

A Global Perspective on Costing Indigenous Language Revitalization

September 2018

**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

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the following individuals, who have graciously shared their time and expertise to assist in the preparation of this report.

Hildegunn Bjørgen, Kulturrådet, Arts Council Norway
Colleen Fitzgerald, National Science Foundation (United States)
Nicandro González, Director Research, INALI (Mexico)
Raewyn Harrison, Director, Te Reo Tuatahi (New Zealand)
Paula Hill, Department of Education (United States)
Eleonor Johansson, Ministry of Culture, Swedish Government
Larry Kimura, Professor, University of Hawai'i at Hilo
Inge Kral, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (Australia)
Monica Macaulay, President, Endangered Languages Fund
Marko Marjomaa, Sámi Giellagáldu (Nordic Center for Saami Languages, Norway)
Felicity Meakins, Australian Research Council (ARC) Future Fellow
D. Kau'ilani Sang, Director, Office of Hawaiian Education
Tracey Shields, Parliamentary Service Te Ratonga Whare Pāremata (New Zealand)
Noenoe Silva, University of Hawai'i at Manoa
Jane Simpson, Australian National University
Vera da Silva Sinha, University of East Anglia
Inée Slaughter, Executive Director, Indigenous Language Institute (United States)
Beth Stelle, Los Alamos National Laboratory (United States)
Anita Szakay, Centre for Language Sciences, Macquarie University (Australia)
Jozina Vander Klok, Department of Linguistics, Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo
Anuschka van 't Hooft, Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí (Mexico)
Sarah Marie Wiebe, University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Situating Myself

I come to this work as a non-Indigenous linguist living and working in the traditional and unceded territories of the hənq̓əmínəm-speaking peoples. I was born and raised in Mohkínsstsis (Calgary, Alberta) and I am the granddaughter of Scottish and British immigrants. I am a proud alumnus of the University of Calgary (BA Honours, 2003; MA 2005) and the University of British Columbia (PhD, 2013). Following my graduate studies, I spent five years at the University of Victoria, first as a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow and then as a Banting Fellow. In 2018, I undertook a new position as Lecturer at Simon Fraser University. My research and interest in Indigenous language revitalization stems from long-standing collaborative relationships with members of the Siksika and Kainai Nations. In addition to my affiliation with Simon Fraser University, I am an Adjunct Professor at the University of British Columbia and the University of Calgary. I am a Board member of the Canadian Language Museum, and the Editor and Curator of the Blackfoot Online Stories Database. The information presented in this report is influenced by my own personal background, experience, and training, and I recognize the limitations of this perspective.

Executive Summary

This report details governmental expenditures on Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) for ten countries, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Government expenditures on ILR (in CAD)

Country	Per-capita (Indigenous)	Per-capita (total)	Percentage of GDP
Spain	\$1,329.77	\$58.37	0.1690%
Norway	\$783.38	\$8.14	0.0082%
Scotland	\$526.45	\$8.45	0.0180%
New Zealand	\$267.06	\$40.25	0.0787%
Wales	\$108.85	\$19.58	0.0594%
Brazil	\$47.83	\$0.20	0.0018%
Sweden ¹	\$29.03	\$0.09	0.0001%
Australia	\$18.82	\$0.51	0.0008%
United States	\$5.64	\$0.14	0.0023%
Mexico	\$0.09	\$0.02	0.0002%

Comparisons between countries reveal a wide range of costing models; whereas Spain, Norway, and Scotland all spend upwards of \$500 per Indigenous person on ILR, Mexico spends less than 10 cents.

In addition to expenditures on ILR, expenditures on environmental protection, other minority languages, and Indigenous affairs are also included for sake of comparison.

1. Introduction

In March 2018, Alaska House Representative Dan Ortiz called for a state of emergency to protect the 20 Indigenous languages in Alaska.² Yet Alaska is well-known in the world of Indigenous language revitalization (ILR) as being a leader in developing and implementing creative community-based programs and initiatives to promote and preserve its languages. The problem is not a lack of community interest or willingness, but rather a lack of funding. The great majority of Alaska’s ILR programs are funded through universities, private organizations, and small federal grants. Sustainable funding from the state or the federal government is not available, leading to a state of linguistic emergency.

Alaska is one example of many around the globe; Moseley (2010) lists 2464 endangered languages from 160 countries, and the great majority of these are underfunded and under-resourced, making language revitalization a challenging task. Yet there are many linguistic, cultural, social, and political reasons for a country to make financial investments in language revitalization. And as Grin (2006) notes, there are also economic reasons. According to Grin, a government is obliged to provide financial intervention in social issues under conditions of market failure, and language endangerment is an example of market failure, insofar as future generations cannot bid for the preservation of endangered languages. “Hence from a policy-analysis standpoint,

¹ The figure cited for Sweden’s ILR expenditures is likely lower than the actual figure, as it may not include the comprehensive range of all ILR programs and activities. See section 4.8 for discussion.

²http://akhouse.org/rep_ortiz/2018/03/19/house-calls-for-a-linguistic-emergency-declaration-to-protect-alaska-native-languages/

language policy is justified, and the policy-analysis perspective provides a rationale for intervention” (p. 84).

This report provides an overview of ILR policies and expenditures from across the globe. Focusing on ten countries that (i) have implemented policies regarding Indigenous language protection, and (ii) have made available the relevant data on ILR expenditures, the report compiles data on these expenditures to facilitate cross-country and within-country analyses and comparisons. The report is organized as follows: section 2 details the methodology, including types, sources, and limitations of the data. Section 3 provides data on Canada – not on its ILR policies and expenditures (which are currently under revision), but on other variables that can be compared with the ten countries under discussion. Section 4 outlines case studies of each of the ten countries, and section 5 summarizes and concludes with observations on comparisons in the data.

2. Methodology

This section details the methods employed for conducting the research. Section 2.1 discusses the types of data gathered and the rationale for their inclusion in the study, including the list of countries surveyed (and a discussion of why certain countries are not surveyed), and the range of information included in each country’s case study. Section 2.2 gives an overview of the sources of data and the methods for compiling figures, and section 2.3 addresses limitations of the data.

2.1. Types of Data and Rationale for their Inclusion

2.1.1. List of Countries Surveyed

The objective of this research is to investigate costing models for different countries of the world that are investing in Indigenous language revitalization programs and initiatives. By definition, the list of countries under consideration is confined to those that (i) are home to Indigenous languages that are to some degree endangered and therefore in need of revitalization, and (ii) have government policies or programs in place with a concurrent financial investment. Under these criteria, nations such as New Zealand and Wales, which are well-cited as having strong government and societal support for ILR initiatives, are included, along with eight other countries, as listed in Table 2.

Table 2. List of countries and languages included in this report

Country	Language(s)	Degree(s) of Endangerment
Australia	120 languages from 28 families	mostly severe/critical
Brazil	178 languages from 12 families	mostly vulnerable, some severe/critical
Mexico	68 languages from 11 families	mostly vulnerable, some severe/critical
New Zealand	Māori	vulnerable
Norway	Sami languages (4)	definite to severe
Scotland	Scots Gaelic	definite
Spain	Aragonese, Aranese, Asturian, Basque	vulnerable to definite
Sweden	Sami languages (5)	definite to critical
USA	169 languages from 33 families	mostly severe/critical
Wales	Welsh	vulnerable

Absent from this report but meeting the criteria outlined above are countries such as Ethiopia, Bolivia, and numerous others, which were not included for reasons related to a lack of available data or challenges related to interpreting the data.

For instance, in Ethiopia, a government reform in 1993 led to a new constitution that recognizes all Ethiopian languages (including around 100 Indigenous vernaculars, 28 of which are classified by Moseley 2010 as endangered) as having equal status. Education policies were also reformed such that local languages are the intended languages of instruction in primary school. However, as Bloor and Tamrat (1996) note, education is only available to a small minority of the population, and the policy is not implemented such that education is available in all languages. Beyond these details, which suggest a scarcity of funding, little information can be located regarding the Ethiopian government's financial support for Indigenous languages.

In Bolivia, 36 Indigenous languages are recognized as official languages alongside Spanish. Thrice-elected Bolivian president Evo Morales is notorious for his strong support for Indigenous language literacy and education. Education policies in Bolivia allow in principle for any of the Indigenous languages to serve as the medium of instruction, and the Vice-Ministry of Decolonization has implemented various reforms including requirements that government officials speak at least one Indigenous language. These initiatives seem hopeful, but these programs are challenging to implement³, and the Bolivian government has been criticized for a lack of follow-through on their promises.⁴ Moreover, and more importantly within the context of this report, there is a lack of transparency and reliability regarding budget reporting, particularly regarding Ministry of Education funding on Indigenous languages (Cardozo 2012). Given this lack of accessible and reliable data, Bolivia is omitted from the report.

Also absent from the report are countries such as Algeria, Sri Lanka, Peru and numerous others, which meet the criterion of being home to endangered Indigenous languages, but do not have a strong history or reputation for providing governmental support for ILR initiatives (see Sands 2018 for Algeria; Uthayakumar 2015 for Sri Lanka; Hornberger

³ <http://education-forum.ca/2017/06/16/transforming-public-education-in-bolivia/>

⁴ <https://theconversation.com/evo-morales-champions-indigenous-rights-abroad-but-in-bolivia-its-a-different-story-38062>

1998 for Peru). Regarding African countries in general, Sands (2018) comments that “generally, governments have not played a major role in the funding of revitalization projects” ... and in some cases, Indigenous languages have even “been threatened by government suppression.” Moseley (2010) lists 160 countries with endangered languages, and assuming that colonialism is the main threat to linguistic diversity (e.g., Dalby 2003), we can hypothesize that the majority of these endangered languages are Indigenous to those countries. However, for the vast majority, either no government data is available, or no government supports exist.⁵

Another country that is well-referenced for ILR but is not included here is Israel. Israel’s revival of the Hebrew language is sometimes cited as the most successful example in history (e.g., Hinton 2003). However, it is not included here because, by current standards, Hebrew is not an endangered language; although in the nineteenth century it had no living speakers, its current speaker population is over 8 million, and it is rapidly growing. Hebrew was declared an official language of Israel in 1948 and it is supported in all public spheres, including education. The Israeli government’s ulpan program ensures that newcomers to Israel learn Hebrew through immersive education.⁶

The revival of Hebrew would be challenging to cost out; it began with a single individual, Ben Yehuda, committing to raising his children in Hebrew and convincing a small group of other families to do the same. While this was moderately successful, it was not until the Israeli Declaration of Independence was signed in 1948, establishing Hebrew as a national language, that revival efforts began to flourish. Freeburg (2013: 17) comments that, “instead of working bottom-up by creating a new generation of native speakers, Hebrew revivalists would work top-down by making other languages less desirable.” The unfortunate and less commonly known consequence of the Hebrew language revival is that other languages Indigenous to Israel were not granted the same status as Hebrew, and due to a systemic lack of support for these languages, they are increasingly endangered (Freeburg 2013). For a case study of Israel to be included in this report it would need to focus on these other languages, as Hebrew is far past the point of needing revitalization, but the reality is that there are few if any government resources allocated towards the endangered Indigenous languages of Israel.

2.1.2 Types of Data in each Case Study

The utility of this research rests in its ability to inform Indigenous language policy by virtue of facilitating cross-country comparisons. Comparisons can be drawn according to demographic variables, such as the total population of the country and its Indigenous population (as well as the percentage of the total population that is Indigenous). To facilitate comparisons with Bliss & Creed’s (2018) community-based costing model for ILR in Canada, the number of Indigenous communities is also included, although direct comparisons may not be valid, given differing notions of ‘community’ across countries (see section 2.3 below). Linguistic variables are also relevant, including the number of Indigenous languages in each country, their diversity (i.e., how many language families they represent), and their degrees of endangerment. This data is all included in each case

⁵ Notably, some of these 160 languages have very high speaker populations (e.g., Bavarian is classified as vulnerable but has millions of speakers) and others are only endangered in a particular region (e.g., Yiddish is endangered in Europe but not North America). In these cases, governments are unlikely to view ILR programs and policies as high priorities.

⁶ https://www.gov.il/en/Departments/General/ulpan_main

study. A review of the small body of literature on the economics of language revitalization informed the inclusion of other data points, as outlined below.

Grin (2006) suggests that when evaluating language policies regarding Indigenous or minority languages, there are two types of market values to consider, in addition to any non-market (i.e., social and/or symbolic) value associated with language preservation or promotion. The first type is the *private market value*, which is the effect accrued to the relevant group of individuals affected by the policy, which in the case of Indigenous language policies is the Indigenous people whose languages are impacted. The second type is what Grin calls *social market value*, which is the effect accrued across the entire population. Given this distinction between private and social market values, and the relevance of each in assessing potential language policies, government expenditures on ILR for each country are expressed on a per-capita basis for the Indigenous population (as a window into private market value) and on a per-capita basis for the population of the country as a whole (as a window into social market value). Expenditures are also expressed in total dollar amounts and as percentages of each country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Along with expenditures on Indigenous languages, expenditures dedicated to other minority languages are also evaluated, with a view to assessing the relevant values different countries place on revitalizing Indigenous languages versus promoting widely spoken ones.

Regarding the non-market value, it is difficult to translate the social and cultural impacts of Indigenous language policies into financial costs and benefits, but Grin (1993) suggests that environmental economics can serve as an analogy, under which language is granted the same status as environmental assets such as air, water, and diverse species. In essence, just as endangered species need protection for intrinsically non-market reasons (or for reasons not cast in terms of current market values), the same can be said for Indigenous languages (see also Krauss 1992). According to Grin (1996), this analogy “yields a procedure for justifying and calibrating public expenditure on language maintenance programs” (p. 26). Given the proposed parallels between environmental and linguistic assets, government expenditures on environmental protection are included for each country as total dollar amounts, per-capita amounts, and percentages of the GDP.

Given the growing body of literature documenting the importance of linguistic health to the health and wellbeing of Indigenous communities (e.g., Whalen et al. 2016; Jenni et al. 2017) and the numerous accounts of the integral role that language can and must play in other domains of Indigenous culture, society, and worldview (e.g., Nicolson 2013; TRC 2015), it is pertinent to include in the report government expenditures on Indigenous affairs more generally, in order to assess the relative value assigned to Indigenous languages amongst other issues. These figures are expressed in total dollar amounts, per-capita amounts (for Indigenous and total populations), and percentages of GDP. The percentages of Indigenous affairs funding devoted to ILR are also included.

In summary, the following data are included in each case study (when available and relevant):

- Demographic and linguistic data:
 - Population for the country (total)

- Indigenous population (for the language(s) in question)
- Percentage of the total population that is Indigenous
- Number of languages and language families
- Number of communities
- Gross Domestic Product
- Indigenous language revitalization expenditures:
 - Summary information on related language legislation and policies
 - Federal funding
 - State-level funding
 - Total government funding
 - Per-capita funding (for total population and Indigenous population)
 - Per-language and per-community funding
 - Percentage of GDP
- Other expenditures (for comparison with ILR expenditures):
 - Minority language funding (total, per-capita, percentage of GDP)
 - Environmental protection funding (total, per-capita, percentage of GDP)
 - Indigenous affairs funding (total, per-capita, percentage of GDP)

2.2. Sources of Data and Methods for Compiling Data and Figures

This section gives an overview of the types of sources consulted and general methodological principles used in the preparation of this report. Specific details are provided in each case study.

For demographic and language data, national and regional census information made available through government statistical organizations was consulted, as well as the *Ethnologue* (Simons and Fennig 2018), and the *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (Moseley 2010); the latter served as the primary reference point for degrees of language endangerment.

GDP figures were all collected via the World Bank (<http://www.worldbank.org/>). For government policies and expenditures (ILR and other), government-produced policy documents, budgets, and annual reports were consulted as a first point of reference whenever possible. In lieu of and/or in combination with government documents, reviews compiled by Indigenous or other external agencies were consulted. In some cases, these types of documents are publicly available, and in other cases, documents and/or relevant data and figures were provided by representatives or affiliates of government institutions or external agencies. As a last resort, in lieu of government or external agency sources, media releases supplemented other data sources.

In some cases, the summative figures for each category of spending (e.g., the total sum of all federal spending on ILR for a given country) were calculated based on a compilation of budgets for various programs. Whenever relevant, ILR funding was separated into federal funding and funding from the state/province/territory/region (henceforth referred to as state-level funding). Figures for state-level funding were challenging to acquire, particularly for countries with many states each having diverse language policies and budgets (e.g., the United States). Specific methodologies for each country are outlined in the introductory sections of each case study in section 4, but as a general

point, it is worth noting that in some cases, estimating the total state-level funding based on select examples was required.

In all cases, the most recent information available was consulted, but this ranges from 2010 to 2018. Figures are taken at “face value,” i.e., at the value cited and in the currency they were presented in. They are not adjusted for inflation. For purposes of comparison, all figures are also converted to Canadian dollars (CAD) at the current conversion rate (calculated using <https://www.xe.com>). All figures presented here are annual; if a source referenced a multi-year budget, the figure was divided by the number of years of implementation (recognizing that multi-year programming does not always distribute evenly over time).

2.3. Limitations of the Research

Broadly speaking, this research is limited by the following three factors: (i) the author’s scope of expertise as a linguist (and not, e.g., as an economist or policy expert), (ii) the range and reliability of available data, and (iii) the validity of drawing comparisons between data sets.

Regarding the first point, as noted in section 2.2., figures were taken at “face value,” and not adjusted for inflation or other economic factors that may impact the accuracy of the data. Further, although assessing the scope of ILR and the associated funding is relatively straightforward, due to a lack of expertise in environmental science and policy, it is unclear whether different sources define the scope of “environmental protection” in different ways, and whether the figures cited for different countries are in fact comparable. Moe & Braathu (2014) describe a methodology for defining environmental protection and calculating government expenditures; ideally this type of methodology would be applied across the board to derive comparable figures for all countries.

As for limitations related to the range and reliability of the data, specific comments are included in the case studies in section 4 below. Generally, while every attempt was made to confirm that the list of programs under the umbrella of each type of funding is complete, there is no guarantee that the figure provided in all cases is comprehensive. For example, whereas the total spending for ILR in Mexico was confirmed via consultations with representatives and affiliates of INALI, the sole government agency responsible for allocating ILR funding, the comparative data for Sweden is less reliable, as it could not be confirmed that the figure listed covers the full range of ILR funding in the country.

Finally, regarding the validity of drawing comparisons across countries, this is particularly relevant for two categories of data. First, building on Bliss & Creed’s (2018) community-based costing model for ILR in Canada, the number of communities was calculated for each country. However, what is meant by “community” across countries is not necessarily a static and comparable thing. In the context of First Nations in Canada, “community” refers to a First Nation. However, attempts to seek out comparable groupings of Indigenous people in other countries proved challenging. In countries like Spain and Wales, “community” is defined as a municipality, whereas in countries like Mexico and Australia it is defined as a dialect group, and in Sweden and New Zealand it is defined as a historically and culturally significant societal organization. Whether it is valid to draw comparisons across these different types of “communities” is unclear; by-community funding is calculated, but it is not discussed at length in the report.

The second comparison that is questionable is between different countries' expenditures on minority languages. The choice to include this category of data was influenced by an interest in comparing Canada's spending on the French language with that on Indigenous languages. For countries like the United States (with Spanish) and Spain (with Catalan), a comparison with Canada's spending on French seems reasonable. But for other countries, the data is on spending for numerous minority languages; whether this is a valid comparison with Canadian French is unclear. Nevertheless, it may be useful to draw comparisons between a country's spending on Indigenous versus other minority languages.

In short, there are various limitations in the data, and for this reason, all figures should be taken as estimates and not absolute figures, designed to give a comparative sense of costing models and the relative value that different countries around the world place on ILR.

3. Canada

Because Indigenous language legislation is currently under development in Canada, figures on ILR expenditures are not included in this report, but for purposes of comparison, demographic and linguistic data, as well as data on expenditures for the French language, environmental protection, and Indigenous Affairs are presented here.

3.1. Demographics and Languages

Indigenous people comprise less than 5% of Canada's population. Assuming 634 First Nations, 53 Inuit communities, and 95 Métis communities,⁷ there are 782 Indigenous communities in Canada speaking 87 languages⁸ representing 12 language families. According to Moseley (2010), the great majority of these languages are critically or severely endangered; less than 30 of the 87 are classified as vulnerable or definitely endangered. These figures are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Demographics and languages in Canada

	Canada
Total population	36,708,083
Indigenous population (figure)	1,673,785
Indigenous population (percentage)	4.56%
Indigenous communities	782
Indigenous languages	87
Indigenous language families	12

⁷ Figures are taken from CIRNAC (<https://www.canada.ca/en/crown-indigenous-relations-northern-affairs.html>), ITK (<https://www.itk.ca/>), and provincial Métis council websites (see <http://www.metisnation.ca/> for links). Métis communities correspond to Chartered Communities (in BC and Ontario), regions (in Saskatchewan and Manitoba), and settlements (in Alberta).

⁸ The Government of Canada cites the number of languages as "over 60." The figure of 87 languages is taken from Moseley (2010).

3.2. Expenditures on French language

Although French is not a minority language *per se*, it is useful to document expenditures on the French language for comparison with proposed costing models for Indigenous languages. The 2011 census cites 7.7 million Francophones in Canada, and a 2012 study conducted by the Fraser Institute concluded that the federal and provincial governments spend \$2.35 billion on the French language annually.⁹ This equates to approximately \$65 per Canadian, \$312 per Francophone, and 0.12% of the GDP, as summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Canada's expenditures on French

	Canada
other minority languages (number of languages)	1
other minority languages (speaker population)	7,700,000
other minority languages expenditure - TOTAL	2,349,000,000
spending on other languages - per capita	63.99
spending on other languages - per relevant population	305.06
spending on other languages - per language	2,349,000,000
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.1166%

3.2. Expenditures on Environmental Protection

Statistics Canada reports that across all levels of government (federal, provincial-territorial, and local), spending on environmental protection in 2016 was \$12.6 billion CAD.¹⁰ In this case, environmental protection is defined as activities “whose primary purpose is the prevention, reduction and elimination of pollution and other forms of degradation of the environment.”

Table 5. Canada's expenditures on environmental protection

	Canada
environmental protection expenditure	12,600,000,000
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	343.25
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.6252

3.3. Expenditures on Indigenous Affairs

The Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs (CIRNA) reports an expenditure of \$8.37 billion in 2017/18.¹¹

⁹ The report estimates that the total annual cost of official bilingualism is \$2.4 billion, but \$51 million of this is for English language education in Quebec.

¹⁰ <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/16-508-x/16-508-x2018002-eng.htm>

¹¹ https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1523210699288/1523210782692#sec4_1

Table 6. Canada's expenditures on Indigenous Affairs

	Canada
Indigenous affairs expenditure	8,366,870,962
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	227.93
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	4,998.77
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	10,699,323
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.4152%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	

4. Case Studies

This section profiles each of the 10 countries, presented in alphabetical order. Each case study begins with a description of the primary sources consulted and any commentary on gaps in or reliability of the data. Each case study includes: (i) a section on demographic and linguistic variables, (ii) a section on Indigenous language policies and associated government expenditures, (iii) a section detailing other government expenditures, including those on other minority languages, environmental protection, and Indigenous affairs more broadly.

4.1. Australia

Although Australia is a relatively large and prosperous country, it ranks low amongst the countries in this study in terms of ILR expenditures. Data in this section is based on websites for and documents from the Australian Bureau of Statistics,¹² the Parliament of Australia¹³, the Australian Government Department of Communications and the Arts,¹⁴ consultations with experts in Australian Indigenous languages and affairs, and other references cited herein.

4.1.1. Demographics and Languages

Australia's population is approximately two-thirds that of Canada, and 2.7% of its population, or around 700,000 people are Indigenous.¹⁵ Although pre-contact there were over 250 languages spoken in Australia, today there are approximately 120 Indigenous

¹² <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/>

¹³ <https://www.aph.gov.au/>

¹⁴ <https://www.arts.gov.au/>

¹⁵ Consultation with many sources failed to shed light on the question of how many Indigenous communities there are in Australia, by analogy with Canada's First Nations and Métis and Inuit communities. This does not seem to be a relevant organization principle in Australian Indigenous society. The figure is listed as 120, corresponding to the number of languages.

languages¹⁶ belonging to 28 language families.¹⁷ Of these languages, the large majority are severely or critically endangered, although some have seen improvements over the past decade (Marmion et al. 2014; Moseley 2010). Very few of the languages are described as “strong,” with the remainder being in a vulnerable or moderately endangered state. A summary of Australia’s demographic profile is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Demographics and languages in Australia

	Australia
Total population	24,770,700
Indigenous population (figure)	669,900
Indigenous population (percentage)	2.70%
Indigenous communities	120
Indigenous languages	120
Indigenous language families	28

4.1.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

In 1991, a national policy on languages and literacy was enacted, which focused on languages other than English and paved the way for the current Indigenous languages policy, which has been in place since 2009.¹⁸ The policy’s objectives are to raise national awareness and strengthen Indigenous identities and pride, protect and revitalize critically endangered languages, provide government services in (some) Indigenous languages, and support Indigenous language education in schools. There is no official language in Australia, but English is used in public spheres; Indigenous languages do not have official language status.

In terms of government expenditures on Indigenous languages, annual funding is estimated to be around \$12.6 million CAD, and it largely in the form of grant programming, some at the national level and some at the state level. These data are relatively reliable; an analysis of government grants specifically for Indigenous language revitalization was conducted by Mahboob et al. (2017); analyses of government expenditures on Indigenous affairs more broadly can be found in work by Marmion et al. (2014) and Russell (2014). These three sources converge (approximately) on the amounts for language, and the figures from Mahboob et al. (2017) are adopted here. A summary is given below.

¹⁶ This figure is taken from Marmion et al. (2014), as it is in the mid-range of the various estimates and based on an Indigenous-led survey of Indigenous languages. Other sources include Dixon 2002 (110 languages), Australian government 2016 census (150 languages), Moseley 2010 (108 languages).

¹⁷ McConvell & Bowern (2011) note that it has been controversial to group languages into families; Dixon (2002) lists 50 language “groups,” which do not always refer to genetic groups. The figure adopted here is based on McConvell & Bowern’s assessment, which they claim has been the most widely adopted.

¹⁸https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House_of_Representatives_Committees?url=atsia/languages/report/index.htm

Table 8. Australia’s expenditures on ILR

	Australia
ILR expenditure – federal	11,734,185
ILR expenditure - state/territory	873,985
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	12,608,170
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	0.51
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	18.82
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	105,068
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	105,068
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0008%

4.1.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Since 2008, the Australian government has implemented various programs to support Asian language learning; the most recent data available is for an Asian literacy program to support five languages (Mandarin, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, and Hindi) with an annual budget of \$15.6 million AUD (\$14.2 million CAD) per annum (Briggs 2013). Census figures show that there are approximately 3.5 million people of Asian descent in Australia. This is summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Australia’s expenditures on minority languages

	Australia
other minority languages (number of languages)	5
other minority languages (relevant population)	3,514,915
other minority languages expenditure – TOTAL	14,256,773
spending on other languages - per capita	0.58
spending on other languages - per relevant population	4.06
spending on other languages - per language	2,851,355
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.0009%

These data demonstrate that Australia spends more overall on Asian languages than on Indigenous languages, but because the Asian population is much higher than the Indigenous population, the per person figure (for the relevant population, i.e., those of Asian versus Indigenous descent) is higher for Indigenous languages than Asian languages (\$18.82 CAD per person for Indigenous languages versus \$4.06 CAD for Asian languages).

The Australian government spends considerably more on environmental protection than on Indigenous language protection, as shown in Table 10. (Figures are quoted from the Ministry of Environment’s most recent budget.)

Table 10. Australia’s expenditures on environmental protection

	Australia
environmental protection expenditure	866,035,246
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	34.96
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0546%

The Australian government released a report in 2017 detailing Indigenous expenditures¹⁹. The word “language” is not found anywhere in the report, suggesting that Indigenous languages are not a high priority in terms of government spending. This is underlined by the figures presented in Table 11; the amount spent on language is 0.22% of the total budget for Indigenous expenditures.

Table 11. Australia’s expenditures on Indigenous affairs

	Australia
Indigenous affairs expenditure	5,714,382,157
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	230.69
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	8,530.20
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	47,619,851
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.3605%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	0.2206%

4.2. Brazil

Brazil falls in the middle of the ranking of countries in this study with respect to ILR funding, but it tops the list in terms of the proportion of overall Indigenous funding devoted to ILR. Data in this section is compiled from the Fundação Joaquim Nabuco (the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation, an organization of the Ministry of Education),²⁰ the Instituto Socioambiental,²¹ the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics),²² Fundação Nacional do Índio (FUNAI, the National Indian Foundation),²³ and additional references cited herein.

4.2.1. Demographics and Languages

Amongst the countries in this study, Brazil’s population is only second to the United States at 211 million people. The Indigenous population of Brazil is relatively small at just under 900,000 or 0.42% of the total population. However, the Indigenous peoples of Brazil are diverse, belonging to an estimated 255 communities and speaking 178 languages from 12 language families. According to Moseley (2010), all of these languages are considered endangered, with over half classified as vulnerable, and close to 50 classified as critically endangered.

¹⁹ <https://www.pc.gov.au/research/ongoing/indigenous-expenditure-report/2017/ier-2017-indigenous-expenditure-report.pdf>

²⁰ http://basilio.fundaj.gov.br/pesquisaescolar_en/index.php

²¹ <https://www.socioambiental.org/en>

²² <https://ww2.ibge.gov.br/english/>

²³ <http://www.funai.gov.br/>

Table 12. Demographics and languages in Brazil

	Brazil
Total population	211,152,687
Indigenous population (figure)	896,917
Indigenous population (percentage)	0.42%
Indigenous communities	255
Indigenous languages	178
Indigenous language families	12

4.2.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

Indigenous languages are not recognized as national or official languages in Brazil; this status is reserved for Portuguese and Brazilian sign language. However, an amendment to the Federal Constitution in 1988 guaranteed Indigenous peoples the rights to their own languages. As detailed by Cabral et al. (2106), beginning around this time and until recently, there were advances in educational policies and programs for Indigenous languages and increases in financial support from government agencies for Indigenous language documentation and research.

However, the state of affairs documented by Cabral et al. (2016) is no longer the status quo in Brazil. Budgetary cutbacks have had impacts in all spheres of society, including education, science, and Indigenous rights. Vera Da Silva Sinha (the third author of the Cabral et al. 2016 paper) notes that most of the programs they described have since been absolved. A 2017 joint submission²⁴ to the United Nations by a group of Brazilian social organizations documents the impacts these program cuts have had on Indigenous peoples. They include a discussion of language, noting that there are no structured policies to recognize or protect Indigenous languages, and despite a Constitutional right to education in Indigenous languages, only 30% of Indigenous schools use Indigenous languages in their teaching, relying on scarce resources to do so.

Based on these findings, the government expenditure for Indigenous languages in Brazil is calculated as follows: The 2017 Ministry of Education budget is R\$108.8 billion BRL and based on the fact that 0.42% of the population is Indigenous, we can assume that 0.42% of the budget, or R\$456.96 million BRL is allocated to Indigenous schools. Based on the fact that 30% of those schools are teaching Indigenous languages, we can assume that 30% of the assumed budget for Indigenous schools, or R\$137 million (\$42.9 million CAD) is the budget for Indigenous language education. The joint submission to the UN claims that there are no other policies to support Indigenous languages; coupled with the widespread budget cutbacks, from this we can assume that the education budget constitutes the full budget for Indigenous language support.

²⁴ https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/brazil/session_27_-_may_2017/js6_upr27_bra_e_main.pdf

Table 13. Brazil's expenditures on ILR

	Brazil
ILR expenditure – federal	42,896,592
ILR expenditure - state/territory	n/a ²⁵
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	42,896,592
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	0.20
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	47.83
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	168,222
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	240,992
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0018%

4.2.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Regarding government support for other minority languages, data on support for Brazilian sign language was not accessible, and although Brazil's national education policies indicate support for the teaching of modern foreign languages such as English, data on government spending cannot be located. A 2015 report²⁶ on English language education in Brazil by the British Council notes that different states and municipalities have their own frameworks for foreign language teaching, and detailed data is difficult to access. In Rio de Janeiro alone, an English language program received R\$151.4 million (\$47.3 million CAD) in government expenditures in 2016. Even under the (false) assumption that this is the only English language program in Brazil, the total investment is just slightly less than that for Indigenous languages.

Table 14. Brazil's expenditures on English (Rio de Janeiro only)

	Brazil
other minority languages (number of languages)	1
other minority languages (speaker population)	6,520,266 ²⁷
other minority languages expenditure – TOTAL	47,288,299
spending on other languages - per capita	0.22
spending on other languages - per relevant population	7.25
spending on other languages - per language	47,288,299
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.0020%

According to Young et al. (2012), the Brazilian government allocated R\$694 million BRL (\$224.5 million CAD) to environmental protection in 2010. Whether this budget has been reduced since that time is not known, but assuming this figure is current, the spending is approximately five times that for Indigenous language protection.

²⁵ The Federal government budget provides funds to the states and municipalities for education.

²⁶ <https://ei.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/latin-america-research/English%20in%20Brazil.pdf>

²⁷ The figure given here is the population of the city of Rio de Janeiro.

Table 15. Brazil's expenditures on environmental protection (2010)

	Brazil
environmental protection expenditure	224,532,848
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	1.06
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0095%

The National Indian Foundation, or FUNAI, is reported to have had a budget of £14 million in 2017 (\$23.8 million CAD).²⁸ Coupled with the estimated budget for Indigenous languages from the Ministry of Education, this is a total of \$66.7 million CAD for Indigenous Affairs, 64% of which is devoted to language. It is unclear whether there are additional funds to support Indigenous Affairs allocated by the Brazilian government, but the joint submission to the UN indicates that funding is minimal.

Table 16. Brazil's expenditures on Indigenous affairs

	Brazil
Indigenous affairs expenditure	66,663,824
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	0.32
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	74.33
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	261,427
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0028%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	64.3476%

4.3. Mexico

Whether analysed in terms of per-capita spending for the total population or the Indigenous population, or in terms of percentage of the GDP, Mexico is at the bottom of the ranking for ILR spending amongst the countries in this study. This is particularly notable given that its Indigenous population is proportionately the highest of any country in the study, at over 21%.

Data in this section comes from the Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas (the National Indigenous Languages Institute, henceforth INALI)²⁹, the Instituto Nacional de Estadística Y Geografía (the National Statistics and Geography Institute, henceforth INEGI)³⁰, the Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas (the National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples, or CDI)³¹, as well as personal communications with Anuschka van 't Hooft from the Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, and sources cited within.

4.3.1. Demographics and Languages

Mexico is similar to Canada in terms of linguistic diversity, with 68 languages representing 11 language families. However, as INALI notes, within these 68 recognized languages are numerous dialects with varying degrees of mutual intelligibility; INALI

²⁸ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jul/10/brazil-funai-indigenous-people-land>

²⁹ <https://www.inali.gob.mx/>

³⁰ <http://en.www.inegi.org.mx/>

³¹ <https://www.gob.mx/cdi/>

advocates for each of these being recognized as distinct languages spoken by distinct communities and the Ethnologue (Simons & Fennig 2018) cites 287 such languages.³² According to statistics on language vitality, the threat of language loss is less pronounced in Mexico than in Canada, with approximately one third of the languages classified as severely or critically endangered, and the remaining two thirds classified as vulnerable or definitely endangered (Moseley 2010).

Although Mexico is similar to Canada in terms of its linguistic diversity, its population is over three times that of Canada, and whereas Canada's population is less than 5% Indigenous, Mexico's Indigenous peoples comprise over 20% of the total population.

Table 17. Demographics and languages in Mexico

	Mexico
Total population	119,938,473
Indigenous population (figure)	25,694,928
Indigenous population (percentage)	21.42%
Indigenous communities	287
Indigenous languages	68
Indigenous language families	11

4.3.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

68 Indigenous languages of Mexico have been recognized as national languages, alongside Mexican Spanish, since 1992 via a constitutional reform that acknowledged the multicultural and multilingual character of the nation (Carranza 2009). As a follow-up to this reform, the Ley General de Derechos Lingüísticos de los Pueblos Indígenas (the General Law on Linguistics Rights of Indigenous Peoples, or LGDLPI) was introduced in 2003 and granted the 68 languages official language status. However, although they are recognized as official languages with equal status to Spanish under the LGDLPI, Indigenous languages in Mexico are vastly under-resourced and under-supported (Carranza 2009), and there are deeply-rooted tensions between ideals of diversity and assimilation that impact policy implementation (Hamel 2009).

This is particularly evidenced in government expenditures on Indigenous languages. Created in 2003 with the passing of LGDLPI, INALI is the federal public agency that oversees Indigenous language revitalization in Mexico. According to INALI's Director of Research Nicandro González, both national and state-level initiatives and projects are funded through INALI, and there is no other source of government funding for Indigenous languages. INALI's total budget for 2018 is reported at 33.3 million pesos (or approximately \$2.3 million CAD), but Nicandro González confirms that only 1 million of this (approximately \$68,000 CAD) goes to supporting language revitalization projects. The remainder goes to salaries and infrastructure, translation services, training workshops, publications, prizes for Indigenous authors, and other miscellaneous services. Even under the assumption that INALI's entire budget is, in some sense, going towards Indigenous languages, spending on Indigenous languages in Mexico is the lowest of any of the nations surveyed here.

³² For purposes of this report, the figure of 68 is taken as the number of languages, and the figure of 287 is taken as the number of communities.

Table 18. Mexico's expenditures on ILR

	Mexico
ILR expenditure – federal	2,283,452
ILR expenditure - state/territory	0
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	2,283,452
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	0.02
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	0.09
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	7,956
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	33,580
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0002%

4.3.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

English language education is a priority in Mexico; revisions to public policy throughout the past two decades has made it increasingly mandatory for English to be taught in Mexican schools. However, education in Mexico is grossly underfunded, and ranks last amongst the OECD nations. Statistics on the amount spent by the Mexican government on English language education could not be located for this report, but it is safe to assume that, concurrent with spending on Indigenous languages, the numbers are low.

Figures from the OECD indicate that Mexican government expenditure on environmental protection was 1.3 billion pesos in 2012.³³ More recent data are not available. Assuming this figure, this means that Mexico spends 40 times more on environmental protection than it does on protection of Indigenous languages.

Table 19. Mexico's expenditures on ILR (2012)

	Mexico
environmental protection expenditure	94,901,509
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	0.79
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0063%

As noted in the preceding section, constitutional reforms introduced in 1992 led to the acknowledgment of the multicultural character of Mexico. Mexico has also adopted the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and has a federal agency, CDI, to support Indigenous affairs in the nation. CDI's annual budget for 2016 was 192.7 million pesos (just over \$13 million CAD); more recent figures are not publicly available.

³³ <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EPER>

Table 20. Mexico’s expenditures on Indigenous affairs (2016)

	Mexico
Indigenous affairs expenditure	13,119,008
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	0.11
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	0.51
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	45,711
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0009
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	17.4057%

4.4. New Zealand

New Zealand is second only to Spain in terms of ILR spending per capita and as a percentage of its GDP, but it falls to fourth place (behind Norway and Scotland) in terms of spending per Indigenous person. Data in this section comes primarily from the New Zealand government³⁴, the Māori language strategy, Te Matawai³⁵, the Māori language commission, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori³⁶, personal communications with Raewyn Harrison, the Director of Te Reo Tuatahi, and additional references cited herein.

4.4.1. Demographics and Languages

New Zealand’s total population is about seven times smaller than Canada’s, but its Indigenous population comprises 15% of the total population, compared with under 5% in Canada. Another key difference between these two nations is that, whereas there are 87 Indigenous languages spoken in Canada, many of which are severely or critically endangered, in New Zealand, there is just one language, Māori, classified as vulnerable. In terms of the number of communities, Māori society traditionally recognizes two levels of social groupings, iwi and hapu (Taonui 2005), and for purposes of grant funding through the Māori language strategy, eight iwi clusters are acknowledged.

Table 21. Demographics and languages in New Zealand

	New Zealand
Total population	4,871,300
Indigenous population (figure)	734,200
Indigenous population (percentage)	15.07%
Indigenous communities	8
Indigenous languages	1
Indigenous language families	1

4.4.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

New Zealand is internationally recognized for its rigorous support of the Māori language. The Māori Language Act, passed in 1987, granted Māori official language status and laid the foundations for systemic changes in many aspects of New Zealand’s education,

³⁴ <https://www.stats.govt.nz/>,

³⁵ <https://www.tematawai.maori.nz>

³⁶ <http://www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz/>

government, and service sectors. The Act was revised in 2016 to the Te Reo Māori Bill, which affirms Māori’s official language status and provides a set of principles to guide government agencies in the infusion of Māori language and culture in all aspects of New Zealand society.

The responsibility for the full implementation of the Te Reo Māori Bill is coordinated across various government agencies, and for some at least of these, it is difficult to determine how much of the annual budget is devoted specifically to the Māori language. A 2011 review of the Māori language sector by Ministry of Māori Development³⁷ cites the total government expenditure as around \$225 million NZD per year (\$196 million CAD). This amount includes spending on language nests and preschools, immersion and other education, media and broadcasting, signage, translation, government services, and other initiatives. Although more recent data are not available, even if this figure is assumed, it situates New Zealand as the country with the second highest per capita investment in Indigenous language revitalization of all of the countries in this report, surpassed only by Spain. This is summarized in Table 22.

Table 22. New Zealand’s expenditures on ILR

	New Zealand
ILR expenditure - federal	196,074,444
ILR expenditure - state/territory	0
ILR expenditure - TOTAL	196,074,444
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	40.25
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	267.06
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	24,509,306
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	196,074,444
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0787%

4.4.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

New Zealand’s investment in Māori far exceeds its investment in other minority languages. Like Australia, New Zealand has a strong Asian population (540,000 people), and the government supports Asian language education, in part by helping primary and secondary schools to develop and strengthen Mandarin, Korean, and Japanese language programs. This initiative is supported by a government investment of \$10 million NZD over the five-year period of 2014-2019 (\$2 million NZD per year, or \$1.72 million CAD).

³⁷ <https://auckland.rl.talis.com/items/7D1E2DBC-3B9A-4874-CC2F-17E8AFC5A5D7.html>

Table 23. New Zealand's expenditures on minority languages

	New Zealand
other minority languages (number of languages)	3
other minority languages (speaker population)	540,000
other minority languages expenditure – TOTAL	1,726,091
spending on other languages - per capita	0.35
spending on other languages - per relevant population	3.20
spending on other languages - per language	575,364
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.0007%

New Zealand's 2016 budget for environment protection was \$2 billion NZD, or \$1.72 billion CAD³⁸, as summarized in Table 24.

Table 24. New Zealand's expenditures on environmental protection

environmental protection expenditure	1,725,710,222
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	354.26
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.6924%

Regarding overall spending on Indigenous affairs, the New Zealand government's Māori Affairs section lists two relevant "votes," with the following annual budgets for 2017/18:

- Māori Development: \$328,737,000 NZD
- Treaty Negotiations: \$432,096,000 NZD

Together, these total just over \$760 million NZD or \$656 million CAD, with close to 30% of those funds going to language.

Table 25. New Zealand's expenditures on Indigenous affairs.

Indigenous affairs expenditure	656,606,911
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	134.79
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	894.32
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	82,075,864
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.2635%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	29.8618%

4.5. Norway

Norway ranks highly compared with other countries in this study, which is particularly noteworthy given that its Indigenous population is just over 1% of the total population of the country. Data in this section comes from websites for and consultations with representatives from Statistisk sentralbyrå (Statistics Norway)³⁹, the Government of

³⁸ <https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/industries/101804162/new-government-accounts-show-value-of-nz-environment-and-human-impact>

³⁹ <https://www.ssb.no/en>

Norway,⁴⁰ the Sámediggi (Sami Parliament of Norway)⁴¹, and other sources referenced herein.

4.5.1. Demographics and Languages

Norway's population is similar to that of New Zealand, approximately 5.3 million, but its Indigenous population (i.e., the population of Sami⁴² people in Norway) is proportionately much smaller at 55,000 people, just over 1% of the total population. Although treated as a single language under the Norwegian government, there are in fact four distinct Sami languages spoken in Norway, Pite Sami, South Sami, Lule Sami, and North Sami. All are endangered, North Sami the least so with over 30,000 speakers, and Pite Sami the most so with under 30 speakers (Moseley 2010). The number of Sami communities is listed in this report as ten, which corresponds to the number of Sami settlements listed in the Norwegian census and in other government documents.

Table 26. Demographics and languages in Norway

	Norway
Total population	5,295,619
Indigenous population (figure)	55,000
Indigenous population (percentage)	1.04%
Indigenous communities	10
Indigenous languages	4
Indigenous language families	1

4.5.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

Under the Norwegian Constitution, Sami people are afforded the right to preserve and develop their own culture and language, and the Sami Act of 1987 affirms that Sami and Norwegian are of equal status. The Sami Parliament (or Sámediggi) was formed in 1989 and functions as an institution of cultural autonomy for the Sami people. An Action Plan for Sami language preservation was developed in 2009 and has undergone reviews and revisions since that time. Its objective is to secure the future of Sami languages in Norway, and to increase the number of people actively using Sami languages. Some aspects of the Action Plan are implemented and funded directly by the Norwegian government, but the primary body responsible for the implementation of the Action Plan, including the allocation of funds to municipalities and counties, is the Sámediggi.

A 2014 review⁴³ of the Action Plan detailed various programs and initiatives along with their respective annual costs, and a second review⁴⁴ prepared for the United Nations in 2012 similarly detailed programs and initiatives. Together, the estimated annual total for

⁴⁰ <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/id4/>

⁴¹ <https://www.samediggi.no/>

⁴² The name of this group is spelled in various ways, including Sami, Sámi, and Saami. The Norwegian government uses the first spelling, and that is what is adopted here.

⁴³ https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kmd/sami/same/oversikt_norges_oppfolging_anaya_2014.pdf

⁴⁴ <https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/ipeoples/emrip/pages/studylanguages.aspx>

all of these is approximately 273 million NOK (\$43 million CAD). More recent figures are not available. Highlights of the 2014 and 2012 reports include:

- Language communication with government agencies in the 10 municipalities (48.5 million NOK)
- Enhancement of public services and public awareness (23 million NOK)
- Language survey and review of legislation (25 million NOK)
- Sami art and culture grants (7.7 million NOK)⁴⁵
- Preschool/kindergarten programs (15.1 million NOK)
- Education, curriculum (113 million NOK)
- Teacher training (7.6 million NOK)
- Support for Giellagáldu, Nordic Resource Centre for Sami Languages (9.7 million NOK)
- Sami newspapers (23 million NOK)⁴⁶

Although these reviews are seemingly comprehensive in scope, it nevertheless remains unclear whether this represents the entire allocation of funds for Sami language revitalization initiatives by the Norwegian government. Moreover, the figures are in some cases estimates, based on other sources, or are no longer current. Thus, the actual total expenditure by the Norwegian government for Sami language revitalization may in fact be higher than what is cited here.

Table 27. Norway's expenditures on ILR (2012-2014)

	Norway
ILR expenditure – federal	43,085,920
ILR expenditure - state/territory	n/a
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	43,085,920
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	8.14
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	783.38
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	4,308,592
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	10,771,480
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0082%

4.5.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Data regarding Norway's support for other minority languages is not currently available, but regarding Norwegian government expenditures towards environmental protection, Moe and Braathu (2014) developed a comprehensive report on precisely this topic, concluding that the annual expenditure is 30 billion NOK (\$4.7 billion CAD), which is over 100 times what the government spends on Sami language protection.

⁴⁵ These are not specific to language, but some may include a language component. The Arts Council Norway also receives funds to support Sami artists, but these do not involve language.

⁴⁶ Public broadcasting is not included, as there is a licensing fee that Norwegians pay for this service and the government incurs no costs.

Table 28. Norway’s expenditures on environmental protection

	Norway
environmental protection expenditure	4,704,039,715
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	888.29
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.8983%

As for Indigenous Affairs, the 2014 review of the Action Plan notes that the Sámediggi receives approximately 418 million NOK annually, and that the total funds “made available for Sami purposes in the central government budget is around NOK 900 million (\$141 million CAD), not including basic funding for services received through the general public welfare system, the general school system and so on.” This suggests that approximately 30% of Indigenous Affairs spending is devoted to the Sami language.

Table 29. Norway’s expenditures on Indigenous (Sami) affairs

	Norway
Indigenous affairs expenditure	141,212,721
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	26.67
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	2,567.50
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	14,121,272
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0270%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	30.5114%

4.6. Scotland

Scotland ranks high amongst countries in this study with a robust Gaelic Language Plan receiving strong financial support from the Scottish government. Data in this section comes primarily from websites and documents from the Scottish Government,⁴⁷ and BBC coverage of the development of the Plan.⁴⁸

4.6.1. Demographics and Languages

In terms of demographics and Indigenous languages, Scotland is somewhat similar to Norway. The two countries both have populations of just over 5 million, and while 1% of Norway’s population is Sami, 1.6% of Scotland’s population speaks Scots Gaelic.⁴⁹ Scots Gaelic is classified as definitely endangered (Moseley 2010), with concentrations of speakers in seven geographic areas around the country.

⁴⁷ <https://www.gov.scot/>

⁴⁸ <http://www.bbc.com/capital/story/20180731-can-27m-a-year-bring-a-language-back-from-near-death>

⁴⁹ This comparison is not exactly valid; for most other countries surveyed here, the Indigenous population is quantified via statistical data, and that population need not be speakers of the language(s) in question. For Scotland (and Wales), there is no data available on the number of Scottish (or Welsh) descendants, so the number of speakers is included instead.

Table 30. Demographics and languages in Scotland

	Scotland
Total population	5,424,800
Indigenous population (figure)	87,056
Indigenous population (percentage)	1.60%
Indigenous communities	7
Indigenous languages	1
Indigenous language families	1

4.6.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

The Gaelic Language Act was passed in 2005 and granted Scots Gaelic official language status with equal rights and protections as English. A national Gaelic Language Plan was announced by the Scottish Parliament in March 2018, and its mandate is to increase Gaelic language use by enabling more people to learn and speak Gaelic in more societal contexts. The Gaelic Language Plan is supported by an investment of £27.4 million (\$45.8 million CAD) in this year’s parliamentary budget.

Table 31. Scotland’s expenditures on ILR

	Scotland
ILR expenditure – federal	45,831,006
ILR expenditure - state/territory	n/a
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	45,831,006
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	8.45
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	526.45
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	6,547,287
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	45,831,006
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0180%

4.6.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Regarding other minority languages, the Scottish government has a policy to enable and encourage school-aged children to learn two additional languages beyond their native language. This “1+2” approach is adopted in some other European countries as well, and it is being implemented in Scotland through the development of modern language programs offering education in French, German, Mandarin, Italian, and Spanish. These programs are intended to be fully operational by 2021, and the Scottish government is providing annual funding of £24.2 million (\$40.9 million CAD) to support this initiative, slightly less than the amount provided to support Scots Gaelic through the Gaelic language plan. The 2016 census reports 684,415 school-aged children in Scotland, the target population for this body of funding.

Table 32. Scotland's expenditures on minority languages

	Scotland
other minority languages (number of languages)	5
other minority languages (speaker population)	684,415
other minority languages expenditure – TOTAL	40,866,582
spending on other languages - per capita	7.53
spending on other languages - per relevant population	59.71
spending on other languages - per language	8,173,316
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.0161%

The Scottish government reports expenditures of £1.208 billion (\$2.04 billion CAD) towards the environment in 2016/17, as shown in Table 33. Spending on Indigenous affairs is not a relevant category in the case of Scotland.

Table 33. Scotland's expenditures on environmental protection

	Scotland
environmental protection expenditure	2,040,734,356
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	376.19
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.8026%

4.7 Spain

Spain outranks the other countries in this study in terms of per-capita spending (total and Indigenous populations) and percentage of the GDP. It is also the only country in the study with comparable expenditures for environmental protection and endangered language protection. Data in this section comes primarily from reports produced by the Ministerio de Educació, Cultura y Deporte (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports)⁵⁰, the Government of Catalonia, Mercator (the European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning), ECRML (the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages), the Instituto Nacional de Estadística (the National Institute for Statistics)⁵¹, and other references cited herein.

4.7.1. Demographics and Languages

Castilian Spanish is the only language in Spain with national official status, but its six other Indigenous languages all have some type of formal governmental recognition at the regional level, and Spanish citizens' rights to these other languages are protected by the Spanish constitution. Of these sixth additional languages, four (Aragonese, Aranese, Asturian, and Basque) are endangered to some degree whereas the remaining two (Catalan and Galician) are not. As this report is on language revitalization initiatives, the focus of this section is the four endangered languages, but Catalan is discussed in section 4.6.3. Brief profiles of the four languages are presented below.

⁵⁰<https://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/dms/mecd/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/estadisticas/educacion/indicadores-publicaciones-sintesis/datos-cifras/Datosycifras1718ing.pdf>

⁵¹ <https://www.ine.es/welcome.shtml>

Aragonese has status as a “recognized” language of the autonomous community of Aragon. A 2011 regional census reports that there are close to 23,000 Aragonese people, 6500 of whom can speak or understand the language. It is a Romance language and is classified as definitely endangered by Moseley (2010).

Aranese is a co-official language of the autonomous community of Catalonia spoken predominantly in the region of Val d’Aran. The 2015 regional census reports that there are close to 3700 Aranese people, and 92% of them speak or understand the language. Aranese is also referred to as Occitan and is a variant of Gascon, a Romance language that is classified as definitely endangered (Moseley 2010).

Asturian is a recognized language of the autonomous community of Asturias and is the family language of 42% of the community’s population, or 449,400 people. It is not clear how many people from this population speak or understand the language. Asturian is a Romance language that is also referred to as Bable and shares a high degree of mutual intelligibility with Leonese and Miranda. Moseley (2010) classifies it as definitely endangered.

Basque is the only language that is not part of the Romance family, and it is the least endangered, classified as vulnerable by Moseley (2010). A 2016 regional census reports 1.57 million Basque people in the autonomous community of Basque; it is not clear how many of these people speak or understand the language. A summary of these four languages is presented in Table 34.

Table 34. Demographics and languages in Spain

	Spain
Total population	46,659,302
Indigenous population (figure)	2,048,157
Indigenous population (percentage)	4.39%
Indigenous communities	82
Indigenous languages	4
Indigenous language families	2

4.7.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

Spain’s recognition of regional Indigenous languages is strongly evidenced in language policies that promote the languages in public spheres, media, and education. For example, González-Riaño and Fernández-Costales (2014) describe the *Llei d’Usu y promoció del Bable/Asturianu* (Use and Promotion of Bable/Asturian Act), which establishes that Asturian is the traditional language of the community, and it is to be taught in schools, promoted in the media, and used in official place names in the region. Other autonomous communities have similar policies for the other languages.

Of the four endangered Indigenous languages, Basque stands out as unique in that public education in the autonomous community of Basque is almost entirely in the Basque language or is bilingual with Basque and Spanish. More broadly, much of the spending on Indigenous languages in Spain is devoted to Basque, Catalan, and Galician education. Leading up to end of the war in 1939, these languages (as well as the other three,

Aragonese, Aranese, and Asturian) were actively suppressed by the government, and since that time, the country has been actively trying to encourage the regeneration of speakers through educational and promotional initiatives.

Regarding Aragonese, although it has formal recognitional status in the region and is in principle protected under Spain's adoption of the European Charter for Regional and Minority languages, Cortés and Martín's (2017) review of Aragonese education and preservation reveals that there is no dedicated governmental funding to support language initiatives. Spanish is the language of instruction in schools, and Aragonese language lessons are minimal and only privately supported. There are no educational centres offering Aragonese language classes, and no public institutions promoting the language (although some private associations are doing so independent of government support). These findings are reiterated by ECRML (2016).

As for Aranese, a 2010 report⁵² on Aranese language policy by the Government of Catalonia reported an expenditure of €182,654.23 to support and promote Aranese, an amount equivalent to 0.595% of the total budget allocated to the General Directorate for Language Policy in the region. More recent reports specific to Aranese are not available, but a 2015 report⁵³ on language policy in Catalonia reports a total budget of €81,456,788.68 for all minority languages (Catalan, Aranese, and Catalan sign language). Assuming the same percentage of 0.595% applies in 2015, the total budget for Aranese in 2015 is €484,668. This budget supports education at the primary, secondary, and postsecondary levels, as well as teacher training, film festivals, television programming, translations, and other promotional activities.

Regarding Asturian, González-Riaño and Fernández-Costales (2014) note that, although language policy in Asturias establishes the possibility of Asturian as a language of instruction, in reality it is most often taught as a subject, and with little financial support. However, it is promoted outside the educational domain in arts and media, and pilot experiments with Asturian immersion education have been successfully conducted. ECRML (2016) reports that the Directorate of General Linguistic Policy was allotted €1.7 million in 2013 for these promotional activities; more recent figures are not available.

Finally, regarding Basque, education in the autonomous community of Basque is available in Basque, Spanish, or both (bilingual). Only 14% of public school students choose the Spanish-only option; the other 86% (totalling 169,329 students) choose Basque or bilingual education. Basque spends more on education than other regions of Spain, with a reported per-student investment of €9143 in 2012/13⁵⁴, or €1,548 billion (\$2.35 billion CAD). More recent figures are not available.

A summary of the annual expenditures for these four languages is presented in Table 35.

⁵² <http://llengua.gencat.cat/permalink/3557395f-5382-11e4-8f3f-000c29cdf219>

⁵³ <http://llengua.gencat.cat/web/.content/documents/informepl/arxiu/IPL-2015-ang.pdf>

⁵⁴ https://www.bizkaiatalent.eus/en/paisvasco_gasto_estudiante/

Table 35. Spain's expenditures on ILR by language

	Aragonese	Aranese	Asturian	Basque	TOTAL
status	recognized	co-official	recognized	co-official	
state expenditure	0	734,486	2,586,456	2,346,495,823	2,349,816,765
population	22,999	3,673	449,400	1,572,085	2,048,157
per capita (relevant population)	0.00	199.97	5.76	1,492.60	1,147.28
per capita (total population)	0.00	0.02	0.06	50.29	50.36

Taken together, the budgets for these four languages totals €1,550,366,450 (\$2.35 billion CAD), as summarized in Table 35.

Table 35. Spain's expenditures on ILR.

	Spain
ILR expenditure – federal	n/a
ILR expenditure - state/territory	2,349,816,765
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	2,349,816,765
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	50.36
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	1,147.28
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	28,656,302
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	587,454,191
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.1458%

4.7.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Although Spain undoubtedly has programs to support non-Indigenous minority or immigrant languages, in this section, the focus is on Catalan. Like French in Canada, Catalan is an official language of the autonomous community of Catalonia, and bilingual education is a priority. According to a 2015 regional census, 64.7% or 4,857,555 of Catalonia's total population is Catalan.

Catalonia produces an annual report on language policy; its 2015 edition is the most recent one available (see footnote 53). The report cites a total budget of €81.5 million for all language policy actions, including those supporting Aranese and Catalan sign language. Given the target populations for these other two languages, we can assume that 99% of this budget goes towards Catalan, a total of €80,62,221 (\$122.2 million CAD).

The language policy budget does not include costs for education, which throughout the region is either in Catalan or is bilingual with Catalan. The Government of Catalonia's 2017 budget for education was €4.771 billion. This yields a per-student cost is €3675, which is far below the per-student cost for Basque language education (see section 4.7.2). Together with the language policy budget, this totals €4,851,642,221 (\$7.35 billion CAD), as summarized in Table 37 below.

Table 37. Spain's expenditures on Catalan (2015)

	Spain
other minority languages (number of languages)	1
other minority languages (speaker population)	4,857,555
other minority languages expenditure – TOTAL	7,352,579,205
spending on other languages - per capita	157.58
spending on other languages - per relevant population	1,513.64
spending on other languages - per language	7,352,579,205
spending on other languages - percentage of GDP	0.4561%

Regarding environment protection, Spain's Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica (Ministry for Ecological Transition) reported a budget of €1.65 billion (\$2.5 billion CAD) in 2017.⁵⁵

Table 38. Spain's expenditures on environmental protection

	Spain
environmental protection expenditure	2,505,954,508
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	53.71
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.1555%

Finally, regarding Indigenous affairs, like Scotland and Wales, this is not a relevant category for Spain.

4.8. Sweden

Like Norway, Sweden is home to Sami people, but the Sami population of Sweden is 0.29% compared with 1% in Norway. ILR expenditures reported in this section are likely incomplete; comparisons between Sweden and other countries should take this into account. Data in this section come from websites for and consultations with representatives from Statistics Sweden,⁵⁶ the Sami Information Centre⁵⁷ (a sub-organization of the Sami Parliament), the Swedish Institute⁵⁸ (a joint project of the Government of Sweden and other institutions), the Sametinget (Sami Parliament)⁵⁹, and the Government of Sweden.⁶⁰

4.8.1. Demographics and Languages

Home to 10 million people, Sweden has nearly twice the population of Norway. However, its Sami population is much smaller, around 30,000. The four Sami languages spoken in Norway are also spoken in Sweden (Pite Sami, Lule Sami, North Sami, and South Sami), as is a fifth language, Ume Sami, which along with Pite Sami is critically endangered with

⁵⁵ https://www.mapama.gob.es/es/ministerio/organizacion-organismos/presupuesto/proteccionymejorademedioambiente_tcm30-423096.PDF

⁵⁶ <http://www.scb.se/en/>

⁵⁷ <http://www.samer.se/>

⁵⁸ <https://sweden.se/>

⁵⁹ <https://www.sametinget.se>

⁶⁰ <https://www.government.se/>

less than 20 speakers. The other languages range from definitely to severely endangered in Sweden. Regarding Sami communities, these are referred to as *sameby* and by description they are analogous to First Nations in a way that many of the other communities in this survey are not; according to the Sami Information Centre, a sameby “is not a village and not collection of huts on a mountain - it is more complex than that. It is a financial and administrative union that is regulated by law.” According to the Sami Parliament, *sameby* refers to an economic and geographic entity. There are 51 samebys in Sweden.

Table 38. Demographics and languages in Sweden

	Sweden
Total population	10,171,524
Indigenous population (figure)	30,000
Indigenous population (percentage)	0.29%
Indigenous communities	51
Indigenous languages	5
Indigenous language families	1

4.8.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

In addition to the Sami languages, Sweden recognizes four other official minority languages, Finnish, Romani, Yiddish, and Meänkieli. The Sami Parliament (Sametinget) was established in 1993, and since the recognition of the Sami language as an official minority language in 2000, financial resources granted to the Sametinget from the Government of Sweden for language preservation have increased. The Sametinget’s language policy is to promote, develop, and preserve the Sami language so that it can be used at home and in official contexts. This mandate is carried out via Sami Language Centres, which are part of the Sametinget. Funding for the Sami Language Centres is part of the Ministry of Culture’s budget and the 2018 allocation to the Language Centres was 6 million SEK (\$870,000 CAD). According to the Ministry of Culture, this is the only government funding directly allocated to Sami language revitalization. However, this figure does not include Sami language education (as a subject or a medium of instruction), and it does not include government funds allocated to the Institutet för språk och folkminnen (The Institute of Language and Folklore),⁶¹ a government agency responsible for the promotion of official minority languages. These budgets are not accessible and requests for information have not received a response. In short, the actual figure is presumed to be higher than that which is presented here.

⁶¹ <http://www.sprakochfolkminnen.se/>

Table 39. Sweden's expenditures on ILR

	Sweden
ILR expenditure – federal	870,899
ILR expenditure - state/territory	n/a ⁶²
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	870,899
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	0.09
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	29.03
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	17,076
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	174,180
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0001%

4.8.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

Spending on other minority languages is not included here, as the budget for the Institute of Language and Folklore, which is the main government body responsible for language planning and promotion, is not accessible. Regarding environmental protection, the Government of Sweden reports an allocation of 10.6 billion SEK in 2018 (\$1.53 billion CAD).

Table 40. Sweden's expenditures on environmental protection

	Sweden
environmental protection expenditure	1,532,380,976
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	150.65
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.2257%

Regarding Indigenous Affairs, the Government of Sweden allocated 190 million SEK to the Sametinget in 2018, with the large majority of this budget devoted to reindeer husbandry, and only a small percentage devoted to language. The Government committed an additional 17.8 million SEK to the promotion of Sami language and culture, giving a total annual government expenditure of 207.8 million SEK ((\$30 million CAD).

Table 41. Sweden's expenditures on Indigenous (Sami) affairs

	Sweden
Indigenous affairs expenditure	30,162,447
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	2.97
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	1,005.41
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	591,421
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0044
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	2.8874%

⁶² Sweden has 25 provinces, but they exist for historical and cultural reasons and have no administrative functions.

4.9. United States

Determining government funding in the United States proves challenging, as there is both federal and state-level funding, and there is no federal oversight for state funding, which means that it has the potential to vary considerably from state-to-state. In fact, however, aside from Hawai'i, state-level funding seems to be low and relatively consistent across states for which there is funding. (It seems that in many there is none.) Despite being the largest and by far the most prosperous country in the study, the United States ranks very low in terms of ILR funding; it's per-capita funding is only 14 cents per year. Data in this section is based on websites for and consultations with representatives from the US Census Bureau⁶³, the US Federal Register⁶⁴, the US Department of Education⁶⁵, the Administration for Native Americans,⁶⁶ the Indigenous Languages Institute,⁶⁷ the National Congress of American Indians,⁶⁸ the Office of Hawaiian Education,⁶⁹ the Alaska Native Language Preservation and Advisory Council,⁷⁰ consultations with representatives and affiliates of these and other organizations, and other references cited herein.

4.9.1. Demographics and Languages

By population, the United States is the biggest country represented in the survey, with over 325 million people. Brazil and Mexico are the only other countries in the survey with populations over 100 million, and the Indigenous population of the United States is between that of these two other countries, at 8.4 million people, or 2.57% of the total population. This figure includes people who identify as Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, Native American, or Alaska Native (alone, or in combination with another race).

In 2011, the US census reported 169 native languages spoken in the country; Mosely (2010) lists 138 (plus 54 extinct languages). For purposes of this report, the higher number of 169 is assumed. Over 100 of these languages are severely or critically endangered; the remainder are definitely endangered or vulnerable. Including isolates as single-member language families, the 169 languages represent 33 distinct language families. As for the number of communities, the US government recognizes 567 tribes in the lower 48 States and Alaska, and there are 8 Hawaiian communities, corresponding to the 8 Hawaiian Islands.⁷¹

⁶³ <https://www.census.gov/>

⁶⁴ <https://www.federalregister.gov/>

⁶⁵ <https://www.ed.gov/>

⁶⁶ <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ana>

⁶⁷ <https://ilinitiative.org/>

⁶⁸ <http://www.ncai.org/>

⁶⁹ <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/StudentLearning/HawaiianEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

⁷⁰

<https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/web/dcra/AKNativeLanguagePreservationAdvisoryCouncil.aspx>

⁷¹ The decision to treat each Hawaiian island as representing a community is based on consultations with Hawaiian scholars Larry Kimura and Noenoe Silva, who both independently suggested this treatment.

Table 42. Demographics and languages in the United States

	USA
Total population	325,719,178
Indigenous population (figure)	8,358,773
Indigenous population (percentage)	2.57%
Indigenous communities	575
Indigenous languages	169
Indigenous language families	33

4.9.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

4.9.2.1. Federal Legislation and Expenditures

There is no national official language in the United States. The Native American Languages Act was passed in 1990 and amended in 1992 as a way to recognize the unique value of these languages and the responsibility of the United States to ensure their survival. Along with the Act, a policy was enacted to “preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop Native American languages,” including in public proceedings and publicly supported education programs (Reyhner 1993). Sixteen years after the introduction of the Native American Languages Act, the Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act was passed, and this provides grant funding to support language immersion programs, distributed via the Administrative for Native Americans (ANA).

The ANA is under the umbrella of the US Department of Health and Human Services and it is the main funding body for federally-supported ILR programs. Its purview includes the 48 lower states as well as Alaska and Hawai’i. 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. In the 2018 fiscal year, the total budget for these programs was \$12 million USD.

The only other institution that receives federal funding for ILR is the National Science Foundation⁷², under its Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) program. The DEL program has two solicitations, one for community-based programs and one for university-level research; together they total just over \$5 million USD.

Together, the ANA and DEL funds, which comprise the total federal expenditure for ILR, total just over \$17 million USD (\$22.3 million CAD).

4.9.2.2. State Legislation and Expenditures

State-level legislation and funding for ILR varies from state to state. McCoy (2003) reported that there are sixteen states with education policies regarding Indigenous

⁷² Consultations with representatives from ANA, DEL, and other federal organizations such as ILI, NCAI, and the US Department of Education confirmed that no other organizations receive federal funding for ILR.

language teaching, and Zinth (2006) reported that there are seven states with established policies pertaining to Indigenous languages. McCoy’s list fully encompasses Zinth’s; the list of all sixteen is given below:

Table 43. US States with Indigenous language policies

Alaska	New Mexico
Arizona	North Dakota
Hawai’i	Oklahoma
Idaho	Oregon
Minnesota	South Dakota
Montana	Washington
Nebraska	Wisconsin
Nevada	Wyoming

Of these states, only Alaska and Hawai’i have granted Indigenous languages official language status at the state-level alongside English.

First regarding Hawai’i, state-level funding is entirely allocated towards what Hawaiian language revivalists deem to be their top priority at current: Hawaiian language immersion and Hawaiian medium education. State-level funds to support these initiatives are administered through the Office of Hawaiian Education, a division of the Hawai’i Department of Education founded in 2015. Its budget for the current fiscal year is \$2.5 million USD, and an additional \$8.6 million is allocated for teaching staff, totalling \$11.1 million USD (\$14.6 millions CAD).

As for Alaska, despite its 20 Indigenous languages having official language status, state-level funding for ILR is not very robust. Prior to 2012, there was little to no state-level funding to support ILR⁷³; the Alaska Native Language Preservation and Advisory Council (ANLPAC) was formed under the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development to help address the growing urgency of language preservation in Alaska. However, ANLPAC’s biennial reports consistently speak to an ongoing lack of funding, and since 2015 their budget includes funding for only one full-time staff member. State-level funding has improved since 2012 but is still insufficient; it was non-existent and now is in the range of \$350,000 USD per year, with \$250,000 going to community-engaged research activities at the University of Alaska.⁷⁴

A comprehensive survey of funding available for other US states was beyond the scope of this report. However, an investigation of ILR programs in two other states – Wisconsin and Montana – suggests that Alaska’s budget for ILR is similar to that of other states with Indigenous language policies. In Wisconsin, an annual allocation of \$222,800 USD supports the Tribal Language Revitalization Grant Program⁷⁵, and in Montana, an annual allocation of \$310,000 USD supports the Montana Indian Language Program.⁷⁶

⁷³This is documented in Sealaska Heritage Institute President Rosita Kaahani Worl’s testimony in support of the establishment of ANLPAC, available at

http://www.akleg.gov/basis/get_documents.asp?session=27&docid=9330

⁷⁴ Other institutions supporting ILR in Alaska such as the Sealaska Heritage Institute and the Doyon Foundation rely on private donations and federal support.

⁷⁵ <https://dpi.wi.gov/amind/language-culture-education/languages-wisconsin>

⁷⁶

<http://marketmt.com/Portals/129/shared/STEDC/docs/2017%20Biennium%20Program%20Guidelines-MILP-STEDC.pdf?ver=2018-06-27-141142-727>

Taking these two states, along with Alaska, as representative of the typical level of state-level funding allocated in the fifteen states with Indigenous language policies (aside from Hawai'i), we can assume an average expenditure of \$300,000 USD in these states. For states without Indigenous language policies, we will assume there is no state-level funding for ILR.

In sum, the total state-level funding includes \$14.6 million USD for Hawai'i, plus \$300,000 USD for each of the remaining fifteen states with Indigenous language policies (\$4.5 million USD total.) This totals \$19.1 million USD (\$24.5 million CAD).

4.9.2.3. Summary: Federal and State Legislation and Expenditures

Combining federal and state-level funding, the total annual expenditure by the United States for ILR is around \$47 million CAD. In terms of per-capita spending (both for the total population and the population of Indigenous people), this is second lowest amount in the survey, surpassed only by Mexico.

Table 44. United States' expenditures on ILR

	USA
ILR expenditure – federal	22,257,083
ILR expenditure - state/territory	24,887,725
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	47,144,808
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	0.14
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	5.64
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	81,991
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	278,963
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0023%

4.9.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

As for spending on other minority languages, the relevant comparison with Canadian French is Spanish in the United States. The US Census reports that there are 57.5 million Hispanic people in the United States, but there are few policy documents relating to Spanish medium education, and no information could be located on government spending for Spanish language support.

As for environment protection, the US Environmental Protection Agency reported a budget of just over \$8 billion USD (\$10.4 billion CAD) for 2018.⁷⁷

Table 45. United States' expenditures on environmental protection

	USA
environmental protection expenditure	10,445,298,448
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	32.07
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0409%

⁷⁷ <https://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/budget>

Regarding Indigenous Affairs, the ANA's total budget for 2018 is \$41 million USD; this is subsumed under the budget for the Department of Indian Affairs, which in 2018 is \$2.5 billion USD⁷⁸ (\$32.6 billion CAD).

Table 46. United States' expenditures on Indigenous affairs

	USA
Indigenous affairs expenditure	32,576,363,033
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per CAPITA	100.01
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	3,897.27
Indigenous affairs expenditure - per COMMUNITY	56,654,544
Indigenous affairs expenditure - percentage of GDP	1.6164%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	0.1447%

4.10. Wales

Wales ranks third amongst countries in this study in terms of per-capita spending and percentage of the GDP devoted to ILR. Data in this section comes primarily from Welsh government websites and documents, including those related to statistics,⁷⁹ the language action plan,⁸⁰ and the budget.⁸¹

4.10.1. Demographics and Languages

According to the Statistics division of the Welsh government, nearly 18% of its population of 3.125 million speak Welsh. Data on the number of Indigenous Welsh people (separate from the number of speakers) is not available. The Welsh language is classified as vulnerable (Moseley 2010). Regarding the number of communities, Welsh speakers are spread across the country; 22 is the number of principal subdivisions recognized by the federal and local governments.

Table 47. Demographics and languages in Wales

	Wales
Total population	3,125,000
Indigenous population (figure)	562,016
Indigenous population (percentage)	17.98%
Indigenous communities	22
Indigenous languages	1
Indigenous language families	1

⁷⁸ <https://nativenewsonline.net/currents/2018-budget-proposes-2-5-billion-indian-affairs/>

⁷⁹ <https://statswales.gov.wales/>; <https://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/mid-year-estimates-population/?lang=en>

⁸⁰ <https://gov.wales/topics/welshlanguage/welsh-language-strategy-and-policies/welsh-language-policies-upto-2017/welsh-language-strategy-action-plan/?lang=en>

⁸¹ <http://www.assembly.wales/laid%20documents/gen-ld11249/gen-ld11249-e.pdf>

4.10.2. Indigenous Language Legislation and Expenditures

Welsh is recognized as an official language in Wales alongside English, and its official status is evidenced in part by the fact that all government websites and documents are available in both languages. The Welsh government has implemented and evaluated various strategies and action plans to increase the use of Welsh in education, technology, and society over the past two decades, the most recent being Cymraeg 2050 which seeks to increase the number of Welsh speakers from half to one million by 2050. This current action plan's key themes are to increase speakers, increase language use, and create favourable conditions for language use, in terms of infrastructure and societal contexts.

The 2017/18 federal budget for implementing the Cymraeg 2050 plan is £36.2 million (\$61 million CAD). It is unclear whether local governments have independent budgets devoted to promoting the Welsh language; only the federal figure is included here. The Welsh Language Society released a report in 2015 criticizing the Welsh government for its lack of investment in the Welsh language, noting that the budget had been cut back in 2014 and again in 2015. The 2017/18 budget represents an increase in funding, and after New Zealand, Wales per capita investment is the second highest amongst the countries surveyed here.

Table 48. Wales' expenditures on ILR

	Wales
ILR expenditure – federal	61,174,058
ILR expenditure - state/territory	
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	61,174,058
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	19.58
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	108.85
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	2,780,639
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	61,174,058
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.0594%

4.10.3. Comparisons with Other Government Expenditures

In 2015 the Welsh government announced a five-year plan to improve and promote modern foreign languages in Wales. Like Scotland's "1+2" program, Wales' "Global Futures" program aims for school-aged children to acquire fluency in three languages: English, Welsh, and one additional foreign language, particularly French, German, Spanish, or Mandarin. There were 430,740 school-aged children in Wales at the time of the last census. Requests for the annual budget for the Global Futures program did not receive a response.

Regarding environmental protection, in the 2017/18 federal budget, £56.4 million (\$95.3 million CAD) was allotted for developing and implementing environmental protection policies and for nature conservation.

Table 49. Wales' expenditures on environmental protection

	Wales
environmental protection expenditure	95,297,750
environmental protection expenditure - per CAPITA	30.50
environmental protection expenditure - percentage of GDP	0.0925%

As with Scotland, expenditures on Indigenous Affairs (apart from expenditures on the Welsh language) is not deemed a relevant consideration here.

5. Summary and Observations

The tables presented in section 4 are compiled in a comprehensive spreadsheet in Appendix A. This section presents some additional observations on the data, focusing on comparisons across countries.

On a per-capita basis (based on the total population of each country), the ranking of the ten countries according to their ILR expenditures (least to most) is given in Table 50. There is a clear divide between the first five countries (under \$1) and the last five (\$8-\$58).

Table 50. Per-capita (total population) spending on ILR (least to most)

Country	Per-capita (total)
Mexico	0.02
Sweden ⁸²	0.09
United States	0.14
Brazil	0.20
Australia	0.51
Norway	8.14
Scotland	8.45
Wales	19.58
New Zealand	40.25
Spain	58.37

If we consider per-capita spending for only the relevant populations (i.e., the Indigenous populations of the languages in question), the ranking shifts, particularly for Norway and Scotland, whose spending per Indigenous person is relatively high.

⁸² Recall from section 4.8 that the figure cited for Sweden may not accurately reflect the full range of ILR programs and activities; its ranking may in fact be higher.

Table 51. Per-capita (Indigenous population only) spending on ILR (least to most)

Country	Per-capita (Indigenous)
Mexico	0.09
United States	5.64
Australia	18.82
Sweden	29.03
Brazil	47.83
Wales	108.85
New Zealand	267.06
Scotland	526.45
Norway	783.38
Spain	1,329.77

If we consider ILR spending in terms of the percentage of GDP, Norway drops down in the ranking, as shown in Table 52.

Table 52. Percentage of GDP spent on ILR (least to most)

Country	Percentage of GDP
Sweden	0.0001%
Mexico	0.0002%
Australia	0.0008%
Brazil	0.0018%
United States	0.0023%
Norway	0.0082%
Scotland	0.0180%
Wales	0.0594%
New Zealand	0.0787%
Spain	0.1690%

In addition to cross-country comparisons, within-country comparisons across different types of funding are also possible. This is summarized in Table 53. As evidenced by Tables 50, 51, and 52, Spain has the highest expenditure on ILR in the study, but it spends over three times that on other minority languages (in this case Catalan). New Zealand, on the other hand, spends considerably more on Māori than on other minority languages (Asian languages). Other countries for which this data is available spend about the same per-capita on Indigenous and minority languages.

As for comparisons with environmental spending, Spain and Wales are the two countries with comparable levels of spending on protection of the environment and protection of Indigenous languages. All other countries spend considerably more on the former than the latter.

Finally, whereas for Australia and the United States, ILR comprises only a very small percentage of the budget for Indigenous affairs (less than 1%), for other countries, ILR constitutes a higher proportion of the budget (17% in Mexico up to 64% in Brazil).

Table 53. Per-capita expenditures on ILR compared with other expenditures

	ILR	other languages	environment	Indigenous affairs
Mexico	0.02	n/a	0.79	0.11
Sweden	0.09	n/a	150.65	2.97
USA	0.14	n/a	21.53	100.01
Brazil	0.20	0.22	1.06	0.32
Australia	0.51	0.58	34.96	230.69
Norway	8.14	n/a	888.29	26.67
Scotland	8.45	7.53	376.19	n/a
Wales	19.58	n/a	30.50	n/a
New Zealand	40.25	0.35	354.26	134.79
Spain	50.36	157.58	53.71	n/a

As a final point, although data on Canada’s current ILR expenditures are not included in this report, for the sake of comparison, figures based loosely on Bliss & Creed’s (2018) community-based costing model for Canada are outlined in Table 54. Assuming an annual budget of approximately \$5 million CAD per community, this totals \$3.91 billion for the 782 Indigenous communities in Canada.

Table 53. ILR expenditures for Canada based on Bliss & Creed’s costing model

	Bliss & Creed model for Canada
ILR expenditure – federal	
ILR expenditure - state/territory	
ILR expenditure – TOTAL	3,910,000,000
ILR expenditure - per CAPITA	106.52
ILR expenditure - per INDIGENOUS PERSON	2,336.02
ILR expenditure - per COMMUNITY	5,000,000
ILR expenditure - per LANGUAGE	44,942,529
ILR expenditure -percentage of GDP	0.1940%
percentage of Indigenous spending devoted to languages	46.7319%

How does this model compare with other models in practice around the world? On a per-language basis, it is much lower than New Zealand’s per-language spending of \$196 million, and it is comparable with Scotland’s per-language spending of \$45.8 million. The main difference between Canada and these two countries, of course, is that Canada is revitalizing 87 languages as opposed to just one.

In terms of per-capita spending, this model is not too far above Spain, which spends \$58 per capita or \$1330 per Indigenous person. In terms of the percentage of Indigenous affairs spending devoted to ILR, this model is comparable to Norway and New Zealand (both 30%).

Finally, and most strikingly, in terms of percentage of the GDP, this model is comparable to Spain, with 0.169% of Spain’s GDP going to ILR. In short, adopting a model along the

lines of that proposed by Bliss & Creed (2018) would put Canada in line with other countries with successful ILR programs.

References

- 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.
- Bloor, Thomas, and Wondwosen Tamrat. 1996. Issues in Ethiopian Language Policy and Education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17(5): 321-338.
- Briggs, Saga. 2013. "Australian Government Invests \$15.2 million in Asian Language Literacy." News article published in informED. Online. <https://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/other/australia-government-invests-15-2m-in-asian-language-literacy-4410/>. Accessed 11 September 2018.
- Cabral, Ana Suely 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.
- Cardozo, Mieke T.A. Lopes. 2012. Decolonising Bolivian education – ideology versus reality. In T. G. Griffiths and Z. Millei (eds), *Logics of Socialist Education: Engaging with Crisis, Insecurity and Uncertainty*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Carranza, Ariel Vázquez. 2009. Linguistic rights in Mexico. *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada* 8: 199-210.
- Cortés, Juan Pablo Martínez, and Santiago J. Paricio Martín. 2017. *The Aragonese language in education in Spain*. Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.
- Dalby, Andrew. 2003. *Language in Danger: The Loss of Linguistic Diversity and the Threat to our Future*. Columbia University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2002. *Australian Languages: Their Nature and Development*. Cambridge University Press.
- ECRML (European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages). 2016. Report on the Application of the Charter in Spain. Online. Available: http://administraciojusticia.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/seccions_tematiques/llengua_catalana/marc_normatiu/normativa_sobre_usos_ling/carta_europea_de_les_llen/report_Committee_Experts_Charter.pdf
- Freeburg, Elizabeth. 2013. *The Cost of Revival: The Role of Hebrew in Jewish Language Endangerment*. BA Honours thesis, Yale University.
- González-Riaño, Xosé Antón, and Alberto Fernández-Costales. 2014. *The Asturian language in education in Spain*, 2nd ed. Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.
- Grin, François. 1993. Minority language promotion: On the practical usefulness of economic theory. In *Economic Development and Lesser Used Languages: Partnerships for Action*, ed. by L. Dafis. Llanbedr Pont Steffan: Cwmni Iaith Cyfyngedig, pp. 29-49.
- Grin, François. 1996. The economics of language: survey, assessment, and prospects. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 121: 17-44.
- Grin, François. 2006. Economic Considerations in Language Policy. In: Ricento, Thomas (ed.), *An Introduction in Language Policy*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 77-94.

- 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.
- Hinton, Leanne. 2003. Language revitalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 23: 44-57.
- Hornberger, Nancy. 1998. Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society* 27(4): 439-458.
- Jenni, Barbara, Adar Anisman, Onowa McIvor, & Peter Jacobs. 2017. An exploration of the effects of Mentor-Apprentice programs on mentors and apprentices' wellbeing. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 12(2), 25-42.
- Krauss, Michael. 1992. The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68(1): 4-10.
- 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.
- McConvell, Patrick, and Claire Bowern. 2011. The prehistory and internal relationships of Australian languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5(1): 19-32.
- 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>.
- Moe, Sigrid Hendriks, and Trine Heill Bratthu. 2014. Government expenditures on environmental protection and resource management. Report prepared for Statistics Norway. Online. Available: <https://www.ssb.no/natur-og-miljo/artikler-og-publikasjoner/attachment/209618?ts=14a103f46bo>
- Moseley, Christopher (ed.). 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edn. Paris, UNESCO Publishing. Online version: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas>
- Nicolson, Marianne. 2013. *Yaxa Ukwine, yaxa Gukw, dhuwida Awinagwis: The Body, the House, and the Land: The Conceptualization of Space in Kwakwak'wakw Language and Culture*. PhD dissertation, University of Victoria.
- Reyhner, John. American Indian Language Policy and School Success. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students* 12: 35-59.
- 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>
- Sands, Bonny. 2018. Language revitalization in Africa. In Rehg, Kenneth L, and Lyle Campbell (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Oxford University Press.
- Simons, Gary F. and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2018. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-first edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Taonui 2005, Rāwiri Taonui, 'Tribal organisation', Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/tribal-organisation>.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.

- Uthayakumar, Prasha. 2015. The rights of Indigenous people in Sri Lanka. ESCR E-Newsletter, issue 16. Online. Available: <https://www.lstlanka.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/indigenous-people-in-sri-lanka-report-issue-16.pdf>
- Whalen DH, Moss M and Baldwin D. 2016. Healing through language: Positive physical health effects of Indigenous language use [version 1; referees: 2 approved with reservations]. *F1000Research* 2016, 5:852.
- Young, Carlos Eduardo Frickmann, Érico Rial Pinto Rocha, Leonardo Barcellos de Bakker, and André Falkenbach Santoro. 2012. How green is my budget? Public environmental expenditures in Brazil. Paper presented at the XII Biennial Conference of the International Society for Ecological Economics (ISEE), Rio de Janeiro.
- Zinth, Kyle. 2006. American Indian, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Education in the States. Denver, CO: *Education Commission of the States*. Online. Available: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED493706.pdf>.

Appendix A.

See the attached spreadsheet.