Predictive Factors for High-Resource Funding in Indigenous Language Legislation

February 2019

Heather Bliss, PhD
for First Peoples' Cultural Council
1A Boat Ramp Road
Brentwood Bay, B.C. V8M 1N9
www.fpcc.ca
info@fpcc.ca

FIRST PEOPLES'
CULTURAL COUNCIL

Executive Summary

The objective of this report is to identify correlations between different aspects of Indigenous language legislation and government spending on Indigenous language revitalization (ILR). The report focuses on data from ten countries with Indigenous language legislation and available information on government expenditures. The countries – and the Indigenous languages they are home to - are listed in Table 1.[1]

Table 1. List of countries surveyed

Country	Language(s)
Australia	120 languages from 28 families
Brazil	178 languages from 12 families
Mexico	Between 68 and 278 languages from 11 families
New Zealand	Māori
Norway	Pite Sami, South Sami, Lule Sami, and North Sami
Scotland	Gaelic
Spain	Aragonese, Aranese, Asturian, and Basque
Sweden	Pite Sami, Lule Sami, North Sami, and South Sami
United States	169 languages from 33 families
Wales	Welsh

This report builds off earlier research reported by Bliss (2018), which documented government spending on ILR by each of these ten countries and found a clear partition in terms of the countries' per-capita spending: half were reported to spend more than $8 per capita annually, and half were reported to spend under $0.75 per capita annually. In this report, I explore potential sources for this divide, examining various aspects of the Indigenous language legislation in each country to find correlations with the observed spending patterns.

The main result of the study is that the legislative variables fall into three categories: (i) ***predictive factors*** that positively and negatively correlate with high and low levels of government spending respectively, (ii) ***positive correlates*** that show a correlation only with high levels of support, and (iii) ***independent factors***, which do not show a correlation with levels of government spending. These are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Legislative variables that correlate with government expenditures

Legislative Variable	Type of variable
Official language status	Predictive factor
Action plan to implement Indigenous language legislation	Predictive factor
Provisions for guaranteed renewal of funding	Predictive factor
Support for language immersion education	Predictive factor
Support for bilingual education	Predictive factor
Non-competitive funding mechanisms (i.e., not grant-based)	Positive correlate
Private donorship is encouraged via tax credits	Positive correlate
Independent body to oversee and enforce legislation	Independent factor
Indigenous control over Indigenous language policies and implementation	Independent factor
Financial support for multi-year projects	Independent factor
Strong support for other multicultural policies	Independent factor

[1] For a comprehensive list of sources for language data, see Bliss (2018).

Situating Myself

I come to this work as a non-Indigenous linguist living and working in the traditional and unceded territories of the hənq̓əmin̓əm̓-speaking peoples. I was born and raised in Mohkinsstsis (Calgary, Alberta) and I am the granddaughter of Scottish and British immigrants. I am an alumnus of the University of Calgary (BA Honours, 2003; MA 2005) and the University of British Columbia (PhD, 2013), and a former postdoctoral fellow at the University of Victoria (SSHRC 2014-16; Banting 2016-18). My research and interest in Indigenous language revitalization stems from long-standing collaborative relationships with members of the Siksika and Kainai Nations. I am a Lecturer at Simon Fraser University, and an Adjunct Professor at the University of British Columbia and the University of Calgary. The information presented in this report is influenced by my own personal background, experience, and training, and I recognize the limitations of this perspective.

Research Question

Broadly, this research seeks to address the question of whether there is a connection between Indigenous language legislation and Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) funding. As Canada is in the midst of developing and passing its own language legislation, it is timely to ask whether there are any ingredients of language legislation that can ensure high levels of financial support for Indigenous languages. What are the predictive factors in language legislation that correlate with a country providing substantive funding for ILR activities?

Methodology

Background: High-Resource vs. Low-Resource Countries

Bliss (2018) surveyed the annual expenditures on Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) activities for ten countries. To facilitate cross-national comparisons, the expenditure amounts were converted to Canadian dollars (CAD) and calculated according to (i) the entire population of the nation (the per-capita amount), the Indigenous population of the nation (the per-capita Indigenous amount), and (iii) the percentage of the nation's Gross National Product (GDP).

The results of the survey revealed a definite divide between what with henceforth be referred to as "high-resource" countries and "low-resource" countries, with high-resource countries devoting more financial resources to ILR than low-resource countries. This is observed most clearly with the ranking of countries based on per-capita expenditures (as shown in Table 3 below); high-resource countries spend between $8 and $50 CAD per person per annum, whereas low-resource countries spend under $0.75 CAD per person per annum.

Table 3. Per-capita spending on ILR

Country	Per-capita (total population), CAD
Spain	$50.36
New Zealand	$40.25
Wales	$19.58
Scotland	$8.45
Norway	$8.14
Australia	$0.51
Sweden	$0.22
Brazil	$0.20
United States	$0.14
Mexico	$0.02

This same divide persists, although not quite as sharply, when we consider the relative rankings according to per-capita spending amounts for just the Indigenous populations. High-resource countries spend over $100 per Indigenous person per annum, and low-resource countries spend $75 or less, as shown in the table below.

Table 4. Per-capital (Indigenous population only) spending on ILR

Country	Per-capita (Indigenous population, CAD)
Spain	1,147.28
Norway	783.38
Scotland	526.45
New Zealand	267.06
Wales	108.85
Sweden[2]	75.38
Brazil	47.83
Australia	18.82
United States	5.64
Mexico	0.09

Finally, this same divide is also observed when we consider the percentage of each country's GDP that is spent on ILR. High-resource countries devote over 0.008% of their GDP to ILR, whereas low-resource countries devote less than 0.0025% of their GDP to ILR.

[2] In the original report (Bliss 2018), Sweden was reported as having a much lower ranking on this measure, due to the unavailability of information about spending on Indigenous language education. This information has since become available, leading to an increase in the overall reported expenditures on ILR in Sweden, and a subsequent rise in its ranking according to the per-capita (Indigenous) measure. See Appendix A for a detailed explanation of Sweden's ILR expenditures based on this newly acquired information.

Table 5. Percentage of GDP devoted to ILR

Country	Percentage of GDP
Spain	0.1458%
New Zealand	0.0787%
Wales	0.0594%
Scotland	0.0180%
Norway	0.0082%
United States	0.0023%
Brazil	0.0018%
Australia	0.0008%
Sweden	0.0003%
Mexico	0.0002%

Legislative Variables as Predictive Factors

Given the clear partition between high-resource and low-resource countries, we can seek differences between the Indigenous language (IL) legislative policies of the respective countries in order to determine whether certain aspects of the legislation align with the high/low-resource partition. In other words, we can assess variables related to IL legislation in terms of a "yes-or-no" checklist to see which variables function as predictive factors in determining whether a country is high- or low-resource.

To compile the list of variables, recommendations for and critical assessments of IL legislation (cited where relevant below) were consulted. These documents identify positive and negative aspects of legislative policies, including potential shortcoming and gaps, which we can be considered legislative variables that may function as predictive factors. Each of these variables is described below, with definitional criteria for what constitutes as "yes" or "no" score in the checklist.[3]

Following these descriptions, surveys of each of the ten countries are presented, organized according to their respective checklists. The data for these surveys was gathered from publicly available sources such as government agency websites, policy documents, and media pieces, as well as published academic articles analysing language policy and the like. Sources are cited where relevant.

The checklist itself – once compiled for all ten countries – serves as a tool to determine which legislative variables function as predictive factors. Which variables score "yes" for all high-resource countries and "no" for all low-resource countries? These are the ones considered to be predictive factors.

[3] An additional variable not included here is whether the government funds public broadcasting in Indigenous languages. Based on the findings of Bliss (2018), we know this not to be a predictive factor, as some high-resource countries do fund public broadcasting (e.g., New Zealand) and others do not (e.g., Norway).

#1. Do Indigenous language(s) have official language status?

Since Prime Minister Trudeau first announced plans to develop an Indigenous languages act, the question of whether the Indigenous languages in Canada should be granted official language status has been discussed and debated (see, e.g., Bellegarde 2015; Lovick 2015; McIvor 2015; Vowel 2018). Those in favour of granting official status to the Indigenous languages of Canada point to the fact that it would lead to guaranteed linguistic rights in domains such as education and government services, which arguably would require increased government funding. Under standard definitions, an 'official language' is one granted special legal status such that it is used by and in a government.[4] As such, an official language is distinguished from languages with recognitional status (such as Aragonese and Asturian in Spain) or official minority status (such as the Sami languages in Sweden). Only countries that recognize Indigenous languages as official languages and grant them legal status as such are counted with a "yes" score in the checklist.

#2. Is ILR legislation accompanied by an action plan?

In a report detailing policy recommendations for Indigenous language revitalization in the province of British Columbia, Kelly (2015) draws a distinction between Indigenous language legislation on the one hand, and the implementation of policies on the other, the latter being that which drives concrete actions with measurable impacts on Indigenous language revitalization. As an example, Kelly points to Manitoba's Aboriginal Languages Recognition Act, which at least in 2015, had not been followed up with any policy that guided actions based on the legislation and had not been supported with any additional funding for language revitalization. This same disconnect is observed by Neumann et al. (2012) in their review of Australia's National Indigenous Languages Policy; they comment: "without concrete actions, clear goals and accountability, the National Indigenous Languages Policy will not achieve its intended goals. If the National Policy is to be taken seriously, then it must contain more than aspirational words" (p. 57). In short, legislation enacted without an accompanying action plan runs the risk of being tokenistic. Only countries with publicly available action plans that include clearly defined strategies and objectives are scored as "yes" in the checklist.

#3. Is ILR policy implementation overseen by an independent body?

Neumann et al. (2012) report that the Australian Human Rights Commission critiqued the implementation of the Australian National Languages Policy for being divided across numerous governmental jurisdictions. The absence of a single governing body managing or overseeing the implementation of the legislation is viewed, in this context, as an impediment to its success. Moreover, regardless of whether the delivery of language-related services is coordinated across a number of government agencies or jurisdictions, the establishment of a singular independent body, separate from other arms of government and able to ensure that language policies are followed by government, is seen as valuable, even if only symbolically (e.g., see Paterson & O'Hanlon 2015 on the role of the Bòrd na Gàidhlig in Scotland). Countries with an established independent body not subsumed under another government agency and mandated to protect Indigenous linguistic rights will receive a "yes" score in the checklist.

[4] see, e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Official_language.

#4. Is ILR policy implementation Indigenous-controlled?

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP 2007) asserts that "control by Indigenous peoples over developments affecting them and their lands, territories and resources will enable them to maintain and strengthen their institutions, cultures and traditions, and to promote their development in accordance with their aspirations and needs." In short, UNDRIP advocates for Indigenous-controlled developments, including Indigenous language legislation and policy implementation. Countries that adopt a model in which Indigenous communities manage and oversee ILR initiatives and activities will receive a "yes" score in the checklist.

#5. Does the legislation include provisions to ensure the renewal of ILR funding?

Of the countries surveyed in this report, none have legislative policies that guarantee a specific dollar amount that will be spent annually on ILR. However, some include provisions that effectively guarantee ongoing financial support from the government for ILR. Countries with such legislative provisions receive a "yes" score on the checklist.

#6. Is the distribution of funding non-competitive?

One of the primary criticisms of Canada's Aboriginal Language Initiative (ALI) program is in regard to the merit-based distribution of funds. In a 2005 report, the Task Force on Aboriginal Languages & Cultures commented: "Concern was expressed that communities are put in the position of competing for the limited funding currently available. Inequities result, as communities that have personnel skilled in preparing grant proposals or those with larger populations and greater administrative capacity are in a better position to receive funding for language initiatives" (Flamont et al. 2005, p. 65). Many of the countries surveyed in this report incorporate merit-based funding competitions as part of their overall strategy to support ILR. However, those that rely on merit-based competitions as the *primary means* of distributing resources to Indigenous communities to support ILR activities receive a "no" score on the checklist.

#7. Is multi-year funding available to support sustained programming?

Interconnected with the question of whether funding is distributed via a merit-based model is the question of whether Indigenous communities or organizations can secure multi-year funding to support long-term projects. In their 2005 evaluation of the ALI program, Flamont et al. (2005) note that the merit-based model, being project-specific, only allows for short-term funding, which prevents communities for carrying out major initiatives. More recently, Indigenous language educators such as Louie John Diabo of the Kahnawake Education Centre have criticized the ALI program for its short-term funding, noting that "it can be reversed or clawed back at any time" and that recipients are required to reapply annually, with no assurance of continuing support (Everett-Green 2016). Countries with legislative policies that permit multi-year funding to Indigenous communities and/or organizations – whether merit-based or not – receive a "yes" score on the checklist.

#8. Are there mechanisms to support private donorship?

Neumann et al. (2012) note that private sector funding made available through philanthropy may offer an additional avenue of financial support for ILR, and they acknowledge that certain

taxation polices in Australia create barriers against this type of funding reaching Indigenous communities and organizations. Countries that allow private donorship to support ILR receive a "yes" score on the checklist.

#9. Does the government support language immersion education?

In her analysis of Indigenous language education policies in Canada and the United States, DeKorne (2009) notes that, although it is rare for a jurisdiction to specifically prevent immersion education, it nevertheless may be prevented via restrictive policies on the language(s) of instruction. Countries with legislation and/or policies that prevent immersion in the Indigenous language(s) of the region receive a "no" score in the checklist.

#10. Does the government support bilingual education?

Just as immersion education may effectively be prevented through legislative restrictions on the language(s) of instruction, so may bilingual education. (See #9 above). Countries with legislation and/or policies that prevent bilingual education in the Indigenous language(s) of the region receive a "no" score in the checklist.

#11. Is the Multicultural Policy Index (MCP) above average?

The MCP Index is part of an ongoing research project based out of Queens University (see Banting & Kymlicka 2019) that assesses Western democracies on the basis of a number of variables related to multicultural policies and assigns them scores according to how their respective policies address these variables. There are three different types of MCP indices: one for immigrant minorities, one for Indigenous peoples, and one for national minorities. Only the latter two are relevant here. Of the ten countries surveyed in this report, five are assigned scores for Indigenous peoples: Australia, New Zealand, United States, Sweden, and Norway. Three of the ten countries are assigned scores for national minorities: Spain, Wales, and Scotland (with the latter two subsumed under a general score for the United Kingdom.)[5] There are no scores calculated for Brazil or Mexico.

The MCP index for Indigenous peoples is scored out of a possible nine points, with each policy variable counting for one point. Countries score one point per variable if they have adopted the relevant policy, 0.5 points if adoption is limited, and zero points if the variable is not adopted. (For detailed documentation of what constituted each score for each country, see Banting & Kymlicka 2019). The relevant variables are listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Variables for assessing the MCP index for Indigenous peoples

Recognition of land rights/title
Recognition of self-government rights
Upholding historic treaties and/or signing new treaties
Recognition of cultural rights (language; hunting/fishing)
Recognition of customary law
Guarantees of representation/consultation in the central government
Constitutional or legislative affirmation of the distinct status of Indigenous peoples
Support/ratification for international instruments on Indigenous rights
Affirmative action

[5] Unlike the MCP index, this current research does not distinguish between Indigenous peoples and national minorities. The MCP index explicitly identifies Basque, Welsh, and Gaelic people as national minorities.

The MCP index for national minorities is calculated in a similar fashion to that for Indigenous peoples, but in this case, there are only six policy variables, leading to a total possible score of 6 points. The relevant variables are listed in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Variables for assessing the MCP index for national minorities

Federal or quasi-federal territorial autonomy
Official language status, either in the region or nationally
Guarantees of representation in the central government or on constitutional courts
Public funding of minority language universities/schools/media
Constitutional or parliamentary affirmation of 'multinationalism'
According international personality (e.g., allowing the substate region to sit on international bodies)

In the MCP Index, scores are calculated for three different times in history: 1980, 2000, and 2010; only the most recent figure is reported here. In order to facilitate cross-national comparisons (given that some are scored out of 9 for Indigenous peoples and others out of 6 for national minorities), the score is converted to a percentage. Then in order to apply the score in the checklist of predictive factors, it is assessed according to the average score for all nations surveyed in the MCP index project. The average score on the MCP Index for Indigenous peoples is 5.78/9 or 64%, and the average score on the MCP Index for national minorities is 3.81/6 or 63.5%. I made the assumption that a "good" score is 10% above the average, so countries with a score of 74% or higher are coded with a "yes" score in the checklist.

Surveys of Countries

This section details the Indigenous language legislation for each of the ten countries, organized according to per-capita spending on Indigenous language revitalization (from highest to lowest).

High-Resource Countries

Spain

Spain is home to four endangered Indigenous languages: Aragonese, Aranese, Asturian, and Basque. Bliss (2018) documents ILR spending for all four languages and finds that over 99% of the government spending is dedicated to Basque. For this reason, only legislative policies applying to Basque are considered here. The checklist for Spain (with respect to Basque only) is given in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Legislative variables checklist for Spain

Country	Spain
High/Low Resource	**high**
Official Language?	yes
Action Plan?	yes
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	yes
Provisions for renewal?	yes
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	no
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes
MCP - above 74%	yes

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	Yes

At the national level, Castilian Spanish is the only official language, but the Spanish constitution recognizes that other languages are also official in their respective autonomous communities in accordance with their own Statutes. Basque Country was recognized as an autonomous community by the Government of Spain in 1978, and its Statute declares Euskera, or Basque, to have official language status alongside Spanish.

Notably, Aranese is also recognized as an official language in the autonomous community of Catalonia, alongside Spanish and Catalan. However, it is not afforded the same legislative protections or government funding as Basque or as Catalan. Aragonese and Asturian do not have official language status. (See Bliss 2018 for details and references.)

Action Plan?	Yes

Grin & Vaillancourt (1998) describe a Basque language revitalization strategy that was adopted by the Parliament of Euskadi (the autonomous community of Basque) in 1995. This strategy provided current (at the time) sociolinguistic information to contextualize and guide the implementation of the 1982 Basic Law of the Standardization of the Basque Language. The strategy focused on three elements: government, media, and education, and although it has not been updated in 20 years, the Basque Language Advisory Council produced a report[6] in 2016 with recommendations for developing a new language strategy.

Independent body?	No

Language policy implementation is the responsibility of the Deputy Ministry for Language Policy, which is subsumed under the Department of Culture (Grin & Vaillancourt 1998), and as such does not function as an independent body. A Basque Language Advisory Board supervises and evaluates progress on Basque language revitalization but does not have any formal control over policy implementation.

[6] http://www.euskara.euskadi.eus/contenidos/informacion/20132016_legealdia_dok/es_def/adjuntos/ETA%20HEMENDIK%20AURRERA_ING.pdf

Indigenous-controlled?	yes

The establishment and recognition by the Spanish constitution of Basque Country as an autonomous community was based on the premise that the Basque people are an autonomous group who are deserving of legal autonomy. Based on this premise, we can assume that the Parliament of Euskadi is considered an Indigenous (/Basque)-controlled institution.

Provisions for renewal?	yes

Provisions for guaranteed renewal of ILR funding come, in part, from Spain's 2001 ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. The Charter guarantees protections of Basque as an official language in Basque Country and it has an evaluation process that requires a report be produced every three years outlining how the Charter is enforced. The most recent report[7] shows that the Spanish Government and the autonomous community of Basque Country are fulfilling their responsibilities with respect to the protection of Basque.

Non-competitive?	yes

The majority of Basque language funding goes towards education. Public schools are funded annually through the Department of Education and private schools (known as *ikastolas*) are funded through annual subsidies from the Department of Culture.

Multi-year funding?	no

Education budgets are reviewed and renewed annually (see above).

Private donors?	yes

Spain provides tax incentives to registered non-profit organizations as well as individuals and businesses who give charitable donations to such organizations (Báez & Pedreira 2012). In the Basque Country, two examples of registered non-profit organizations engaged in Basque language initiatives are the Basque Centre on Cognition, Brain, and Language[8] and UNESCO Etxea.[9]

Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes

Students (and/or their parents) can choose between four different educational models in Basque Country, two of which are Spanish-Basque bilingual and one of which is Basque medium. As reported in Bliss (2018), only a small minority of students choose the fourth option, Spanish-medium.

MCP - above 74%	yes

Spain's score on the MCP Index for national minorities is 6/6 (100%).

New Zealand

New Zealand is often cited as a global leader in Indigenous language revitalization. The checklist for New Zealand is given in Table 8 below.

[7] https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/reports-and-recommendations
[8] https://www.bcbl.eu/
[9] http://www.unescoetxea.org/

Table 8. Legislative variables checklist for New Zealand

Country	New Zealand
High/Low Resource	**high**
Official Language?	yes
Action Plan?	yes
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	partial
Provisions for renewal?	yes
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	yes
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes
MCP - above 74%	yes

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	yes

Māori was declared an official language in 1987 via the Māori Language Act. The Act was replaced with the Te Reo Māori Bill[10] in 2016, which reaffirmed Māori's official status, alongside English and New Zealand Sign Language.

Action Plan?	yes

The Te Reo Māori Bill includes provisions for the co-development of two language strategies: one by the New Zealand Government and one by an independent Māori-controlled body, Te Mātāwai. The Government's language strategy, Maihi Karauna[11], is redeveloped every four to five years, with the current strategy in effect from 2018 through 2023. It establishes clear objectives and evaluation measures for the Government's role in supporting language revitalization through media, research, documentation, education, and public awareness. The language strategy of Te Mātāwai, Maihi Māori[12], is in effect from 2017 through 2040, and provides longer term guidance and principles to support language revitalization in homes and communities. The two strategies are meant to complement each other so as to support language revitalization from all perspectives and sectors of public and private life in New Zealand.

Independent body?	no

Te Mātāwai, an independent statutory entity acting on behalf of Māori people, was established via the Te Reo Māori Bill. However, while the Te Mātāwai is indeed independent, this organization alone is not responsible for overseeing Māori language revitalization. Te Mātāwai has jurisdiction over certain language revitalization initiatives, and the New Zealand Government has jurisdiction over others. With regards to the relationship between these two bodies, Te Mātāwai has the capacity to "support, inform, and influence the Crown's initiatives" and it operates in conjunction with the Ministers of Māori Development and Finance to provide oversight and direction to the Māori Television Service.

[10] http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2016/0017/29.0/DLM6174509.html
[11] https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/a-matou-kaupapa/maihi-karauna
[12] https://www.tematawai.maori.nz/maihi-maori-english

Indigenous-controlled?	partial

Because Māori language revitalization is the joint responsibility of the New Zealand Government and Te Mātāwai, it is only partially under Māori control. Te Mātāwai is under the directorship of a Board of Directors, the majority of whom are representatives of iwi, i.e., Māori traditional societies.

Provisions for renewal?	yes

The Te Reo Māori Bill explicitly outlines how Te Mātāwai is funded, through a purchase agreement submitted annually and supported by a statement of intent renewed every three years. These provisions specified in the Bill effectively serve as a guarantee of ongoing funding.

Non-competitive?	yes

Te Mātāwai provides grant funding to community organizations through a competitive program under the umbrella of their Te Mātāuru investment fund. However, this grant program is one of many initiatives funded through the investment fund, and Te Mātāuru is one of many initiatives funded by the Te Mātāwai annual budget. (Additional details are available in the 2017/18 Te Mātāwai annual report.[13])

Multi-year funding?	yes

Te Mātāwai supports research projects with three-year timelines, amongst other projects with multi-year or ongoing funding needs.

Private donors?	yes

The New Zealand Government supports charitable donations to registered charities by offering tax credits to donors. The list[14] of registered charitable organizations includes a number of early childhood education centres and other organizations supporting Maori language revitalization.

Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes

The language strategies developed by the New Zealand Government and Te Mātāwai act in concert with a Māori education strategy[15] developed by the Ministry of Education to offer Māori language courses in the English curriculum, bilingual Māori-English curricula, and Māori medium curricula for all levels of education, from preschool to tertiary.

MCP - above 74%	yes

New Zealand scores 7.5/9 or 83% on the MCP Index for Indigenous Peoples.

Wales

Wales has a long history of supporting Indigenous language revitalization, with the first Welsh Language Act dating back to 1967. The checklist for Wales is given in Table 9 below.

[13] https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5a172ab3f4308f0001d518e6/5c4fab6bbca6e1989af53d58_Te%20Mātāwai%20Annual%20Report%20ENGLISH%20DIGITAL.pdf
[14] https://www.ird.govt.nz/donee-organisations/
[15] https://www.education.govt.nz/our-work/overall-strategies-and-policies/ka-hikitia-accelerating-success-20132017/the-maori-education-strategy-ka-hikitia-accelerating-success-2013-2017/

Table 9. Legislative variables checklist for Wales

Country	**Wales**
High/Low Resource	**high**
Official Language?	yes
Action Plan?	yes
Independent body?	yes
Indigenous-controlled?	yes
Provisions for renewal?	yes
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	yes
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes
MCP - above 74%	yes

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	yes

The Welsh Language Act of 1993 updated the original 1967 legislation and declared Welsh an official language alongside English, ensuring both languages are equal in the public sector. This was superseded by the Welsh Language Measure of 2011, which confirmed the official status of Welsh in Wales and created a system of accountability for Welsh language services, enforced via a Welsh Language Commissioner, Tribunal, and Partnership Council.

Action Plan?	yes

Cymraeg 2050 is the Welsh Language Strategy[16], announced in 2017 to replace the preceding strategy that was developed following the passing of the Welsh Language Measure in 2011. The goal of Cymraeg 2050 is to have one million Welsh speakers by the year 2050, and the strategy is supported by both a Work Programme, outlining initial steps over a four-year period (2017-21), and an annual Action Plan, providing specifics on policy implementation throughout the financial year.

Independent body?	yes

The 2011 Welsh Language Measure mandated the establishment of a Welsh Language Commissioner's office, whose role it is to oversee policy implementation and ensure that the Welsh Government and other public and private organizations in Wales are compliant with the legislation. The Commissioner is politically independent of the Government. The Minister of International Relations and the Welsh Language is the main liaison between the Welsh Government and the Welsh Language Commissioner. The Minister oversees the implementation of the Welsh Language Strategy, including the development of the annual Action Plan in collaboration with other Ministers and in consultation with the Welsh Language Partnership Council. The Welsh Language Tribunal, also an independent body, is responsible for monitoring the Welsh Language Commissioner and dealing with complaints about the Commissioner.

[16] https://gov.wales/topics/welshlanguage/welsh-language-strategy-and-policies/cymraeg-2050-welsh-language-strategy/?lang=en

Indigenous-controlled?	yes

The Welsh Language Commissioner is appointed by the First Minister for a 7-year non-renewable term. It is a requirement of the position that the Commissioner have a background in Welsh and be fluent in the language.[17]

Provisions for renewal?	yes

The Welsh Language Commissioner's office is governed by a framework agreement[18] outlining how it will receive its annual budget from the Welsh Government, and how additional expenditures towards Welsh language revitalization will be budgeted. Included in the agreement are clauses stating that the Government will consider the Commissioner's funding requests fairly, and that the Commissioner should have as few constraints as reasonably possible.

Non-competitive?	yes

While there are some competitive grant schemes for language promotion[19] and education (Burrowes et al. 2011), these grant programs comprise less than 10% of the total expenditures on ILR activities in Wales. The majority of funds go towards the Commissioner's office and related administrative bodies, capital projects (e.g., language centres), educational programs, etc.

Multi-year funding?	yes

Some of the merit-based grant programs provide up to three years of funding for community organizations. A large investment in capital projects such as language centres, nursery schools, and primary schools was made in 2018, with funding stretching over five years for development.

Private donors?	yes

Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Welsh Language Society)[20] is one of numerous charitable organizations whose mandate is to support Welsh language revitalization in some way. The Welsh Language Commissioner acknowledged the important role that charitable organizations play in revitalization Welsh in her 2013-15 strategic plan.[21]

Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes

Both English-Welsh bilingual education and Welsh medium education are supported by the Welsh Government's Department for Education and Skills. Policy development is currently underway to support changes to the Welsh language curriculum (see Edwards 2017).

MCP - above 74%	yes

The MCP is not calculated for Wales specifically but for the United Kingdom as a whole. The UK receives a score of 6/6 (100%) for national minorities.

[17] https://cymru-wales.tal.net/vx/mobile-0/appcentre-3/brand-2/candidate/so/pm/1/pl/8/opp/4663-Appointment-of-Welsh-Language-Commissioner/en-GB
[18] https://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/141124-framework-agreement.pdf
[19] https://gov.wales/topics/welshlanguage/promoting/grants/cymraeg-2050-grant-scheme/?lang=en
[20] https://cymdeithas.cymru/node/2818
[21] http://www.comisiynyddygymraeg.cymru/English/Publications%20List/20130821%20PL%20S%20Welsh%20Language%20Commissioner%27s%20Third%20Sector%20Work%20Programme.pdf

Scotland

Although Scotland ranks relatively low amongst the high-resource countries, it has rigorous legislation and policies to support Gaelic language revitalization. The checklist for Scotland is given in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Legislative variables checklist for Scotland.

Country	**Scotland**
High/Low Resource	**high**
Official Language?	yes
Action Plan?	yes
Independent body?	yes
Indigenous-controlled?	no
Provisions for renewal?	yes
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	no
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes
MCP - above 74%	yes

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	yes

The Gaelic Language Act was passed in 2005 and granted Scots Gaelic official language status with equal rights and protections as English.

Action Plan?	yes

The Gaelic Language Act requires the development and occasional renewal of a National Gaelic Language Plan, which functions as a legal document and "is more than a list of corporate priorities."[22] The most recent plan was revealed in 2018 and is in effect until 2023. This 56-page document[23] was developed via a public consultation and details a list of key priorities, along with specific strategies for how "the Scottish Government (SG), Bòrd na Gàidhlig, public authorities, voluntary and private sectors, communities, families and individuals across Scotland can help to make progress with the aim, priorities and commitments" [of the plan]. The plan also outlines steps for implementation and monitoring.

Independent body?	yes

Terms of the Gaelic Language Act required the establishment of an independent body, Bòrd na Gàidhlig[24], to secure the status of Gaelic as an official language in Scotland on equal footing with English. Bòrd na Gàidhlig is an executive non-departmental public body that receives annual Grant-in-Aid awards from the Scottish government to meet its objectives, which include increasing language use, promoting the language in all spheres, advising the Scottish

[22] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/bord/the-national-gaelic-language-plan/.
[23] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/BnG-NGLP-18-23-1.pdf.
[24] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/bord/.

Government and other sectors on Gaelic issues, and overseeing Gaelic language education. Bòrd na Gàidhlig also functions as a liaison between the Scottish Government and the Council of Europe with respect to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages[25].

Indigenous-controlled?	no

Bòrd na Gàidhlig is the independent body responsible for overseeing all Gaelic language initiatives in Scotland. Members of this body are appointed by the Scottish Ministers, and there is nothing in the framework document[26] outlining the roles and responsibilities of Bòrd na Gàidhlig requiring its members to be Gaelic.

Provisions for renewal?	Yes

The Gaelic Language Act mandates the development and ongoing renewal of a National Gaelic Language Plan by Bòrd na Gàidhlig. The current plan is the third renewal and is in effect from 2018 through 2023. The Action Plan outlines commitments to be carried out by Bòrd na Gàidhlig, and these commitments are funded through an annual budget submitted to the Scottish Government.

Non-competitive?	yes

The majority of Bòrd na Gàidhlig's budget funds Gaelic organizations (including educational institutions) through ongoing contracts. However, it also offers a variety of grants for initiatives surrounding teacher training, early education, art and media, and other creative implementations of the Act.[27] The funds for these grant programs comprise a small percentage of the overall budget.[28]

Multi-year funding?	no

All the competitive grant funds are for one-year projects. Moreover, because Bòrd na Gàidhlig's budget is based on an annual grant-in-aid from the Scottish Government, its other projects and initiatives are also designed with one-year timeframes.

Private donors?	yes

There are a number of non-profit organizations supporting Gaelic language development in Scotland, including Comunn na Gàidhlig (CnaG)[29], which supports youth engagement with the language through camps, employment opportunities, and family support systems. CnaG was established in 1984 with support from the Scottish Government and has official charitable status in the country.

Bilingual education?	yes

The Gaelic Language Act establishes Bòrd na Gàidhlig as having statutory guidance over Gaelic language education in Scotland, from preschool to postsecondary. These are two educational streams, one of which is bilingual English-Gaelic education for non-fluent learners.

[25] https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages
[26] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Bord-na-Gaidhlig-Framework-Document-Final-Draft-August-2016..pdf
[27] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/bord/fundraising/.
[28] http://www.gaidhlig.scot/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/BnG-Annual-Report-and-Accounts-2017-18Electronic.pdf
[29] https://www.cnag.org/index.php/en/

Immersion education?	yes

The second education stream that Bòrd na Gàidhlig supports (in addition to bilingual English-Gaelic education) is Gaelic medium education, from preschool through postsecondary. In addition to providing educational support and resources, Bòrd na Gàidhlig also provides grants for teacher training in immersion.

MCP - above 74%	Yes

The MCP is not calculated for Scotland specifically but for the United Kingdom as a whole. The UK receives a score of 6/6 (100%) for national minorities.

Norway

Just over 1% of Norway's population is Sami but Norway's Sami Act asserts the equality of the Sami and Norwegian languages. The checklist for Norway is given in Table 11 below.

Table 11. Legislative variables checklist for Norway

Country	**Norway**
High/Low Resource	**high**
Official Language?	yes
Action Plan?	yes
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	partial
Provisions for renewal?	yes
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	yes
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes
MCP - above 74%	no

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	yes

The official language status of the four Sami languages of Norway is affirmed in the Sami Act (1987),[30] which asserts that Norwegian and Sami are languages of equal worth and are to be afforded equal status.

Action Plan?	yes

The Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion of the Norwegian Government developed an Action Plan for Sami language preservation in 2009[31]. While a new Action Plan has not been developed since that time, the existing one has undergone reviews and revisions since its release.

[30] https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/the-sami-act-/id449701/

[31] https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/fad/vedlegg/sami/hp_2009_samisk_sprak_engelsk.pdf

Implementation of the strategies and objectives in the Action Plan is the joint responsibility of the Norwegian Government and the Sami Parliament.

Independent body?	no

The Sami Parliament (or Sámediggi) was formed in 1989 and functions as an institution of cultural autonomy for the Sami people. The Sámediggi receives annual block grants from the Norwegian Government and has the capacity to distribute these funds at will. A Language Council within the Sámediggi functions as an advisory council for implementing Sami language policies and has decision-making authority over Sami language issues within the Sámediggi. However, the Sámediggi is not the only governing body in Norway with jurisdiction over Sami language legislation and policy; the Norwegian Government developed an Action Plan for Sami language revitalization in 2009, and some of the initiatives of the Action Plan are carried out by various arms of the Norwegian Government, not the Sámediggi itself. According to Falch et al. (2016), approximately half of the Norwegian Government's expenditures on Sami language and culture are filtered through the Sámediggi. The Sámediggi is responsible for managing Sami language education, and for allocating Sami language funds to municipalities. Other Sami language initiatives, such as those surrounding increased national awareness and access to Sami language services, are the responsibility of the Norwegian Government.

Indigenous-controlled?	partial

The Sámediggi and its associated Language Council are under Sami control. However, the Norwegian Government developed the Action Plan for Sami language preservation and is responsible for implementing some its initiatives. Stępień et al. (2015) observe the Sami self-determination remains challenging in that the Sámediggi does not have full autonomous control over Sami-related government expenditures.

Provisions for renewal?	yes

Although allocations of funding are not directed mandated in the Sami Act, the Act requires ongoing renewals of funding to support Sami language services in government, health and public sectors, and education. A 2014 review[32] of the 2009 Action Plan observed that funding has steadily increased each year since the Action Plan was developed.

Non-competitive?	yes

The Sámediggi's model for distribution of language funds is based on a regional subsidy model; the Sámediggi allocates annual subsidies to municipalities and other regional authorities, regional language centres, and educational institutions. Funds are not merit-based.

Multi-year funding?	yes

The Action Plan outlines ongoing multi-year projects for developing Sami curricula and teacher training, with provisions to review the projects in order to renew the funding annually.

Private donors?	yes

Although no Sami language organizations are currently registered as charitable organizations with the Norwegian Tax Administration,[33] there is nothing in principle that prevents such

[32] https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kmd/sami/same/oversikt_norges_oppfolging_anaya_2014.pdf

[33] https://www.skatteetaten.no/en/person/taxes/get-the-taxes-right/gift-and-inheritance/gift-to-organisation/list/

organizations from registering and permitting donors to claim tax deductions. According to Norwegian taxation laws, organizations promoting enrichment, cultural, or health activities for youth and/or underprivileged youth are eligible to offer taxable deductions to donors (Gjems-Onstad 2012).

Bilingual education?	yes
Immersion education?	yes

The Sámediggi was granted authority over Sami language education and curriculum in 1998. The Sami Act guarantees the right for all children to learn and be educated in Sami, regardless of where in Norway they live. In Sami administrative areas, there are both Norwegian-Sami bilingual programs and Sami-as-medium programs. Outside of Sami administrative areas, such programs also exist, but require minimum enrolments. (For additional information, see Falch et al. 2016)

MCP - above 74%	no

Norway scores 5/9 or 56% on the MCP Index for Indigenous Peoples.

Low-Resource Countries

Australia

Although Australia ranks highest of the low-resource countries, its ILR expenditures fall well below those of the high-resource countries described above. The checklist for Australia is given in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Legislative variables checklist for Australia.

Country	**Australia**
High/Low Resource	**low**
Official Language?	no
Action Plan?	no
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	no
Provisions for renewal?	no
Non-competitive?	no
Multi-year funding?	yes
Private donors?	no
Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	no
MCP - above 74%	no

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	no

Australia does not have an official language.

Action Plan?	no

Australia's National Indigenous Languages Policy[34] was introduced in 2009 and included five broadly conceived strategic objectives, namely (i) to bring national attention to Indigenous languages, (ii) to reinforce the use of critically endangered languages, (iii) to increase services in more widely-spoken languages, (iv), to strengthen pride in identity and culture, and (iv) to support language education programs. As documented by Neumann et al. (2012), when the policy was first announced, various initiatives were taken but no sustainable long-term plan was developed. One of the recommendations of Neumann et al. is to make publicly available an "action plan with clear goals, accountability, and reporting requirements to implement its National Indigenous Languages Policy." To date, this recommendation seemingly has not been adopted, although the Australian Government Department of Communications and the Arts has announced that it will release a National Indigenous Languages Report in 2019[35], and perhaps this is a step towards developing an action plan.

Independent body?	no

The Australian Government's Department of Communications and the Arts is the lead agency responsible for the implementation of the National Indigenous Languages Policy through its Indigenous Languages and Arts (ILA) program. In addition, many states and territories have their own language programming, largely education-focussed.

Indigenous-controlled?	No

Mahboob et al (2017) argue that having ILR under the jurisdiction of a variety of diverse federal and territorial government departments has led to an increase in administrative burdens and a decrease in Indigenous autonomy. They go on to suggest that Indigenous peoples' needs would be better served if they were more involved in the development and delivery of programs and services.

Provisions for renewal?	No

Calma (2009) notes that, although new initiatives stemmed from the introduction of the National Indigenous Languages Policy, the policy itself was not accompanied by an increase to ILR funding. Thus, there is nothing in the policy that will guarantee a renewal of funding. Rather, funding seems to fluctuate depending on partisan politics; the 2017/18 annual report[36] from the Australian Government Department of Communications and the Arts explicitly notes that their budget increase to the Indigenous Language & Arts Program was based on an election promise.

Non-competitive?	no

The majority of funding for ILR in Australia is distributed via competitive short-term grant programs. At the federal level there is the Indigenous Languages and Arts (ILA) program, and many of the states and territories have similar programs. The total collective expenditures of these grant programs are documented by Mahboob et al. (2017), and their figures are similar to the overall ILR expenditures reported by Marmion et al. (2014) and Russell (2014), suggesting that the large majority of ILR funds are distributed as grants.

---

[34] https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House_of_Representatives_Committees?url=atsia/languages/report/index.htm.

[35] https://www.arts.gov.au/what-we-do/indigenous-arts-and-languages/2019-international-year-indigenous-languages/national-indigenous-languages-report..

[36] https://www.communications.gov.au/sites/g/files/net301/f/doca_annual_report_17-18.pdf.

Multi-year funding?	yes

The majority of grant funding available through the federally-administered ILA program is for projects of one to two years in duration. However, there is a second category of grant – available by invitation only to select Indigenous language centres or organizations – that is on a five-year cycle.[37]

Private donors?	no

Neumann et al. (2012) report that charitable donations would provide an additional source of funding for ILR initiatives, but the government limits these opportunities through restrictive tax policies that prevent Indigenous language organizations from offering potential donors the incentive of a tax-deductible gift receipt, a practice available to other non-profit organizations.

Bilingual education?	some

A 2008 report on the status of Indigenous language education in Australia found that, of the 260 Indigenous language programs offered throughout the country, approximately 28% were bilingual programs (Purdie et al. 2008). Nearly a decade later, Lattimore (2017) compared Indigenous bilingual education programming in Peru and Australia and found it to be much more widespread in Peru than Australia. Only five official bilingual programs are reported in the Northern Territory; numbers for the remaining six territories are not reported but are presumably also small. Moreover, Williams (2011: 16) notes "…bilingual education in Australia remains controversial, and a hotly debated arena of contestation between those of us who advance the need to sustain first languages and cultural praxis and those who demand that Westcentric learning competencies be met over and above this."

Immersion education?	No

Both Purdie et al. (2008) and Williams (2011) report on the advantages of immersion education and point to examples in Canada as aspirational models for Australia. However, there is no available evidence to suggest that immersion models have been put to practice in Australia.

MCP - above 74%	no

The MCP Index for Indigenous Peoples in Australia is 6/9, or 67%.

Sweden

Both Norway and Sweden are on the traditional territories of the Sami, and both have language legislation protecting Sami languages. However, whereas Norway is a high-resource country, Sweden is low-resource.[38] The checklist for Sweden is presented in Table 13 below.

[37] https://www.arts.gov.au/funding-and-support/indigenous-languages-and-arts-program.
[38] See Appendix A for a revision to the ILR funding scheme for Sweden (based on new information acquired after the submission of the 2018 report).

Table 13. Legislative variables checklist for Sweden

Country	Sweden
High/Low Resource	low
Official Language?	no
Action Plan?	no
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	yes
Provisions for renewal?	no
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	no
Private donors?	no
Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	no
MCP - above 74%	no

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	no

Due to a National Minorities Act that was ratified in 1999, Sami is recognized as an official minority language in Sweden alongside four other official minority languages, Finnish, Romani, Yiddish, and Meänkieli. Although Sweden is home to four different Sami languages, only Sami (as a homogenous entity) is recognized by the National Minorities Act. Notably, official minority languages are not afforded equal status and rights as Sweden's official language, Swedish.

Action Plan?	no

Unlike Norway (and Finland), Sweden does not have any specific legislation that protects the Sami language, aside from the more general National Minorities Act (Anaya 2011). The Sámetinget (Sami Parliament) has a language policy to support Sami language revitalization in various ways but does not have an action plan detailing specific objectives and strategies.

Independent body?	no

Within the Sámetinget (Sami Parliament), there are two organizations that fund and support Sami language activities: the Sami School Board and the Sami Language Board (Huss 2001). The Sámetinget itself is not entirely an independent entity; it functions as an agency within the Swedish Government, but its right to self-determination is affirmed in the Bill that led to its creation in 1992. These tensions between autonomy and dependency are explained on the Sámetinget website.[39]

Indigenous-controlled?	yes

Insofar as the Sámetinget has jurisdiction over Sami language matters in Sweden, it can be considered Indigenous-controlled, as the Sámetinget itself is a Sami-controlled organization.

Provisions for renewal?	no

The Sámetinget receives its annual budget to support language centres through allocations from the Ministry of Culture of the Government of Sweden. As there is no dedicated legislation to

[39] https://www.sametinget.se/9688

protect the Sami languages, there is no guaranteed renewal of funding. Sami language education is funded by allocations from the Government of Sweden to the Sami School Board, but this funding too is not guaranteed and is reportedly insufficient for offering Sami language education to all those who request it (Anaya 2011).

Non-competitive?	yes

As noted, the majority of funding goes to language centres and educational programs. No information about competitive grant schemes was found.

Multi-year funding?	no

Budgets are reviewed and revised annually (see above).

Private donors?	no

Until recently, Sweden did not afford individuals or businesses any tax deductions for charitable donations. However, this changed in 2012 and donations to select types of charitable organizations (namely those focused on the poor and needy populations or on scientific research) are now eligible for tax credits (Arvidsson 2012). Donations to organizations focused on Sami language revitalization are therefore not eligible for tax deductions.

Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	no

While Sami language education is said to be guaranteed by the National Minorities Act, in practice it is mostly offered as a subject in Swedish medium schools. Bilingual Sami-Swedish programs reach only a small percentage of the Sami student population requesting it (Anaya 2011). Moreover, Sami-Swedish bilingual education is largely restricted to primary school and Sami medium education only exists as a brief transitional measure for a small number of L1 primary school children (Huss 2001).

MCP - above 74%	no

Sweden receives a score of 3/9 (33%) on the MCP Index for Indigenous Peoples.

Brazil

Although not long ago Brazil had developed important policies and programs supporting ILR (see Cabral et al. 2016), recent political changes in the country have led to significant budgetary cutbacks and the dismantling of many ILR initiatives. The checklist for Brazil is given in Table 14 below.

Table 14. Legislative variables checklist for Brazil

Country	**Brazil**
High/Low Resource	**low**
Official Language?	no
Action Plan?	no
Independent body?	no
Indigenous-controlled?	no
Provisions for renewal?	no
Non-competitive?	n/a
Multi-year funding?	no
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	no
MCP - above 74%	n/a

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	no

Indigenous languages are not recognized as national or official languages in Brazil; this status is reserved for Portuguese and Brazilian sign language.

Action Plan?	no

The current political powers in Brazil are not supportive of Indigenous rights. A 2017 joint submission[40] to the United Nations by a group of Brazilian social organizations documents the recent impacts on Indigenous peoples. They include a discussion of language, noting that there are no structured policies to recognize or protect Indigenous languages in the country.

Independent body?	no

Education – including bilingual education – is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. Other ILR activities are overseen by Fundação Nacional do Índio (the National Indian Foundation, or FUNAI), a government body responsible for managing policies related to Indigenous peoples and currently subsumed under the Ministry of Family, Women, and Human Rights Issues.

Indigenous-controlled?	no

Although FUNAI's mandate is to protect Indigenous rights, it is not an Indigenous-run organization.

Provisions for renewal?	no

Under the current political regime in Brazil, budgets for FUNAI and other Indigenous language organizations (e.g., schools) are being cut back with no guarantees of renewal.[41]

[40] https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/brazil/session_27_-_may_2017/js6_upr27_bra_e_main.pdf

[41] e.g., https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jul/10/brazil-funai-indigenous-people-land; https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-39944744.

Non-competitive?	yes

Given the overall lack of support for Indigenous issues in Brazil under the current regime, it seems unlikely that there are any budgetary funds devoted to new ILR initiatives, competitive or not. In the Bliss (2018) report, only (non-competitive) education funds were reported.

Multi-year funding?	no

The only current funding for ILR is for Indigenous language education, and it is filtered through the Ministry of Education, whose budget is reviewed annually.

Private donors?	yes

Souza et al. (2018) document a grassroots movement amongst Indigenous teachers to provide Guarani immersion education, and they list fundraising as one of the sources of financial support, with private donations coming from NGOs both within and outside Brazil. This indicates that there are no legislative barriers to private donorship to support ILR initiatives. Moreover, Bruha (2014) writes that charitable donations are tax-deductible in Brazil; (whether this has changed with the recent political changes in Brazil is unknown.)

Bilingual education?	very few

As noted in the 2017 submission to the UN (see footnote 40), the Brazilian Constitution establishes the right to bilingual education in Indigenous schools, but in practice few Indigenous schools have the resources to offer bilingual programming.

Immersion education?	no

Aside from grassroots initiatives such as the one documented by Souza et al. (2018), there seem to be no government-supported immersion programs.

United States

Although Hawaii and a small number of other states are well-recognized for ILR initiatives, at the national level, there is little government support for ILR. The checklist for the United States is presented in Table 15 below.

Table 15. Legislative variables checklist for the United States

Country	**USA**
High/Low Resource	**low**
Official Language?	no
Action Plan?	no
Independent body?	yes
Indigenous-controlled?	no
Provisions for renewal?	no
Non-competitive?	no
Multi-year funding?	yes
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	very few
MCP - above 74%	yes

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	no

While some states have advanced legislation recognizing Indigenous languages (e.g., South Dakota[42]), there is no national official language in the United States.

Action Plan?	no

The United States passed the Native American Languages Act (NALA) in 1990, but it was largely tokenistic, with no clear plans or funds for implementation (DeKorne 2009; Klug 2012). The Act was updated in 1992, adding a grant scheme administered by the Administration of Native Americans (ANA) to support community projects. However, aside from the initiatives taken by individual states to develop ILR strategies, there is no concerted action plan for the country.

Independent body?	No

The main funding body for federally-supported ILR programs for all fifty states is the Administration for Native Americans (ANA). This organization is under the umbrella of the US Department of Health and Human Services. Indigenous education is supported by the Office of Indian Education, which is under the umbrella of the US Department of Education. Research funding is also available through the National Science Foundation.

Indigenous-controlled?	no

The organizations responsible for funding and overseeing ILR initiatives (listed above) are all subsumed under arms of the United States federal government. DeKorne (2009) comments that grant projects funded by the ANA are required to originate in an Indigenous community or organization, but community control of the projects is effectively undercut "because the ultimate control rests with the approval of the ANA." McCoy (2003) similarly notes that "more direct tribal governance of Indian education is needed, and more direct governance is the next logical step."

Provisions for renewal?	no

Budgetary funding for the ANA, the primary funding body for ILR initiatives, is dependent on Congressional appropriations and vary depending on the political climate. There is no clause in the NALA guaranteeing any funding for ANA or for ILR more generally.

Non-competitive?	no

The primary mechanism for delivering ILR funding in the United States is through the grant programs administered by the ANA.

Multi-year funding?	Yes

ILR funding through the ANA is filtered through one of three grant programs: (i) the Native Language Preservation & Maintenance Program, (ii) the Esther Martinez Immersion Program, and (iii) Native Language Community Coordination Grants. These grants vary in timeframe from one to three years.

[42] https://www.ksfy.com/content/news/South-Dakota-Senate-panel-advances-indigenous-language-bill-505576871.html

Private donors?	yes

There are a number of registered charitable organizations in the United States engaged in ILR initiatives, including the National Indian Education Association[43], the Native American Rights Fund[44], and the Association on American Indian Affairs[45]. Each of these solicit donations that are potentially eligible for charitable contribution tax credits.

Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	very few

McCarty (2008) documents the very few bilingual and/or immersion language schools in the United States, offering education with language such as Navajo, Cheyenne, Hawaiian as the medium. She points out that, although there is growing interest in bilingual and/or immersion education, there are some states with laws expressly prohibiting it, requiring English as the medium of education.

MCP - above 74%	yes

The United States received a score of 8/9 (89%) on the MCP Index.

Mexico

Amongst the ten countries analysed by Bliss (2018), Mexico ranked at the very bottom with the smallest expenditures on ILR. The checklist for Mexico is presented in Table 16 below.

Table 16. Legislative variables checklist for Mexico

Country	**Mexico**
High/Low Resource	**low**
Official Language?	no
Action Plan?	no
Independent body?	yes
Indigenous-controlled?	no
Provisions for renewal?	no
Non-competitive?	yes
Multi-year funding?	no
Private donors?	yes
Bilingual education?	very few
Immersion education?	no
MCP - above 74%	n/a

Each of these variables is discussed in turn below.

Official Language?	no

In 2003, Ley General de Derechos Lingüísticos de los Pueblos Indígenas (the General Law on Linguistics Rights of Indigenous Peoples, or LGDLPI) was introduced, granting 68 Indigenous languages of Mexico national status, alongside Mexican Spanish. However, it is important to

[43] www.niea.org/
[44] https://www.narf.org/
[45] https://www.indian-affairs.org/

distinguish between national language status and official language status. Haboud et al. (2016) note that, although Spanish and Indigenous languages share the same status as national languages, neither is legally declared an official language by the LGDLPI or by the Mexican constitution, and "Spanish remains the *de facto* official language and stands, in practice, at the top of a sociolinguistic hierarchy."

Action Plan?	no

Citing Pons & Johnson (2005), Haboud et al. (2016) note that the LGDLPI is largely symbolic, a declarative instrument with no clear strategies or actions outlined that could have real positive effects on reversing language shift. They point to specific wording in the legislative document that are vague in nature, and thus do not have any legally binding force.

Independent body?	yes

With the passing of the LGDLPI came the establishment of the Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas (National Indigenous Languages Institute, or INALI), a decentralized body of the Federal Public Administration of Mexico. According to the INALI website, it is a legally independent body, "with its own patrimony" (translation provided by Google Translate).

Indigenous-controlled?	no

Although it is an independent body, INALI is sectorized within the Ministry of Culture and receives its annual budget from the federal government. Moreover, Indigenous education – along with all public education in Mexico - is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Department of Education, which requires the same curriculum for all schools across the country (Hamel 2008).

Provisions for renewal?	no

Although INALI was established via the passing of the LGDLPI, there is nothing in the legislation itself that guarantees any federal expenditures for the organization, or for Indigenous language education. When INALI was first established, its annual budget was defined by the current House of Representatives and the budget continues to fluctuate annually (Szekely 2010; also evidenced in INALI's annual reports). Moreover, financial support for bilingual education shifts depending on the political landscape of the country; it goes through waves of being well-supported followed by waves of funding cutbacks (Szekely 2010).

Non-competitive?	yes

Although there are some funds administered via INALI through a competitive grant scheme, the majority of INALI's budget is devoted to personnel, infrastructure, education, translation, and research.

Multi-year funding?	no

Because INALI's budget fluctuates annually, grant programs and other projects are funded on an annual basis.

Private donors?	yes

The lack of barriers blocking private donorship for ILR initiatives is evidenced by the many fundraising campaigns for Mexican ILR initiatives referenced online (e.g., Haley DeKorne's

Kickstarter to support language revitalization workshops in Oaxaca[46]). Moreover Báez (2016) documents the experiences of a Zapotec preschool teacher, whose annual budget from the government was so low that she and her colleagues were required to fundraise to run the school. Presumably, this Indigenous language school is one of many that fundraises to secure the needed funds.

Bilingual education?	very few

Hamel (2008) reports that the most common paradigm for schools with high populations of Indigenous students is to use the Indigenous language as the initial medium of instruction, but to switch to Spanish as quickly as possible, as the federally-approved curriculum and teaching materials are oriented towards monolingual Spanish speakers. Hamel further notes that pilot projects conducted in the 1990s focused on developing literacy skills in an Indigenous language (alongside Spanish) have not been very successful.

Immersion education?	no

While there are reports of some language immersion programs in Mexico (see e.g., Bonilla 2017; Hansen 2016), these are not financed by the government, whose curriculum and teaching materials are Spanish-oriented (see Hamel 2008).

Summary and discussion: Which variables function as predictive factors?

The preceding section detailed the legislative variables for each of the ten countries. Scaling back, we can observe which variables correlate with the division between high-resource and low-resource countries. A table compiling the results for the ten countries and highlighting the variables that correlate with the high/low division is presented below.

[46] https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/64252097/indigenous-language-revitalization-and-art-worksho/

Table 17. Legislative variables checklist for ten countries surveyed

Country	Spain	NZ	Wales	Scotland	Norway	Australia	Sweden	Brazil	USA	Mexico
High/Low Resource	**high**	**high**	**High**	**high**	**high**	**low**	low	**low**	**low**	**low**
Official Language?	yes	yes	Yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Action Plan?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Independent body?	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	yes
Indigenous-controlled?	yes	partial	yes	no	partial	no	yes	no	no	no
Provisions for renewal?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Non-competitive?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes
Multi-year funding?	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no
Private donors?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes
Bilingual education?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	very few	very few	very few	very few	very few
Immersion education?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	very few	no
MCP - above 74%	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	n/a	yes	n/a

Legend:	green = correlates with high-resource
	pink = correlates with low-resource
	white = no (total) correlation

In the discussion that follows, the variables outlined in the checklists above are organized into the following three categories:

i. Variables that absolutely correlate with the divide between high- versus low-resource countries (i.e., all "yes" scores for high-resource countries, and all "no" scores for low-resource countries.) These variables are referred to as ***predictive factors***.

ii. Variables that positively correlate with high-resource countries, but do not negatively correlate with low-resource countries. These variables are refereed to as ***positive correlates***.

iii. Variables that do not correlate either way with high- or low-resource countries. These variables are referred to as ***independent factors***.

Predictive Factors

Predictive factors are legislative variables that are scored "yes" for all high-resource countries and "no" for all low-resource countries. This 100% correlation can be taken to signal that these variables function as predictors for determining whether a body of legislation yields high-resource or low-resource governmental support.

Official Language Status

The question of whether Canada's Indigenous languages should be granted official language status is controversial (see, e.g., Lakritz 2015 responding to Bellegarde 2015). However, it is clear from this survey that official language status is one of the predictors that determines whether funding can be secured to support ILR. It should be noted that for four of the five high-resource countries surveyed here, there is only one Indigenous language to consider (Basque in Spain, Māori in New Zealand, Welsh in Wales, and Gaelic in Scotland). As for the fifth country, Norway, there are four distinct Sami languages, but they are effectively treated as one under the legislation. Can official language status be scaled up in scope to accommodate more languages? It is useful in this context to recall the Spanish model, which recognizes only one official language (Castilian Spanish) nationally but grants official regional status to Basque, Catalan, and Galician – all of which are well-supported by strong education policies.

Action Plan

An Action Plan can serve as a roadmap for creating languages plans and meeting objectives, and it can also serve as tool for accountability to ensure that the concerted efforts of various stakeholders are yielding results. DeKorne (2009) cautions against vague legislative policies without clear directives, noting that they, although they may seem positive in that they do place restrictions on governments and communities, they may be "open to interpretations which may or may not be beneficial." Scotland's Bòrd na Gàidhlig is particular progressive with its language planning; the Gaelic Language Act requires the ongoing development and renewal of an Action Plan and the Bòrd na Gàidhlig has extensive tools and resources that to assist with Action Plan development (see http://www.gaidhlig.scot/bord/gaelic-you/.)

Provisions for renewal

Unsurprisingly, no legislation (at least of those considered here) commits to specified funding amounts, but all of the high-resource countries specifically reference the necessity of government funding in their Indigenous language legislation, and outlines measures and procedures for allocating funds on an ongoing basis. In comparison the legislation of low-

resource countries appears particularly tokenistic in this regard as no mention is made of the mechanisms by which Indigenous language legislation will be financially supported.

Bilingual and immersion education

There is substantive research suggesting that bilingual and immersion education, in which an Indigenous language is a medium of instruction, is one of the primary tools for ILR (see, e.g., Hinton 2011 and many others). Implementation and delivery of such educational programs requires long-term planning and concerted effort across various public and private sectors (see Bliss & Creed 2018 for timelines and models.) As such, legislation ensuring a jurisdiction's commitment to support Indigenous language-medium education require high-resource funding.

Positive Correlates

Positive correlates are variables that score "yes" for all high-resource countries, but do not a score "no" score for all low-resource countries. What these patterns tell us is that these variables can help to ensure that legislation yields high-resource funding, but it is not a predictive factor.

Non-Competitive Funding Model

The majority of countries surveyed include some competitive grant schemes in their funding models (the only exceptions that do not are Spain, Norway, Sweden, and Brazil). However, none of the high-resource countries rely on competitive grant schemes as their primary mechanism for distributing Indigenous language funding. For those that do (Australia and the United States), there have been suggestions that this type of funding mechanism results in an unequal distribution of funding, an unnecessary administrative burden, and a lack of sustainability (see, e.g., DeKorne 2009; Mahboob et al. 2017).

Sanctioned Private Donorship

Charitable donations to Indigenous language organizations are rewarded with tax deductions in all countries except Australia and Sweden. This is a simple government measure that, not only can increase funds to support ILR, but may also increase awareness of the importance and legitimacy of Indigenous language revitalization. Notably, with the exception of Norway, all high-resource countries sanctioning private donorship have registered charities raising ILR funds, regardless of the high level of government support, suggesting that private donorships can indeed be a useful resource to support ILR efforts.

Independent Factors

Independent factors are variables that do not consistently score "yes" for high-resource countries or "no" for low-resource countries. Although these variables may be considered important aspects of effective Indigenous language legislation, in the countries surveyed here, they do not correlate with government spending.

Independent body

Only three of the ten countries surveyed legislate Indigenous language revitalization to an independent body, legally autonomous and responsible for overseeing Indigenous language policy development and implementation. Two of these countries are high-resource (Scotland and Wales) and one is low-resource (Mexico). The lack of correlation suggests that the establishment of an independent body is not a necessary ingredient in Indigenous language legislation to guarantee high-resource government support. However, it is worth noting that the

utility of an independent body can vary country to country. In Scotland, for instance, the establishment of an independent body has helped to unify disparate ideological views and ensure policy compliance (Paterson & O'Hanlon 2015).

Indigenous control

Indigenous control over Indigenous rights (including language rights) is an important and principled objective, as asserted by the United Nations Declaration of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Haboud et al. (2016) attribute the failings of Mexico's Indigenous language legislation to the lack of Indigenous control, noting that "the case of Mexico shows the limited effect of language revitalisation policies based on top-down initiatives such as language legislation, especially when the laws have no binding force and stand in a subordinate position within the larger juridical framework of the nation-state." Falch et al (2016) similarly note that the Sami in Norway lack self-determination and autonomy, as the Sámediggi's decisions can in some cases be appealed to the Norwegian Government and in other cases only serve as recommendations to the Government. Despite the fact that Indigenous control is not a predictive factor for high-resource support in Indigenous language revitalization, it remains a principled objective.

Multi-year funding

A lack of commitment to multi-year projects may be problematic for a funding model that relies primarily on competitive grant schemes, but for high-resource countries will guaranteed annual funding renewals, multi-year funding need not be secured, as it will be available on an ongoing basis. This is evidenced most sharply with Spain, the highest resource country in the survey and the one with no documented support for projects extending beyond a single fiscal year.

MCP Index

Unlike the other legislative variables analysed in this report, the MCP Index is not specific to Indigenous languages, but it relates to Indigenous language legislation insofar as it provides a general measure of a country's responsiveness to issues of importance for Indigenous peoples or national minorities. One might speculate that a country that is generally supportive of these types of issues would also be in a position to provide high-resource support for Indigenous languages, but in fact, no correlation was found between a high score on the MCP index and high-resource support for Indigenous language revitalization.

Conclusion

This report has compared aspects of Indigenous language legislation from different countries and correlated these with levels of government funding for Indigenous language revitalization. The findings are useful insofar as they can help us determine which legislative variables function as predictive factors for high-resource financial support. Practically, identifying these predictive factors can be a fruitful step in legislative development in order to determine the necessary ingredients of an effective Indigenous Languages Act. However, it is important to caution against a "one-size-fits-all" approach when comparing countries around the world; the countries surveyed here represent a diverse range of sociolinguistic, cultural, and political situations, each requiring their own unique legislative solutions.

References

Anaya, James. 2011. *The situation of the Sami people in the Sápmi region of Norway, Sweden and Finlan*d. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of Indigenous people. Online: http://www.samer.se/3543. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

Arvidsson, Richard. 2012. *Swedish National Report: Taxation of Charities*. Annual meeting of the Association of Tax Law Professors. Rotterdam, May 31-June 2, 2012. Online: http://eatlp.org/documents/rotterdam-2012. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

Báez, Gabriela Pérez. 2016. Addressing the gap between community beliefs and priorities and researchers' language maintenance interests. In Báez, Gabriela Pérez, Chris Rogers, and Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada (eds). *Language Documentation & Revitalization in Latin American Contexts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 165-194.

Báez, Andrés, and José Pedreira. 2012. *Taxation of charities in Spain*. Annual meeting of the Association of Tax Law Professors. Rotterdam, May 31-June 2, 2012. Online: http://eatlp.org/documents/rotterdam-2012. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

Bonilla, Natalia. 2017. "Mexican women lead initiatives to rescue native tongues." Article published in PRI's the World. Online: https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-06-21/mexican-women-lead-initiatives-rescue-native-tongues. Last accessed 2019 February 17.

Banting, Keith and Will Kymlicka. 2018. Multiculturalism Policy Index. Online: https://www.queensu.ca/mcp/. Last accessed 2019 February 17.

Bellegarde, Perry. 2015. "Indigenous languages of Canada should be declared official languages." Interview with the Globe and Mail, 2015 July 8. Online: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/afn-asks-ottawa-to-declare-all-aboriginal-languages-official/article25378218/. Last accessed 2019 February 17.

Bliss, Heather. 2018. *A Global Perspective on Costing Indigenous Language Revitalization*. Report prepared for the First Peoples' Cultural Council of British Columbia.

Bliss, Heather, and Myles Creed. 2018. *Costing Models for Language Maintenance, Revitalization, and Reclamation in Canada*. Report prepared for the First Peoples' Cultural Council of British Columbia.

Burrowes, Einir, Nia Bryer, Huw Bryer, Cefin Campbell, and Eluned Charles. 2001. *Review of the Welsh language support services for schools*. Report prepared for the Welsh Government Social Research Division.

Bruha, Patrick. 2014. "Tax-deductible donations in Brazil." Article for the Brazil Business. Online: https://thebrazilbusiness.com/article/tax-deductible-donations-in-brazil. Last accessed 2019 February 21.

Cabral, Ana Suelly Arruda Câmara, Wany Bernardete de Araujo Sampaio, and Vera Da Silva Sinha. 2016. Indigenous language policies in Brazil. In Filipović, Luna and Martin Pütz (eds), *Endangered Languages and Languages in Danger: Issues of Documentation, Policy, and Language Rights*. Benjamins: 45-59.

Calma, Tom. 2009. *The perilous state of Indigenous languages in Australia*. Chapter 3 of the Social Justice Report 2009. Report prepared by the Australian Human Rights Commission. Online: https://www.humanrights.gov.au/our-work/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-social-justice/publications/social-justice-report-0. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

DeKorne, Haley. 2009. *Indigenous language education policy: Supporting community-controlled immersion*. MA thesis, University of Victoria.

Edwards, Iddon. 2017. *Welsh language and bilingual learner resources*. Equality impact assessment template prepared for the Welsh Government, Language Department.

Everett-Green, Robert. 2016: "Trudeau promises Aboriginal language bill but the whole system needs an overhaul." Article in the Globe and Main. Online: https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/trudeau-promises-aboriginal-language-bill-but-the-whole-system-needs-an-overhaul/article33444970/. Last accessed 2019 February 17.

Falch, Torvald, Per Selle, and Kristin Strømsnes. 2016. The Sámi: 25 Years of Indigenous Authority in Norway. *Ethnopolitics* 15(1): 125-143.

Flamont, Bruce, Ron Ignace, Mary Jane Jim, Amos Key Jr., Helen Klengenberg, Alexina Kublu, Rosemarie McPherson, Ruth Norton, Frank Parnell and Linda Pelly-Landrie [Task Force

on Aboriginal Languages & Cultures]. 2005. *Towards a New Beginning: A Foundational Report for a Strategy* to *Revitalize First Nation, Inuit and Métis Languages and Cultures*. Report to the Minister of Canadian Heritage by The Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures, June 2005.

Gjems-Onstad, Ole. 2012. *Norway: National report on taxation of charities*. Annual meeting of the Association of Tax Law Professors. Rotterdam, May 31-June 2, 2012. Online: http://eatlp.org/documents/rotterdam-2012. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

Grin, Francois, and Francois Vaillancourt. 1998. *Language Revitalisation Policy: An Analytical Survey Theoretical Framework, Policy Experience and Application to Te Reo Maori*. Report prepared for the New Zealand Treasury.

Haboud, Marleen, Rosaleen Howard, Josep Cru, and Jane Freeland. 2016. Linguistic human rights in Latin American and the Caribbean. In Coronel-Molina, Serafín and Teresa McCarty (eds). *Indigenous Language Revitalization in the Americas*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 10, 24 pages.

Hamel, Rainer Enrique. 2008. Indigenous language policy and education in Mexico. In May, S., and N. H. Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd ed, pp 301-313.

Huss, Leena. 2001. The national minority languages in Sweden. In Extra, Guus, and Durk Gorter (eds). *The Other Languages of Europe*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 137-157.

Kelly, Avery. 2015. *Many Voices; building on Aboriginal language preservation and revitalization: Recommendations for British Columbia*. Report prepared for the B.C. Ministry of Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation.

Klug, Kelsey. 2012. "Native American Languages Act: Twenty years later, has it made a difference?" Article written for Cultural Survival. Online: https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/native-american-languages-act-twenty-years-later-has-it-made-difference. Last accessed 2019 February 18.

Lakritz, Naomi. 2015. "More money won't save Indigenous languages." Opinion piece published in the Calgary Herald, July 11, 2015. Online: https://calgaryherald.com/opinion/columnists/lakritz-more-money-wont-save-aboriginal-languages. Last accessed 2019 February 22.

Lattimore, Sarah. 2017. *A comparative analysis of Indigenous bilingual education policy and practice in Australia and Peru*. BA Honours thesis, Australian National University.

Lovick, Olga. 2015. "Aboriginal languages should be official." Opinion piece published in the Winnipeg Free Press, 2015 July 20. Online: http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/analysis/aboriginal-languages-should-be-official-317509341.html. Last accessed 2019 February 17.

Mahboob, Ahmar, Britt Jacobsen, Melissa Kemble, and Zichen Catherine Xu. 2017. Money for Australia: Indigenous language funding in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 18(4): 422-441.

Marmion, Doug, Kazuko Obata, and Jakelin Troy. 2014. *Community, identity, wellbeing: The Report of the Second National Indigenous Languages Survey*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

McCarty, Teresa. 2008. Bilingual education by and for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. In J. Cummins and N. Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language & Education*, 2nd ed. Springer: 239-251.

McCoy, Melody. 2003.*A Compilation of Federal and State Education Laws regarding Native Language in Curriculum and Certification of Teachers of Native Languages*. Report prepared for the Native American Rights Fund. Online. Available: http://www.narf.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/pink.pdf.

McIvor, Onowa. 2015. "Aboriginal languages can and should be made official." Interview with All Points West, CBC News, 2015 July 11. Online:

http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/aboriginal-languages-in-canada-can-and-should-be-made-official-expert-says-1.3147759
Neumann, Shayne, Sharman Stone, Sharon Grierson, Natasha Griggs, Barry Haase, Ed Husic, and Graham Perrett. 2012. Our Land, Our Languages: Language Learning in Indigenous Communities. Report on the inquiry into language learning in Indigenous communities prepared for the House of Representatives. Online: https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House_of_representatives_Committees?url=/atsia/languages2/report.htm. Last accessed 2019 February 19.
Paterson, Lindsay, and Fiona O'Hanlon. 2015. Public views of minority languages as communication or symbol: the case of Gaelic in Scotland. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development:* 1-16.
Purdie, Nola, Tracey Frigo, Clare Ozolins, Geoff Noblett, Nick Thieberger, and Janet Sharp. 2008. Indigenous Languages Programmes in Australian Schools: A Way Forward. Report prepared for the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
Russell, Lesley. 2014. Impact of the 2014-15 federal budget on Indigenous programs and services. Ms., University of Sydney. Online. Available: https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/2123/11442/1/2014-15IndigenousProvisions.pdf
Souza, Teodora, Veronice Lovato Rossato, Neimar Machado Sousa, and José Paulo Gutierrez. 2018. The social movement of Indigenous teachers for education in the State of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil. In the *Proceedings of Rising Up: A Graduate Students Conference on Indigenous Knowledge and Research*. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
Stępień, Adam, Anna Petrétei, and Timo Koivurova. 2015. Sámi Parliaments in Norway, Finland, and Sweden. In Malloy, Tove, Alexander Osipov, and Balázs Vizi (eds). *Managing Diversiy through Non-Territorial Autonomy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 117-137.
Szekely, Emilia. 2010. *Overcoming Inequality through Intercultural Bilingual Education: State policies in China and Mexico towards minority groups*. MA thesis, Tsinghua University.
UN General Assembly. 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly*, 2 October 2007.
Vowel, Chelsea. 2018. "Why Indigenous Languages Should Be Taught Alongside French and English." Opinion piece in Chatelaine magazine, 4 May 2018. Online: https://www.chatelaine.com/opinion/indigenous-languages-census-canada/
Williams, Shayne T. 2011. The importance of teaching and learning Aboriginal languages and cultures: a mid-study impression paper. Report prepared for the NSW Government, Office of Communities, Aboriginal Affairs. Online: https://www.aboriginalaffairs.nsw.gov.au/pdfs/research-and-evaluation/importance-of-teaching-learning-aboriginal-languages-cultures.pdf. Last accessed 2019 February 19.

Appendix A. Addendum to Bliss (2018) on Sweden

Bliss (2018) reported only on the Sámetinget's annual budget of 6 million SEK to support the Sami Language Centres, as this was the only information available at that time. Since then, additional information has been received about funding through the Sami School Board to support Sami-Swedish bilingual education.[47] Specifically, the 2018 budget allocated 2 million SEK towards Sami language teacher training, and 50 million SEK for language education in municipal or independent schools. However, the Sami School Board charges municipalities 40

[47] Thank you to Eleonor Johansson from the Ministry of Culture in the Government of Sweden for providing this information.

million SEK for education, yielding a net budget of 12 million SEK for education and teacher training combined. Along with the originally reported expenditure of 6 million SEK for language centres, the total budget is 16 million SEK or $2,261,540 CAD.

Table 18. Sweden's expenditures on ILR (revised)

	Sweden
ILR expenditure – federal	$2,261,540
ILR expenditure - state/territory	n/a
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	**$2,261,540**
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	$0.22
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	$75.38
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	$44,344
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	$452,308
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0003%

Although this new data increases the expenditures for Sweden substantially, it does not shift Sweden's ranking amongst the ten countries; it is still a low-resource country by all three measures, as shown in Table 19 below.

Table 19. Rankings of high- and low-resource countries

Country	**Per-capita (total)**	**Per-capita (Indigenous)**	**Percentage of GDP**
Spain	$50.36	$1,147.28	0.1458%
New Zealand	$40.25	$267.06	0.0787%
Wales	$19.58	$108.85	0.0594%
Scotland	$8.45	$526.45	0.0180%
Norway	$8.14	$783.38	0.0082%
Australia	$0.51	$18.82	0.0008%
Sweden	$0.22	$75.38	0.0003%
Brazil	$0.20	$47.83	0.0018%
United States	$0.14	$5.64	0.0023%
Mexico	$0.02	$0.09	0.0002%