

13 The drivers of home language maintenance and development in indigenous communities

Elisabeth Mayer, Liliana Sánchez, José Camacho, Carolina Rodríguez Alzza

1. Introduction

Indigenous and tribal peoples represent 5% of the 7.7 billion world population, with roughly 370 million worldwide distributed over 70 countries and accounting for the bulk of the world's linguistic and cultural diversity. According to UNESCO (n.d.) and The World Bank (2019), while indigenous peoples own, cultivate or occupy almost a quarter of the world's surface, they embody 15% of the world's extreme poor and face problems of marginalization and other human rights violations. Indigenous people speak roughly three quarters of the approximate 7000 known spoken languages today (McCarty, Nicholas and Wigglesworth 2019). Despite the fact that language rights for indigenous and tribal peoples are enshrined in articles 13 and 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, indigenous languages across the world continue to have a minoritized status, despite efforts from indigenous communities, regional and in some cases even national governments to secure policies and practices to turn this status around (Annamalai and Skutnabb-Kangas, this volume). The development and maintenance of indigenous languages exhibit great variability around the globe. It is driven by multiple factors such as numbers of first and second language speakers, access to intercultural bilingual education, and adequate language policies and their implementation (Lo Bianco 1987; McCarty, Nicholas and Wigglesworth 2019; Coronel-Molina and McCarty 2016).

Traditionally indigenous communities have been characterized by extensive multilingualism on a global scale, dating back to premodern and precolonial times (Boas 1940; McCarty, Wyman, and Nicholas 2014; Simpson and Wigglesworth 2008; Vaughan and Singer 2018). In many modern and postcolonial societies their language rights as well as the use of their indigenous languages are under threat or critically endangered (Patrick 2012). Indigenous languages across the world exhibit different configurations and vary in relation to the challenges these bring. For instance, indigenous languages in Australia and the USA are usually spoken and used in very small communities, and most of these are endangered. In Latin America, however, these languages may be spoken by a larger percentage of the population and enjoy different degrees of vitality. However, despite having larger numbers of speakers, they remain minoritized and may encounter negative attitudes that lead to discrimination of their speakers.

This chapter will first engage in a global discussion of the major challenges faced by indigenous languages' maintenance and development, as well as revitalization efforts in indigenous communities. This will be followed by an in-depth country-study (Peru). The issues to be discussed include conflicting perspectives in language policies about minoritized indigenous languages as a resource, as a right or as a problem, as well as local and family language planning, educational practices, language attitudes and community-based activities.

We will use the following terminology throughout the chapter "minority language" refers to a language spoken by a minority of the population within a larger national or regional context, whereas "minoritized language" refers to their minimized status in the larger society either in

terms of legitimization or actual language planning (Groff 2017: 136). A “local language” is “a language spoken in a fairly restricted geographical area, and usually not learned as a second language by people outside the immediate language community” (Kosonen and Young 2009: 12). A “national language” is “a language that is considered to be the chief language of a nation state” (Crystal 1999: 227), and an “official language” is “used in such public domains as the law courts, government, and broadcasting. In many countries, there is no difference between the national and official language” (Crystal 1999: 227). We will use the term “indigenous” to refer to peoples, groups or communities that have coexisted since colonial times within and across national boundaries. Importantly, indigenous peoples possess their own cultures, institutions, customs, economic and political systems and languages (see ILO 2017 for definitions and legal conditions)¹. We acknowledge that the term “indigenous” to refer to peoples, groups or communities is controversial in some areas of the world (African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights 2006).

2. Language-as-problem and language-as-right perspectives on indigenous language policies

Ruiz (1984) originally articulated three orientations in language planning: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource (Hult and Hornberger 2016 present further developments). The first concept arises from a monolingual ideal and assimilationist mindset (Hornberger 1990) that results in limiting or eliminating multilingualism. The notion of language-as-right relies on the idea that language is an essential factor in enabling full access to healthcare, employment, legal rights, among others. We should also note that the language-as-right perspective is not always implemented in meaningful planning and practice policies. We first discuss these two perspectives, and then turn to initiatives that shift the perspective to language-as-a-resource.

2.1. Language-as-problem perspectives

National language policies tend to oscillate between the language-as-problem and the language-as-right perspectives. Language-as-problem perspectives were pervasive in legislation of many newly independent postcolonial states in the 19th and 20th centuries. Simpson (2008) notes that many countries faced the challenge of continuing with colonial languages as official languages or choosing some of the many indigenous languages spoken in their territories as official languages creating a marginalization of indigenous languages. In many cases, the result was the selection of a single national language, using it at all levels of administration and in the educational system, and ensuring that it is employed as the official means of interaction in the country. In the extreme case, minority languages have no official status, for example in Honduras, where only Spanish is considered a national language while indigenous languages such as Mískito and Mayangna are not (Lewis, Simons and Fennig 2015). Similarly, other Latin

¹ Australians refer to their indigenous populations as Aboriginal people or First Nations people, in the United States they are referred to as Native American People, in Canada as First Nations and in Latin America all groups that inhabited the continents before colonization are named indigenous.

American countries fail to recognize indigenous languages as official languages (Zajíková 2017). Among them are countries where indigenous languages are no longer spoken, such as Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay and Puerto Rico, as well as countries such as El Salvador where indigenous languages are spoken but the constitution does not mention them. This group further includes Costa Rica, Panama, and Guatemala. The latter two countries have constitutions that acknowledge indigenous languages but do not declare them official.

The United States has no official language, although several states have implemented English-only legislation at the state level which reflects the language-as-planning perspective (Menken 2013). Arguably, the transitional language education programs that have dominated bilingual education in the US throughout the past 60 years also had as a goal to incorporate speakers of minority languages into a society conceived of as essentially monolingual.

South-East Asian nations also faced the challenge of establishing official languages after independence in a linguistically diverse region with over one thousand languages (Kosonen 2005, Kosonen and Young, 2009). These nations faced a difficult balance between promoting a single official language as a symbol of national identity and the fact that a significant percentage of the population speaks a local language (Bradley 1985, 2007, 2019). The result has put pressure on the maintenance of local languages. In many countries, English, as the former colonial language of current international importance also remains in the educational system.²

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy of 1991 reversed the perspective of the previous 1987 law (see below) to a language-as-problem perspective that led to “an almost exclusive emphasis on English” enforcing national literacy standards (McKay 2011: 297). This policy resulted in the decline of the use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, which can be seen as “a result of repressive policies, both explicit and implicit” (McKay 2011: 297).

Although national language policies built on the language-as-problem perspective constructed multilingualism as a practical obstacle to overcome, this perspective is rooted in social, emotional and ideological factors that relate to the powerful role of language as a cultural and national identity symbol.

2.2. Recognition of minority languages as a right

Minority languages may have different degrees of legal recognition. Furthermore, legal recognition usually does not entail equal social status (Hinton and Hale 2001). International agreements, such as the ILO Convention 169, have an important role in elevating the legal status of indigenous languages. For example, many countries in Latin America have passed legislation to protect indigenous language rights at the central government level inspired by Convention

² The promotion of a majority language as a national symbol can be seen in the case of Tagalog in the Philippines, Lao in Laos, Malay in Malaysia, Burmese in Myanmar, Khmer in Cambodia and Thai in Thailand, with some variations in each case. In the case of Indonesia, for example, the national language (Malay or Bahasa Indonesia) was different from the ethnic majority's language, Javanese (Guan and Suryadinata 2007: 39). Sometimes national languages, as is the case of Bahasa Malaysia, are used as lingua franca to communicate across indigenous language groups given their mutual unintelligibility (Ting and Ling 2012: 85).

169. Countries that recognize indigenous languages as official languages with some territorial restrictions in Latin America are Nicaragua, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. Argentina and Chile recognize indigenous languages as co-official languages along with Spanish at the level of regional, but not national, legislation.

Mexico does not have *de jure* official languages but gives indigenous languages the same status as Spanish as national languages. Venezuela recognizes indigenous languages for indigenous peoples, and, in Paraguay, despite there being other indigenous languages recognized by the Language Act of 2010 (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2015), only Paraguayan Guaraní is a co-official language with Spanish spoken by indigenous and non-indigenous speakers in a unique diglossic situation in Latin America.

In the United States, some federal legislation in the United States protects and promotes indigenous languages as rights: The Native American Languages Act (McCarty 2003: 160) and the Native American Languages Reauthorization Act.³

In some African countries like Cameroon and Sudan, indigenous languages achieved official status after independence, representing examples of the implementation of inclusive postcolonial language policies.

India also represents an interesting attempt to promote minority languages as official in a very complex linguistic landscape (Pandharipande 2002, Bhatt and Mahboob 2008, Groff 2017). Estimates of the number of languages in India vary from 270 reported in the 2011 census (Kidwai 2019: 154) to 447 reported in the *Ethnologue* (Lewis, Simons and Fennig 2015). Hindi, the national language, is spoken only by about one third of the population but the Indian constitution also provides strong safeguards for minority languages. It explicitly lists two sets of languages: 18 so-called “scheduled” languages, later extended to 22, and 48 minority languages (Pandharipande 2002: 228-230).

In multi-ethnic Singapore, bilingualism in English and a home language is one of the pillars of the country’s strategy, indicating recognition of language as a vehicle for ethnic cultures, and economic considerations. For example, Mandarin was initially marginalized after independence, but has become much more prominent as China’s economic rise made it more relevant for the Singaporean economy (Guan and Suryadinata 2007: 79).

3. Minority and indigenous languages as resources

In parallel with the inclusion of language as a legal right, minority and indigenous languages are now increasingly seen as resources. This shift in perspective has produced new revitalization efforts whose results can be classified at the national level and at the local and regional level.

The Australian National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco 1987; Moore 1996) illustrates a shift in national policy that unfortunately only lasted for four years. This national language framework, which was locally developed by all States and Territories and was adopted by the Australian Government, gave Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages significant recognition as an important social and cultural resource. This policy pioneered very successfully

³ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/2299/text>

the establishment of Regional Aboriginal Language Centres as well as language management committees (McConvell and Thieberger 2001). The introduction of bilingual education in the Northern Territory was also highly valued by indigenous communities. Regrettably, it has been marred by policy failures based on multifaceted misunderstandings and miscalculations, a deficiency of appropriate training for Indigenous educators and English as a second language teachers (Simpson, Caffery, and McConvell 2009; McKay 2001; Simpson and Wigglesworth 2018). The introduction of the English-speaking policy labeled “First Four Hours” in addition to other negative changes all but wiped out Bilingual Education for indigenous languages (Devlin 2011; Disbray 2014). As reported by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016), of the estimated 250 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, less than half are still spoken in homes with 90% of the indigenous languages in a critically endangered state.

3.1. Indigenous languages in national education policy

Education policies have a large impact on Indigenous home-language maintenance, so it is no surprise that most changes in language policy have focused on local, regional or national educational systems. We will begin the discussion with India’s program, which is perhaps the most comprehensive attempt at incorporating Indigenous languages into the educational system.

For several decades, India has developed an innovative language education policy that factors in its complex linguistic landscape and the recognition of linguistic rights of its citizens. India’s constitution includes the right to maintain one’s culture and language, and to develop minority languages through education, particularly at primary levels (Bhatt and Mahboob 2008; Kidwai 2019). In addition to the introduction of a home or regional language at the primary level, two additional languages chosen among Hindi, English or some other Indian languages are planned to be introduced at later stages. However, as Bhatt and Mahboob (2008) point out, not all states have implemented the three-languages policy equally. The goal of introducing the home languages poses a challenge for languages that lack or use scripts that differ from the mainstream.

In addition, the generalized three-languages policy and the increasing urbanization and development of rural communities has resulted in reduced functional domains for local languages in favor of regional ones. Some communities have reacted against language regulations, demanding greater autonomy in setting their educational or linguistic policies, as in the case of Bengali speakers in Assam (Pandharipande 2002). In other cases, minority communities have segregated from majority communities, elevating the symbolic status of their language, as in the case of Konkani speakers in Maharashtra and Karnataka. In most cases, however, minority linguistic communities have assimilated (Pandharipande 2002). As in other situations around the world, local languages face familiar challenges such as lack of educational materials, teachers, and exclusion from many social contexts. As a result, Razz and Ahmed (1990, quoted in Pandharipande 2002: 223) suggest that half of India’s tribal population have already lost their languages.

Kosonen (2005) notes that in South East Asia, many children who are minority language speakers only have minimal knowledge of the national language in which education is typically delivered. These gaps potentially hinder their achievement and their access to further educational levels. Kosonen (2005) and Kosonen and Young (2009) describe several initiatives in which minority language education is an opportunity to bridge the gap between the minority home-language and the national language. For these projects to be successful, local community involvement is a crucial factor. At the same time, the unavailability of trained teachers who can speak minority languages raises a big challenge for these programs.

Kosonen (2005: 113) describes four different patterns in South East Asia: countries in which local languages are used in education to a great extent, and all activities are provided by the government, as in China. Second, countries like Vietnam, where the government provides education in local languages, but these are not widely used. Third, countries where both the government and non-governmental groups provide education in local languages to different degrees, as in Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines, and fourth, countries where non-governmental organizations carry the bulk of local language education, as in Thailand, Cambodia and Myanmar.

Morocco's language policy represents an interesting example of how language policies have evolved from the non-inclusive postcolonial language-as-problem status quo: Morocco's traditional linguistic identity has been built on French and Arabic. More recently, the country's official stance has shifted, allowing for the introduction of Berber in elementary education. Berber is one of the indigenous languages spoken, in addition to French as a colonial language, Classical and Moroccan Arabic (Zouhir 2014). However, this shift in national-level policy still faces challenges in the language ideologies and practices of some Berber parents, who, according to Zouhir (2014: 46), "seem to distance themselves from their Berber roots in an attempt to be socially accepted into mainstream Moroccan linguistic culture." In this case, the strong symbolic status of French and Arabic as prestigious national languages challenges the affective connection to Berber as a family language for the Berber community.

In sum, the survey of minority language education policy and practice reveals several common threads: the need to involve local communities for initiatives to be successful, the challenge of finding appropriate curricular materials and qualified teachers, the need for political support. In some cases, we find increasingly urbanized and mobile populations whose connection to the symbolic identity of the indigenous language may be diminished. Finally, smaller indigenous languages have a difficult challenge in expanding their social prestige and functionality in the larger national context.

3.2. Local initiatives: Indigenous language education

Ash, Fermino and Hale (2001: 20) point out that "local language projects operate independent of one another" as a result of the fact that "the structure of a local language program is determined by local considerations." In this sense, local programs are unique, sometimes adapting methodologies developed for other populations, other times developing original programs that

stem from their local realities. Language immersion schools in Hawaiian, Ojibwe, Mohawk, Maori, Navajo (Bishop 2003; Harrison and Papa 2005; McCarty 2003) are examples of local initiatives. However, immersion schools are difficult to implement in communities with few speakers or little control of the educational system. Other options include summer immersion programs e.g. Acoma, Cochiti (McCarty 2003), language classes in a system that operates in the majority language e.g. Hupa, Acoma, and Master-Apprentice language learning programs (MALLP) that pair a master, a speaker fluent in the language, and a dedicated learner, who is guided by the master through regular phone calls and visits. This model has been implemented in Sauk and Chickasaw and many other languages in the US (Hinton 2001), and in Canada, Brazil and Australia (Tom, Huaman, and McCarty 2019). McCarty (155-157) also discusses the Navajo Nation immersion schools' program, and the language reclamation efforts of the Keres-speaking Pueblos of Acoma and Cochiti as examples of community-based efforts at promoting immersion education in native languages.

Increasingly, minority communities have been questioning Western education paradigms and incorporating traditional indigenous educational perspectives and epistemologies (McCarty, Nicholas, and Wigglesworth 2019). These initiatives also take different shapes. In some cases, traditional knowledge is included within Western-style educational structures (cf. the Maori-language immersion school in New Zealand as described in Harrison and Papa 2005); in other cases, indigenous educational practices challenge formal educational practices more directly, as described in contributions to McCarty, Nicholas, and Wigglesworth (2019) and Lee and McCarty (2017). Or, as in the case of the urban Inuktitut in Canada, where state-driven language policies void of appropriate cultural content, paved the way for community-based "Indigenous-defined language and literacy learning activities" targeting not only children but including families across several generations. Two long-term community projects 'Photovoice' and 'Sculpin fishing song' aimed at bringing back cultural knowledge from the rural into the urban domain and extending it to cultural and linguistic practices through literacy material prepared in multiple workshops (Patrick, Budach, and Muckpaloo 2013).

In Australia, due to a small and shrinking indigenous population in conjunction with a steady increase in urbanization (now 79 %) with half of the rural population living in remote or isolated areas in the Northern Territory, promotion and valorization of indigenous languages depends heavily on national language policies and strongly on community-based support. The introduction of bilingual education in the 1970s was highly successful at first but failed to address cultural and language needs of aboriginal people. For example, for the Yolŋu people, the struggle for "Both Ways" bilingual and multilingual education and teacher training for indigenous teachers continues to present a challenge. Additionally, "aboriginalization" of the curriculum, i.e. ownership of educational content of the Yolŋu people as well as representation at the School Council and integration of the wider community, remain outstanding issues (Stockley et al. 2017). Community involvement also came up as the top theme in responses for key elements of language activities in the 2014 Indigenous Language activity and Language attitude survey (Marmion, Kazuko, and Troy 2014).

3.3. Community-based initiatives

Across the globe, the lack of appropriate support for indigenous languages has given rise to community-based efforts to develop and maintain their home languages globally, showing an increasing awareness of the language-as-resources perspective. Here a distinction has to be drawn between urban and rural contexts due to different opportunities and needs, although, in most cases both, urban and rural communities profit from most efforts through continuous connection, specifically in a digital age.

In urban environments, community-driven activities, raised from indigenous people's agency as a reaction to living in environments where they lack representation, may serve as incentives to pass on their language and culture to their children. Patrick, Budach, and Muckpaloo (2013) link Inuit-centered literacy activities developed between an Inuit Children's Center in Ottawa and a Family Literacy Program to drivers of family language policy. This creates a link between urban Inuit and an educational center for Arctic Inuit families in their homeland. At the core of this collaboration was the exchange of travelling objects and cultural artefacts that helped create a greater understanding of traditional Inuit culture and language in the context of migration.

Rural remoteness worldwide poses enormous challenges for language vitality and intergenerational transmission, calling for everyday language policies and practices in and out of school to counter language loss. In the Australian Western Desert, Elders use narratives and cultural activities to teach language, speech styles, registers and traditional knowledge within the extended family setting on country⁴. Storytelling practices are filmed in order to document and promote indigenous languages and cultures, to counter loss of oral practices, and to pass on traditional knowledge and culture to the next generation (Kral and Ellis 2019).

The availability of modern digital communication technologies across the world has created invisible learning spaces without borders or socio-spatial confines (Hatoss this volume; Palviainen this volume). Access to such technologies unites globally Indigenous youth as they explore and share new / hybrid modes of cultural production through song-writing and recording and film-making on media such as Facebook and Youtube. Although oral and written language use is impacted by daily communication practices of online messaging, SMS and WhatsApp text and visual messages, the new practice is an invaluable addition to corpus building not only in Australia but also worldwide (Kral 2010). Other Australia-wide online resources such as National Indigenous Television on Demand (NITV), Indigenous Community Television (ICTV), IndigiTUBE—featuring language and culture, ABC Indigenous Radio for news and current affairs, TV and iview are fundamental instruments of and for Aboriginal voices and promotion of aboriginal cultures and languages. The introduction of *narrangunwali* — Reconciliation in

⁴ Aboriginal Australians have a strong social, cultural and spiritual connection to their homeland and to land- and waterways management.

schools, and early learning and access to online resources from AIATSIS (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies)⁵.

Finally, an important factor globally across urban and rural domains is raising the status of indigenous languages through professionalization. Translation and Interpreting as public services serve multiple purposes and are often seen just as “*social lubricants* that prevent social tensions” (Serrano and Fouces 2018: 8). Although this may be true to a certain extent, professionalizing these services raises not only the status of indigenous languages, but also their economic value by creating professional paid workplaces. Additionally, extending the practice of indigenous languages from the private into the public domain by regulation and certification helps to ensure ethnolinguistic vitality of indigenous languages (Spolsky 2004). Shifting from community-based voluntary work to paid professional work also improves the status of indigenous languages by raising their economic value.

4. Language attitudes

An important factor that impacts minority language home maintenance relates to language attitudes (Albury, this volume). We can distinguish several related threads. Speakers of “pure” varieties are seen as more prestigious than those understood to be influenced by the majority language. Since purer varieties tend to be identified with older speakers, one unintended consequence of this ideology is that younger generations of speakers, who may speak varieties more influenced by the majority language, and sometimes may also be perceived as less proficient speakers, may feel less confident in their ability to use the minority language (Dorian 1994).

In some cases, communities that used to be monolingual in an indigenous language and that lacked access to majority/socially dominant languages, have become bilingual (Arguedas 1966) and must come to terms with the idea of indigenous languages having become heritage languages (Hornberger 2005). In recent years, minority language planning has begun to incorporate the notion of heritage speakers (Valdés 2000) and adult L2 speakers (Hornberger 2005). Heritage learners are exposed to input that includes more frequent use of the majority language, and the resulting linguistic abilities may be markedly different from those of older speakers, and in this sense minority languages share aspects of heritage varieties (Eisenclas and Schalley this volume). In states that have invested in revitalization efforts of indigenous and minoritized languages, differences between “new speakers”, namely second language speakers of these languages, on the one hand, and heritage and native speakers, on the other, have opened the door to the debate of what constitutes being a native speaker of a minoritized language (O’Rourke and Pujolar 2013; O’Rourke and Ramallo 2014).

Another dimension related to language attitudes involves the urban/rural divide. Traditional population patterns tended to associate higher density of minority languages with rural areas. However, increased migration to cities means that large numbers of minority

⁵ AIATSIS is an independent Australian Government statutory authority that has been instrumental in raising awareness and connecting indigenous culture Australia-wide (AIATSIS n/d).

language speakers are now located in urban centers, sometimes creating more complex linguistic interactions as well as the need to redefine what constitutes an indigenous linguistic identity in an urban environment (May 2014; Davis 2018; Shulist 2018; Ferguson 2019). Sánchez et al. (2018) describe how attitudes towards languages have changed over fifteen years in a community of speakers of Shipibo who migrated from the Amazonian region of Pucallpa to the city of Lima, Peru. Away from the traditional rural areas where minority languages were based, some groups have begun to develop innovative initiatives where minority languages may be rooted. These initiatives, however, face a multiplicity of challenges such as lack of support from central governments and urban administrations that do not view revitalization efforts as a priority. This is especially the case in the area of education in indigenous languages (Hornberger 2008).

The case of local languages in India also illustrates the importance of attitudes connected to the broader geographic divide. Most local languages tend to be rural, whereas regional and national languages are associated with urban centers, with economic mobility and progress. Even co-official indigenous languages such as Guaraní in Paraguay are subject to this perception. Despite being considered central in Paraguayan identity, Guaraní is at the same time associated with ruralness and ignorance (Mortimer 2013). As a result of these assumptions, as local languages become less functional, speakers perceive them as less valuable.

In the last section, we turn to the case of indigenous languages in Peru, which show a clear example of how the changing urban/rural divide is altering the traditional perspectives on indigenous language maintenance. Peru also exemplifies the case of a country where while legislation recognizes indigenous languages, maintenance depends on a combination of government policies, NGOs and community initiatives.

5. Peruvian Amazonian and Andean languages across urban and rural conditions.

Peru currently has 19 language families, and 48 indigenous languages actively spoken (Ministerio de Educación, Perú 2019). In the 2017 General Census (INEI 2017a), 22,209,686 individuals 5 and older (82,6%) declared Spanish to be the language they acquired in childhood, followed by 3,735,682 Quechua speakers (13,9%), 444,389 Aymara speakers (1,7%) and 210,017 speakers of other indigenous languages (0,8%).

Language acquisition differs in the urban and rural contexts. In the urban context, 87,9% of the population acquired Spanish in childhood, 9.7% acquired Quechua, 1.1% acquired Aymara and 1.3%, all other indigenous languages. In rural communities, on the other hand, more children acquire indigenous languages than in cities: 61.8% acquire Spanish, 30.3% Quechua 3.9% Aymara, and 3.2% other indigenous languages. This distribution indicates that indigenous languages, while present in urban centers, continue to have a stronger presence in rural areas.

Rural communities, usually not much larger than a town, are basic, officially recognized territorial organizations with title to communal lands. 64% of the 6682 rural communities

identified as belonging to one of the 20 indigenous people. The most frequently spoken indigenous languages in those communities are Quechua (69.9%) and Aymara (9.3%). Additionally, 17 other indigenous languages are also spoken (all under 1%), as well as Spanish (21%, INEI 2017b).

Indigenous languages in the Andean and Amazonian regions of Peru have been historically minoritized and their speakers have been traditionally discriminated against. Their use is associated with indigenous and rural backgrounds. Given that most of their speakers reside in rural areas, it is not surprising that the majority of language planning and educational efforts are focused on rural populations.

Early efforts to gain official recognition for indigenous language rights started in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In the 1980s intercultural bilingual education was overseen by a low-level unit within the Division of Elementary Education. As Sánchez, Lucero and Córdova (2012) point out, the unit was promoted to a higher rank only in 1989, demoted again in the 1990s, and finally converted to a Division again in 2000.

Currently, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education are the main sources of language planning dedicated to protecting the language rights guaranteed by the Constitution and the Language Rights Bill (Ley de Lenguas, N° 29735). The National Policy of Original Languages, Oral Tradition and Interculturality, approved in 2017, has resulted in several initiatives, including (Ministerio de Cultura, Perú 2019): the program “Voces Vivas” (Living Voices), which aims to revitalize the endangered languages Jaqaru, Kukama, Isconahua, Shiwilu, Uro and Iquito, the Technical Committee on Indigenous Languages (Comité Técnico Especializado en Lenguas Indígenas (CTELI), which develops language policies, and the program “Estado Multilingüe” (Multilingual State), which implements linguistic rights in public administration currently focused on the Cuzco region and to a lesser extent on the regions of Loreto, Ucayali, Junín y San Martín. A very successful initiative has been the training of indigenous language translators and interpreters to assist indigenous people in administrative processes. Graduates of this training program are listed in the National Register of Translators and Interpreters of Indigenous Languages created in 2014. In April 2019, the Peruvian Institute of Indigenous Languages, was formally established, with the charge to promote research, documentation, preservation, development and teaching of indigenous languages in Peru.

5.1 Educational Policies

Several initiatives in the early 1990s developed programs in intercultural bilingual education at the Elementary school level, before the current legal framework was created. As noted by Sánchez, Lucero and Córdova (2012), intercultural bilingual education in indigenous languages and Spanish was already recognized as a fundamental right of indigenous peoples both by the Language Rights Bill (2011) and by Peru’s Ombudsman Office (Defensoría del Pueblo 2011) and further developed by law as a right from kindergarten to 12th grade This law promotes the use of indigenous languages by teachers and it seeks to ensure indigenous peoples’ participation

in the formulation and implementation of educational and language planning in indigenous languages (DIGEIBIR 2005-2007).

The 2015 National Plan of intercultural bilingual education (DIGEIBIR 2015) aims to expand the number of indigenous children and youth attending intercultural bilingual schools. These schools are defined as having an intercultural bilingual education curriculum and materials in the indigenous language, and at least one teacher with knowledge of the relevant indigenous culture and language. The policy aims to expand the percentage of children receiving pre-school intercultural bilingual education, from 52% in 2015 to 90% in 2021. It also aims to increase the percentage of students receiving elementary intercultural bilingual education, from 52.6% in 2015 to 90% in 2021 and the percentage of students who receive intercultural bilingual education at the secondary education level from 0% to 50%. Some regions with high percentages of indigenous population and with indigenous teachers and administrators such as Puno have made significant progress in developing an indigenous approach to curricular development (Ministerio de Educación-CARE 2009). In 2009, the Huancavelica region also characterized by strong indigenous leadership approved an ordinance that prohibits discrimination on the basis of many factors that typically identify indigenous peoples, among them language. In the region of La Libertad in Northern Peru, several programs for the revitalization of Muchik, an extinct language have begun to gain strength in recent years.

5.2. NGOs and local initiatives

Throughout the years, and even before the creation of an intercultural bilingual education unit within the Ministry of Education, a succession of non-profit organizations initiated and implemented indigenous bilingual education. Sánchez (2016) notes the existence of multiple NGOs, many of them with indigenous leadership and membership, whose work focuses on indigenous rights, among them language rights, revitalization, and intercultural bilingual education in many regions of Peru.

In the Amazonian region, AIDSESEP (Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana ‘Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest’) is a macro-level organization. It represents indigenous organizations from the northern, central, and southern parts of the Amazonian region (65 federations representing 1,500 communities, around 650,000 indigenous people, and 16 language families) (Sánchez 2016). It collaborates in teacher training efforts with the Programa de Formación de Maestros Bilingües de la Amazonía Peruana (Institute for the Education of Bilingual Teachers in the Peruvian Amazonian Region, FORMABIAP). Efforts to revitalize the Kukama language through communal schools are promoted by indigenous people in the Loreto region, too. More recently, the Wampis indigenous people established their “Autonomous Territorial Government of the Wampis Nation” declaring the necessity to guarantee education in the Wampis language which in their view is a mechanism to transmit their culture (GTANW 2015).

In the Andean macroregion, regions such as Apurímac, Ayacucho, Cusco, Huancavelica, Junín, and Puno have either NGOs or regional efforts to support intercultural bilingual education. Some like the Asociación Pukllasunchis' (Asociación Pukllasunchis n.n.) educational projects focus on intercultural bilingual education in Quechua in an urban school and a Pedagogical Institute for bilingual teachers. The HOPE Foundation supports a network of four intercultural bilingual education schools in the community of Tiracancha, Cusco, where teachers and indigenous parents work together to generate a participative and cooperative educational organization that has Quechua language and culture at the center of their endeavors. In addition to intercultural bilingual education, radio channels and social media play an important role in the promotion and use of indigenous languages (IWGIA 'International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs' 2016). IWGIA supports, along with Servindi, La Voz Indígena a radio station in Shipibo in the Ucayali region and the Aymara radio program Wiñay Pankara in Radio Pachamama in the Puno region (Servindi n.d.). Since 2016, the Peruvian State is promoting news programs in Quechua, Aymara and Ashaninka.

There are multiple radio programs that transmit exclusively in indigenous languages. One of those is Axenon Ikanwe, a radio program in Shipibo-Konibo that started in 2017 and has as its main objective to strengthen the Shipibo-Konibo language from the perspective of traditional indigenous knowledge and to promote the end of language shift towards Spanish (Axenon Ikanwe n.d.). Despite governmental, NGO and community efforts, and even when indigenous communities have positive attitudes towards home language maintenance, the road to widespread implementation of intercultural bilingual education and to a complete reversal of language shift from indigenous languages to Spanish in Peru is still paved with obstacles. An example of the difficulties of promoting and sustaining home language maintenance in indigenous languages is Sánchez et al.'s (2018) study of Shipibo speakers in the city of Lima. The study shows how despite positive attitudes among urban speakers of the indigenous language Shipibo living in the city of Lima, language shift is still likely to take place given the lack of intergenerational transmission of Shipibo. Such cases show that without sustained efforts from the whole society, indigenous languages revitalization, maintenance and development will continue to be a challenge.

While there has been progress at the local and the state institutional level, for intercultural bilingual education to reach the majority of indigenous communities in Peru further progress is needed in terms of generalized teacher training and development, indigenous language standardization, and the development of culturally appropriate assessment techniques that also respond to national assessment standards.

6. Conclusion

Indigenous communities across the world have been multilingual societies for millennia, free of the confines of monolingual nation-states and with very different language planning, management and practices from the explicit top-down monolingual language policies employed

by the latter. Therefore, in many postcolonial societies, the coexistence of top-down monolingual language policies and traditional language practices including linguistic repertoires consisting of indigenous and other languages have given rise in many cases to language shift posing challenges to home language maintenance. Sadly, few tangible improvements have been registered despite the growing global focus and interest in indigenous languages.

In this chapter we endeavoured to present a synoptic view of the challenges indigenous and minority languages face in maintaining and passing on their languages to the next generation globally and locally, in a detailed case study from Peru. We have shown how indigenous languages are seen as a problem, a right and a resource (Ruiz 1984). Across the globe, we see national shortcomings in terms of bringing indigenous languages into the public sphere and raising thus their status which would make them desirable to learn and practice in all domains. However, we also witness a growing interaction between national policies and local and communal efforts for home language maintenance reflecting positive language attitudes and ideologies and allowing for group and language and culture-specific practices across urban and rural domains.

Home language maintenance and development will continue to depend strongly on recognising and actively supporting the fact that it is “the inherent human right to learn, use and transmit a language of heritage and birth” (McCarty, Nicholas, and Wigglesworth 2019: 4). A huge task that requires good will and action from all parts of society.

References

- African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR). 2006. Indigenous Peoples in Africa: The Forgotten Peoples? International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- AIATSIS (n.d.) Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies <https://aiatsis.gov.au/>. (accessed 6-27-2019)
- AIDSESEP. n.d. Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana. <http://www.aidesepe.org.pe/index.php/> (accessed 6-26-2019).
- Albury, Nathan. this volume. Language attitudes and ideologies on linguistic diversity.
- Annamalai, Elayaperumal & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, this volume, Social justice and inclusiveness through linguistic human rights in education.
- Arguedas, José María. 1966. *Mesa redonda sobre el monolingüismo quechua y aymara y la educación en el Perú*. Lima: Casa de la Cultura.
- Ash, Anna, Jessie Little Doe Fermino & Ken Hale. 2001. Diversity in Local Language Maintenance and Restoration: A Reason For Optimism. In Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale (eds.) *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, 19--37. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004261723_003.

- Asociación Pukllasunchis. n.d. <https://www.pukllasunchis.org/educacion-intercultural>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016. 2011.0 -Census of Population and Housing: Reflecting Australia, Stories from the Census 2016. <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2011.0~2016~Main%20Features~Aboriginal%20and%20Torres%20Strait%20islander%20Population%20Article~12> (accessed 6-28-2019).
- Axenon Ikanwe n.d. <https://alianzaarkana.org/es/work/axenon-inkanwe> (accessed 6-29-2019)
- Bhatt, Rakesh & Ahmar Mahboob. 2008. Minority Languages and their Status. In Braj Kachru, Yamuna Kachru & S. N. Sridhar (eds). *Language in South Asia*, 132--152. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511619069.009>.
- Bishop, Russell. 2003. Changing Power Relations in Education: Kaupapa Maori messages for 'mainstream' education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Comparative Education*, 39(2): 221-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060302555>
- Boas, Franz. 1940. *Race, Language and Culture*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bradley, David (ed.). 1985. *Language policy, language planning and sociolinguistics in South-East Asia* (Papers in Southeast Asian linguistics, 9, Pacific Linguistics A-67) Canberra: Dept. of Linguistics, Australian National University.
- Bradley, David. 2007. Language policy and language rights. In Osahito Miyaoka, Osamu Sakiyama & Michael Krauss (eds.) *Vanishing Languages of the Pacific Rim*, 77--90. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bradley, David. 2019. Minority Language Learning in Mainland Southeast Asia. In Andy Kirkpatrick and Anthony Liddicoat (eds.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Language Education Policy in Asia*, 14-28. London: Routledge.
- Coronel-Molina, Serafin & Teresa McCarty. 2016. *Indigenous Language revitalization in the Americas*. New York: Routledge.
- Crystal, David. 1999. *The Penguin Dictionary of Language*. 2nd Edition. London: Penguin.
- Davis, Jenny. 2018. *Talking Indian: Identity and language revitalization in the Chickasaw renaissance*. University of Arizona Press.
- Defensoría del Pueblo. 2011. <https://www.defensordelpueblo.es/informe-mnp/mecanismo-nacional-de-prevencion-de-la-tortura-informe-anual-2011/> (accessed 6-27-2019)
- Devlin, Brian. 2011. The status and future of bilingual education for remote Indigenous students in the Northern Territory. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34(3), 260-279.
- DIGEIBIR. 2005-2007. <http://centroderecursos.cultura.pe/es/editorial/ministerio-de-educaci%C3%B3n> (accessed 6-27-2019)
- Disbray, Samantha. 2014. 'Evaluating the bilingual education program in Warlpiri Schools' In Pensalfini, Rob, Myfany Turpin and Diana Guillemin (eds) *Language*

- description informed by theory Netherlands: Johns Benjamins. pp. 25-46.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1994. Purism vs. compromise in language revitalization and language revival. *Language in Society* 23(4). 479--494. doi:10.1017/S0047404500018169.
- Eisenclas, Susana A. & Andrea C. Schalley. This volume. Making sense of the notion of “home language” and related concepts.
- Ferguson, Jean. 2019. Words like Birds: Sakha Language Discourses and Practises in the City. University of Nebraska Press.
- Groff, Cynthia. 2017. Language and language-in-education planning in multilingual India: a minoritized language perspective. *Language Policy* 16: 135--164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9397-4>
- GTANW. 2015. <https://www.forestpeoples.org/en/node/50347> (accessed 6-27-2019)
- Guan, Lee H. & Leo Suryadinata Leo (eds). 2007. *Language, Nation and Development in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Harrison, Barbara & Rahui Papa. 2005. The development of an Indigenous knowledge program in a New Zealand Maori-language immersion school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(1). 57--72.
- Hatoss, Anikó. this volume. Transnational grassroots language planning in the era of mobility and the Internet.
- Hinton, Leanne. 2001. The master-apprentice language learning program. *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, pp.217-226.
- Hinton, Leanne & Ken Hale (eds.). 2001. *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Hornberger, Nancy H. 1990. Bilingual education and English-only: A language-planning framework. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 508(1), pp.12-26.
- Hornberger, Nancy H. 2005. Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), p.605.
- Hornberger, Nancy H. 2008. Introduction: Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages? Policy and Practice on Four Continents. In Nancy H. Hornberger (ed.) *Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages?* (Palgrave Studies in Minority Languages and Communities), 1--12. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hult, Francis M. & Nancy H. Hornberger. 2016. Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 33(3). <http://bilingualreview.utsa.edu/index.php/br/article/view/118> (accessed 8/26/2019)
- International Labor Organization (ILO) 2017. *C169 - Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169)*. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_INST RUMENT_ID:312314 (accessed 6-12-/2019).

- INEI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática). 2017a. *Perú: Perfil sociodemográfico. Informe Nacional*.
https://www.inei.gob.pe/media/MenuRecursivo/publicaciones_digitales/Est/Lib1539/libro.pdf (accessed on 8-8-2019)
- INEI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática). 2017b. *Resultados definitivos del Censo de Comunidades Campesinas*.
https://www.inei.gob.pe/media/MenuRecursivo/publicaciones_digitales/Est/Lib1599/ (accessed on 6/28/2019)
- IWGIA -International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs. 2016.
<https://www.iwgia.org/es/peru/2351-emisoras-indigenas-en-peru-el-derecho-a-la-comunicacion> (accessed 6-27-2019)
- Kidwai, Aysha. (2019). The People's Linguistic Survey of India Volumes: Neither Linguistics, Nor a Successor to Grierson's LSI, but still a Point of Reference. *Social Change*, 49(1), 154–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085718821783>
- Kosonen, Kimmo. 2005. Education in local languages: Policy and practice in South-East Asia. In *First language first: Community-based literacy programmes for minority language contexts in Asia*, 96--134 Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok.
- Kosonen, Kimmo & Catherine Young (eds.). 2009. *Mother tongue as bridge language of instruction: policies and experiences in Southeast Asia*. Bangkok: SEAMEO.
- Kral, Inge. 2010. Plugged in: Remote Australian Indigenous youth and digital culture. CAPER Working paper no. 69/2010. Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research. Australian National University. College of Arts & Social Sciences.
- Kral, Inge & Elizabeth Marrkylyi Ellis. 2019. Language Vitality In and Out of School in a Remote Indigenous Australian Context. In McCarty, Teresa L., Sheilah E. Nicholas & Gillian Wigglesworth (eds.). 2019. *A World of Indigenous Languages - Resurgence, Reclamation, Revitalization and Resilience*, 115-133. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lee, Tiffany S. & Teresa L. McCarty. (2017). Upholding indigenous education sovereignty through critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy. In Django Paris & H. Samy Alim (eds.) *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*, 61-82. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2015. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Eighteenth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. <https://www.ethnologue.com/country/IN>, (accessed 6-26-2019)
- Lo Bianco, Jo. 1987. *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Marmion, Doung, Obata Kazuko & Jakelin Tory. 2014. *Community, identity, wellbeing: the report of the Second National Indigenous Languages Survey*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

- May, Stephen. 2014. Contesting Metronormativity: Exploring Indigenous Language Dynamism Across the Urban-Rural Divide, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 13(4), 229--235, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2014.939036>
- McCarty, Teresa L. 2003. Revitalising Indigenous Languages in Homogenising Times. *Comparative Education* 39(2). 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060302556>
- McCarty, Teresa L., Sheilah E. Nicholas & Gillian Wigglesworth (eds.) . 2019. *A World of Indigenous Languages - Resurgence, Reclamation, Revitalization and Resilience*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, Teresa, Leisy T. Wyman & Sheila E. Nicholas. 2014. Activist ethnography with indigenous youth. *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- McConvell, Patrick & Nick Thieberger. 2001. *State of Indigenous Languages in Australia – 2001*. Canberra: Department of the Environment and Heritage.
- McKay, Penny. 2001. National literacy benchmarks and the outstreaming of ESL learners. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (eds.) *Australian Policy Activism in Language and Literacy*, 221-237. Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Menken, Kate. 2013. Restrictive Language Education Policies and Emergent Bilingual Youth: A Perfect Storm With Imperfect Outcomes. *Theory Into Practice* 52. 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.804307>
- Ministerio de Educación-CARE. 2009. Proyecto Curricular Regional Puno. Puno, Perú: Ministerio de Educación.
- Ministerio de Cultura, Perú. 2019. Lenguas indígenas. <http://www.cultura.gob.pe/es/interculturalidad/programas-y-proyectos> (accessed on 6-28-2019)
- Ministerio de Educación, Perú. 2019. Lenguas originarias del Perú <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/campanias/lenguas-originarias-del-peru.php> (accessed on 6-28-2019)
- Moore, Helen. 1996. Language policies as virtual reality: Two Australian examples. *TESOL Quarterly* 30: 473--497
- Mortimer, Katherine.S., 2013. Communicative event chains in an ethnography of Paraguayan language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 219: 67-99.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette & Joan Pujolar. 2013. From native speakers to “new speakers” – problematizing nativeness in language revitalization contexts. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 35(2). 47--67.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette & Fernando Ramallo. 2014. Neofalantes as an active minority: understanding language practices and motivations for change amongst new speakers of Galician. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2015, 231.147--165. (Retrieved 6/12/2019, from doi:10.1515/ijsl-2014-0036).

- Palviainen, Åsa. this volume. Future prospects and visions for family language policy research.
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari. 2002. Minority Matters: Issues in Minority Languages in India. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4(2). 213--234.
- Patrick, Donna. 2012. Indigenous contexts. In Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blakledge & Angela Creese (eds.) *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism*, 29--48. New York: Routledge.
- Patrick, Donna., Gabriele Budach & Igah Muckpaloo. 2013. Multiliteracies and family language policy in an urban Inuit community. *Language Policy* (12)(1). 47--62.
- Razz, Moonis & Aijazuddin Ahmed. 1990. *An Atlas of Tribal India*. New Delhi; Concept Publications.
- Ruiz, Richard. 1984. Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2). 15--34.
- Sánchez, Liliana. 2016. The linguist gaining access to the indigenous populations: sharing cultural and linguistic knowledge in South America. In Gabriela Pérez Báez, Chris Rogers & Jorge E. Rosés Labrada (eds.). *Language Documentation and Revitalization in Latin American Contexts*, 195-214. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sánchez, Liliana. Milagros Lucero, & Paola Córdova. 2012. Análisis comparativo e interpretativo de propuestas de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe como base para una elaboración de estándares de evaluación en EIB.
- Sánchez, Liliana, Elisabeth Mayer, José Camacho & Carolina Rodríguez Alza. 2018. Linguistic attitudes towards Shipibo in Cantagallo: reshaping indigenous language and identity in an urban setting" *International Journal of Bilingualism*. DOI: 10.1177/1367006918762164.
- Serrano, M.S.C. & Fouces, O.D., 2018. Building a field: translation policies and minority languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2018(251), pp.1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-0001>
- Servindi n.d. <https://www.servindi.org/> (accessed (6-28-2019))
- Shulist, Sarah, 2018. Transforming indigeneity: Urbanization and language revitalization in the Brazilian Amazon. University of Toronto Press.
- Simpson, Andrew (ed.). 2008. *Language and national identity in Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, Jane H & Gillian Wigglesworth. 2008. *Children's language and multilingualism: Indigenous language use at home and school*. Continuum Intl Pub Group.
- Simpson, Jane H, Jo Caffery & Patrick McConvell (2009). Gaps in Australia's Indigenous language policy: dismantling bilingual education in the Northern Territory. (AIATSIS Discussion Paper No.24).
- Simpson, Jane H & Gillian Wigglesworth. 2018. Language diversity in Indigenous Australia in the 21st century. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 20 (1). 67--80. doi:10.1080/14664208.2018.1503389.

- Spolsky, Bernard. 2004. *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Stockley, Trevor , Banbapuy Ganambarr, Dhungala Munungurr, M. Munungurr, Greg Wearne, W.W. Wunujmurra, Leon White & Yalmay Yunupingu. 2017. The Quest for Community Control at Yirrkala. In Brian Devlin, Samantha Disbray & Nancy Devlin. (eds.). *History of bilingual education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies*, 141-148. Singapore: Springer.
- The World Bank. 2019. Indigenous Peoples.
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/indigenouspeoples> (accessed on 6-29-2019)
- Ting, Su-Hie & Teck-Yee Ling. 2012. Language use and sustainability status of indigenous languages in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(1) 77-93.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.706301>
- Tom, Miye N., Elizabeth S. Huaman & Teresa L. McCarty. 2019. Indigenous Knowledges as vital contributions to sustainability. *International Review of Education* 65(1). 1-18 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09770-9>
- Valdés, Guadalupe. 2000. The teaching of heritage languages: An introduction for Slavic-teaching professionals. In Olga Kagan & Benjamin Rifkin (eds.) *The learning and teaching of Slavic languages and cultures*, 375–403. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Vaughan, Jill & Ruth Singer. 2018. Indigenous multilingualisms past and present. *Language and Communication*. 62B: 83-90.
- Zajiková, Lenka. 2017. Lenguas indígenas en la legislación de los países hispano-americanos. *Onomázein*, pp.171-203.
- Zouhir, Abderrahman. 2014. Language Policy and State in Morocco. *Domes* 23: 37-53. doi:[10.1111/dome.12039](https://doi.org/10.1111/dome.12039)