. In doing so, the governing body may legislate the use of language. Accordingly, the policies may discourage or even prohibit the use of other languages. National policy, including the lack of overt policy, has in any case a direct impact on the language attitude of the community itself.

4.2.2.1 Language Attitudes and Policies: Dominant and Non-dominant Language Communities

A country's government may have an explicit language use policy for its multiple languages. At one extreme, one language may be designated as the sole official language of the country, while all others are condemned. At the other extreme, all languages of a nation may receive equal official status. Equal legal status, however, does not guarantee language maintenance and long-term vitality of a language.

**Factor 7: Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes And Policies, Including Official Status and Use**

Governments and institutions have explicit policies and/or implicit attitudes toward the dominant and subordinate languages.

*Equal support (5)*: All of a country’s languages are valued as assets. All languages are protected by law, and the government encourages the maintenance of all languages by implementing explicit policies.

*Differentiated support (4)*: Non-dominant languages are explicitly protected by the government, but there are clear differences in the contexts in which the dominant/official language(s) and non-dominant (protected) language(s) are used. The government encourages ethnonational groups to maintain and use their languages, most often in private domains (as the home language), rather than in public domains (e.g. in schools). Some of the domains of non-dominant language use enjoy high prestige (e.g. at ceremonial occasions).

*Passive assimilation (3)*: The dominant group is indifferent as to whether or not minority languages are spoken, as long as the dominant group’s language is the language of interaction. Though this is not an explicit language policy, the dominant group’s language is the *de facto* official language. Most domains of non-dominant language use do not enjoy high prestige.

*Active assimilation (2)*: The government encourages minority groups to abandon their own languages by providing education for the minority group members in the dominant language. Speaking and/or writing in non-dominant languages is not encouraged.
**Forced assimilation (1):** The government has an explicit language policy declaring the dominant group’s language to be the only official national language, while the languages of subordinate groups are neither recognized nor supported.

**Prohibition (0):** Minority languages are prohibited from use in any domain. Languages may be tolerated in private domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Official Attitudes toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>equal support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All languages are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiated support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minority languages are protected primarily as the language of the private domains. The use of the language is prestigious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive assimilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active assimilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government encourages assimilation to the dominant language. There is no protection for minority languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced assimilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The dominant language is the sole official language, while non-dominant languages are neither recognized nor protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minority languages are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 8: Community Members’ Attitudes toward Their Own Language**

Members of a speech community are not usually neutral towards their own language. They may see it as essential to their community and identity and promote it; they may use it without promoting it; they may be ashamed of it and, therefore, not promote it; or they may see it as a nuisance and actively avoid using it.

When members’ attitudes towards their language are very positive, the language may be seen as a key symbol of group identity. Just as people value family traditions, festivals and community events, members of the community may see their language as a cultural core value, vital to their community and ethnic identity. If members view their language as hindrance to economic mobility and integration into mainstream society, they may develop negative attitudes toward their language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Community Members’ Attitudes toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All members value their language and wish to see it promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most members support language maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Many members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only a few members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No one cares if the language is lost; all prefer to use a dominant language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.2 Language Attitudes and Policies: Interaction and Social Effects

Attitudes towards the language, be they positive, indifferent, or negative, interact with governmental policy and societal pressures to result in increased or decreased language use in different domains.

In many cases, community members abandon their language because they believe they have no alternative, or because they do not have enough knowledge about the long-term consequences of the “choices” they make. People in such a situation have often been presented with an either-or choice (“either you cling to your mother-tongue and identity but don’t get a job,” or “you leave your language and have better chances in life”). Actually, maintaining and using both languages will allow even better chances in life.

When languages have an unequal power relationship, members of the subordinate group usually speak both their native language and the dominant language. Speakers may gradually come to use only the dominant language. On the other hand, the subordinate group may resist linguistic domination and mobilize its members to revitalize or fortify their language. Strategies for such linguistic activism must be tailored to the particular sociolinguistic situation, which generally is one of three types:

a. Language Revival: re-introducing a language that has been in limited use for some time, such as Hebrew after the creation of the state of Israel, or Gaelic in Ireland;

b. Language Fortification: increasing the presence of the non-dominant language to counterbalance a perceived linguistic threat of a dominant language, such as Welsh;

c. Language Maintenance: supporting the stable use, in speaking and in writing (where orthographies exist), of the non-dominant language in a region or state
with both multilingualism and a dominant language (lingua franca), such as Maori in New Zealand.

For language vitality, speakers ideally not only strongly value their language, but they also know in which social domains their language is to be supported. A positive attitude is critical for the long-term stability of a language.

4.2.3 Urgency for Documentation

Factor 9: Amount and Quality of Documentation

As a guide for assessing the urgency for documenting a language, the type and quality of existing language materials must be identified. Of central importance are written texts, including transcribed, translated, and annotated audiovisual recordings of natural speech. Such information importantly helps members of the language community formulate specific tasks, and enables linguists to design research projects together with members of the language community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Documentation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Language Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superlative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high-quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are one good grammar and a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>There may be an adequate grammar or sufficient amount of grammars, dictionaries, and texts; but no everyday media; audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality or degree of annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are some grammatical sketches, word-lists, and texts useful for limited linguistic research but with inadequate coverage. Audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality, with or without any annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only a few grammatical sketches, short word-lists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Language Vitality Index: Evaluating the Significance of Factors

This section describes how the above nine factors may be used. Taken together, the tables are a useful instrument for assessing the situation of a community’s language, the type of support needed for language maintenance, revitalization, perpetuation, and for documentation.

The vitality of languages varies widely depending on the different situations of speech communities. The needs for documentation also differ under varying conditions. Languages cannot be assessed simply by adding the numbers; we therefore suggest such simple addition not be done. Instead, the language vitality factors given above may be examined according to the purpose of the assessment.

Above we have explored the following factors:

Factor 1. Intergenerational Language Transmission (scale)
Factor 2. Absolute Number of Speakers (real numbers)
Factor 3. Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population (scale)
Factor 4. Trends in Existing Language Domains (scale)
Factor 5. Response to New Domains and Media (scale)
Factor 6. Materials for Language Education and Literacy (scale)
Factor 7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies, Including Official Status and Use: (scale)
Factor 8. Community Members’ Attitudes toward Their Own Language (scale)
Factor 9. Amount and Quality of Documentation (scale)

The Factor descriptions given above are offered as guidelines. Each user should adapt these guidelines to the local context and to the specific purpose sought.

Example 1. Self-assessment by a speech community

A speech community may examine these factors first to assess their language situation and to determine whether action is needed, and if so, what to do next. For this purpose, although all factors are important, the first six are especially useful. The community may find that the language is mostly being spoken by grandparents and the older generation so their language could be characterized as “severely endangered” (Grade 2) with regard to Factor 1 “Intergenerational Language Transmission.” In addition, the community may find that the language is used mainly on ceremonial occasions and at community festivals. In terms of Factor 4 “Trends in Existing Language Domains,” then, the language use can be assessed at the level of “limited or formal domains” (Grade 2). On the other hand, the community may find that “most members of the community support
language maintenance” (Grade 4, Factor 8 “Community Members’ Attitudes toward Their Own Language”). At this point, the community members may conclude that their language is in extreme danger of being lost in a short period of time if nothing is done about the situation. They have also found that the community people are very much interested in reversing language shift and have expressed their support for language revitalization efforts. Once the community considers the full range of factors and completes its self-assessment, it will have a well-founded basis on which to seek support from relevant agencies.

Example 2. External evaluation
The guidelines could also be utilized as a policy tool by other bodies, of an official or voluntary nature, concerned with language maintenance, revitalization, literacy development, or documentation.

When more than one language is being considered, each of the above factors may become an important point of comparison. The result of such comparison has a wide range of possibilities for fortifying language diversity in a particular region: it may be useful in ranking the severity of language endangerment for the purpose of support; in educating the public on the importance of language diversity; in formulating a language policy for the purpose of maintaining language diversity; in mobilizing language specialists to counter the language shift; or in alerting the national and international organizations of the diminishing human intellectual resources (see Appendix 1 for an example of comparison of languages in Venezuela).

V. Concluding Remarks

The world faces new challenges in keeping its languages alive and well. It is time for the peoples of the world to pool their resources and build on the strengths of their linguistic and cultural diversity. This entails pooling the resources at all levels: individual language specialists, local speaker community, NGOs, and governmental and institutional organizations.

At the local community level and over the past several decades, for example, many people have been working to develop language education programs, usually with extremely limited technical resources. Unlike teachers of major languages of the world, they lack not only formal training in language teaching, now often required by local governments, but also language curricula and, even more crucially, usable basic language descriptions. These language teachers require a variety of skills: some are pedagogical in nature (e.g. curriculum and materials development, language teaching techniques and methods); some are sociolinguistic (e.g. analysis of ongoing language contact processes, of past and present ancestral language functions); and some are linguistic (e.g. data collection, analysis, and description).

Similarly, linguists, language activists, and policy makers have a long-term task to compile and disseminate the most effective and viable mechanisms for sustaining and revitalizing the world’s endangered languages. Most importantly, they have the
responsibility of working collaboratively with endangered language communities that enjoy an equal partnership in the projects.

We all share the responsibility of ensuring that no languages will disappear and that all languages will be maintained and perpetuated into the future generations. The reason why we must fortify the diversity of language is, indeed, captured by a Navajo elder:

If you don't breathe,
there is no air.

If you don't walk,
there is no earth.

If you don't speak,
there is no world.

(Paraphrased by Yamamoto from a Navajo elder's words, PBS-TV Millennium Series Tribal Wisdom and the Modern World, hosted by David Maybury-Lewis aired on May 24, 1992)
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Appendix 1. Language Vitality Assessment: An example from Venezuela (prepared by Maria E. Villalón)

In this document nine factors have been proposed to assess language vitality and need for documentation. These can be applied simultaneously to several languages in order to obtain a comparative picture of their relative strength, appraise their contrasting sociolinguistic situation, and to establish priorities for action. The following example illustrates the comparative application of the factors across three indigenous languages of Venezuela, a country that recognizes and protects its minority languages. Mapoyo is a Cariban language no longer naturally spoken, but remembered by a handful of elders in a multi-ethnic community all of whose members communicate in Spanish, which is also the first language learned by all the Mapoyo children. Kari'ña is a Cariban language as well, but has many more speakers, most of whom are bilingual. Some elders learned Kari'ña as their first language and can speak it fluently, although nowadays Spanish is the preferred language of communication for most Kari'ña, numbering over 8,000. Sanima, related to Yanomami, has over two thousand speakers, yet very few of them are bilingual in the dominant Spanish language.

The “number of speakers” in the table below refers to the number of fully competent speakers. In the case of Kari'ña and Sanima the figures given are but estimates, for no recent reliable statistics are available. The Mapoyo ciphers are more precise, and based on relatively recent fieldwork2. They are placed in parenthesis to indicate that they quantify “rememberers” rather than speakers. With regards to “Materials for Language Education and Literacy,” I have given Mapoyo a 1, because a practical orthography has been developed for the first time, and will be presented shortly to the community, along with audiovisual learning materials4. Finally, although Venezuelan Sanima is basically undocumented, unannotated recordings of varying quality exist, as well as a grammatical sketch of the closely related and better-documented Brazilian variety5. Thus, it may be ranked as a 1 on “Amount and Quality of Documentation.”

---


Estimated Degree of Endangerment and Urgency for Documentation: the case of three Venezuelan Indigenous Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapoyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Language Transmission</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Number of Speakers</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Existing Language Domains</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to New Domains and Media</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for Language Education and Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental &amp; Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies including Official Status &amp; Use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members' Attitudes toward Their Own Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and Quality of Documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D: UNESCO LANGUAGE VITALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This appendix consists of UNESCO’s *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity* questionnaire, which was the basis for large-scale data collection and collation on language vitality from 2006 to 2009. UNESCO disseminated this questionnaire both online and in hardcopy. It is downloadable directly from UNESCO’s website at: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Linguistic_Vitality_and_Diversity-20090209.doc. The questionnaire forms the basis for the Music Vitality Questionnaire, discussed in Chapter 7.3 and presented in Appendix E of this dissertation.
UNESCO Survey: Linguistic Vitality and Diversity

Objectives of the present survey

Our objective is to collect a large and representative sample of comparable data on the world’s languages, particularly endangered and indigenous languages, with two specific purposes in mind. First, these data will be used to prepare the third revised print edition of UNESCO’s landmark publication, the Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger of Disappearing (see http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/dangerlanguages/atlas), and to create an interactive on-line Digital Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger of Disappearing. Second, the data will serve to develop a methodology for an “Indicator on the Status and Trends of Linguistic Diversity and Numbers of Speakers of Indigenous Languages”, as requested by the States Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (for information please see http://www.unesco.org/culture/ch/index.php?la=0014). We hope that this questionnaire, if used on an ongoing basis into the future, will offer a basis for verifiable claims about trends in numbers of speakers, language endangerment and linguistic diversity.

The first section of the questionnaire, titled “Language Vitality and Endangerment”, is based on a framework that was developed by an international group of linguists in 2002-2003 to assess the degree of endangerment of specific languages (see http://www.unesco.org/culture/ch/index.php?la=0014). This framework has previously been applied by individual linguists, and in a few cases on a larger scale by national authorities, but it has not yet been used for a global-scale data collection exercise, and this is what we are currently attempting to do.

The second section of the questionnaire, titled “Linguistic Diversity Indicators”, has been developed very recently and is still very much a work-in-progress. We would highly appreciate it if you could spare a few minutes and supply information under that section as well. Your feedback on the survey design and questions will also be very welcome.

Complete many questionnaires, share blank forms with colleagues

We are interested in gathering as many independent reports covering as many languages as possible, including multiple reports for the same language, which would enhance the reliability of the data and also allow us to validate the pertinence of the questions we are asking. We are also interested to begin to create time-series data, so if you have had long-term involvement with a given language we encourage you to complete one form reporting the current status of the language and one form reporting its status when you first encountered or began working with the language. The more good data we have, the more reliable will be our generalizations and the more useful they will be for communities, researchers and policy-makers. So, we also encourage you to provide us with information about other people who can be invited to complete a questionnaire for a given language, and we encourage you to pass the survey on to others. In order to help us assess the validity of the survey instrument, it will be more useful if two observers report independently on the same situation than if two observers collaborate on a single report.

URL: http://www.unesco.org/culture/ch/index.php?la=0014
E-mail: ilp.diversity@unesco.org
Units of analysis: language, dialect and reference community

The primary entity to be reported in this questionnaire is a language as spoken in a given reference community, with particular attention in the second half of the survey to the dialectal situation of that reference community. Better linguists than we have tried and failed to define the difference between “language” and “dialect”, and we do not pretend to have a solution to that problem. We ask you to use common-sense understandings of the two terms, to identify the specific named language variety your report is specific to, and to provide us with sufficient information. This would allow us to link your report on a given language to other reports on the same or related languages or dialects. Our hope is that with the accumulation of fine-grained reports on specific communities, we will be able over time to assemble reliable and generalizable data. Where a gravely endangered language is spoken by only a handful of speakers all living in the same village, language and dialect and reference community are coterminous. However, most reports will be only a snapshot of a specific situation in a particular locality at a certain moment. Where we have only a single report on one community for a language that is known to be spoken over a vast territory, that report will serve—until others arrive—as representative. Where we accumulate multiple reports on different reference communities speaking the same language or dialect, we will be able to provide both fine-grained detail and more general aggregated statements. Where we receive multiple reports on the same reference community, we will be able to assess the validity of the questionnaire and, if the reports cover different time periods, to compile diachronic data.

For instance, if you are reporting on the Evenki language in China, you need not worry about reflecting the situation of this language in Russia or Mongolia (unless you fill out separate forms for those communities!). Moreover, if you consider that a group of Evenki speakers in China forms a distinct cultural-linguistic community due to great differences in lifestyle and/or language vis-à-vis other Evenki communities, please fill in a separate form for this group. Throughout, the important thing will be that you indicate as clearly as possible what the reference community is that serves as the basis for your report, and provide enough identifying information about the language so that we can later link reports on the same or related languages or dialects.

Geographic coordinates

We would highly appreciate it if you could provide geographic coordinates for the reference community. This will in particular facilitate the task of mapping the languages in the new edition of the Atlas, especially in its on-line version. We hope to have both fine-grained detail and aggregated data that can allow users to zoom in from larger to smaller units. Online tools can help you define easily such coordinates placing dots on maps or entering location names. For more information, please consult the following URL:

http://www.unesco.org/culture/fulldoc/atlas/geoofpco
Guidelines for filling in the survey

Please provide a rating score for your language of expertise on each of the factors listed below, where possible. Assign those scores that come closest to describing the situation according to your expertise. If you answer falls between two score options, please pick one and then explain in the “Comments” section. Please note that not all choices are mutually exclusive, and, in some cases, it is possible to check more than one box.

For each assigned score, please also provide a ‘reliability’ score based on the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>assigned score is based on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence from fieldwork and direct observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evidence from other reliable sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very little evidence; a 'best guess'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No data available [no score provided]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An HTML version of this questionnaire will be accessible shortly from here: http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00144. In the meantime, the MS Word version can be downloaded from the same URL.
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| Name of the language being described in this report: |  |
| Alternative names of the language: |  |
| ISO 639 code(s) of the language (can be obtained from here: http://www.unece.org/surpl/english/206e.html). Please correct if you have any reservations about the ISO code(s). |  |
| Family and branch of the language |  |
| Cultural group where the reference community whose language is being described is located |  |
| Province(s)/region(s) where the community is located |  |
| Reference community (village/town) where the language described is spoken |  |
| Geographic coordinates of the community whose language is being described if possible in a decimal format. Multiple entries are welcome. For help, please refer to the paragraph on geographic coordinates in the introduction or to http://www.unesco.org/education/learning/gender.php. Please also comment on the accuracy of the geographic coordinates you are providing. |  |
| Year of the data reported in this report: |  |
| Name, address and E-mail address of expert providing report: |  |
| Would you like to have your name associated with this data when it is employed? |  |
| Name(s) and E-mail address(es) of other linguist(s) who could provide independent information on this language: |  |
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SECTION I: Language Vitality and Endangerment within the reference community

1. Overall vitality / endangerment score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is safe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Usually vulnerable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Definitely endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Generational language use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>All generations, including children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Only some children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only grandparents and older generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only the great-grandparential generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Number of speakers

Please provide the number here for:

a) Number of speakers in this reference community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Absolute number of speakers of the language

4. Proportion of speakers within the reference community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nearly all speak the language (&gt;90%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The great majority speak the language (70-90%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A majority speak the language (50-70%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A minority speak the language (10-50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few speak the language (&lt;20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None of the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URL: http://www.unesco.org/culture/fulldocs/ldi/surveyldi_index.php?page=0014
E-mail: linguisticdiversity@unesco.org
Version: 2000-02-08
### 5. Domains of language use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Universal use: The language is used in all domains and for all functions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Multilingual parity: Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions; the use of the language is usually rare in the official domains (e.g., governance, business, administration, education, etc.) but may still be in the community’s public domains (e.g., religious ceremonies, community gatherings, etc.) and informal domains (e.g., using the language at home).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited domains: The language is used in limited social domains, for limited functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highly limited domains: The language is used only in very restricted domains, for very limited functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No longer spoken. The language is not used in any domain at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. New domains, i.e., new media, including broadcast media and the Internet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is frequently used in new domains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is sometimes used in new domains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is rarely used in new domains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Domain of traditional knowledge (TK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TK is conveyed using another language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>TK is rarely conveyed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNESCO Survey: Linguistic Vitality and Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Materials for language education and literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is an established orthography and literacy tradition with fiction and non-fiction and everyday media. The language is used in administration and education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Written materials exist but school children are developing literacy in the language. The language is not used in written form in the administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form in school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written materials exist but they may be useful only for some members of the community, for others, they may have a symbolic significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A.priori orthography is known to the community and some material is being written.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. No orthography is available to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reliability Index:</strong></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **9. Governmental and institutional language policies, including official status and use** |
| 5. Equal support for all languages, including the target language. |
| 4. Differential support: Non-dominant languages are protected primarily in the language of the private domain. The use of the target language is permitted. |
| 3. Passive assimilation: The dominant language prevails in the public domain, and an explicit policy exists for non-dominant languages. |
| 2. Active assimilation: Government encourages shift to the dominant language. There is no protection for non-dominant languages, including the target language. |
| 1. Forced assimilation: The use of non-dominant languages, including the target language, is discouraged; the target language is not recognized nor protected by the Government. |
| 0. Prohibition: Non-dominant languages, including the target language are prohibited. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reliability Index:</strong></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **10. Reference community members' support for their own language** |
| 5. All members value the language of their community and wish to see it promoted. |
| 4. Most members support the survival of their language. |
| 3. Active support for speech: Language is spoken in the home or school by the individuals or family members who are most likely to be monolingual. |
| 2. Some members support language survival; some use it or prefer it when instructed or asked to use it. |
| 1. Only a few members support language maintenance; but most use it occasionally. |
| 0. No one uses the language in the families; all prefer to use the dominant language. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reliability Index:</strong></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Types and quality of documentation</td>
<td>Reliability Today</td>
<td>Comments (Please note whether the materials are specific to the reference community and whether they are available to them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. There is at least one good teacher, a few dictionaries, books, and everyday materials available, and high-quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frequent use of audio recordings is common, and books and dictionaries are available.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Audio recordings are of very high quality, and materials are available.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is at least one good teacher, a few dictionaries, books, and everyday materials available, and high-quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Frequent use of audio recordings is common, and books and dictionaries are available.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audio recordings are of very high quality, and materials are available.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is at least one good teacher, a few dictionaries, books, and everyday materials available, and high-quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Frequent use of audio recordings is common, and books and dictionaries are available.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Audio recordings are of very high quality, and materials are available.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Status of language programs</th>
<th>Reliability Today</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Successful: A regular and sustained program is running involving 75 percent of the community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good: A program is running with one of the following characteristics: regular attendance involving 50 percent of the community.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair: A program is running with one of the following characteristics: regular attendance involving 25 percent of the community.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor: A program is running with one of the following characteristics: regular attendance involving 15 percent of the community.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Abysmal: No language program is being seriously taken or sustained.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. None: No language program exists in the village.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION II: Linguistic Diversity

In this section, please describe the reference community as above in Section I. Assign scores for the following factors (where possible and where relevant) to characterize the linguistic situation and experience in the reference community:

(a) External diversity, i.e. linguistic environment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. In everyday life, how many languages would a typical member of this community encounter?</th>
<th>Hear</th>
<th>Speak</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. In how many languages is a typical member of this community fully fluent?</th>
<th></th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. In how many languages is a typical member of this community at least partially fluent?</th>
<th></th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one(s)?

---

1 "Fully fluent" is here defined as able to communicate fluently in the language for everyday interaction and conversation.
2 "Partially fluent" is here defined as able to engage in basic conversation and understand most of what is said.
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#### 16. How many languages are represented in the local schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>Tolerated</th>
<th>Taught as Subject</th>
<th>Used for Instruction</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one(s)?

#### 17. How many languages are represented in the local media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one(s)?

#### 18. How is TV presence (broadcast time) distributed across the various languages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>Each language receives equal amount of broadcast time</th>
<th>Two or more languages predominate</th>
<th>One language predominates, but other language(s) are well-represented</th>
<th>Over 90 percent of the TV broadcast time is dominated by only one language</th>
<th>Other one language is represented on TV</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one(s)?

### (b) Internal diversity in the language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages</th>
<th>Very high internal diversity</th>
<th>High internal diversity</th>
<th>Moderate internal diversity</th>
<th>A little internal diversity</th>
<th>Very low internal diversity</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Reliability Index</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In everyday life, how many dialects would a typical member of this reference community encounter?</td>
<td>5 or more dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. In how many dialects is a typical member of this community fully or partially fluent?</td>
<td>More than 2 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How equal are the dialects in speaker numbers?</td>
<td>Each dialect has equal numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several dialects have sizable numbers of speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One dialect predominates, but other dialect(s) have good numbers of speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over two thirds of speakers use one dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One dialect is used by virtually all speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How equal are the dialects in symbolic status and prestige?</td>
<td>Dialects are equally equal in status and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several dialects have parity in status and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two dialects have higher status/prestige than the others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One dialect has higher status/prestige than all other dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One dialect has lowest status/prestige than all other dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Would you say the language is characterized by high stylistic diversity, i.e., a variety of different registers and styles are commonly used in interaction?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very high stylistic diversity, frequently encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High stylistic diversity, often encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate stylistic diversity, occasionally encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some stylistic diversity, occasionally encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little stylistic diversity, encountered infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Virtually no stylistic diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Overall comments and suggestions regarding this questionnaire:

**URL:** http://www.escsco.org/unescocurrentPage.php?page=14

**E-mail:** lingdiversity@escsco.org

**Version:** 20000908
APPENDIX E: MUSIC VITALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Closely modelled on the data collection tool for UNESCO’s *Linguistic Vitality and Diversity* survey (Appendix D), this appendix comprises a parallel questionnaire I have developed for music genres. It represents a tool via which necessary data may be gathered in order to assess the vitality of a genre, for example according to the *Music Vitality and Endangerment Framework* (MVEF) presented in Chapter 5. Issues surrounding the implementation of such a survey are discussed in Chapter 7.3.
QUESTIONNAIRE: MUSIC VITALITY AND ENDANGERMENT

Catherine Grant (catherine.grant@griffith.edu.au)
Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre, Griffith University
Brisbane, Australia
2011

Objective of the survey
The objective of this survey is to collect comparable data on the levels of vitality of 100 of the world’s music genres. Its primary aim is to test the survey instrument itself for usability and generalisability to a range of circumstances. The data collected will also serve to investigate the vitality and viability of the music genres surveyed.

Eventually, this questionnaire may be used as the basis for a larger survey that produces a representative sample of comparable data on the situation of music genres across the world. This in turn could provide a basis for verifiable claims about trends in music vitality and endangerment. This will be useful for communities, researchers, and policy-makers.

How the questionnaire was developed
This questionnaire was designed in 2010-2011 as a part of a doctoral research project on music vitality and viability (Catherine Grant, Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia). The questionnaire and survey methodology is closely derived from UNESCO’s large-scale data collection and collation effort (2006-2009) on linguistic vitality and diversity. The standardised data collection tool for that survey was the questionnaire Linguistic Vitality and Diversity (see http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CL/ed /Linguistic_Vitality_and_Diversity-200905293.pdf).

The implementation of this pilot stage of the survey is funded by the five-year project Sustainable Futures for Music Cultures (http://musicology.griffith.edu.au/), funded by the Australian Research Council and led by Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre.

How to use this questionnaire
Complete multiple questionnaires, and feel free to share blank forms with colleagues. The aim at this stage is to gather independent reports on 100 music genres, including multiple reports on the same genre, which would enhance the reliability of the data and also help confirm the relevance of the survey questions. In order to assess the validity of the survey instrument, it will be more useful if two observers report independently on the same genre than if two observers collaborate on a single report.

This questionnaire is in three parts: 1) background information on the music genre; 2) information on its vitality and endangerment; and 3) feedback on the questionnaire itself. Your comments on the survey design and questions are very welcome.

For further copies of the Word version of this questionnaire, please contact the researcher. An e-version is in development.
Units of analysis: music genres and the reference community
The primary entity to be reported in this questionnaire is a music genre as found in a given reference community. The difference between one genre and another can be difficult to define. Please indicate the specific variety of the music genre you are reporting on, and provide sufficient identifying information about the music genre to enable later comparisons to be drawn between reports on the same or related music genres.

Where a music genre is performed by only a handful of musicians all living in the same village, music genre and reference community are coextensive. However, most reports will be only a snapshot of a specific musical situation in a particular locality (town, village, region, country) at a certain moment. Where only a single report is submitted on one community for a music genre that is known to be found over a wider territory, that report will serve - until others arrive - as representative. Where multiple reports are submitted on different reference communities performing the same genre (or versions of it), this will enable both focused and broader statements on the vitality of the genre. Where multiple reports are submitted on the same reference community, this will help assess the validity of the questionnaire.

For instance, if you are reporting on gamelan selonding in Bali, you need not worry about reflecting the situation of this genre in Java, the United States, or Australia (unless you fill out separate forms for those communities). Moreover, if you consider that a group of Balinese gamelan selonding musicians forms a distinct cultural-musical community due to great differences in social practice and/or music vis-à-vis other gamelan selonding communities, please fill in a separate form for this group.

Throughout, the important thing is that you indicate as clearly as possible what the reference community is that serves as the basis for your report.

Defining “the community” of a music genre
This questionnaire sometimes asks for information about “the community”, in relation to the music genre in question. Community here is broadly defined: it may refer to a group of people who share the music genre by virtue of their common geographical, cultural or ethnic background. It may also denote a “community of practice”: a group of people bound together first and foremost by their practice and interest in the music genre.

Community does not only refer to performers, but to those who engage with the genre in other ways too: learners, teachers, custodians, audience members and other consumers. Depending on the genre, where appropriate, the term should also be taken to refer even more widely to those who identify ethnically or culturally with the genre.

Geographic coordinates
It would be highly appreciated if you could indicate - at least tentatively or approximately - geographic coordinates for the reference community. This will facilitate the task of mapping the music genres reported upon. To quickly and easily define coordinates of your music genre by clicking on a map, please visit http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/atlas/georef.php
**QUESTIONNAIRE: MUSIC VITALITY AND ENDANGERMENT**

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the music genre being described in this survey:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative names of the music genre, if any:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider category the music genre belongs to: (e.g. classical, Khmer, Celtic folk, Australian Aboriginal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/countries where the reference community whose music genre is being described is located:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province(s)/region(s) where the reference community whose music genre is being described is located:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village/town where the reference community whose music genre is being described is located (if applicable):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic coordinates of the community whose music genre is being described (multiple entries possible. To quickly and easily determine co-ordinates by clicking on a map, visit <a href="http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/atlas/georef.php">http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/atlas/georef.php</a>). Longitude (in decimal format):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (in decimal format):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please also circle the level of accuracy of the geographic coordinates you are providing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very accurate / somewhat accurate / approximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of the data reported in this report:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of expert providing this report:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to have your name associated with these data in results of this research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes / no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: VITALITY AND ENDANGERMENT OF THE MUSIC GENRE WITHIN THE REFERENCE COMMUNITY

Please assign the grade score for your music genre of expertise that come closest to describing the situation as you understand it. If the grade descriptions are not applicable, please disregard them, choose an appropriate score, and explain in the “Comments” section. If your answer falls between two score options, choose the closest relevant score, and explain in “Comments”.

For each assigned score, please also provide a “reliability” score based on the following index:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>3 Evidence from fieldwork and direct observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Evidence from other reliable sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very little evidence; a best guess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No data available [no score provided]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer Question 1A OR 1B.
If the music genre has already undergone some degree of revitalisation recently, please answer 1B. Otherwise, answer 1A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1A. Intergenerational transmission</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 The genre is performed/sung/played by all appropriate ages and is transmitted intergenerationally</td>
<td>3 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The genre is performed by all appropriate ages, but transmission to the youngest appropriate generation is weakening</td>
<td>2 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The genre is performed mostly by the middle generations and up</td>
<td>1 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The genre is performed mostly by the older generations</td>
<td>0 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The genre is performed only by the very elderly, and then only partially and infrequently</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 There exists no performer of the genre</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1B. Intergenerational transmission</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 The genre is performed by all appropriate ages and is transmitted intergenerationally in an unbroken chain from older to younger generations</td>
<td>3 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The genre is being re-established among the oldest generation in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger and middle generations</td>
<td>2 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The genre is being re-established among the middle generations in an unbroken intergenerational chain from younger generations</td>
<td>1 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The genre is being re-established among the younger generations, but not by the middle generations. The older generations may or may not perform the genre</td>
<td>0 ☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The genre is performed mostly by the youngest appropriate generation, and then only partially and infrequently</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 There exists no performer of the genre</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Change in the number of proficient musicians in the reference community in the last 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments (including the number of proficient musicians in the reference community, if known, currently and 5-10 years ago)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in numbers of proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No proficient musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Change in the number of people engaged with the genre in the reference community in the last 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments (including the number of people engaged with the genre in the reference community, if known, currently and 5-10 years ago)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant increase in people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate increase in people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little or no change in people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate decrease in people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Significant decrease in people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No people engaged with the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"Engaged" in any number of ways: as learners, audience members, other "consumers"; etc.

### 4. Pace and direction of change in the music and music practices in the last 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change in the music and associated music practices reflect significantly increased strength of the genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately increased strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect little or no change in strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect moderately decreased strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect significantly decreased strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pace and direction of change reflect no or almost no strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. shifts in gender roles, use of technology and media, performance practices, or repertoire. Whether such changes reflect increased or decreased vitality will be wholly genre-dependent.
6. Change in performance contexts and function(s) in the past 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integral contexts and functions: The genre continues to be performed in one or more regular, well-established contexts and holds integral functions within the community. Continuous expansion of contexts or functions: The genre has expanded to new contexts and functions, and is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Static contexts and functions: Context(s) and function(s) for the genre have remained largely stable, even in relation to changing environments. The genre is performed regularly or semi-regularly.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highly limited contexts and functions: The genre is performed only occasionally in limited contexts and functions (e.g., sporadic events to represent the community symbolically).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inactive: The genre is not performed in any context for any function.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Response to mass media and the music industry*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Robust: The genre displays significant strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong: The genre displays strength in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coping: The genre displays coping ability in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weak: The genre displays weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very weak: The genre displays significant weakness in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unable to cope: The genre displays an inability to cope in its engagement with and response to mass media and the music industry.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How a genre displays strength in this regard will be genre-dependent. For some genres, high media and industry engagement will indicate strength; for others (e.g., certain kinds of ritual music), strength may be indicated by a lack of engagement.
7. Accessibility of infrastructure and resources for music practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All infrastructure and resources required for creating, performing, and transmitting the music genre are easily available and accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All infrastructure/ resources are accessible, but not necessarily easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most, but not all required infrastructure/ resources are accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure/ resources are only accessible with great difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some required infrastructure/ resources are completely inaccessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Accessibility of knowledge and skills for music practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The reference community holds all knowledge and skills required for creating, performing, and transmitting the music genre, and these are easily available and accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The reference community holds all required knowledge and skills, but these may not be easily available or accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The reference community holds only some of the required knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The reference community holds only a little of the required knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Required knowledge and skills are almost or completely absent in the reference community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. instruments, venues for rehearsal and performance, teaching materials, infrastructure for teaching and learning

* e.g. musical and social knowledge and skills needed for composing/creating and performing; linguistic knowledge needed for creating new song texts; understanding of genre-specific pedagogical methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. Official attitudes toward the music genre</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Blanket support: the music genre is supported through specific cultural policies developed and implemented in consultation with relevant bodies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support through overarching policies supporting cultural expressions, without discrimination and without consultation with culture owners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Passive accommodation: no explicit policy exists for supporting or recognising non-mainstream cultural expressions, such as the music genre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Active accommodation: implicitly or explicitly, the government encourages the development of 'small' or non-mainstream cultural expressions, for example, by providing funding only in the language and culture of the majority group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forced assimilation: government policy explicitly declares the majority group to represent the only recognised culture. 'Small' or non-mainstream cultural expressions are neither recognised nor supported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prohibition: performance of the music genre is prohibited. It may be tolerated in private social contexts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. Reference community members' attitudes toward the music genre*</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No community members support the maintenance of the genre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community support for the maintenance of the genre is weak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community support for the maintenance of the genre is moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community support for the maintenance of the genre is very strong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 'Community' broadly defined (see definition on p.2 of this document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11. Relevant outsiders' attitudes toward the music genre*</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support of the genre by relevant outsiders is absent altogether, or attitudes to the genre are adverse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support of the genre by relevant outsiders is weak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support of the genre by relevant outsiders is moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support of the genre by relevant outsiders is very strong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* e.g. of researchers, academics, fieldworkers, activists, commercial enterprises, funding bodies, NGOs
12. Documentation of the music genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extensive: high-quality documentation exists in a range of formats, including audiovisual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good: adequate high-quality documentation exists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair: adequate documentation exists in varying quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inadequate; limited documentation exists; varying quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequate; documentation is very limited or is of unsatisfactory quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Undocumented; documentation is non-existent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quality of documentation refers to a range of factors including comprehensiveness, rigour, accessibility (including via archives), and the availability of metadata.*

13. Your overall perception of the vitality/endangerment of the music genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vibrant and viable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vulnerable / at risk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No longer being performed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Status of music sustainability initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability Index</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Superb: regular, successful sustainability initiatives are running, involving the majority of members of the reference community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good: effective, well-run, well-supported initiatives are in place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair: initiatives are in place but may not be well run or well-supported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Basic: initiatives are in place but may be irregular, poorly supported, or poorly resourced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aspiring: no initiatives but some plans to start one</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None: no sustainability initiatives and no interest among the reference community in starting any</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Initiatives, projects, or activities with a primary aim to document, protect, promote, maintain, or revitalise the music genre in question.*
SECTION 3: FEEDBACK ON THIS SURVEY

Overall comments and suggestions regarding this questionnaire:

Many thanks for your collaboration.

Please tick here if you would like to receive a collated summary of results of the survey by email, in due course: □