A comparative analysis of indigenous bilingual education policy and practice in Australia and Peru

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Language Studies

School of Literature, Languages & Linguistics

The Australian National University

October 2017

Sarah Lattimore

Acknowledgements

A significant portion of Chapter 2 has been recycled from the research proposal submitted as part of the assessment for the Honours course LING4009 – Selected Topics in Methodologies for Researching Language.

Countless people deserve recognition for the help and support they have given me over the past year. I would firstly like to thank all those who offered up their time and expertise to assist me in directing my research and developing my argument; Liliana Sanchez, Jane Simpson, Susy McQueen, Cathy Bow, Jaky Troy, Inge Kral, and Samantha Disbray.

I also need to thank my friends – I won't name you all but you have kept me sane this year. For his proofreading skills and unique motivational techniques, Thomas Harold Hilton Dodds, your acknowledgment as promised. And to Kim Squires, who shared in the ups and downs of Honours – we did it!

Special thanks have to go to my family for their constant love and support over the last 23 years, and particularly throughout this year – I love you all.

Last, but certainly not least, to my supervisor Dr. Elisabeth Mayer. This year has been a rollercoaster and I would not have made it to the end without you. Your expertise and guidance have been invaluable, but above all else, your passion and enthusiasm, both for your own work and mine, have truly kept me going. Gracias por todo.

Abstract

Australia and Peru are both signatories of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which asserts that indigenous peoples have a right to an education in their own languages, and that States have an obligation to ensure this is possible. Nevertheless, despite similarities in the early histories of indigenous education and the emergence of bilingual programs in the 1970s, the current language policy situations differ greatly between the two countries. This thesis seeks to explain the different outcomes of bilingual education policies using the framework of language policy developed by Spolsky, which conceptualises language policy as a three-component system that operates within multiple domains and functions in an ecological relationship with an array of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. As such, it will examine several areas of language management, ideology, and practices, as well as the ecological context and the domains in which these components of language policy take place. In doing so, the thesis identifies areas in which the Australian policy situation must change if it is to support bilingual education for indigenous students in the future.

Contents

1 Introduction

Recent decades have seen a growing concern by many national governments for the outcomes gap experienced by their indigenous peoples in comparison to broader society (Hynsjö & Damon, 2016; Martin-Jones, 2015). This has led to considerable research into the causes of such inequality, as well as the creation of declarations, legislation, and policies which seek to alleviate these effects. One area that has been viewed as fundamental to this problem is education, and specifically, the medium of instruction used in the education system (Groff, 2017; Hynsjö & Damon, 2016). Extensive research has shown that bilingual education, in which indigenous students learn equally through their heritage language (L1) and the dominant language (L2), has numerous academic, social, and emotional benefits, when compared to situations in which they are required to learn through the dominant language only (Benson, 2010; Hornberger, 1987, 2006; Hynsjö & Damon, 2016; Patrinos & Velez, 2009). The United Nations have enshrined in the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2008) their evidence-based support for the use of indigenous languages in the education system, asserting that:

"Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their education systems providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning" (art. 14.1).

The Declaration also states that:

"States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language" (art. 14.3).

The UN Declaration is an example of a language policy decision made within the supranational domain. However, as Spolsky (2004, 2012a, 2012b) recognises under his language policy framework, policy can be made within any number of domains, and the successful implementation of such policies is dependent on the complex interactions between domains and their ecological relationships with external factors. Perhaps the most visible of the domains is that of the national government, which is often at odds with the supranational and many micro-level domains, such as the family. In fact, even amongst member-states of the UN who are signatories to the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, there is considerable variation in the national policies regarding indigenous languages in education. This thesis looks particularly at the cases of Australia and Peru, both signatories of the UN Declaration. The current language policies posed by these two national governments differ greatly. While Peru acknowledges in law the right of indigenous people to receive education in their own language and has implemented a policy of Intercultural Bilingual Education for all Peruvians, Australia recognises English as the sole language through which learning should occur in schools.

The disparity in policy is in spite of several ecological similarities within the linguistic landscape of the two countries. Australia and Peru are both countries in which standard language cultures and the myth of monolingualism have, for centuries, permeated popular society due to the effects of European colonisation (Hornberger, 2000; Simpson, Caffery, & McConvell, 2009). Official prohibition of indigenous languages and the social denigration of their speakers has had devastating effects on the indigenous languages of these lands, both of which are located in regions of the world which see the highest levels of severe language endangerment (Cenoz et al.). Despite these effects, there remains a considerable

amount of linguistic diversity within the two countries (Simons & Fennig, 2017). They also share similarities in the emergence of bilingual education policy throughout the 1970s and 1980s, diverging only in the last two and a half decades.

To my knowledge, there exists in the literature no comparisons made between the indigenous situation in Australia and Peru, let alone an examination of the history and outcomes of bilingual education policy and practice. Given the similarities and differences in both the ecological context and policy progression, however, I posit that this is a worthwhile investigation. This thesis aims to fill the gap in the literature by comparing the past and present state of official bilingual education policy in the two countries, identifying the key ecological factors that have influenced these policies, and suggesting ways in which Australia may learn from the Peruvian experience to advance bilingual education in the future.

1.1 Methodology and Data Sources

In order to achieve this aim, I utilise Spolsky's framework of language policy, analysing the language management, practices, and ideologies that occur within the various domains, the specifics of which will be discussed in the following chapter. The information on which the analysis is based comes primarily from scholarly articles and books, as well as a number of primary sources, including policy documents, legislation, and census data. While there is considerable information to be found in the literature relating to the history of bilingual education in Peru, particularly in the Andes, little has been done to date to collate this into a holistic account, spanning the diverse regions of the country. In Australia, a recent work, edited by Devlin, Disbray, and Devlin (2017), provides a detailed account of the history of bilingual education in the Northern Territory, from the perspective of professionals who had worked in such programs. This has been an invaluable source

of information. Nevertheless, I have chosen to supplement it with the limited material available on the bilingual programs that have also existed in other Australian states over the years, but which, for the most part, have ceased to run.

Where the literature makes reference to specific policies or laws, the original documents have been consulted whenever possible. Such documents have been of particular importance when examining the more recent policy trajectories, as these have not yet been discussed in the literature. This is true also of the recent demographic information that I have extracted from the census databases of both countries. The chapter in which I discuss the role of new media relies heavily on primary sources as well. Through personal communications and a series of web-searches, I have identified numerous sites of indigenous language use in the digital world.

1.2 Structure

The analysis is divided into several chapters and subchapters, each with a different focus, but tied together by the key principles of Spolsky's framework. Chapter 2 presents the thematic and theoretical backgrounds that underpin this thesis. After establishing the monolingual, standard language cultures that have existed in Peru and Australia since European colonisation, I address the high linguistic diversity in both countries and identify the many benefits associated with bilingualism. The focus then turns to the issue of indigenous education, emphasising the importance of the role of indigenous languages in schooling, following a bilingual model of education. In particular, I discuss the development of literacy in both the dominant and indigenous languages, and the particular challenges that literacy education poses for indigenous students. The chapter than turns its attention to the

language policy framework, developed by Spolsky (2004, 2012b), which forms the basis of the analysis throughout the following chapters.

Chapter 3 is divided into four subsections, each looking at a period in the history of bilingual education policy in Australia and Peru. The first section outlines the early histories of indigenous education, highlighting the regional differences within the countries but similarities between them. Throughout the 1970s, both countries followed similar progressions in their attitudes towards indigenous languages and the place they should hold in education. However, into the 1980s, a number of factors would start to differentiate the two. This will be explored in the second section. The chapter will then examine the twenty-year period beginning in the 1990s, during which the policy context continued to diverge, concluding with an examination of the current state of bilingual programs and the official policies surrounding them.

Chapter 4 seeks to expand on the analysis of the current policy situation by examining some of the factors contributing to the relative success or failure of bilingual education. The first subsection identifies the demographic similarities and differences relating to the indigenous languages of Australia and Peru and their speakers. In particular, it addresses the total numbers of indigenous language speakers within the countries, the distribution of these speakers across different regions, both urban and rural, and the existence of some of the Peruvian languages, such as Quechua, across national borders; a benefit to the vitality of these languages that is not enjoyed by any of the Australian indigenous languages. The next section examines the effects of the language management decisions made within the government domain on the practices and ideologies of the public sector, school, and

family domains. Specifically, the notions of legitimation and institutionalisation are discussed, as well as the status and corpus planning actions that are involved in their implementation. It is argued that Peru's historical and current focus on these issues is one of the key differentiators between the two countries, and that if Australia were to implement similar measures, the policy context within each domain would be more amenable to the promotion of bilingual education in the future.

Chapter 5 follows on from the notion of institutionalisation, exploring how indigenous languages are currently being used in the new media domain and how this might open up ideological and implementational spaces that could allow for the strengthening of bilingual programs in the years to come. The chapter begins with an examination of the ideological changes that the presence of indigenous languages in new media can have on attitudes towards indigenous literacy, followed by a consideration of the multimodal features of new media in relation to the creation of materials that incorporate the oral and visual aspects of indigenous culture. The chapter also addresses the issue of dominant language-speaker attitudes towards indigenous languages and how these can be improved by the increased visibility of indigenous languages made possible by new media.

The final chapter will draw together the arguments presented in the previous chapters and areas of potential improvement in the Australian context which could allow for the development of bilingual education policies in the future.

2 Thematic and theoretical backgrounds

Before commencing the analysis of this thesis, it is essential to position the topic and methods within the broader fields of bilingualism, language-in-education, as well as language policy and planning research. This chapter begins with a discussion of the conflict between the monolingual ideologies of modern nation-states and the bi- (or multi-) lingual realities of the majority of the world's population, with particular emphasis on the benefits of bilingualism, not only for the individual but for society as a whole. The focus then turns to education and the effects that the education system has on the outcomes for indigenous students, who often come to school without prior knowledge of the dominant language or exposure to the uses of literacy. These topics all feed into the language policy decisions that will be explored in the following chapters, and the final section establishes the theoretical framework around which this analysis will be built.

2.1 Monolingualism, nationalism, and standard language cultures

There exists throughout much of the world today the idea that national monolingualism is the prevailing norm and the ideal way of being (May, 2006). This can largely be attributed to the ideas of modernism and nationalism that spread throughout the world following the French Revolution at the end of the 18th century (May, 2006). The new political structure that emerged brought with it a shift in the understanding of what was involved in national loyalty. Whilst in the past, economic loyalty through the payment of taxes would suffice in the management of empires, "for the most part [leaving] unmolested the plethora of cultures and languages subsumed within them" (May, 2006, p. 261), the new nation-state organisation viewed multilingualism as a hindrance to modernity, progress, and national unity (Ricento, 2006). For this reason, many nations came to make decisions regarding the

use of different languages, implementing policies and legislation that legitimise and officialise only one *national* language. These decisions indicate "a wider pattern of social, cultural, and political displacement" (May, 2006, p. 259) as they almost invariably favour the language spoken by the people who hold the most power, rather than those already facing marginalisation. Nevertheless, these processes cannot occur independently of acquisition and corpus planning. In particular, as well as the implementation of state controlled education in the dominant language, the legitimation and officialisation of a national language relies heavily on standardisation (Cenoz et al.).

Milroy (2001) explains the process of standardisation as the purposeful imposition of uniformity onto pre-existing language varieties, and a phenomenon that cannot be isolated from language ideology. The standardisation of a language causes speakers to view certain forms as either correct or incorrect, whether or not they use those forms in daily life. The language is no longer seen as belonging to and created by native speakers, rather it is something that must be explicitly taught by knowledgeable authorities. These beliefs give rise to what Milroy describes as "standard language cultures" (2001, p. 530). Such cultures perpetuate social inequalities through the prestige awarded to the speakers of the "standard" variety and the subsequent degradation of those who speak differently. This is a form of discrimination that people often will not recognise, believing, instead, that their "adverse judgements…are purely linguistic…[and] sanctioned by authorities on language (Milroy, 2001, p. 536). In nationalistic societies built around the idea of the standard language, it is likely that these judgements would extend not only to non-standard varieties, but to any language not recognised as an official language of the

state, thereby allowing its people to cast judgements on minority language groups under the guise of concern for linguistic purity and national unity.

Despite the structures and beliefs described above, it is likely that monolingualism is not as prevalent as many would assume. While there are only about 200 independent states in the world today, there exist somewhere between 5,000 and 7,000 languages (Cenoz et al.). The disparity between these numbers indicates that multilingualism within a state, if not within individuals, is the overwhelmingly more common of the two phenomena. Migration and colonialism have been important factors in the spread of multilingualism throughout history, and more recently, a renewed interest in the revival and maintenance of minority and indigenous languages has further supported this spread (Cenoz et al.). As these factors increase, it becomes progressively harder to deny national multilingualism and more important to both conduct research into the effects this has on speakers and society, and to develop language policies which reflect the linguistic diversity of a nation.

2.2 Bilingualism and bilingual education

Extensive research throughout recent decades has given credence to a number of benefits associated with bilingualism. At the level of the individual, there is considerable evidence supporting the cognitive benefits of learning and knowing more than one language. These include improvements to executive function (Bialystok, 2011); episodic and semantic memory (Kormi-Nouri et al., 2008); creativity (Leikin, 2012); development of metalinguistic awareness (Cummins, 1978); as well as a decreased risk of Alzheimer's disease (Bialystok, 2011). It has been proposed that these cognitive changes benefit not only the individual, but society as a whole. Stolarick and Florida (2006) outline the way in which the increased creativity

associated with bilingualism encourages innovation within society, as well as the economic benefits that come with this. The economics of language, while still a relatively new area of research, conceptualises language as a cultural good and multilingualism as a way of increasing human capital by expanding the number of potential trade and business partners an individual or a nation can have (Cenoz et al.; Mehitso & Marsh, 2011). Additionally, “the value of bilingualism in enriching individuals and in creating modern flexible and tolerant societies” (Simpson et al., 2009, p. 7) has been internationally recognised in the UNESCO Guidelines on Language and Education (2003).

The nature of bilingualism, however, has often been misunderstood. Early studies of bilingualism tended to conceptualise the phenomenon as "cumulative monolingualism" (Matras, 2013, p. 7), by which bilingual speakers organise their communicative tools into two distinct languages, potentially stored in different regions of the brain. In contrast, more recent studies provide strong evidence for the dynamism of bilingual speakers who use their "linguistic repertoires as adjustable and adaptable instruments of communication" (Matras, 2013, p. 7). The linguistic choices made by the bilingual speaker are similar, therefore, to those of the monolingual speaker who alters her language use based on the setting, her interlocuters, or other contextual variations (Matras, 2013). These linguistic decisions are influenced by the patterns of language contact that are implied by the very nature of a bilingual setting. This modern conceptualisation of bilingualism has implications for the education of bilingual students, as they have different needs, and should expect different outcomes, to their monolingual peers.

The relationship between bilingualism and education is a complicated one, especially in regards to indigenous populations and their heritage languages. Many

scholars recognise the importance of institutions in planning for the maintenance and vitality of any given language, with the role of the education system given particular attention (Cenoz et al.; Pennycook, 2006; Tollefson, 2006). Grin (2002) goes so far as to assert that education is "the single most important channel of government intervention in the sphere of language" (Cenoz et al., p. 21). On the one hand, this can have devastating effects on minority and heritage languages, given the history of linguistic and cultural standardisation and assimilation in formal Western education (Hornberger, 2000). However, when bilingualism is successfully integrated into the education system, it not only provides institutional support for the heritage language, but also offers numerous benefits to the outcomes of indigenous students.

In its most successful conceptualisation, bilingual education uses and values, in the process of teaching and learning, more than one language and set of cultural beliefs, encourages dialogue across differing worldviews, and draws on pre-existing student knowledge as the basis for academic success (Hornberger, 2009). Research has shown that when such programs are implemented, indigenous students experience positive outcomes. Hornberger (1987), in her comparative study of traditional and bilingual schools in Peru, saw that indigenous students participating in bilingual education outperformed their peers in traditional Spanish-medium schools in both Quechua (first language, or L1) and Spanish (second language, or L2) literacy. These children also had less behavioural issues and participated more actively in the class. The academic benefit of bilingual education extends also to numeracy, with indigenous students in Quechua-medium schools in Peru outperforming their traditional school counterparts in mathematics (Hynsjö & Damon, 2016). Further studies show that bilingual education can increase school attendance and reduce drop-out rates in indigenous populations (Patrinos & Velez, 2009). It also leads to a

number of social and emotional benefits for the children, including increased self-esteem, activation of voice, and pride in their indigenous identity (Benson, 2010; Hornberger, 2006).

Nevertheless, bilingual programs often follow starkly different structures, reflecting different orientations to language policy. Ruíz (1984) identifies three orientations that may guide policy decisions relating to minority languages. Hornberger's idealised form of bilingual education most closely reflects a language-as-resource orientation. Following this line of thought, indigenous languages are seen not only as an important resource for their speakers, but for society as a whole, and as such, their use should be encouraged and developed. The second orientation, language-as-right, acknowledges the use of indigenous languages as "a basic human and civil right for their speakers" (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16) but does not necessarily grant those languages any intrinsic value. Nevertheless, both these orientations lead to a maintenance model of bilingual education, in which the indigenous language continues to be used as a medium of instruction alongside the introduced dominant language (Hornberger, 1987). On the other hand, the language-as-problem orientation promotes a transitional model. This view conceptualises indigenous languages as a "problem standing in the way of the incorporation of cultural and linguistic minority groups in society" (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16). Accordingly, these languages are used only in the early stages of schooling, while the students are acquiring basic knowledge of the dominant language, and then phased out of use in the later years (Hornberger, 1987).

2.3 Literacy and indigenous education

The concept of literacy, as it exists today, is considered fundamental to modern democracy and, as such, to the education systems of such countries (Morais,

2017). Despite this, there is no one definition that explains what literacy is and what it is not. The English word 'literacy' simultaneously refers to the ability to recognise the relationship between the letters of a written text and the sounds that they represent, to extract meaning from written language, to critically evaluate information obtained from multiple written sources, and to create knowledge through writing (Kress, 2003; Morais, 2017). In other languages, including Spanish, however, the concept has a somewhat narrower meaning, focusing on the ability to recognise and produce alphabetic symbols in order to read and write, and is therefore labelled as 'alfabetismo' (Kress, 2003). In any case, most traditional conceptualisations agree that reading and writing are the skills being referenced (Kress, 2003). This being the case, the teaching of 'literacy' in any dominant language is supported by longstanding written traditions and the use of written language in everyday life.

When considering indigenous education, however, the teaching of literacy becomes more complex. Firstly, there is the issue of language. Many indigenous students come to school with little knowledge of the dominant language (Cummins, 2001; Hornberger, 1987; Hynsjö & Damon, 2016; Simpson et al., 2009). Despite this, literacy is generally taught through this language, rather than building on the students pre-existing linguistic resources. It is often believed that by giving attention to L1 literacy, the students literacy development in the dominant language will be stunted (Cummins, 2001). While it is clearly important for the child to develop literacy in the dominant language in order to participate fully in the modern, literate society, the evidence indicates that a well-implemented bilingual program, as described in the previous section, can actually promote L2 literacy development, rather than harm it (Cummins, 2001; Morais, 2017). By learning literacy firstly

through the indigenous L1, the student is better equipped to make the necessary connections between the spoken and written forms, and as such, develops an understanding of the *concept* of literacy (Cummins, 2001). Having acquired the basic skills required for literacy and an understanding of the various uses of these skills, transfer to L2 literacy in the dominant language can occur (Roberts, 1994).

However, before literacy in either language can be developed, the indigenous student must first overcome another challenge. Many indigenous languages continue to exist only in the spoken form, and the very concept of Western literacy is foreign to their cultures (Brady, Dyson, & Asela, 2008). As such, indigenous children, particularly those living in remote indigenous communities, grow up with little exposure to writing outside of the school setting, and so literacy is not considered to be a useful skill (Godenzzi, 1997). Additionally, even where literacy is valued and a writing system has been established, indigenous languages lack an extensive body of written works, and as a result, there is less opportunity to develop and enrich these skills beyond the primary school level (Hornberger, 1997b).

Historically, the orality of indigenous cultures has been viewed by the literate West as being primitive, "essentially unskilful and not worth serious study" (Ong, 2002, p. 10). On the contrary, these oral traditions are rich communicative practices which pass on knowledge to every new generation through "myths, legends, rituals, ceremonies, songs and tales" (Ščigulinská, 2015, p. 122), assisted by memorisation techniques such as repetition, mnemonics, and formulas (Ong, 2002). A growing area within the literature seeks to redefine the concept of literacy, proposing a multimodal system of communication rather than one that is focussed on written language (Auld, Snyder, & Henderson, 2012; Kral, 2010; Kral & Schwab, 2012; Kress,

2003, 2010). Under this definition, there is space to recognise the long oral traditions of indigenous peoples within the confines of literacy, and to utilise such forms of knowledge within the education system.

2.4 Language policy and planning framework: Spolsky

The analysis in the following chapters will follow Spolsky's framework for language policy research. Backed by a long career in the research areas of applied linguistics, language policy and planning, and minority languages, Bernard Spolsky proposed a cohesive framework for the study of language policy (Spolsky, 2004, 2012a, 2012b). This framework is built around four fundamental notions: (1) language policy is a three-component system which (2) is concerned not only with named languages, but with all aspects of language, (3) operates within speech communities, or domains, and (4) functions in an ecological relationship with an array of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Due to their importance throughout my analysis, notions 1, 3, and 4 will be explained here in more detail.

Notion 1

Spolsky (Spolsky, 2004, 2012b) divides language policy into three distinct categories. *Language practices* refer to the linguistic choices and behaviours of individuals and speech communities, whilst *language ideology* is the attitudes and beliefs surrounding these practices. All explicit attempts to modify practices or ideologies, made by a person or group in a position of authority, are categorised as *language management.* This idea reflects Cooper's (1989) definition of language planning, which he identified as a three-point process. *Status planning* involves "deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community's languages" (Cooper, 1989, p. 99). When a function is novel to a particular language, *corpus planning,* or the modification and expansion of linguistic forms, is often

required. Finally, *acquisition planning* is concerned with who will learn the language and how this will be achieved (Cooper, 1989). All these areas influence and are influenced by one another, and as such, "to study one component of language policy while ignoring the other[s]…will provide a very incomplete and biased view" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 40).

Notion 3

In contrast to many earlier frameworks which worked off a hierarchical model, identifying different *levels* of policy, Spolsky preferred to conceptualise language policy as operating within a "complex and chaotic non-hierarchical system" (2012a, p. 3), the components of which he labelled *domains*. These domains of language policy, based on Fishman's sociolinguistic domains, "may be any definable social or political or religious group or community, ranging from a family through sports team or neighbourhood or village or workplace or organization or city or nation state or reginal alliance" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 40). Within each domain, individual participants may exhibit varying language *practices* and *ideologies*, and will often attempt to *manage* those of other participants (Spolsky, 2012a).

Notion 4

Spolsky also draws heavily on the 'language ecology' metaphor, proposed by Haugen in 1972, through which language both affects and is affected by its environment (Spolsky, 2012b). He proposes that language policy too operates in "a complex ecological relationship among a wide range of linguistic and non-linguistic elements, variables and factors" (Spolsky, 2004, p. 41). These are the factors that exist outside of the control of policy domains, such as demographics, language contact, and attempts made by any one domain to influence the language practices

or ideologies of another, a phenomenon that is particularly common in regards to minority language use (Spolsky, 2012a).

Throughout this thesis, I draw on the key ideas of Spolsky's framework to explain the similarities and differences between the language policy contexts surrounding bilingual education in Australia and Peru. In particular, I focus on the language management decisions made within the domain of government, and how these influence and are influenced by the ideologies and practices that exist within the domains of the school, family, workplace and the media. I also examine the growing domain of new media and how this might interact with the other domains and aspects of language policy to create a situation more amenable to bilingual education in the future.

2.5 Summary

While the modern nation-state functions under the illusion of the monolingual norm, in which the language of the most powerful echelon of society is officialised as the one national language and supported by a culture of linguistic standardisation, bilingualism is in fact the more common of the two phenomena and an extensive body of research indicates that this has many benefits, both for the individual and society. The relationship between bilingualism and the education system of a nation is particularly complicated when considering indigenous languages and their speakers. The monolingual policies of many national governments can have devastating effects on the vitality of indigenous languages and on the outcomes for indigenous students who come to school without prior knowledge of the dominant language. In contrast, the successful implementation of bilingual programs, particularly those designed around a language-as-resource orientation in which both languages are used and valued equally throughout the education system,

has numerous benefits, including improvements in both L1 and L2 literacy development, a skill that is particularly difficult for indigenous students to master given the oral, rather than written, cultures in which they are raised. The concepts I have explored throughout my thematic review of the literature bring into focus a number of considerations that are taken by 'policy makers' in all domains, and which are prominent throughout my analysis of bilingual education policy in Australia and Peru. The effects of these decisions will be explained within the framework described in this chapter.

3. A history of bilingual education in Australia and Peru

Since European colonisation, both Australia and Peru have experienced considerable differences in the policies and practices surrounding the education of their indigenous populations, particularly in relation to the language of instruction. The two countries initially followed rather similar trajectories, moving from Church-based to government run education and bouncing between the three language planning orientations proposed by Ruíz (1984), resulting in constant shifts between dominant-language monolingual instruction and some form of bilingual education. However, since the 1990s, the national policies have diverged greatly, as has the implementation of bilingual education. Many factors have led to the relative success or failure of bilingual education in Peru and Australia respectively, though this chapter will focus on the policy decisions made within the domain of government, as it is certain that "national multilingual language education policy opens up ideological and implementational spaces for multilingual education" (Hornberger, 2009, p. 199).

3.1 Before the 1970s

The periods proceeding European colonisation in both Australia and Peru saw similar progressions in the views and practices surrounding the education of their respective indigenous populations. The general consensus during the early days of colonisation was that the native people were uneducable (Cadzow, 2007; Pike, 1967), and their languages primitive (Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs & Kerr, 1992). Nevertheless, there were some attempts made in both countries to “Christianise and civilise” (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012, p. 12; Cerrón-Palomino, 1989) the indigenous populations in schools established by missionaries. There was, however, considerable variation between, and even within the two countries in

regards to the language of instruction. The Jesuits were one of the most influential religious groups in Peru prior to their expulsion from the country in 1767 (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989). They supported the use of indigenous languages, particularly Quechua and Aymara, in Andean schools, as well as the integration of Incan culture into their teaching of Christian traditions (Andrien, 2011). Similarly, the German Lutheran missionaries, predominantly located in South Australia, learnt, documented, and taught in the local indigenous languages, as they believed this to be the most effective way to "reach the soul of a people" (Ganter, 2016). In contrast, the British mission schools of the 1800s, particularly those in New South Wales, sought to teach Christianity and the Western way of life using English as the primary mode of communication (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012).

The first public schools, run by the Government rather than the Church, opened in the Coastal and Andean regions of Peru after the War of Independence from Spain (Ortiz, 2004). These schools were intended to provide free primary education to all Peruvians, however, it was noted in a survey of the Azángaro region, conducted in 1833, that schools had not been established in the rural areas in which most of the indigenous population resided (Walker, 1999). Where these students did have access to education during the Republican era, the national policy was dominated by a "hispanist assimilationist" (Hornberger, 1988) position whereby Spanish medium instruction was preferred and the use of indigenous languages was seen as a problem. During the Pardo administration of the 1870s, there was an increased focus on assimilation. Despite objection from the Church, Pardo intended to further expand and centralise primary education, believing that "economic and political development hinged on extending education to the popular classes, particularly the unintegrated Indian masses" (Klarén, 2000, p. 180). Whilst he was

unable to achieve centralised government control over primary education, Pardo did establish Peru's first workshop school for the purpose of teaching industrial skills to indigenous people, and decreed that they should all learn Spanish by studying the *Gramática y diccionario español-quechua* of José de Anchorena (Pike, 1967).

The mid- to late 1800s saw a shift towards a more secular system of education in Australia as well, with the NSW government's establishment of the Board of National Education in 1848 (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012). Unlike Peru, the public schools set up under the Board of National Education operated under a policy of exclusion of indigenous children. This formed part of the general 'Protection' policy which followed the belief that indigenous people could not achieve a place in Western society and that they should, therefore, be protected against themselves while the race died out (Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs & Kerr, 1992). The year 1866 then saw the formation of the NSW Council of Education, as well as the establishment of the Public Schools Act (Cadzow, 2007). Following this, there was a brief period of improved access to government schools. Nominal progress was made in 1880 when the Public Instruction Act was passed, introducing free, compulsory, and secular primary education for all children (Cadzow, 2007). Whilst there was a rapid increase in the number of indigenous students enrolled in public schools, they were often excluded at the principal's discretion or at the request of non-indigenous parents, and many were forced to attend Aboriginal only schools in which the teachers were rarely qualified (Burridge & Chodkiewicz, 2012). The next major policy shift came in the late 1930s with a move towards an assimilationist policy. Throughout the following decades, public schools were encouraged to readmit indigenous students, however, the education system

devalued their culture and forbade the use of indigenous languages within the classroom (Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs & Kerr, 1992; Cadzow, 2007).

The history of indigenous education in the Northern Territory follows a slightly different path to the south-eastern parts of Australia described above, and resultantly was more akin to that in the Peruvian Amazon. Colonisation and the spread of formal education occurred relatively late in both these regions, and it was not until the early- to mid-1900s that the first missionary schools were established (Devlin, Disbray, & Devlin, 2017; Greene, 2009). Given the relatively late colonisation of the NT and the geographic isolation of many of its indigenous communities, the traditional languages and way of life have been less affected (Devlin et al., 2017). In fact, it wasn't until 1950 that the first government schools were opened in the NT. Whilst the underlying assimilation policy of the rest of the country remained intact here, the Commonwealth Government acknowledged that in certain circumstances, in which indigenous people of the region continued to live in traditional communities, bilingual instruction may be beneficial (Devlin, 2017a). This was the first time the Commonwealth Government had recommended bilingual education under any circumstances, a decision which would lay the foundations for the policy changes of the 1970s (Devlin, 2017a).

Similarly, the Amazonian regions of Peru received bilingual education ahead of the rest of the country. The Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) launched a number of bilingual programs for indigenous Amazonians throughout the 1950s, eventually encompassing almost every minority language group in the region (Greene, 2009). Their efforts were supported by the military government of General

Odría, whose Minister of Education, General Juan Rodríguez Mendoza, authorised the creation of the first bilingual teacher training centre for indigenous Amazonians (SIL International, 2017). The increased supply of teacher training allowed for the expansion of the bilingual programs, and by 1967 there were 46 SIL- and 42 Jesuit missionary-run bilingual schools across the region (Greene, 2009).

By the end of the 1960s, despite the emergence of bilingual education in certain regions, both Australia and Peru continued to hold a language-as-problem orientation towards indigenous language policy. Over the coming decades, however, the two countries would progress at a similar pace, moving slowly towards a more accepting view of those languages and their speakers.

3.2 1970s-80s

In both Australia and Peru, during the 1970s and 1980s, there were a number of changes to policy and legislation which would have lasting effects on the implementation of bilingual education programs. The first of these changes, occurring in 1972, largely shared reasons and intentions for implementation, due not only to the similarities between the early histories of indigenous education in the two countries, but also as a result of growing human rights movements on a global scale. Throughout the two decades, however, there were a number of unique actions and events which would differentiate Australian and Peruvian bilingual education, leading into the 1990s.

The Peruvian Education Reform (*Ley General de Educación*) and the National Policy of Bilingual Education (*Política Nacional de Educación Bilingüe* or *PNEB*) launched in 1972 under the Velasco government to accompany the many social reforms that formed part of the 1968 revolution (Hornberger, 1988). The impetus for

these changes came from a concern for the right of indigenous peoples to participate fully in the nation and an acknowledgement of the role of education in the marginalisation and oppression of minority groups (Hornberger, 1988). The Education Reform sought to achieve greater control over Peruvian education, particularly in indigenous communities, through a process of decentralisation which allowed newly established community educational nuclei to take responsibility for education in their locality (García, 2005). The law also encouraged bilingual education as a means to overcome the linguistic barrier faced by indigenous citizens (Hornberger, 1988). The PNEB, which fashioned itself as the first "official bilingual education policy that is respectful of linguistic diversity and makes hispanicization a harmonious and dignified human process" (Hornberger, 1988, p. 26) further strengthened the use of vernacular languages in schools and paved the way for the creation of the Bilingual Education Unit within the Ministry of Education. The support for bilingual education shown in these documents should not, however, be mistaken for a complete acceptance of indigenous languages and cultures; the focus at this time was still very much in line with the language-as-problem orientation (Hornberger, 1988).

Also in 1972, the newly elected Labor Government in Australia, under the leadership of Gough Whitlam, launched its policy of self-determination which included the implementation of the Northern Territory Bilingual Education program (Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs & Kerr, 1992). This program grew out of recommendations from the 1971 National Workshop, *Aboriginal Education: Priorities for Action and Research*, which sought to "test the efficiency of teaching literacy in the vernacular following the proposals put forward by Mrs. Kinslow Harris" in 1968

(Devlin, 2017a, p. 13). In 1973, the Minister for Education, Kim Beazley, established a three-person advisory group on teaching in Aboriginal languages in schools in Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory (known as the Watts Committee) who were enlisted to visit potential bilingual schools and propose further recommendations to the Parliament (Devlin, 2017a). As with the Peruvian policies, the primary concern of the Australian government was the poor English skills of many indigenous Australians and how this affected their participation in broader society (Devlin, 2017a). Nevertheless, a number of the Watts Committee recommendations reflected a more respectful view of the languages and cultures of the NT. They proposed that education should be both bilingual and bicultural, that indigenous adults should be included in the teaching process through a system of team-teaching, and that while the programs would ultimately allow, and require, the students to transition to English literacy, the indigenous language could remain in use during Aboriginal studies classes (Devlin, 2017a). Following this, the national policy entered a brief language-as-right phase during which the primary aim of the programs was "to help each child to believe in himself and be proud of his heritage by the regular use of the Aboriginal language in school and by learning about Aboriginal culture" (Simpson et al., 2009, p. 9).

Outside of the governmental domain, a number of bilingual programs were also established in other regions of Australia, including one which began in Aurukun, Queensland in 1973. This program was born out of research conducted by Athol Durre, the head teacher at the time, and was supported by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (Sayers, 1982). Throughout the 1970s, and into the 1980s, the school benefited from the production of educational materials in the local language, Wik Mungkan, as well as significant community input (Kretschmann, 1988). However,

without sufficient governmental funding and support, and with a lack of trained bilingual support staff, the bilingual coordinator, principal, and teachers were overworked and the program was not achieving the desired literacy outcomes. As such, by 1987, the program was discontinued in its original form, in favour of a model which allowed only for the use of oral Wik Mungkan as a tool for the development of English-only literacy (Kretschmann, 1988).

With the growing emergence of national policies in both Australia and Peru which encouraged the use of indigenous languages in education, practical steps had to be taken to support the implementation of such programs. These included further linguistic documentation of the languages, development of appropriate resources, teacher training, and the formation of organisational bodies. Similar to the Peruvian Bilingual Education Unit established in 1973, the Australian Bilingual Unit was set up in Darwin in 1974 (Disbray, 2013; Hornberger, 1988). Both units were comprised of several language and education professionals and were intended to oversee the training of teachers, the production of materials, and the general implementation of bilingual programs (Disbray, 2013; Hornberger, 1988). Another body established in Australia was the School of Australian Linguistics, which sought to increase formal knowledge about the structures of indigenous languages (Devlin, 2017a). In Peru, linguistic development took place in the form of the 1975 Law on the officialisation of Quechua (Congreso de la República, 1975). This law not only recognised Quechua as an official language, coequal with Spanish, but also emphasised the importance of preserving, developing, and maintaining the many varieties that existed within the country, whilst developing a standardised corpus and orthography which could be used in education and other public spheres (Congreso de la República, 1975). Importantly, this law reflected a language-as-resource orientation, demonstrated by

its insistence on the universal teaching of Quechua to Spanish speakers across all levels of education.

Teacher training, or a lack there of, has often been cited as an important factor in the success or failure of bilingual programs (Disbray, 2017b; Hornberger, 1987, 2009; Hynsjö & Damon, 2016; Simpson et al., 2009). As such, the establishment of institutions for the training of bilingual teachers and support staff, and particularly of those who are first language speakers of indigenous languages, was an important practical measure in support of the national policies. In 1974, the Australian training program for indigenous teacher aides and assistants, which had previously run as a small annexe of Kormilda College in Darwin, was relocated to Batchelor College, now known as the Batchelor Institute for Indigenous Tertiary Education (Batchelor Institute, 2017). Accompanying this move came a large increase in the intake of assistant teacher trainees (Devlin, 2017a). The College provided training opportunities for indigenous people through a combination of "in-community on-the-job learning, intensive courses at Batchelor College, and support from travelling Batchelor College lecturers" (Disbray, 2017b). In 1982, the School of Australian Linguistics, now subsumed within the Batchelor Institute, in collaboration with the Bilingual Unit, organised an eight-week training course in applied linguistics, which would later become part of the Graduate Diploma of Applied Linguistics at the Northern Territory University (Disbray & Devlin, 2017). Over the subsequent years, however, "changes to accreditation regimes and changes to Batchelor College funding have meant that these opportunities are now rarely available to Indigenous people in remote communities" (Disbray, 2017b).

In Peru, one of the first indigenous teacher training programs was established in 1975 at Alto Napo, department of Loreto, with the aim of preparing students, who had not yet completed secondary education, to become teachers in their communities (Rivera & Leyva, 2004). Later, in 1983, the National Bilingual Pedagogy Institute (*Instituto Pedagógico Nacional Bilingüe*) was established in Yarinacocha, allowing indigenous bilingual teachers to continue their higher education, the first initiative of its kind directed specifically at indigenous people (Rivera & Leyva, 2004). Additional programs were established in 1985, 1988, and 1989 with the creation of the Masters and Secondary Specialisation in Andean Linguistics and Education at the National Technical University of Altiplano (*Universidad Nacional Técnica del Altiplano*), the Training Program of Bilingual Teachers of the Peruvian Amazon (*Programa de Formación de Maestros Bilingües de la Amazonía Peruana* or *FORMABIAP*), and a bilingual teacher training program for Quechua and Aymara people at the Higher Education Institute of Puno (*Instituto Superior Pedagógico de Puno*) (Hornberger, 1988; Rivera & Leyva, 2004). In contrast to the situation in Australia, most of these programs for the training of bilingual teachers continue to operate today.

Thanks to the many supporting measures implemented in conjunction with the national policy, by 1974, eleven project schools were in operation in the NT (Devlin, 2017b). However, over the coming years the Territory would face a number of set-backs to bilingual education. On Christmas Eve 1974, Cyclone Tracy hit Darwin, leaving 66 dead and over 40 000 homeless, most of whom were relocated to other areas of the NT or interstate (Northern Territory Government Department of Tourism and Culture, 2017). This included half of the senior advisory staff at the Bilingual Unit (Devlin, 2017a). The following year saw a change in Government as Malcolm Fraser's

Liberal party came into power. Under this leadership, the bilingual programs entered a consolidation phase, spanning the late 1970s to mid-1980s, during which the government would not provide funding to establish new programs (Devlin, 2017b). This policy of consolidation was inherited by the NT government in 1978 with the shift to self-government, and accompanied by reduced support of bilingual education in general (Devlin et al., 2017; Vaarzon-Morel & Wafer, 2017). The retreat in orientation from language-as-right to language-as-problem was evidenced in the reordering of the government priorities to place English literacy development ahead of all other aims in 1982 (Simpson et al., 2009).

The late 1970s also saw a retreat in Peruvian policy, though bilingual programs continued to grow. The 1979 Constitution declared Spanish the official language of the Republic and relegated Quechua and Aymara to official use only in the areas in which they were predominantly spoken (Asamblea Constituyente, 1979; Hornberger, 1988). Whilst this law guaranteed "the right of the Quechua, Aymara, and other native communities to receive primary education in their own language"[1] (Asamblea Constituyente, 1979, Art. 35, translated from Spanish), it did not recognise these languages as a national resource that should be learnt by all (Hornberger, 1987). As such, the Quechua corpus planning that had occurred in the preceding years was given less government attention, and it wasn't until late 1983 that the first workshop on Quechua and Aymara orthography was organised (Hornberger, 1988). Nevertheless, three additional bilingual projects were started in the departments of Ayacucho, Cusco, and Puno during this period (Hornberger, 1988). The Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (PEEB), which began in 1977, was initially

[1] "…el derecho de las comunidades quechuas, aimara y demás comunidades nativas a recibir educación primaria también en su propio idioma o lengua."

implemented in 100 schools, though by 1987 this number had reduced to only forty (Hornberger, 1987). Despite the reduction in numbers, the PEEB is generally considered a success. Hornberger (1987) found a number of pedagogical benefits of the project schools, including better receptive and productive competency in Spanish, greater use of Quechua, in both quantity and quality, and less behavioural issues than at the traditional schools. While the national policy continued to retreat deeper into the language-as-problem ideology, calling for transitional-type bilingual education, the PEEB, with all its successes, moved to a maintenance-type model, in which it was required that Quechua be used as a medium of instruction consistently in all subjects and throughout all grades as the children from the initial first grade cohort progressed through primary school (Hornberger, 1987).

By the end of the 1980s, both countries had once again experienced a return to policy which, to some extent, supported bilingual education and respected multilingualism and indigenous culture as valuable national resources, though in Australia this would be short lived. In 1985, the Peruvian government officially sanctioned the alphabets of Quechua, as well as Aymara, further legitimising the two largest Andean language families (García, 2005). Two years later, the Department of Bilingual Education was reinstated and in 1989 the government approved the Bilingual Intercultural Education Policy (García, 2005). In Australia, under Bob Hawke's Labor government, the National Policy on Languages was implemented (Lo Bianco, 1987). This policy explicitly recognised "the right of Aboriginal Australians who do not speak English to obtain information about and access government services in their own languages" and to expect "the positive affirmation of their linguistic and cultural background" in schools (Lo Bianco, 1987, p. 73). Additionally, in 1988, the departmental accreditation procedures which had been in place for

bilingual schools were replaced with a community-based appraisal system which was intended to be more "constructive, consultative, open and fair" (Devlin, 2017c, p. 203). Nevertheless, despite the policy changes in the preceding years, Australia chose not to ratify the *Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention* proposed by the International Labour Organisation in 1989 (Simpson et al., 2009).

3.3 1990s-2000s

Leading into the 1990s, both Australia and Peru were experiencing a period of relative acceptance and respect for multilingualism, though throughout the decade, the growing disparity between the two countries would became apparent. The Fujimori government of Peru promoted a new National Policy of Intercultural and Bilingual Intercultural Education in 1991 (García, 2005). The government also produced a new constitution in 1993, which remains current today, declaring the responsibility of the State to "recognise and protect the ethnic and cultural plurality of the Nation"[2] ("Constitución Política del Perú," 1993, Art. 2.19, translated from Spanish) and promoting "bilingual and intercultural education, depending on the characteristics of each zone"[3] (Art. 17, translated from Spanish). The renewed commitment of the Peruvian government to support the needs and rights of its indigenous population coincided with the International Year of Indigenous People (1993), which was later transformed into the International Decade for the World's Indigenous People (1995-2004) (García, 2005). The UN declared that the goal of both the Year and the Decade was "the strengthening of international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by indigenous people in such areas as human rights, the environment, development, education and health" (United Nations, 1993). Australia

[2] "…reconoce y protege la pluralidad étnica y cultural de la Nación."
[3] "…la educación bilingüe e intercultural, según las características de cada zona."

also promoted these actions, acknowledging the injustices committed against the indigenous peoples and committing to the goals of reconciliation in a speech given by then Labor Prime Minister, Paul Keating in 1992 (Keating, 1992).

In the early part of the decade, two reports, as well as a new language policy, were released, supporting the continuation of bilingual programs, though by 1996, government support had waned (Devlin, 2017b). The report tabled in the NT Legislative Assembly in 1990, while not giving unconditional support to bilingual education, recommended that communities should have control over the decision to establish and maintain bilingual programs, and "that such programs be developed in accordance with the Bilingual Education Handbook" (Harris, 1990, p. 38). The following year, the Commonwealth Government released *Australia's language: The Australian language and literacy policy* (Australia. Department of Employment, 1991). This policy acknowledged that "bilingual programs provide a sound basis for successful English language and literacy development for all children of non-English-speaking background, where there are sufficient numbers of children speaking the same language" (Australia. Department of Employment, 1991, p. 52). It also recommended "the targeting of funds…", as part of the Aboriginal Languages Education Strategy, to support a number of initiatives, including "…bilingual/bicultural programs" (Australia. Department of Employment, 1991, p. 96). The report that proceeded the new policy more strongly emphasised the value of bilingual education that is also intercultural, utilises indigenous teachers, and follows a maintenance rather than transitional model.

Nevertheless, in contrast to the community-based appraisal system of the late 1980s, the 1990s ushered in a rise of standards-based accountability by which

English literacy and numeracy were the primary indicators of success (Disbray & Devlin, 2017). Not only did this move clearly demonstrate a language-as-problem orientation towards indigenous languages, but it also opened the programs up to criticism from proponents of English-only education, as it allowed them to ignore the holistic success of vernacular language instruction. When the Liberal Party came into office in 1996, under the leadership of John Howard, funding for Aboriginal programs was cut and the general focus on reconciliation was set aside (Devlin, 2017b). The education of L1 speakers of indigenous languages was further affected in 1998 when the Commonwealth Government implemented a new policy which "subsumed ESL funding under the literacy umbrella" (Devlin, 2017b) despite recommendations from the report they commissioned a year earlier which emphasised the importance of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Second Dialect (ESD) support for linguistic minority speakers (Lo Bianco & Freebody, 2001). Additionally, the Country Liberal Party Government in the NT attempted to abolish bilingual education in favour of English-only programs, much to the objection of many communities, linguists, and education professionals (Simpson et al., 2009). The conflict between government and local stakeholders resulted in a major government-commissioned review of bilingual programs, known as the Collins Report (Collins, 1999). This report re-branded bilingual education as "two-way learning" and recommended that the NT Department of Education support this style of teaching "in schools where the local community wants such a program" (p. 12, rec. 98) and that they issue "a formal policy document…affirming the value of Indigenous language and culture" (p. 12, rec. 100). The report also addressed the issue of teacher training, which had long been identified as a major factor in the success of bilingual programs, emphasising the importance of cross-cultural training for non-indigenous teachers (rec. 63), increased

numbers of indigenous staff (rec. 70), and ESL training for all (rec. 67). While the government did back down on its aim to cease all bilingual education, none of the recommendations, apart from the name change, were adhered to, and by the end of 2000, four of the programs had closed, leaving only sixteen in operation in the NT (Devlin, 2017a, 2017b).

Meanwhile, in both the Andean and Amazonian regions of Peru, there were increasing levels of official support for bilingual education in general, and specifically for an enrichment, rather than transitional, type. One of the advantages experienced by Peru is its positioning within Latin America and the discourse between countries in regard to indigenous education. In 1995, the first bi-annual Latin American Intercultural Bilingual Education Congress was held in Guatemala (López, 2009). The point of these congresses was to open up a conversation between Latin American countries and to address issues of policy, politics, and implementation of Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) programs (López, 2009). Peru also received assistance from other international bodies, particularly the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the German Development Bank, who provided funds specifically for the development of indigenous education (Howard, 2011; López, 2009).

With this international backing, which was lacking in Australia, IBE received more government attention in Peru. In 1996, the National Unit for Intercultural Bilingual Education (*Unidad Nacional de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* or *UNEBI*) was established, and later transformed into the National Directorate for Intercultural Bilingual Education (*Dirección Nacional de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* or *DINEBI*) in 2000 (Howard, 2011). Between 1996 and 2000, UNEBI rolled out two Plans of

Action; one for the preparation of educational texts in indigenous languages, and the other for the training of teachers (Martínez & Franco, 2015). The running of IBE programs was further institutionalised in national legislation with the Bilingual Intercultural Education Law (*Ley 27818*) in 2002, during the government of Alejandro Toledo (Martínez & Franco, 2015). This law recognised the value of Peru's cultural diversity, guaranteed the right of the indigenous peoples to participate in the creation, administration, and implementation of educational systems and institutions, and asserted that it is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education to make available all necessary resources and to promote bilingual intercultural education at all levels of schooling (Congreso de la República, 2002). The new General Law of Education (Congreso de la República, 2003) also legislated the use of IBE, emphasising the value of incorporating indigenous languages, cultures, and knowledge into education, and the importance of teaching Spanish as a second language whilst preserving and promoting the use of indigenous languages. Additionally, the concept of interculturality was listed among the eight fundamental principles of education under the law, stating that "the recognition and respect of differences, as well as the mutual knowledge and attitude towards learning about the other, supports the harmonious cohabitation of and exchange between the diverse cultures of the world"[4] (Congreso de la República, 2003, Art. 8.f, translated from Spanish). Such assertions promote the view of indigenous languages and cultures not only as a right of indigenous people, but as a resource for the whole nation. It is

[4] "…el reconocimiento y respeto a las diferencias, así como en el mutuo conocimiento y actitud de aprendizaje del otro, sustento para la convivencia armónica y el intercambio entre las diversas culturas del mundo."

this view, and the enrichment-type bilingual intercultural education that it implies, that marks the greatest divergence between policy in Peru and Australia.

Whilst the early years of the new millennium offered some optimism regarding the newly branded two-way education programs in Australia, there remained, at best, a language-as-right orientation, but more commonly a view of indigenous languages as a problem to be overcome. Following the 2005 review of indigenous languages and culture in Northern Territory schools and the report "Two-way learning in the NT: Some research based recommendations" (Devlin, 2005), the NT Department of Employment, Education and Training released the Indigenous Education Strategic Plan 2006-2009 which gave support to bilingual programs while stressing "an unwavering focus on developing the English literacy and numeracy skills of indigenous students" (Northern Territory. Department of Employment, 2006, p. ii; Simpson et al., 2009). The popular view that bilingual programs were failing to teach students English was heightened in 2008 with the release of the results of the first National Assessment Program Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) tests, which indicated that students in remote Northern Territory schools were underperforming in comparison to their urban and interstate peers (Devlin, 2017c). This led to a drastic change in policy which would essentially end all government support for bilingual education. On the 14th of October 2008, NT Minister for Education and Training, Marion Scrymgour, announced that "the first four hours of education in all Northern Territory schools [would] be conducted in English" (Scrymgour, 2008). The decision was made without consultation with communities and schools, and ignored the multitude of factors that may have led to the poor NAPLAN results (Simpson et al., 2009). Ironically, only a few months later, in April 2009, Australia became a signatory of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,

though the UN's stance on indigenous language rights in education has had little impact on Australian policy.

3.4 Now

The current state of bilingual education is starkly different between Australia and Peru. Notably, while Peru is currently home to 24,951 IBE institutions, only five officially-bilingual programs are currently in operation in the Northern Territory of Australia (S. Disbray, personal communication, October 3, 2017; Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). This is a direct result of the differing language management decisions made within the government domains of the two countries, and the policy changes that have occurred over the past decade suggest that these differences will continue to grow.

In Peru, after a brief retreat in orientation away from language-as-resource which resulted in the merging of DINEBI and the National Directorate of Rural Education to form the General Directorate of Intercultural, Bilingual and Rural Education (*Dirección General de Educación Intercultural, Bilingüe y Rural* or *DIGEIBIR*), despite the high numbers of non-rural first language speakers of indigenous languages (López, 2009), recent years have seen a renewed dedication to language rights and implementing IBE for all Peruvians. The Prior Consultation Law of 2011 mandated that indigenous peoples be consulted before any administrative or legislative measures are taken by the state that may affect their collective rights, their physical existence, their cultural identity, their quality of life, or their development (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011b). Additionally, it required that official state registered interpreters be part of the consultation process wherever they are needed (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011b). Also in 2011, the Language Rights Law (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a) was passed. This law guarantees individual and

collective rights of indigenous peoples to use indigenous languages in the public sphere, to be taught in their first language through IBE at all levels of the national education system, and to learn Spanish as an additional language (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a). It also recognises the responsibility of the State in assisting in the promotion, conservation, and revival of indigenous languages, as well as the creation and distribution of official documents in those languages (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a).

In the wake of these laws, the National Plan of Intercultural Bilingual Education 2016-2021 was developed, followed by the National Policy of Original Languages, Oral Tradition and Interculturality in 2017. The National Plan acknowledged the advances that had been made between 2011 and 2015 in regards to indigenous student access to IBE, development of a relevant curriculum, the initial and in-service training of IBE teachers, and the decentralisation and social participation of IBE management (Ministerio de Educación, 2016). Nevertheless, it recognises the continued need for development in these areas and outlines strategies and actions that are to be taken in order to "offer a relevant and pertinent education service, that guarantees the improvement of the learning of children, adolescents, youths, adults and seniors belonging to the original peoples, through the implementation of intercultural and bilingual education in all the stages, forms, and modalities of the education system, from a critical perspective of the treatment of the ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity of the country"[5] (Ministerio de

[5] "Brindar un servicio educativo relevante y pertinente, que garantice la mejora de los aprendizajes de los niños, niñas, adolescentes, jóvenes, personas adultas y personas adultas mayores pertenecientes a los pueblos originarios a través de la implementación de una educación intercultural y bilingüe en todas las etapas, formas y modalidades del sistema educativo, desde una perspectiva crítica de tratamiento de la diversidad étnica, cultural y lingüística del país."

Educación, 2016, pp. 21-22, translated from Spanish). The National Policy outlines the specific commitments expected from all sectors and levels of government in order to uphold the principles of the Language Rights Law (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). Throughout, there are guidelines not only directed towards speakers of indigenous languages, but to all Peruvians, as it is recognised that the linguistic rights of the former "can only be guaranteed if Peruvian society in its entirety positively value indigenous languages and if discriminatory practices against their speakers are eliminated"[6] (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017, p. 13, translated from Spanish). The actions required by the document reflect three core themes which will be discussed further in the following chapter; these being the status, acquisition, and development of indigenous languages.

The current policy environment in Australia regarding indigenous languages and education is considerably mixed and differs greatly from the situation in Peru. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010-2014 acknowledged the importance of the unique cultural and linguistic identity of indigenous students and highlighted the benefits to student wellbeing and success when this identity is embraced by schools (Ministerial Council for Education, 2010). However, there was no mention of bilingual education nor any recommendations for how these schools might incorporate indigenous languages into their teaching practices. Instead, the focus was solely on the improvement of Standard Australian English literacy and numeracy, and minimal attention was given to the importance of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction in achieving this (Ministerial Council for Education, 2010). Despite the national focus on English instruction, the NT

[6] "…solo podrán garantizarse si la sociedad peruana en su conjunto valora positivamente las lenguas indígenas y si se eliminan las prácticas discriminatorias contra sus hablantes."

Government officially repealed the 'Four hours of English' policy in June 2012, replacing it with a policy that would allow bilingual education, though this was never implemented due to the change of government when the Country Liberal party won the election two months later (Hall, 2017). However, 2014 did see the reinstatement of the NT Department of Education manager position for the remaining eight bilingual schools, as well as the publication of a review of indigenous education in the NT, known as the Wilson review (Disbray, 2017a). The Wilson review "acknowledges and supports the role of students' first languages in education and supports their teaching" (Wilson, 2014, p. 11), recognising the large body of international evidence supporting the benefits of first language programs in schools that seek to teach first language literacy, specifically in relation to educational outcomes, identity formation, and attendance. Nevertheless, the core concern of the review continues to be Standard Australian English literacy, and it asserts that the curriculum should be delivered in English, with the assistance of indigenous language speaking adults where necessary and possible (Wilson, 2014). In response to the review, the Indigenous Education Strategy 2015-2024 was rolled out, which makes no mention of indigenous languages, ESL teaching, or bilingual education (Northern Territory Government Department of Education, 2015). This contradiction in view of the importance of indigenous languages is reflected in national discourse. The Australian Federal Government policy for 'Closing the Gap' emphasises "the strong connections between culture, language and identity and the strong correlation between language status and educational, employment, training, and physical and mental health outcomes in communities" (Commonwealth of Australia. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2017, p. 15). Additionally, it recognises some benefits from the incorporation of indigenous languages into the education system (Commonwealth of

Australia. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Office for the Arts, 2013). However, the key measure of parity in educational success between indigenous and non-indigenous students is the standardised NAPLAN testing, conducted solely in English (Disbray, 2017a).

The current Australian National Curriculum promotes the learning of indigenous languages, cultures, and histories, and acknowledges the particular linguistic and cultural challenges experienced by indigenous students who speak a language other than English at home. However, it does not support a bilingual model of education akin to those that were supported prior to the 2008 decision in the NT, or that continue to be maintained in Peru today. As one of three cross-curriculum priorities, the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) list Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017a). Through the interconnected themes of People, Culture, and Country/Place, ACARA seeks to allow indigenous students "to see themselves, their identities and their cultures reflected in the curriculum of each of the learning areas" (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017a), boosting their self-esteem and enabling them to participate fully in schooling. Importantly, this integration of the indigenous perspective into all school subjects is directed not only towards indigenous students, but also to their non-indigenous peers, so as to engage them in the process of reconciliation by building recognition and respect for the diverse indigenous cultures throughout the country (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017a). Included in the English-subject area of the curriculum is the recognition and appreciation of the long oral traditions within indigenous societies, juxtaposed with the written literacies of the Western world. The ACARA also developed a Framework for Aboriginal

Languages and Torres Strait Islander Languages (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017b). The framework is intended to give indigenous students the chance to study their traditional language, and it is asserted that through learning a framework language, "all students gain access to knowledge and understanding of Australia that can only come from an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander perspective" (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017b). For students who come to school speaking little or no English, including first language speakers of indigenous languages, the curriculum emphasises the importance of English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) support, building on their pre-existing linguistic resources and taking into account the cultural differences that may affect their understanding of certain topics (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017c). Nevertheless, throughout the curriculum, "learning is accessed [only] through English, and achievement is demonstrated through English" (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017c).

A detailed analysis of the Australian Curriculum and any impacts it may have on implementation at the State level is not yet possible, however, there are some indications that it is opening up ideological and implementational spaces, as defined by Hornberger (2005), which could make way for the development of bilingual programs in the future. The Northern Territory Education Department is currently rewriting their curriculum to fit the National Curriculum, and in Queensland there have been several recent workshops on the incorporation of indigenous languages in schools (S. Disbray, personal communication, October 3, 2017). Also in Queensland, conversations are currently being had between the Department of Education and Training, academics at the University of Queensland, and the deputy principal at

Aurukun School, with the intention of establishing a "literacy (and aspirationally Bilingual Ed) program in Aurukun" (D. Osgarby, personal communication, October 3, 2017).

3.5 Summary

Indigenous language policy decisions within the governmental domains in both Australia and Peru have had a complicated history which has led to vastly different outcomes in current policy and implementation of bilingual programs. Whilst both countries experienced similar trajectories in early policies, both in their initial rejection of indigenous languages within public education and the emergence of State-funded bilingual programs in the 1970s, the following decades saw the national policies diverge. Today, the success of Peru's bilingual programs can be seen in the existence of 24,951 IBE institutions. The implementation of such programs is supported by official policies that not only recognise the right of indigenous people to use their languages in the public sphere, but that view these languages as a resource to be enjoyed by the whole nation. In contrast, while the importance of Australia's indigenous languages as an expression of culture and identity is acknowledged by the government, the Australian Curriculum maintains a focus on English literacy development. As a result of the national policy, the number of official bilingual programs for indigenous students in operation within the country has been reduced to only five in the Northern Territory. This is unlikely to improve if the policy continues with the current focus, however, it is worth noting that there are some indications that the priority of respect for indigenous languages and cultures within the Australian Curriculum is generating space for discussions about languages in

education, and that this may create an ideological and implementational environment more amenable to the development of bilingual programs in the future.

4. Unpacking the current state of bilingual education

To whatever extent the explicit language-in-education policies of Peru and Australia have led to the relative success or failure of bilingual education programs, they cannot be explained in isolation. Instead it is necessary to examine other areas of language management, ideology, and practices, as well as the ecological context and the domains in which these components of language policy take place. This chapter will firstly look at several demographic similarities and differences relating to the indigenous languages and their speakers in each country, and explain how they operate in an ecological relationship with the creation and implementation of policy. Later, the relationship between status and corpus planning, as well as the interaction between language practices and ideologies within the domains of government, workplace, school, and family, will be explored in relation to the processes of legitimation and institutionalisation.

4.1 Number of languages and concentration of populations

Both Australia and Peru are located in parts of the world characterised by high linguistic diversity (Simons & Fennig, 2017). Despite the multiplicity of languages, these countries are home to many of the most severely endangered languages in the world (Cenoz et al.). However, the actual makeup and geographic spread of the indigenous languages and their speakers, and how they relate to the non-indigenous populations, differs greatly between the two countries. These demographic differences are arguably the most patent of the ecological variables that have influenced language policy generally, and bilingual education specifically, in Australia and Peru. While these factors are out of the control of policy makers, it is important to discuss the effects they have had, and will continue to have, on policy development and implementation.

Of the 250 languages traditionally spoken by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, 150 were reported as being spoken in homes across Australia in 2016 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017a). Peru has significantly fewer indigenous languages spoken today, with a total number of 47 (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). The most widely spoken of the indigenous languages in Peru is Quechua, which is more "accurately described as a family of language varieties" (King & Hornberger, 2006, p. 188), with 3,360,331 speakers spread across the whole country (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). The amplitude of Quechua speakers can largely be attributed to its role as a lingua franca during the Incan Empire, and continued importance of the language as an intermediary between the indigenous peoples and colonising Spaniards from the 15th century onwards (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989; King & Hornberger, 2006). Aymara is the second largest language, spoken by 443,248 people, followed by Ashaninka with 67,724 (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). Seven further languages have between 10,163 and 55,366 speakers, and eleven more between 1,864 and 8,016 (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). The rest are spoken by less than 1,000 people each. According to the Australian Indigenous Languages Database (AUSTLANG), supported by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), Warlpiri and Pitjantjatjara have the largest communities of speakers, at 3,000 each, and a total of only nine Australian languages are spoken by 1,000 people or more (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2017). The absolute numbers of indigenous languages and speakers, therefore, indicate that Australia is already at a disadvantage in terms of ethnolinguistic vitality, and as such, these languages, and their speakers, may hold less sway with policy makers (Ferguson, 2006).

According to the Peruvian National Institute of Statistics and Information (*Instituto Nacional de Estadistica e Informática* or *INEI*), Peru currently has a population of about 31,151,653 people (Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática, 2015). Of these, 13.17% speak an indigenous language (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). In contrast, less than 0.3% of Australia's total population of 24,385,600 reported speaking an indigenous language at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017a, 2017b). This disparity holds up even when considering the larger indigenous population in Peru than in Australia. Of the 46% of Peru's population who identify as indigenous, 28.6% speak an indigenous language, whilst only 10% of the 3% of Australians who identified as indigenous did the same (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016; LT Media Lab, 2012). When you examine the breakdown of indigenous populations in Australia by State, however, a more varied picture emerges. While only 4% of indigenous people in NSW and Victoria, and 7% in the ACT, speak an indigenous language, the percentages rise to 24% in both South Australia and Western Australia. The Northern Territory exceeds these numbers even further with 68% of its indigenous population speaking indigenous languages (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). Furthermore, considering the higher percentage of the total NT population that identify as indigenous (25.5% compared to less than 5% of all other States and Territories), the proportion of NT citizens who speak an indigenous language is much higher than elsewhere, at 17.34% of the total population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017a). Similarly, in Peru the percentages are very different when the provinces are compared. Eighteen of the 196 provinces, spread over 8 of the 25 regions of the country, have a majority population of indigenous language speakers, with nine provinces reaching or exceeding 90% (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). As Ferguson (2006, p. 85) explains, "concentrations of

speakers in an area where they constitute a high proportion of the population has long been acknowledged as one factor favourable to language maintenance". It can be extrapolated from this that high concentrations of indigenous language speakers may be beneficial to the creation and implementation of language policies that support the use of these languages. This statement is supported by the relative success of bilingual education policies and programs in the NT, compared to the rest of Australia, and more clearly, to the general vitality of such policies in Peru.

As well as the regional differences concerning indigenous languages and populations, Australia also experiences a major divide between remote and urban communities. In 2014-15, 79% of indigenous people were living in non-remote areas, with 35% in major cities (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). In such areas, the proportion of indigenous people aged 15 years and over who spoke an indigenous language was only 28% (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). In contrast, 76% of remotely situated indigenous Australians reported as indigenous language speakers (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). In NSW and Queensland, the states in which the majority (60%) of indigenous Australians lived, 95% and 81% respectively were located in non-remote areas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016). While the total number of indigenous people was lower in the NT, one in four people identified as indigenous, and of those 79% resided in remote locales (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016, 2017a).

The situation in Peru is somewhat dissimilar, due partially to its world ranking position as a developing country, in comparison to Australia which is classified as developed (United Nations, 2017). The majority of the country can be considered rural or remote, contrasting primarily with the urban centre of Metropolitan Lima.

As such, there is a much higher percentage of indigenous people living outside of urban centres in Peru. In contrast to Australia, however, indigenous language speakers are not so heavily confined to remote areas. This is due to the processes of internal migration which continue to see the movement of people between the "educationally and socioeconomically neglected rural areas" (Mayer, 2017, p. 15) of Peru and the urban centre of Lima. Today, Metropolitan Lima has a population of over 9,000,000, with almost 500,000 people speaking indigenous languages (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). These speakers belong to seven language groups, making Lima the most linguistically diverse city in the country (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). Additionally, Metropolitan Lima encompasses six of the districts with the highest numbers of Quechua speakers, and is home to the greatest number of indigenous language learners (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017).

Rurality is associated with a number of issues that affect education. Due to geographic isolation, rural students often have to travel considerable distances to attend school, and a lack of funding means that both infrastructure and educational resources are minimal and substandard (Lamb & Glover, 2014). In such locations, qualified teachers are scarce and high teacher turnover creates instability in the classroom and disrupts students' learning (Lamb & Glover, 2014). As such, the outcomes for rural and remote students tend to be significantly worse than their urban peers (Lamb & Glover, 2014)(). The 2008 decision to cease bilingual education in the Northern Territory of Australia was justified based on the apparent failure of these programs to deliver results comparable to the rest of the country (Devlin, 2017c). However, given the high percentage of remotely situated indigenous students in the NT, it is likely that the poor NAPLAN results of these students were less a reflection on the effectiveness of bilingual education, but due to the

disadvantages associated with rurality. While Peruvian schools in remote regions experience the same issues, the even spread of indigenous language speakers across the country, and particularly the prevalence of these speakers within Metropolitan Lima, makes it harder to ignore the linguistic diversity of the country and to blame bilingual programs for the limited achievement of rural students.

A final point on the demographics of indigenous language speakers relates to the issue of national borders. Prior to European colonisation, the Quechua language was spoken throughout the Incan empire as a lingua franca (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989). This was a result of five centuries of expansion, extending "even beyond the limits of the present Peruvian territory" (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989, p. 15). As such, this language continues to be spoken in several countries, including Ecuador, Bolivia, and Argentina (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). This is true also of Aymara and fourteen of the Amazonian languages (Ministerio de Educación, 2013). The total number of speakers of these languages, therefore, is much larger than the population in Peru alone, and these expanded speech communities give more strength to indigenous language advocacy and provide opportunities for the sharing of language resources. Given Australia's isolated position in the world, the small indigenous speaking populations are not supplemented by transnational speech communities, and so all pushes for indigenous language recognition must be internally driven.

4.2 Legitimation and Institutionalisation

The success or failure of any minority language policy is largely dependent upon the levels of legitimation and institutionalisation experienced by said language (May, 2000; Spolsky, 2012b). These two concepts are distinct, but connected due to their reliance on one another. Legitimation refers to the official *recognition* of a language by the State, often through the sanctioning of co-official status alongside a

majority language (May, 2000). In theory, official status should guarantee the right of the minority language speaker to use their own language in place of the majority. However, unless the language is institutionalised in a range of domains, this right will remain purely symbolic. Institutionalisation refers specifically to the *use* of a minority language "in a wide range of social, cultural and linguistic domains or contexts, both formal and informal" (May, 2000, p. 102). The focus on both legitimation and institutionalisation throughout the history of and in the current Peruvian policies is one of the key differentiators when comparing Peru and Australia, and a study of how these actions have been carried out could teach the latter an invaluable lesson in language policy and open up a pathway to successful bilingual education in the future.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, it was in 1975 that Peru first officialised Quechua as a national language alongside Spanish (Congreso de la República, 1975). While there was a retreat in this policy towards the end of the 1970s, Quechua, and also Aymara, were still recognised as official languages in the areas in which they were predominantly spoken (Asamblea Constituyente, 1979). Today, all 47 indigenous languages of Peru have co-official status "in the communities, districts, provinces, departments or regions in which they predominate"[7] (Ministerio de Educación, 2017, translated from Spanish), guaranteed by the Language Rights Law (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a). This law mandates that all indigenous languages benefit from "the same legal value and the same privileges as Spanish (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a). Such decisions relate to Cooper's (1989) conception of status planning and operates within the domain of government. A

[7] "…en las comunidades, distritos, provincias, departamentos o regiones en donde predominen."

process that often coincides with the status planning action of legitimation, though each can occur without the other, is that of linguistic standardisation (Fishman, 2006). This process, which falls under the banner of corpus planning, includes the development of a standardised orthography, and is one that has received much attention in Peru (Cooper, 1989). Currently, the orthographies of 37 indigenous Peruvian languages have been officialised by the Ministry of Education, one is waiting on ministerial approval, and nine are at varying stages of the process of standardisation (Ministerio de Educación, 2017). Whilst the official sanctioning of these corpus decisions remains in the governmental domain of policy making, the process actually involved interaction between a number of actors from more micro-level domains, including language specialists, teachers, and members of the appropriate speech communities (Vexler, 2015). Through the combined efforts of standardisation and legitimation, both written resources and bilingual programs delivered in these languages are more readily created and justified than would be likely in a context, like Australia, where these processes are lacking (Ministerio de Educación, 2017).

The legal status of a language does not, however, guarantee the social status of its speakers nor positive attitudes towards it. An often-cited reason for the rejection of indigenous languages in education, and particularly for the development of literacy in these languages, is that they are less economically useful than the dominant language of the country (Grin, 2002; Hornberger, 1988, 1997a; Sallabank, 2012; Spolsky, 2012a). Within the literature on the economics of language, one of the largest areas of research centres around the idea that "linguistic attributes can influence earnings" (Grin, 2002, p. 14). The people with the most physical or financial capital in the economy of a nation, and who exert the greatest amount of

influence within the employment domain, tend to be speakers of the dominant language (Grin, 2002). As a result, speakers of a minority language often experience a wage rate disadvantage, either due to deliberate attempts by speakers of the dominant language to control the "rate at which the goods primarily produced by one of the two groups are bought and sold" (Grin, 2002, p. 14), or through less patent discriminatory practices by which employers "prefer to hire a workforce from the same group, because cultural proximity will make it easier to assess…the employee's productivity" (Grin, 2002, p. 15). In both Peru and Australia, a history of language management actions has discriminated against the use of indigenous languages, and resultantly have influenced language practices to exclude indigenous languages from use in the public sphere, in favour of Spanish and English. As such, for the L1 speakers of these indigenous languages, there is economic value in learning the dominant language of their respective countries (Grin, 2002). This has direct implications on language ideologies held by indigenous language speakers as they come to view their L1 as a hindrance to economic success (Ferguson, 2006; Grin, 2002).

A key strategy, therefore, for increasing the perceived value of these languages is to connect their use to employability and promotion opportunities in well-paying jobs (Ferguson, 2006). In order to do this, the use of these languages must be institutionalised in a range of public domains. Peru's Language Rights Law requires that all "public and private entities that offer public services implement…training and hiring policies and programs so that in the zones of the country where an indigenous language predominates, their civil and public servants, as well as the members of the Armed Forces and National Police of Peru can

communicate sufficiently in that language"[8] (Ministerio de Cultura, 2011a, Art. 15.2, translated from Spanish). Additionally, it has recently been mandated that translation and interpreter services be available to speakers of indigenous languages in all public governmental spaces (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). To support this new initiative, the Ministry of Culture established the National Register of Interpreters and Translators of Indigenous and Original Languages, the official database of all those accredited by the Ministry (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). To date, 311 translators and/or interpreters have been registered, 82 of whom are specialised in law and health (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). Not only do these systems deliver essential services to Peruvians who speak an indigenous language, but they also provide employment to these speakers. As these languages continue to be institutionalised in a range of public domains, their economic value will increase. Ultimately, following the view of the current Director for Indigenous Languages at the Ministry for Culture, indigenous languages should be recognised not as a hindrance to economic success, but as a "professional weapon"[9] (Panizo Jansana, 2017, translated from Spanish). The policy decisions made in the domains of government and the workplace would, therefore, influence those made within the family and school domains (Spolsky, 2012a). The pro-indigenous language practices of the public sector will change the language ideologies of families who, seeing the economic worth of their languages, are more likely to support their use within the school setting, in conjunction, rather than in conflict, with Spanish, as a way of

[8] "Las entidades públicas y privadas que prestan servicios públicos implementan…políticas y programas de capacitación o contratación para que en las zonas del país donde una lengua originaria sea predominante sus funcionarios y servidores públicos, así como los integrantes de la Fuerzas Armadas y Policía Nacional del Perú se puedan comunicar con suficiencia en esa lengua."

[9] "…un arma profesional."

encouraging the development of the linguistic skills required for employment (Ferguson, 2006; Grin, 2002).

As well as the concern for economic usefulness, many see their indigenous languages as belonging solely to the private and Spanish to the public, as demonstrated by the personal view expressed by a well-known Peruvian congress woman and linguist Martha Hildebrandt that "there are two classes of languages – one like a tailored suit for wearing out in the street, the other, like a pair of pyjamas that feels comfortable, but that you would not go outside in"[10] (Panizo Jansana, 2017, translated from Spanish). It is a current goal of the Ministry of Culture to counteract such beliefs through continued institutionalisation of indigenous languages leading to increased visibility of the languages in the daily lives of all Peruvians (Panizo Jansana, 2017). In December 2016, a committee for the elaboration of language policies was established, following several workshops held in conjunction with Mexico, Paraguay, and Spain (Panizo Jansana, 2017). The committee have proposed three main pillars under which policy should be developed: the transfer of languages; the study of the languages; and *increasing the value* of the languages (Panizo Jansana, 2017, emphasis added). At the 2017 roundtable discussion about language policies between Peru and Mexico, Dr Augustín Panizo Jansana, Director for Indigenous Languages at the Peruvian Ministry for Culture, exemplified the public use of the Quechua language in his introduction of the event. Later, he acknowledged that while there is a lack of funding, it is important that the State use the indigenous languages, and that already existent processes for doing so be formalised (Panizo Jansana, 2017). One area in which the

[10] "Hay dos clases de lenguas – una como sastre y terno para salir a la calle. La otra, que es como un pijama y uno se siente cómodo, pero no saldría a la calle con ella."

use of indigenous languages has already begun is the media. Since the 12th of December 2016, national TV and radio have broadcasted a daily Quechua-language news program, called Ñuqanchik, written and produced by L1 speakers of the language (Collyns, 2016; Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). A similar Aymara-language program, Jiwasanaka, has run since the 24th of March 2017, and plans for other indigenous language programs, including ones in the Amazonian languages of Ashaninka and Awajun, are underway (Collyns, 2016; Ministerio de Cultura, 2017).

Though not directly related to institutionalisation, negative attitudes towards indigenous languages, held by both community and non-community members, can also be improved through the implementation of strategies for the prevention of linguistic discrimination. In fact, this is listed as one of the six specific objectives of the 2017 policy. As mentioned in chapter 2, linguistic discrimination often goes unnoticed by the perpetrators, who are conditioned by the standard language culture in which they live to believe that their adverse judgements of other languages or dialects are "purely linguistic…[and] sanctioned by authorities on language" (Milroy, 2001), rather than being discriminatory. As such, the policy seeks to overcome this issue, firstly by bringing awareness to the realities of linguistic discrimination amongst both the speakers of indigenous languages and broader society, and by implementing strategies "of social communication that position indigenous languages in the public agenda"[11] (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017, Obj. 3.2, translated from Spanish) and supporting initiatives that work to achieve these ends.

Returning to the idea of institutionalisation, it is important also to discuss another aspect of corpus planning; the modernisation and development of

[11] "…de comunicación social que posicionen a las lenguas indígenas en la agenda pública…"

terminology required by the expanded domains of use (Spolsky, 2012b). In the words of Fishman (2006, p. 4) "sometimes corpus change is a byproduct of prior status change decisions…and, sometimes, it is a tool for bringing social change and, therefore, status change into being". In whatever order these actions take place, it is clearly important that they co-occur so as to not rely on the borrowing of specialised vocabulary from the dominant language (Fishman, 2006). The National Policy of Original Languages, Oral Traditions and Interculturality recognises this need, particularly in the fields of science and technology (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). Additionally, it promotes the development of new genres for both spoken and written texts (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017). In order to conduct these corpus changes, the Policy recommends that the government encourage research into the forms of all indigenous languages, and "institutionalise spaces at the national level for the teaching, research and *development* of the languages"[12] (Ministerio de Cultura, 2017, Obj. 6.2. Translated from Spanish, emphasis added). In this way, the changing language practices of the public sector are supported by the corpus planning actions being taken. As the corpus is developed and expanded, the language ideologies held by both speakers and non-speakers of indigenous languages will also be altered, as these languages come to be seen not as relics or languages suitable only for "local and emotional…" functions, but as dynamic, modern systems "…equipped to express contemporary scientific and technological concepts (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989, p. 29).

In Australia, there exists no legislation recognising an 'official' language of the country. Nevertheless, English as the dominant language, spoken to some

[12] "Institucionalizar a nivel nacional espacios de coordinación de enseñanza, investigación y desarrollo de las lenguas…"

degree by 98% of Australians and as the sole home language of 81% of the population, is generally considered to be the only language suitable for official use (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012). For example, the Federal Parliament acknowledges that "although there is no specific rule set down by standing order, the house follows the practice of requiring members' speeches to be in English" (House of Representatives, 2005). This was demonstrated in December 2015, when Northern Territory MP Bess Price requested to freely use Warlpiri, an indigenous language of the NT which she speaks as an L1, but was denied approval (Pearson, 2016). It is clear that Australia's indigenous languages do not have the same legal backing as those in Peru, and without governmental legitimation, it is unlikely that the languages will be institutionalised within the public sector. Following the current trajectory, therefore, there is little hope that the change in language ideologies and practices that continue to assist the implementation of bilingual programs in Peru will occur within Australia. However, recent events have brought indigenous languages back into public discussion and may indicate an emerging space for policy change. In February 2016, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull opened his Closing the Gap address with an Acknowledgement of Country in the Ngunawal language (Gordon, 2016). More recently, at the annual parliamentary dinner of the Minerals Council of Australia, the Gondwana children's choir performed a verse of the Australian national anthem, translated into Ngunawal (Le Lievre, 2017). Whilst these actions are purely symbolic, new legislation introduced in the NSW parliament on the 11th October 2017 represents a more tangible change. The Aboriginal Languages Bill acknowledges the indigenous languages of NSW as part of the cultural heritage of the State, and seeks the establishment of "an Aboriginal Languages Trust governed by Aboriginal people that will facilitate and support Aboriginal language activities to

reawaken, nurture and grow Aboriginal languages" (Parliment of New South Wales, 2017, Obj. b) in accordance with a strategic plan that will be developed. This bill is the first of its kind in Australia, though it remains to be seen what impact this will have on the status and usage of indigenous languages within the State and throughout the country.

4.3 Summary

The demographic factors and language management actions described in this chapter help to explain the disparate language policy situations in Australia and Peru which have led to the current states of bilingual education, as discussed in Chapter 3. The larger populations of indigenous language speakers in Peru, both in actual numbers and as a percentage of the total population, create an environment that is more amenable to the creation and implementation of language policies that support the use of indigenous languages. Conversely, the concentration of Australian indigenous language speakers within remote regions of the NT has allowed the government to confound the poor performance of remote indigenous students with the failure of bilingual programs to produce results, leading to the 2008 decision to cease bilingual education in the NT. While the majority of Peruvians live in rural or remote areas, and as such experience the same educational disadvantages associated with rurality in Australia, the large number of indigenous languages, speakers, and learners within Metropolitan Lima makes it harder to ignore the countries linguistic diversity and to blame bilingual programs for unsatisfactory outcomes for students.

Bilingual education in Peru has also benefitted from a number of government domain language management decisions which have affected the language ideologies and practices within the workplace and family domains. Thanks to the

focus on legitimation and standardisation of indigenous languages in Peru, written resources in these languages and bilingual programs are more readily created and justified. Other status and corpus planning actions, including the institutionalisation of languages and the development of new terminology to accommodate for the expanded domains of use, also work to change language ideologies. As speakers come to view their L1 as an economically useful language that can be used in the full range of modern contexts, support for the use of these languages within the school domain grows. The Peruvian government also seeks to improve attitudes towards indigenous languages through educating all citizens about the realities of linguistic discrimination and positioning these languages within the public agenda. Australia's indigenous languages do not share the same legal or institutional support as those in Peru. Recently there has, however, been an increase in the presence of indigenous languages within the governmental domain, though the impact of this remains to be seen. Ultimately, unless the government implements policies which legitimise and institutionalise the indigenous languages of the country, it is unlikely that the change in language ideologies and practices that continue to assist the implementation of bilingual programs in Peru will occur.

5. New media and the future of bilingual education

While language management decisions made within the government domain certainly influence the position of indigenous languages within a country, change can also be driven by other domains (Hornberger, 1997a). Of particular interest to this chapter is the growing influence of new media on the status of indigenous languages, and the ways in which this may affect bilingual education policy and practice in both Australia and Peru. Firstly, it will discuss new media technologies that increase the visibility of written language in the daily lives of indigenous people and therefore the perceived utility of indigenous literacy. It will also examine multimodal technologies which allow for the creation and dissemination of resources that incorporate the oral and visual elements of indigenous cultural knowledge into modern domains of use. Finally, the chapter will look at how the sharing capabilities of new media can change the language ideologies of non-indigenous society by increasing the visibility of indigenous languages.

5.1 Visibility of indigenous literacy

As discussed in Chapter 2, children develop initial literacy skills best through their L1, though indigenous students are disadvantaged in their learning as there are limited bodies of written works in these languages and the very concept of writing may be foreign to these children due to the oral traditions of their cultures and the apparent irrelevance of literacy to their daily lives. Due to the perceived lack of utility and socioeconomic value of indigenous language literacy in particular, it is often asserted that there is no point in fostering such skills, and as such, that bilingual education is unnecessary (Godenzzi, 1997; Hornberger, 1997b). In order to overcome these barriers and to increase support for bilingual programs, it is necessary to increase the visibility of written language, particularly amongst social

networks of young speakers (Ferguson, 2006; Godenzzi, 1997). This is a task which new media technologies are well positioned to accomplish, given that "indigenous youth are now firmly part of a 'digital culture'" (Kral, 2010, p. 1) and that new domains such as…media, computers and mobile phones increase both language awareness and perceived utility" (Sallabank, 2012, p. 117).

In both Australia and Peru, there is an increasing presence of indigenous languages in digital spaces. For example, Wikipedia databases have been established in Quechua, Aymara, and Noongar (an indigenous language of Western Australia)[13] and Google Peru can be accessed through Quechua as an alternative to Spanish[14]. Social media platforms also present a space for the written use of these languages. Both Quechua and Aymara are available on Facebook as a translation option and are in use on Facebook pages and Twitter[15]. In both Australia and Peru, there is also an increasing use of indigenous languages in private messaging on Facebook, particularly amongst Peru's IBE teachers who prefer to share educational materials via 'Face' (I. Kral, personal communication, September 21, 2017; E. Mayer, personal communication, October 19, 2017). As well as the online spaces for indigenous language use, Microsoft have established the YouthSpark Local Language Program in order to develop Language Interface Packs (LIPs) for indigenous languages throughout the world, allowing students to access all Microsoft software in their L1.

[13] https://qu.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qhapaq_p%27anqa
https://ay.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nayriri_u%C3%B1stawi
https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Noongarpedia
[14] https://www.google.com.pe/
[15] https://www.facebook.com/quechuarayku/?hc_ref=ARTlF3hwOvau0mlp4MyV0QagmGXapC750FCuhrAcjNksAozYG05GutiNhJkFUE9zvlk&fref=nf
https://twitter.com/GVAymara
https://twitter.com/jaqiaru?lang=en
https://twitter.com/hablemosquechua?lang=en
https://twitter.com/Charango_masi?lang=en

There are currently 75 LIPs available, including one in Quechua, though none have yet been developed in Australian languages.[16] A number of free keyboard apps have also been developed to allow for ease of typing in the complicated orthographies of many indigenous languages, including Yän[17], an Australian language keyboard that runs on iPads, and FirstVoices Keyboards[18], which is compatible with both Apple and Android technologies and operates in more than 100 languages spoken in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the US. An important, and well-funded project currently underway in Peru is the development of automatic speech recognition of Quechua, using Linux-based systems, started by Peruvian man, Luis Camacho Caballero, whose grandparents were L1 speakers of the language (Linux Foundation, 2016). With the support of the Linux Foundations Training Scholarship, Caballero hopes to preserve Quechua, and other languages indigenous to Peru, by linking them to computational systems (Linux Foundation, 2016). All of these technologies increase the visibility of the written forms of indigenous languages in Australia and Peru, and connect indigenous children's in-school development of literacy with their out-of-school lives, thus increasing the perceived utility of indigenous language literacy (Auld et al., 2012).

5.2 Multimodal resources and oral traditions

As well as the positive change in attitudes towards indigenous literacy that can be brought about by increasing the visibility of written language, new media technologies "make it easy to use a multiplicity of modes, and in particular the mode of image - still or moving - as well as other modes, such as music and sound" (Kress,

[16] https://support.office.com/en-us/article/Office-language-interface-pack-LIP-downloads-d63007c2-e8ae-41fd-8bfb-fce2857010e1?CorrelationId=f9aecc45-0bb3-413e-91dc-1fb7f27324ee&ui=en-US&rs=en-US&ad=US&ocmsassetID=HA001113350
[17] https://itunes.apple.com/au/app/yan/id683941172?mt=8
[18] http://www.firstvoices.com/en/apps

2003, p. 5), allowing for the successful incorporation of the oral and visual elements of indigenous languages and cultures into modern domains of use. As such, multimodal texts can be created and used within the classroom to allow for a truly bilingual and intercultural experience. In Australia, the Living Archive of Aboriginal Languages[19] houses a large collection of endangered literature in the languages of the NT, allowing them to be accessed, free of charge, across the country. An important feature of the Archive is that it allows the addition of audio versions of the texts, as well as supporting visuals. Australia's Remote Indigenous Media Organisations (RIMOs), such as PAW Media[20], create radio and video content in local indigenous languages, ranging from oral histories and animations to local news and feature length documentaries. In Peru, similar resources can be accessed on YouTube, which is the most popular medium through which to share videos in both Quechua and Aymara (Coronel-Molina, 2012). App based technology also provides valuable resources for use in education. 'NTLanguages – Anindilyakwa'[21] is a bilingual flash card language app developed by the Northern Territory Library, designed for use by both speakers of Anindilyakwa and of English. Importantly, the app includes video of traditional hand signs which form an essential part of the Anandilyakwa communication system, a feature that would be missed in traditional flash cards. Other Australian apps[22] have been developed to present indigenous stories, incorporating effective still or moving visuals and audio, both in indigenous

[19] http://livingarchive.cdu.edu.au/
[20] http://www.pawmedia.com.au/home
[21] https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/ntlanguages-anindilyakwa/id585478474?mt=8
[22] https://itunes.apple.com/au/app/warlu-song-australian-aboriginal-interactive-storybook/id660554154?mt=8
https://itunes.apple.com/au/app/ngurrara-australian-aboriginal-interactive-storybook/id660560818?mt=8
https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.indigital.storytelling&hl=en
https://itunes.apple.com/app/sharing-the-dreaming/id642267711?ign-mpt=uo%3D5

languages and English, as a way of continuing the oral traditions of indigenous cultures. The use of such multimodal resources that incorporate the traditional visual and oral learning styles of indigenous cultures increases indigenous student engagement in the education system.

New media technologies can also be used by students to create multimodal expressions of their indigenous identity, and to build a sense of pride in their language and culture. In particular, indigenous youth in both Australia and Peru are using mobile phone cameras and music mixing software, such as GarageBand, to create and share music videos (Kral, 2010; Brady et al, 2008). These include original songs performed in language, or bilingually with the dominant language, that celebrate their rich cultures, incorporating the visual elements of traditional dance and art[23]. In Australia, a large number of youth music videos also call out unacceptable social behaviours and promote healthy and responsible living[24]. Indigenous language renditions of pop songs are also popular amongst indigenous youth. The Quechua language has an especially large corpus of translated songs available on YouTube, including those sung by Quechua teenager, Renata Flores Rivera[25], whose cover of Michael Jackson's 'The Way You Make Me Feel' went viral in 2015. In creating these resources, indigenous students come to see their languages and cultures as having a "positive and constructive contribution to make to the world" (Street, 1997 p.371). Not only does this benefit L1 speakers of these languages, but it can also encourage indigenous people who have stopped using their

[23] https://ictv.com.au/video/item/4660
https://ictv.com.au/video/item/4761
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNXoXOnKfMg
[24] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u4g731MZnMY
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vp-qxTC33iM
[25] https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-QM2vahE4-IOAsLGCIecdw

traditional language, either due to forceful measures taken by governments to eradicate them or negative attitudes held towards their use, to learn them (Sallabank, 2012). Increasing the number of indigenous language speakers makes these languages more visible and means that there is a larger network of people who can push for the use of these languages within education.

5.3 Visibility of indigenous languages in non-indigenous society

In addition to the change in attitudes of indigenous people towards their languages, their presence within the new media domain also has an effect on the language attitudes held by non-indigenous society. One of the greatest challenges faced in the implementation of policies that support the use of minority languages is "convincing majority language speakers to accommodate such changes" (May, 2000, p. 378). The interactive and networkable nature of new media allows for the easy dissemination of resources, such as the music videos discussed above, bringing these languages "to the attention of a wider audience, and help[ing] to associate [them] with modernity" (Ferguson, 2006, p. 83). They also provide new opportunities for "learning about and interacting with other cultures", thereby "promoting social cohesion and peaceful coexistence" (Resta & Laferrière, 2015, p. 749). A recent example of an Australian indigenous language entering the public consciousness is the success of the 20 year-old Yolngu hip hop artist, Danzal Baker, on popular ABC radio station, Triple J. After uploading his debut track *Cloud* 9 onto the Triple J Unearthed website in May 2017, Baker Boy, as he is known, was awarded the Unearthed NIMA prize which saw him perform in Darwin at the National Indigenous Music Awards, alongside some of Australia's biggest names (Triple J, 2017). Throughout this song, Baker Boy celebrates his indigenous identity and comments on the discrimination face by Aboriginal Australians, rapping in both Yolgnu and English.

He has also garnered much attention from his second single *Marryuna*, which was released in October 2017. As indigenous languages become more common place in mainstream media and pop culture, dominant language-speakers will become more aware of the linguistic and cultural diversity that exists in their country and more accepting of the use of these languages within public spaces, creating an ideological space in which bilingual education can thrive.

5.4 Summary

Throughout both Australia and Peru, there is a growing presence of indigenous languages, both written and spoken, within the domain of new media. The language practices within this domain have a range of effects on the language ideologies held by both indigenous and non-indigenous members of society, which in turn influence the implementation of bilingual education. Given the ubiquitous nature of new media in the everyday lives of indigenous youth, the use of indigenous languages in their written forms within this domain increases the perceived utility of indigenous literacy and, as such, emphasises the importance of bilingual education. The multimodal features of these technologies permit the creation of educational resources that appropriately reflect the oral traditions of indigenous peoples and allow indigenous youth to create digital expressions of their cultures and identity. This not only engages students within the classroom, but also encourages indigenous people who are L1 speakers of the dominant language to have pride in their heritage and learn their traditional languages, thereby creating a larger community of speakers who can push for the use of these languages in education. As well as the effects that new media has on the language ideologies of indigenous communities, the sharing capabilities of these technologies help to increase the visibility of indigenous languages in broader society. The transformative effects this has on the

language ideologies of dominant language-speakers is particularly important for the successful implementation of bilingual education policies, considering negative attitudes of dominant language-speakers towards indigenous languages is one of the prime difficulties associated with the enactment such policies.

6. Conclusion

Australia and Peru, while differing in their levels of development, share similarities in their histories that have led to the subordination of their many indigenous languages in favour of English and Spanish. Despite the monolingual, standard-language cultures that have permeated these societies since European colonisation, high levels of linguistic diversity continue in both countries to this day. However, throughout their histories, indigenous students have experienced severe disadvantage within the education system in comparison to their non-indigenous peers, largely due to inappropriate teaching methods that favour the dominant language and culture over the indigenous L1 of these students. Today, both countries are signatories to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which supports the right of indigenous people to "establish and control their education systems providing education in their own languages" (art. 14.1) and to be supported in this endeavour by the State. Most countries have interpreted this to be a recommendation for bilingual education, in which both an indigenous language and the dominant language are used. Nevertheless, current language-in-education policy differs greatly between the two countries. In Peru, bilingual education is flourishing, supported by a policy of Intercultural Bilingual Education for all citizens. In contrast, only 5 officially bilingual programs exist in Australia, operating in spite of a strict English-only policy. The aim of this thesis was to examine the reasons for the disparity between these countries, and to suggest potential areas of improvement for Australia based on the Peruvian experience.

In order to conduct this analysis, the thesis followed the framework proposed by Spolsky, which conceptualises language policy as comprising of language ideologies, language practices, and language management. Each of these aspects of

language policy function within a number of non-hierarchical domains, such as the family, school, workplace, new media, and government. Additionally, Spolsky posits that language policy operates in an ecological relationship with any number of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. The analysis began with an exploration of the language management decisions made within the governmental domain in both Australia and Peru, highlighting the similarities and differences in the progression of indigenous education policies. The different outcomes of these management decisions were then further explained through an examination of the ecological relationship between indigenous demographics and language policy, as well as the interaction between government and workplace domain language management and the ideologies and practices of the family and school domains. This section presented a case study of the Peruvian policies of legitimation and institutionalisation of indigenous languages, two actions that are missing in the Australian context. Finally, the focus turned to the domain of new media, discussing the transformative effect the use of indigenous languages within this domain has on the language ideologies of both indigenous and dominant language-speaking members of society, and how this might influence the implementation of bilingual education in the future.

In the 1970s, both Australia and Peru attempted to combat educational discrimination through the implementation of bilingual programs which sought to teach indigenous students initially through their L1 before transitioning to the use of the dominant language. Over the coming decades, the two countries would follow similar trajectories, alternating between policies which saw indigenous languages as a problem to be overcome and those that viewed their use as a right afforded to indigenous peoples, if not a resource for the nation as a whole. By the end of the

1990s, the policy situations had started to diverge, establishing the foundations of the current states of bilingual education.

Despite the shared linguistic diversity within both countries, the demographics of their indigenous language speakers are rather disparate. Peru has higher total numbers of indigenous language speakers, which make up a greater percentage of its total population. Combined with the large number of indigenous language speakers within Metropolitan Lima, these factors create an environment that is more amenable to the creation and implementation of bilingual education policies than is possible in Australia. The focus on legitimation and institutionalisation within the Peruvian policy context also supports the implementation of bilingual education, as these management decisions increase the perceived utility of indigenous languages, and as such, emphasise their importance within the education system.

While language policy at the governmental domain differs greatly between the two countries, both Australia and Peru are currently experiencing an increase in the use of indigenous languages within the domain of new media. Not only does this increase the visibility and perceived utility of indigenous literacy, but these technologies also allow for the creation of resources that are both linguistically and culturally relevant to indigenous students, and which provide opportunities for cultural expression. Music videos, for both original songs and covers, are a particularly popular mode of cultural expression in both countries, and one which is starting to receive more attention within non-indigenous society. All these uses help to improve attitudes towards indigenous languages, thereby creating ideological space for the development of bilingual education policies.

It is clear that there are a number of factors that have led to Peru's relative success in the implementation of bilingual education, and that Australia must learn from this example if it is to honour its commitment to indigenous rights as a signatory of the UN Declaration. While it is unlikely that the Australian situation will improve in the near future, this thesis suggests that there are a few preliminary indications of changing ideologies that are more accepting of indigenous languages and which could create space for the development of bilingual programs in the future. In the domain of government, the current Australian Curriculum emphasises indigenous languages and cultures as a cross-curriculum priority, and the NSW Parliament has recently passed the first Aboriginal Languages Bill. Additionally, indigenous languages have made symbolic appearances at a couple of parliamentary events. Nevertheless, the exact effects these actions may have on the status of indigenous languages within Australia, and on their place within the education system, remains to be seen. Perhaps more relevant to the current Australian situation is the increased use of indigenous languages within the new media domain, which may in fact prove to be a driving force in the creation of new policies that would recognise and accept the use of indigenous languages within the public sphere.

References

Andrien, K. J. (2011). The Bourbon Reforms, Independence, and the Spread of Quechua and Aymara. In P. P. Heggarty, A (Ed.), *History and Languages in the Andes*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Constitución Política del Perú, (1979).

Auld, G., Snyder, I., & Henderson, M. (2012). Using mobile phones as placed resources for literacy learning in a remote indigenous community in Australia. *Language and Education, 26*(4), 279-296.

Australia. Department of Employment, E. a. T. (1991). *Australia's language: The Australian language and literacy policy* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Australia. Parliament. House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, & Kerr, D. J. C. (1992). *Language and culture: a matter of survival: report of the inquiry into Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander language maintenance*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2012). 2071.0 - Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census. Retrieved October 2017 http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2016). 4714.0 - National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey, 2014-15. Retrieved September 2017 http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4714.0~2014-15~Main%20Features~Population%20context~2

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017a). 2071.0 - Census of Population and Housing: Reflecting Australia - Stories from the Census, 2016. Retrieved September 2017 http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2071.0~2016~Main%20Features~Aboriginal%20and%20Torres%20Strait%20Islander%20Population%20Data%20Summary~10

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017b). 3101.0 - Australian Demographic Statistics, Mar 2017. Retrieved September 2017 http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/mf/3101.0

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017a). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures. Retrieved from https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/cross-curriculum-priorities/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-histories-and-cultures/

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017b). Framework for Aboriginal Languages and Torres Strait Islander Languages. Retrieved from https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/languages/framework-for-aboriginal-languages-and-torres-strait-islander-languages/

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017c). Students for whom EAL/D. Retrieved from https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/resources/student-diversity/students-for-whom-eald/

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (2017). AUSTLANG: Australian Indigenous Languages Database. Retrieved September 2017 http://austlang.aiatsis.gov.au

Batchelor Institute. (2017). History. *Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education.* Retrieved from https://www.batchelor.edu.au/about/history/

Benson, C. J. (2010). Real and potential benefits of bilingual programs in developing countries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5*(6), 303-317.

Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology, 65*(4), 229-235.

Brady, F., Dyson, L. E., & Asela, T. (2008). *Indigenous adoption of mobile phones and oral culture.* Paper presented at the Cultural Attitudes Towards Communication and Technology, Murdoch University, Australia.

Burridge, N., & Chodkiewicz, A. (2012). An Historical Overview of Aboriginal Education Policies in the Australian Context. In N. Burridge, F. Whalan, & K. Vaughan (Eds.), *Indigenous Education: A Learning Journey for Teachers, Schools and Communities* (pp. 11-21). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.

Cadzow, A. (2007). *A NSW Aboriginal Education Timeline 1788-2007*. Sydney: Board of Studies NSW.

Cenoz, J., Nunes, P., Riganti, P., Onofri, L., Puzzo, B., & Sachdeva, R. Benefits of linguistic diversity and multilingualism. *Sustainable Development in a Diverse World (SUS. DIV) position paper, Research Task, 1*.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). Language policy in Peru: a historical overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*(77), 11-34.

Collins, B. (1999). *Learning Lessons. An independent review of Indigenous education in the Northern Territory*. Darwin: Northern Territory Department of Education.

Collyns, D. (2016, December 14). Peru airs news in Quechua, indigenous language of the Inca empire, for first time. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from www.theguardian.com/world/2016/dec/14/peru-nuqanchik-quechua-broadcast-inca-empire

Commonwealth of Australia. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. (2017). *Closing the Gap: Prime Minister's Report*.

Commonwealth of Australia. Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Office for the Arts. (2013). Culture and Closing the Gap. Retrieved from http://iaha.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/000214_cultureclosinggap.pdf

Ley 21156: Ley que reconoce el quechua como lengua oficial de la República, (1975).

Ley 27818 para la educación bilingüe intercultural (2002).

Ley 28044: Ley general de educación, (2003).

Constitución Política del Perú, (1993).

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*: Cambridge University Press.

Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2012). New functional domains of Quechua and Aymara: Mass media and social media. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (pp. 278-300). New York: Routledge.

Cummins, J. (1978). Bilingualism and the development of metalinguistic awareness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 9*(2), 131-149.

Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum, 19*, 15-20.

Devlin, B. (2005). *Two-way learning in the NT: Some research-based recommendations*. Darwin: Northern Territory Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Devlin, B. (2017a). A Glimmer of Possibility. In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 11-26). Singapore: Springer.

Devlin, B. (2017b). Government Support for NT Bilingual Education after 1950: A Longer Timeline. *Friends of Bilingual Learning.* Retrieved from https://www.fobl.net.au/index.php/au-BU/history

Devlin, B. (2017c). Policy Change in 2008: Evidence-Based or a Knee-Jerk Response? In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 203-218). Singapore: Springer.

Devlin, B., Disbray, S., & Devlin, N. (2017). A Thematic History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory. In B. C. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. R. F. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 1-10). Singapore: Springer.

Disbray, S. (2013). *At benchmark? Evaluating the Northern Territory bilingual education program*. Paper presented at the 44th Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.

Disbray, S. (2017a). Policy and Practice Now. In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northen Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 237-246). Singapore: Springer.

Disbray, S. (2017b, 27 July). Why more schools need to teach bilingual education to Indigenous children. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from http://www.sbs.com.au/nitv/article/2017/06/16/why-more-schools-need-teach-bilingual-education-indigenous-children

Disbray, S., & Devlin, B. (2017). Consolidation, Power Through Leadership and Pedagogy, and the Rise of Accountability, 1980-1998. In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 101-112).

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language Planning and Education*. Edingburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fishman, J. A. (2006). *DO NOT Leave Your Languages Alone: The Hidden Status Agendas Within Corpus Planning in Language Policy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ganter, R. (2016). German Missionaries in Australia - a web-directory of intercultural encounters. Retrieved from http://missionaries.griffith.edu.au/introduction

García, M. E. (2005). *Making Indigenous Citizens: Identities, Education, and Multicultural Development in Peru*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Godenzzi, J. C. (1997). Literacy and modernization among the Quechua speaking population of Peru. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (pp. 237-250). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gordon, M. (2016). Closing the gap and learning the language. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.smh.com.au/comment/turnbulls-address-to-parliament-mark-of-respect-for-ngunawals-rediscovery-of-collective-soul-20160212-gmsanf.html

Greene, S. (2009). *Customizing Indigeneity: Paths to a Visionary Politics in Peru*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Grin, F. (2002). Using language economics and education economics in language education policy. *Conseil de l'Europe*.

Groff, C. (2017). Language and language-in-education planning in multilingual India: a minoritized language perspective. *Language Policy, 16*(2), 135-164. doi:10.1007/s10993-015-9397-4

Hall, N. (2017). Forty Years on: Seeking a Way for the Future - Dhawal'yurr Yuwalkku. Reflections on Bilingual Education at Shepherdson College, Galiwin'ku. In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory: People, Programs and Policies* (pp. 307-324). Singapore: Springer.

Harris, T. (1990). *'Talking is not enough': A review of the education of traditionally oriented Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory*. Darwin: The Office of the Minister for Education, the Arts and Cultural Affairs. Northern Territory.

Hornberger, N. H. (1987). Bilingual education success, but policy failure. *Language in Society, 16*(02), 205-226.
Hornberger, N. H. (1988). *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
Hornberger, N. H. (1997a). Language planning from the bottom up. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (pp. 357-366). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Hornberger, N. H. (1997b). Quechua literacy and empowerment in Peru. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (pp. 215-236). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual Education Policy and Practice in the Andes: Ideological Paradox and Intercultural Possibility. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 31*(2), 173-201.
Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 605-609.
Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Voice and biliteracy in indigenous language revitalization: Contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Māori contexts. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 5*(4), 277-292.
Hornberger, N. H. (2009). Multilingual education policy and practice: Ten certainties (grounded in Indigenous experience). *Language Teaching, 42*(02), 197-211.
House of Representatives. (2005). Control and conduct of debate. In I. C. Harris (Ed.), House of Representatives Practice (5th Edition). Canberra: Department of the House of Representatives. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/House_of_Representatives/Powers_practice_and_procedure/practice/chapter14.
Howard, R. (2011). The Role of the State in Guiding the Fate of the Quechua Language. In P. P. Heggarty, A (Ed.), *History and Language in the Andes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hynsjö, D., & Damon, A. (2016). Bilingual education in Peru: Evidence on how Quechua-medium education affects indigenous children's academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review, 53*, 116-132. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.05.006
Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. (2015). Día Mundial de la Población. Retrieved from http://www.inei.gob.pe/media/MenuRecursivo/publicaciones_digitales/Est/Lib1251/Libro.pdf
Keating, P. (1992, 10 December). Redfern Speech: Year for the World's Indigenous People. Retrieved from https://antar.org.au/sites/default/files/paul_keating_speech_transcript.pdf
King, K. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Quechua as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 177-196.
Klarén, P. F. (2000). *Peru: Society and Nationhood in the Andes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kormi-Nouri, R., Shojaei, R.-S., Moniri, S., Gholami, A.-R., Moradi, A.-R., Akbari-Zardkhaneh, S., & Nilsson, L.-G. (2008). The effect of childhood bilingualism on episodic and semantic memory tasks. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49*, 93-109.
Kral, I. (2010). Plugged in: Remote australian Indigenous Youth and Digital Culture. *Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Working Paper, 69*.
Kral, I., & Schwab, R. G. (2012). *Learning spaces: youth, literacy and new media in remote Indigenous Australia*. Canberra: ANU E Press.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.
Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London: Routledge.
Kretschmann, G. C. (1988). Bilingual program - the Aurukun experience: Where from? Where to? *Aboriginal Children at School, 16*(4), 21-28.
Lamb, S., & Glover, S. (2014). Educational disadvantage and regional and rural schools.
Le Lievre, K. (2017). Advance Australia Fair translated into Ngunawal for first time, sung at Parliament House. *The Canberra Times*. Retrieved from http://www.canberratimes.com.au/act-news/advance-australia-fair-translated-into-ngunawal-for-the-first-time-sung-at-parliament-house-20170915-gyiknn.html
Leikin, M. (2012). The effect of bilingualism on creativity: Developmental and educational perspectives *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(4), 431-447.
Linux Foundation. (2016). 2016 LiFT Scholarship winner Luis Camacho Caballero: Preserving Amazon languages with Linux. Retrieved from https://www.linuxfoundation.org/blog/2016-lift-scholarship-winner-luis-camacho-caballero-preserving-amazon-languages-with-linux/
Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Lo Bianco, J., & Freebody, P. (2001). *Australian literacies: Informing national policy on literacy education*: ERIC.
López, L. E. (2009). Reaching the unreached: indigenous intercultural bilingual education in Latin America. *Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report*.
LT Media Lab. (2012). Earthducation Expedition 4: Indigenous Cultures. Retrieved from http://lt.umn.edu/earthducation/expedition4/indigenous-cultures/
Martin-Jones, M. (2015). Classroom Discourse Analysis as a Lens on Language-in-Education Policy Processes. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide* (pp. 94-106). Malden: Wiley.
Martínez, G. V., & Franco, B. (2015). Educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador y Perú. *Revista Digital de Historia de la Educación, 18*, 148-159.
Matras, Y. (2013). Languages in contact in a world marked by change and mobility. *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée, 18*(2), 7-13.
May, S. (2000). Accommodating and resisting minority language policy: The case of Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(2), 101-128.
May, S. (2006). Language Policy and Minority Rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 255-272). Oxford: Blackwell.
Mayer, E. (2017). *Clitics on the Move: Variation in Time and Space* (Vol. 14). Berlin: De Gruyter.
Mehitso, P., & Marsh, D. (2011). Approaching the economic, cognitive and health benefits of bilingualism: Fuel for CLIL. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. M. Sierra, & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and Foreign Language Integrated Learning: Contributions to Multilingualism in European Contexts* (pp. 21-47). Bern: Peter Lang.
Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardisation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 5*(4), 530-555.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan 2010-2014, (2010).
Ley 29735: Ley que regla el uso, preservación, desarollo, recuperación, fomento y difusión de las lenguas originarias del Perú (2011a).
Ley 29785: Ley del derecho a la consulta previa a los pueblos indígenas u originarios, reconocido en el Convenio 169 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo (OIT), (2011b).
Política Nacional de Lenguas Originarias, Tradición Oral e Interculturalidad, (2017).

Ministerio de Educación. (2013). *Documento Nacional de Lenguas originarias del Perú* Retrieved from http://www2.minedu.gob.pe/filesogecop/DNL-version%20final%20WEB.pdf
Plan Nacional de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe al 2021, (2016).
Ministerio de Educación. (2017). Lenguas Originarias del Perú. Retrieved from http://www.minedu.gob.pe/campanias/lenguas-originarias-del-peru.php
Morais, J. (2017). Literacy and democracy. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*.
Northern Territory Government Department of Education. (2015). *A share in the future: Indigenous Education Strategy 2015-2024*.
Northern Territory Government Department of Tourism and Culture. (2017). Cyclone Tracy. Retrieved from https://dtc.nt.gov.au/arts-and-museums/northern-territory-library/nt-history/cyclone-tracy
Northern Territory. Department of Employment, E. a. T. (2006). *Indigenous education strategic plan 2006-2009*. Retrieved from
Ong, W. J. (2002). *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge.
Ortiz, E. R. (2004). Las primeras escuelas normales en el Perú. *Rhela, 6*, 57-86.
Panizo Jansana, A. (2017, 19 July). *Roundtable discussion between Peru and Mexico about Language Policies.* Paper presented at the Diplomatic Academy of Perú, Lima.
Aboriginal Languages Bill: An Act relating to Aboriginal languages, (2017).
Patrinos, H. A., & Velez, E. (2009). Costs and benefits of bilingual education in Guatemala: A partial analysis. *International Journal of Educational Development, 29*(6), 594-598.
Pearson, N. (2016). Indigenous tongues deserve recognition as official languages. *The Weekend Australian*. Retrieved from http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/noel-pearson/indigenous-tongues-deserve-recognition-as-official-languages/news-story/f28675bf74264f43a4b1f7113123a9bc
Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in Language Policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 60-76). Oxford: Blackwell.
Pike, F. B. (1967). *The Modern History of Peru*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
Resta, P., & Laferrière, T. (2015). Digital equity and intercultural education. *Education and Information Technologies, 20*, 743-756.
Ricento, T. (2006). Language Policy: Theory and Practice - An Introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 10-23). Oxford: Blackwell.
Rivera, A. C., & Leyva, M. Z. (2004). *Educación Indígena en al Perú*. Lima: Instituto Internacional para la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe.
Roberts, C. A. (1994). Transferring literacy skills from L1 to L2: From theory to practice. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 13*, 209-221.
Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15-34. doi:10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464
Sallabank, J. (2012). Diversity and language policy for endangered languages. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp. 100-123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sayers, B. J. (1982). Aurukun Children's Speech: Language History and Implications for Bilingual Education. In G. R. McKay & B. A. Sommer (Eds.), *Applications of Linguistics to Australian Aboriginal Contexts* (pp. 46-56). Parkville: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.
Ščigulinská, J. (2015). Oral tradition in Native American and Australian aboriginal culture. In Z. Straková (Ed.), *English Matters VI (a collection of papers)*. Prešove: Prešovská Univerzita

Scrymgour, M. (2008). Education restructure includes greater emphasis on english [Press release]. Retrieved from http://newsroom.nt.gov.au/mediaRelease/4656
SIL International. (2017). Peru: History. Retrieved from http://www.peru.sil.org/about/history
Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2017). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twentieth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com.
Simpson, J., Caffery, J., & McConvell, P. (2009). *Gaps in Australia's indigenous language policy: Dismantling bilingual education in the Northern Territory* (Vol. 24). Canberra.
Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Spolsky, B. (2012a). Family language policy - the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(1), 3-11.
Spolsky, B. (2012b). What is language policy? In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stolarick, K., & Florida, R. (2006). Creativity, connections and innovation: A study of linkages in the Montréal region. *Environment and Planning, 38*(10), 1799-1817.
Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical Theory in Language Policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 42-59). Oxford: Blackwell.
Triple J. (2017). Meet Baker Boy, the deadly winner of our Unearthed NIMAs comp. Retrieved from http://www.abc.net.au/triplej/news/musicnews/meet-baker-boy-the-deadly-winner-of-our-unearthed-nimas-comp/8702304
United Nations. (1993). International Decade of the World's Indigenous People. *United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 48*(163).
United Nations. (2008). *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.
United Nations. (2017). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2017*. New York: United Nations.
Vaarzon-Morel, P., & Wafer, J. (2017). 'Bilingual Time' at Willowra: The Beginnings of a Community-Initiated Program, 1976-1977. In B. Devlin, S. Disbray, & N. Devlin (Eds.), *History of Bilingual Education in the Northern Territory* (pp. 35-48). Singapore: Springer.
Vexler, I. (2015). Normalización de lenguas originarias. https://diariocorreo.pe/opinion/normalizacion-de-lenguas-originarias-600628/
Walker, C. F. (1999). *Smoldering Ashes: Cuzco and the Creation of Republican Peru, 1780-1840*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Wilson, B. (2014). *A share in the future: Review of Indigenous Education in the Northern Territory*: Education Business.