25

Growing Up in Multilingual Societies: Violations of Linguistic Human Rights in Education

Ajit K. Mohanty & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

PROOF

25.1 Introduction

Presence of multiple languages in different societies and contexts is an increasingly global phenomenon. However, simple presence of languages does not make a society multilingual. Many societies remain dominantly monolingual despite multiplicity of languages which are used as separate entities with impermeable boundaries between them. Gogolin (1997: 41) has written about 'monolingual habitus' as 'the deep-seated habit of assuming monolingualism as the norm'. Languages are often associated with specific communities, ethnic groups, regions or nations, and this association leads to promotion of a single dominant language even when other languages are present in the milieu. Those who can and do use multiple languages in such contexts are usually parallel users of the languages with clear borders between them. Heller (1999) describes such situations as 'parallel monolingualism'. Similarly, Li (2011) speaks of use of 'one language at a time' in societies characterised by presence of many languages. In dominant monolingual societies, use of multiple languages in the same communicative context may be uncommon. Such use is likely to be viewed as a deviation from a relatively rigid context specificity of languages and as a transgression of the boundaries between them. The situation can be described as a multiglossia, where each language has its own domain.

In contrast, growing up in societies where multilingualism is the norm involves moving between languages naturally and spontaneously as one moves between people and contexts of use (Mohanty 2019). Languages in

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 579

multilingual societies may be viewed as distinct entities, but the boundaries remain fluid. Moving across such boundaries is usually not treated as infringements. This is partly because the presence of languages in these societies as well as in the minds of the language users is holistic and integrated. The usual distinctions between being a monolingual, bilingual, trilingual and multilingual may be matters of formal learning of languages as sets of monolingual skills, but they do not reflect the totality of the communicative repertoire of the common language user in multilingual societies where 'languages are experienced as a network or a totality of communicative acts' (Mohanty 2019: 2). Languages are also not used in isolation but as a composite set of tools complementing each other for making such communicative acts more effective. A multilingual's competence in using different languages as communicative tools is not static across domains of use since such use is guided by the functional significance of a preferred language in a given context of communication. As Skutnabb-Kangas (1984) suggested in her early attempt at conceptualising bilingualism, free use of languages and switching between them are two functional aspects of communication in multilingual societies. As such, multilingualism is not to be viewed as a sum of specific (and, often, normative) levels of competencies in societies and individuals in different languages, but as holistic acts of communication involving functionally effective use of more than one language in a variety of sociolinguistic contexts. Mohanty (2019: 17) addresses the core aspects of multilingualism in defining it as '[t]he ability of communities or persons to meet the communicative requirements of themselves and their society in normal daily life in two or more languages in their interaction with speakers of any of these languages'. This can be compared with a part of Skutnabb-Kangas' (1984: 90) definition of bilingualism as an educational goal: 'A bilingual speaker is someone who is able to function in two (or more) languages, either in monolingual or bilingual communities, in accordance with the sociocultural demands made on an individual's communicative and cognitive competence *by these communities or by the individual herself*' (emphasis added).

Thus, multilingualism is not a sum of (native-like) competences in multiple languages; it is a holistic use of languages for functionally effective communication in multilingual societies. Children grow up developing socially appropriate communicative skills as a lifestyle in multilingual societies and, as Skutnabb-Kangas (2019a: xiii) observes, such patterns of development can be characterised as 'multilingualism as a first language' (MFL).

In all societies children are socialised to use language(s) socially appropriately. The processes of such socialisation necessarily involve use of language (s) by the adults and peers to shape children's acquisition of the norms of communication in multilingual contexts. Languages, thus, are both objects and instruments of socialisation. However, the degree to which a child's

PROOF

early experience fosters awareness of multilingual norms of communication and openness to multiple languages differs across sociolinguistic contexts in diverse societies which vary on a continuum between monolingualism and multilingualism. In all societies children's early sociolinguistic experiences are also divergent across hierarchies of social class and languages as well as gender and other social conditions.

While there are broad differences across societies in the extent to which the processes of early language socialisation promote monolingual or multilingual ideologies, there are also notable variations within each society in respect of how languages and their speakers are placed vis-à-vis other languages, but all societies organise languages hierarchically. Languages of the Indigenous/Tribal, Minority and Minoritized (ITM) communities all over the world are invariably subjected to the processes of discrimination and *stigmatisation*, together with a relative *glorification* of more dominant languages. Usually one language, such as a colonial/'international' language like English or a 'national' or official language has a dominant presence at the top of the hierarchy. There are mostly two major power cleavages – one between the most dominant or powerful language and the major national/regional languages, and the other between these latter languages and the ITM languages. Languages on the lower rungs of the hierarchy are constantly under pressure from the more powerful languages, and ITM languages are under constant threat of displacement from significant domains of use in the society, including education. This sociolinguistic 'double divide' (Mohanty 2010, 2019) affects the nature of multilingualism in any society. These processes (*stigmatisation*, *glorification*) and their results are then *rationalised* in a hegemonic way, always to the benefit of those higher up in the linguistic and social hierarchies (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 196).

In this chapter, we discuss how children grow up in multilingual societies moving between languages and sociolinguistic contexts of their use and how they go through the developmental processes of multilingual socialisation acquiring MFL. This involves not so much learning of the languages as separate systems as learning multilingualism as the norm of communication. Our examples are taken from Indian contexts, but the basic processes of development of multilingualism are similar across all linguistically diverse societies which do not suffer from a monolingual habitus. This includes, for instance, most African countries. The developmental processes of childhood multilingualism in multilingual societies are contrasted with those in relatively monolingual ones. The role of early formal educational practices in sustenance of the societal multilingual orientation is discussed. We discuss how schools as social power instruments perpetuate inequality and discrimination and violate linguistic human rights (LHRs) of children. We show that social practices and State (and local) policies in education across the world often promote linguistic homogenisation. Likewise, they promote loss of childhood multilingualism, particularly among the ITM communities, often leading to linguistic genocide in education, using the

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 581

definitions of genocide in the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). In conclusion, the chapter reflects on the meaning and implications of growing up in a multilingual world, and how children's LHRs, provided that they are implemented and do not only stay on paper, can support the development and maintenance (and also revitalisation) of both multilingualism and endangered languages.

25.2 Growing Up in Multilingual Societies

Multilingualism is not just the presence of many languages in a society; it is how these languages are interrelated both in their sociolinguistic contexts and in the minds of the language users. Languages in multilingual societies are characterised by two striking features. The boundaries between the languages remain fluid with these languages extending into each other in their social use; often, it is difficult to say where one language ends and another begins. Further, multiple languages used in specific domains complement each other for effective communication, and communicative functions in social domains are usually shared by multiple languages. 'Complementarity of languages and their functions across different domains makes living with many languages easier and it forms a major aspect of early language socialisation' (Mohanty 2019: 23). In this section, we describe how children in multilingual societies gradually move from a relatively less complex home domain to wider social contexts and learn to negotiate multiple languages. Our studies show that children do so by not necessarily acquiring high competence in multiple languages, but by progressively sharing the norms for socially appropriate communication in multilingual contexts.

PROOF

25.2.1 Moving from Home Language to Many Languages

Children learn to communicate using the language(s) they encounter in their sociocultural context. In multilingual societies children encounter 'concentric layers of societal multilingualism' (Mohanty 2006: 263) quite early in development. Fluid layers of languages are nested into each other as one moves from the zone of immediate family and neighbourhood communication to the wider local and regional areas of communication and to more complex multilingual zones such as a marketplace. The languages form a network of communication for the common person as she learns to engage effectively in multilingual communication in routine daily life activities. In many cases (except in families where parents have different first languages and both use their own languages), the home environment of children can be dominantly but not exclusively monolingual.

As a child widens her domains of social interaction she moves into zones of other languages as part of her multilingual exposure. Our examples here

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 582

come from Kui-speaking Kond tribal communities in Odisha (India). Members of the family typically use a particular variety of Kui, often code-mixed with words or expressions borrowed from other languages present in the wider social context. The adults are multilinguals and use Odia, the dominant contact language in the region, in their daily life routine interactions with Odia-speaking non-tribals, many of whom also have passive understanding of Kui. Hindi, Telugu and other languages are also contact languages that are present particularly in the local shops, weekly markets, banks and Government offices. Occasionally, some words from Hindi or English or other languages with which the community has contact (either through visitors to the local weekly markets or through television and radio programmes) also form part of the code-mixed Kui. Many words borrowed from Odia, with some minor modifications, are used as part of regular Kui vocabulary. For example, the Odia word *hāti* (elephant) is used as *āti*. Some common English words such as *ball*, *bus* which are often used by Odia speakers have also become a part of Kui vocabulary. As soon as children are able to move outside their home, between 2 to 3 years of age, they come in greater contact with Odia spoken by adults and children from non-tribal Odia settlements adjacent to the Kond villages. Gradually children accompany their parents to local shops and weekly, markets which are linguistically more heterogeneous domains of interaction with two to three other languages, besides Kui and Odia, used by the vendors and some of the commercial traders who visit regularly. Visits to the local churches by the Christian families or to the local Hindu and tribal places of worship by the non-Christian families also widen the communicative network of children through exposure to languages like English (particularly for the churchgoers; the Bible was translated into Kui and printed in Odia script as early as 1850, and religious discourses and other domains of communicative activities in the local Churches use many English terms and expressions), Hindi, Odia and Sanskrit (used in prayers in local temples). Children in the tribal areas and other rural settings grow up with gradual exposure to multiple languages in different domains of their communication. The urban areas are distinctly more heterogeneous linguistic areas, with communities from different parts of the country in mutual contact. Thus, children in most parts of India grow up as multilinguals. They learn to live with and communicate effectively in multiple languages in their daily life interactions with other contact groups from a variety of language communities. With some exceptions, these children may not show high levels of proficiency in the languages other than their home language(s), but they show age-appropriate skills in using multiple languages in socially appropriate ways in their communication.

However, children's multilingualism and their proficiency in the mother tongue are affected by the hierarchical organisation of languages in the society, state policies of discrimination, and monolingual school practices. As a result, development of children's linguistic resources and

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 583

multilingualism that they bring to school are adversely affected by formal education that denies them LHRs.

As we have noted children's communicative development happens at two levels. Their sphere of exposure to varieties of languages in multilingual societies progressively widens as they acquire varying degrees of skills in language use ranging from development of age-appropriate competence in the language(s) of their family and immediate neighbourhood to functional proficiency in multiple languages in their society. At a second level, they learn to communicate socially appropriately in the multilingual environment that they encounter in their daily routine life. In the next section, we describe how children proceed through this second level of development in multilingual socialisation.

25.2.2 Multilingual Socialisation: Stage and Strategies

Acquisition of language(s) involves socialisation of children in their family, community and sociocultural context to use language(s) to communicate in a culturally appropriate manner. The processes of such socialisation by the adults, peers and others in the family and in the neighbourhood involve use of language(s) for development of children's language(s) and also their understanding of the principles for socially appropriate use of these language(s) in communication. 'While proper use of language must reflect social parameters, language also serves as a powerful medium through which family and others seek to socialise the child. Thus, language is both a medium and a product of socialisation' (Mohanty et al. 1999: 126).

Language socialisation is defined as the process of 'socialisation through language and socialisation to use language' (Ochs 1986:2). Processes and goals of language socialisation vary across cultures. Cultures may differ in socialisation strategies and in relative functional emphases such as social- and person-orientation, object exploration and control of child's actions through the use of language. But language socialisation practices in different sociocultural contexts do share some common goals of developing understanding of rules of social communication, orienting children to status- and role-appropriate use of language, setting stylistic preferences and functional priorities in the use of language in social interactions, transmitting values and affect, controlling children's actions, providing exposure and practice in socially appropriate use of language and development of metacommunicative awareness (Mohanty 1994a; Mohanty et al. 1999).

Multilingual societies are characterised by grassroots levels of multilingualism and functional allocation of languages into domains of daily life activities. As contexts and interlocutors vary in their sociolinguistic characteristics, learning to communicate appropriately requires attention to and awareness of this diversity and of the underlying social norms. Multilingual socialisation involves development of awareness of language variations, differentiation of languages in terms of their functions and a hierarchy of

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 584

preferences in patterns of language use in diverse sociolinguistic domains of use. As Mohanty et al. (1999) point out, in addition to the broader processes of language socialisation, multilingual socialisation involves the following developmental tasks:

(1) awareness of language variations across sociolinguistic contexts;
(2) domain-appropriate hierarchy of preferences for use of languages;
(3) functional allocation of languages in different domains of communication;
(4) understanding and use of rules for appropriate code-switching and code-mixing in different contexts; and
(5) sharing and using appropriately the social norms (such as politeness rules, status appropriate use of language) of multilingual communication.

Children in multilingual environments may develop some competence in multiple languages as they go through the processes of multilingual socialisation. However, learning aspects of the languages per se and learning the social competences listed above as part of language socialisation must be viewed as different (though overlapping) processes. Multilingual socialisation is not learning of languages as such, but understanding how these languages are socially interrelated and projected into the real world of many languages. Differentiation of languages and codes into specific domains and hierarchical layers of communication also have pragmatic functions, since use of any incongruent code is problematic and likely to be viewed as socially unacceptable. Pragmatic knowledge of context-appropriate choice of languages is an essential element of language socialisation in multilingual societies. Multilingual socialisation is more about learning multilingualism as a first language than learning multiple languages (Mohanty 2019).

A number of studies on multilingual socialisation were conducted by Mohanty and his students (Bujorbarua 2006; Mohanty 1994a; Mohanty et al. 1999) among 2- to 9-year-old children from different regions of India (multilingual campus of the GB Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Uttarakhand; multilingual contact areas of Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh; migrant non-Odia families living in Cuttack city of Odisha; Assamese families in Delhi; and middle-class Assamese families in multilingual contact areas in Guwahati, Assam) with diverse levels of linguistic heterogeneity. These studies show that multilingual socialisation involves development of social and communicative skills necessary for competent functioning in multilingual contexts regardless of children's personal competence in the use of the languages in their milieu. Children do not usually develop any appreciable or age-appropriate monolingual-like competence in these languages, but they progressively develop skills necessary for functioning effectively in their multilingual context. They show gradual differentiation of languages in the milieu, moving from early undifferentiated perception of languages to broader differentiation. Such differentiation of

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 585

languages and contexts of use is necessary for children to learn to communicate socially appropriately. The studies show that, by about 9 years of age, most children have developed an understanding of the hierarchical positioning of languages in the society and display awareness of the sociolinguistic hierarchy which makes some languages more prestigious and preferred over others in specific contexts of use. For example, most 9-year-olds in India, regardless of their own experience and language of schooling, show some awareness that English is a more prestigious language and a preferred language of schooling than the regional languages and other mother tongues. Our analysis shows that Indian children go through three broad developmental periods in their multilingual socialisation – a period of language differentiation, a period of social awareness of languages, and a period of competent multilingual functioning. While learning to live with many languages does continue through life-span development, each of the early periods of development has a major focus on and development of a specific aspect of multilingual socialisation. Each period is further divided into two stages (Mohanty et al. 1999).

The Period of Language Differentiation

This period is characterised by development of awareness of differences between languages based on regularity of their occurrence in specific communicative contexts as well as a rote-level knowledge of languages. The first stage of emergence of language differentiation begins quite early (by about 2 years of age) with the child's recognition of the existence of different languages (e.g., TV programmes in different language-specific channels, specific visitors or persons in the neighbourhood who use different languages), awareness of different labels/names (in different languages) for familiar objects and also differences in modes of expression. Children's ability to differentiate languages develops earlier than their ability to consistently name the languages in their surroundings.

Children move beyond simple awareness and naming of languages during the second stage of this period of language differentiation; they develop some understanding of how the languages are differentiated. They respond to various languages as different from each other and begin to follow the social conformity norm of responding in a language one is spoken to. For example, Chotu, a 3 years and 10 months old child in our study (Mohanty et al. 1999) tries to correct his mother's Punjabi to Hindi to make it more appropriate for the third person (Hindi speaker) being spoken to.

Mother: (in Punjabi) *Teri nā ki hai?* (What's your name?)
Chotu: (in Hindi) *Nām kyā hai, ye pucho.* (What's the name? Ask like this.)

Sometimes, lacking the required competence in using another language appropriately, children try to follow this norm by making some attempt in

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 586

their communication to bring in the language of interlocutors from different language communities. The implicit social norms requiring a speaker to try and accommodate to the language of the interlocutor is quite typical of the multilingual societies contrasted with dominant monolingualism ones. Studies in the South African context also show similar fine-tuned development of an awareness that a multilingual person tries to use the language of her interlocutor in a conversation; the accommodation is from the speaker towards the interlocutor, and the speaker does not insist on using her language preference in conversations.

The Period of Social Awareness of Languages

The second period of multilingual socialisation usually begins around the age of 4 when children show greater appreciation of the norms of multilingual communication and social practices associated with sociocultural and contextual differentiation of languages. They begin to understand that use of a certain language may be appropriate in some contexts but not in others.

The first stage in this period shows emergence of social awareness of context-appropriate use of multiple languages and recognition of language variations across different domains and speakers. During this stage, children begin to understand the need for appropriate choice among languages and try to speak differently in the presence of speakers of different languages. For example, a Tamil child Aditya (4 years 3 months) talks to his mother in Tamil, but tries to speak in 'broken' Odia to the milkman (who is an Odia speaker) and, when probed, he says that it is not 'right' to speak in Tamil to the Odia milkman. However, Aditya cannot say why it is not right. He is also aware that Odia is spoken in his neighbourhood, Tamil in his home and English in his school.

During the next stage in the period of social awareness of languages, children begin to understand that languages have different social roles and contextual appropriateness. For example, children in this stage understand the politeness norms that the home language may not be appropriate for use with a visitor who speaks a different language. Even when they do not know the language of another person in a social context, they show clear awareness of the need to use that language or, at least, a language different from home language. A 5 year 3 months old Bengali child Teeya, living in an Odia-majority city in Odisha, speaks in Bengali with her parents but attempts to change to Hindi (not Odia) in presence of visitors from other language communities (regardless of their language background) and, sometimes, seeks to obtain social support from other family members for communication in a different language. Even with little or no competence in other languages, children at this stage show context-sensitivity in their own choice of languages and in attempting code-switching for enhancement of communicative effectiveness. Children's understanding of the social role of languages in multilingual contexts shows that they have a

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 587

broad appreciation of the need for their own speech acts to be communicative. It also involves basic perception of the mental state of others when a language is not intelligible.

The Period of Competent Multilingual Functioning

The norms of communication in multilingual societies are progressively internalised by children. Usually 7- to 9-year-old children begin to show their norm awareness and develop competence in multilingual functioning. During this third period of multilingual socialisation, children, who, in most cases, are already able to display sensitivity to context-specific use of languages, develop a broader understanding of the social hierarchy of preferences for languages. They also appreciate the relative appropriateness of different languages to a given social context in which multilingual speakers are present. During this stage, children show awareness of the implicit social rules of functional code-switching (politeness- and prestige-based rules, for example). This period is also characterised by emergence of systematic code-mixing in multilingual communication.

The first stage in this period involves development of understanding of the social conventions associated with functional roles of different languages. Children show some understanding that, in multilingual communication, languages have socially accepted functions in different contexts. Children begin to understand that their home language is more appropriate for intimate and affective communication and other languages like English may be more appropriate in formal and academic contexts. They perceive the social differences in prestige value of languages and begin to internalise the preference hierarchy across languages. In our studies there were many 7- to 8-year-old urban middle-class children who tried to impress the Research Investigators (RIs) by attempting to use English in their conversations even if they had other Indian languages (e.g., Odia, Hindi or Assamese) in common with the RIs and even when they were being spoken to in an Indian language which they knew.

During the second stage of this period, children's multilingual communication becomes more systematic and socially appropriate; they show progressive understanding of the linguistic hierarchy and the implicit social norms for code-switching. Code-switching or, at least, some attempt to use a different language to communicate meaningfully in the presence of other speakers of different language(s) becomes more consistent and regular. Puja, an 8-and-a-half-year-old girl from a Bengali family living in Odisha, tries to use Odia in speaking to local visitors and switches to Bengali talking to her family members. She also knows that in her school she has to speak in English and not in Bengali or Odia. Another child Samparna (also 8 and half) speaks to the RI in Hindi, switches to Odia when her friend enters and then speaks to her mother freely mixing Hindi and Odia. By about 9 years of age, children seem to be able to show socially appropriate and systematic (rule-based) code-switching and code-mixing. They are able to deal with the

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 588

nuances of multilingual social communication even as they continue to develop proficiency in the languages in their environment and schooling.

Strategies in Multilingual Socialisation

A variety of socialisation strategies and devices are used by adults in the families and communities to facilitate children's differentiation of languages and understanding of the norms of multilingual communication (Mohanty 2014). Parents and adult members of the family model multilingual speech for children through speech expansions, translation and simplification devices and repeated code-mixing and code-switching routines. In their own multilingual communication, parents demonstrate preferential patterns of language use. Language socialisation is a collaborative process in which adults and children mutually regulate and change their own speech acts to gradually approximate the social norms of communication in their interactions. In multilingual societies, children's encounters with family members and adults of the communities of practice in a given sociocultural setting and repeated collaborative (and agentic) participation in multilanguaging activities lead to progressive appreciation and approximation of a variety of complex norms of multilingual lifestyle. Parents, grandparents, other family members, neighbours, community members and visitors share distributed roles and responsibilities in multilingual socialisation. It is also important to note that as children are socialised to multilingual modes of functioning and multilingual communication, they develop conscious awareness of languages in society and show increased communicative sensitivity compared to their counterparts in monolingual societies.

Mohanty (2019) argues that multilingual socialisation and diversity of sociolinguistic encounters facilitate children's metalinguistic awareness quite early in their development. He cites the case of his grandson Om, who grew up in a multilingual area in Delhi, India. Om grew up with Odia in his family, Hindi through interactions with Hindi-speaking children, domestic helpers and family visitors, and some exposure to Bengali, English and other Indian languages. Later, Om moved to Mumbai at the age of 4 and attended an English-medium pre-primary school. Soon he showed a differentiated perception of languages in his surroundings. Asked about the languages in his school, Om could name a number of languages (English, Marathi, Bengali, Gujarati) in his classroom used by his friends and showed his awareness of the use of English in the classroom and use of other languages only outside the classroom. His metalinguistic reflections included identifying some words common between Odia and Marathi languages (such as *pāni* or water, *sakāla* or morning) and between Odia and Bengali. Om also showed his awareness of the differences in articulation of Odia and Bengali words. It seems that, due to the early encounters with multiple languages and the challenges involved in dealing with societal multilingualism, children show early development of

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 589

metalinguistic awareness. Mohanty (2019) has argued that, with early metalinguistic development, cross-linguistic transfer is more likely to occur earlier among children in multilingual societies. As a result, aspects of cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP; see Cummins 1979, 1984) may develop even before formal schooling. This has implications for planning multilingual education for children in these societies.

The processes of multilingual socialisation prime the children to develop multilingualism as a first language. Mohanty (2019: 33–34) elaborates this priming:

> Our language socialisation studies show that a multilingual society is NOT a tower of Babel; it is a dynamic structure of multiple languages each extending into the other in a complex interplay of multiple identities and, early in their development, children are socialised to live with multilingualism as a natural phenomenon.

Societal multilingualism is thus supported and sustained by early multilingual socialisation. Further, it is also likely that early development of linguistic sensitivity leads to appreciation of linguistic diversity and to psychological readiness which supports the features of multilingualism such as its maintenance norms and multiplicity of linguistic identities, making multilingualism a positive force (Mohanty 2019). The processes of multilingual socialisation transform the sociolinguistic synergy in multilingual societies to a psychological reality for every child.

Children growing up in multilingual societies do have divergent experiences of diversity in the specific contexts of their development and exposure to the complexities of multilingualism. The challenges of dealing with the nuances of multilingual communication is a major developmental task for children. It requires greater cognitive effort and these experiences endow them with cognitive advantages (Bialystok & Barac 2013; Bialystok et al. 2012; see Mohanty 2019 for a review). Thus, languages are resources for children in multilingual societies even if, as we show later, they are often not treated as such in multilingual societies.

In contrast, children growing up in monolingually oriented societies experience a different sociolinguistic reality, and the processes underlying their communicative development are likely to be less challenging in many respects.

25.3 Growing Up in Societies with Monolingual Orientation

Unfortunately, most of what we know about development of linguistic and communicative skills of children is based on studies in what we call dominant monolingual societies. Early development of monolingual children in these societies (except ITM children) lacks the experience of sociolinguistic

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 590

diversity and associated complexity of the level that we have noted above for children in multilingual societies. Monolingual societies do have regional, dialectal and cross-linguistic variations and diversity. However, awareness of such diversity develops much later in children growing up as typically monolingual in these societies, at least partly because languages and varieties do not usually come in social contact in the early experience of children, in contrast to the ones facing complex sociolinguistic realities in multilingual societies. Monolingual children's language socialisation targets development of communicative skills in their language including pragmatic and social conventions of such communication. Contextual differentiation of languages, learning of the implicit social rules for communication as in multilingual contexts and requirements of frequent code-switching and code-mixing routines often do not constitute aspects of such early language socialisation of these children.

In dominant monolingual societies, bilingualism and multilingualism are typically minority-group phenomena except in cases of elite learning of multiple languages through schooling or formal learning and informal acquisition associated with prolonged contact with other languages. The migrant and other ITM communities in these societies are mostly bilingual in their indigenous/native languages. However, such bilingualism is usually a marked phase of transition from monolingualism in the native language to monolingualism in the dominant language (Mohanty 1994b). The native languages of the ITM communities are under pressure of language shift, and there is a gradual decline in the rate of maintenance of the native languages of the Indigenous and migrant communities all over the world. The report of the US Census Bureau (Ryan 2013) shows the presence of 169 Native languages out of approximately 300 before colonisation; while 20 per cent of the 65+ age group of the American Indians speak a Native language at home, 10 per cent of the 5–17 age group speak their Native language. In Canada, 29 per cent of the Aboriginal people spoke an Aboriginal language in 1996; by 2001 this figure declined to 24 per cent (Bear Nicholas 2009). The number of languages of the First Nations People in Canada has declined rapidly compared to the pre-colonisation period (Mohanty 2019). In Europe there is a language shift of the native languages of the immigrant families in about three to four generations (Tabouret-Keller 2013), and this is also true of the immigrants in most other dominant monolingual societies. As pointed out earlier, in dominant monolingual contexts, the bilinguals or multilinguals are parallel users of languages which otherwise occur without much social contact among them. It is unusual for multiple languages to be used simultaneously in code-mixed and/or in code-switched forms as languages of communication in common contexts of social interaction.

Multilingual/bilingual children in monolingual societies use any one of their multiple languages in specific contexts and they are usually not expected to engage in code-mixing or free code-switching for effective

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 591

communication. For example, the three 12-, 7- and 5-year-old children in an Odia-speaking immigrant family in the US mostly speak in Odia with their parents and grandparents. They speak to each other and with the visitors to their home (including two other Odia-knowing children of a family friend) in English. They speak in English in all other contexts outside their home. Their bilingualism involves a clear diglossic use of Odia and English in parallel contexts; the domains of use of the two languages have clear boundaries which are normally not transgressed. In most cases, the languages of multilingual children in monolingual societies remain as independent skills. These children develop varied levels of competence in their first, second and other languages, but they do not use them holistically for effective communication. Such isolated use of languages leads to the view of multilingualism as a sum of independent competences in multiple languages and not as MFL. Sami (12 years 2 months; the names of the children have been changed for anonymity) speaks to his parents and grandparents in Odia, occasionally using English words for effective communication when he cannot find a corresponding word in his Odia lexicon. He believes that the English words he uses are also Odia words and, on being probed further, he cites many English words which his parents use in their conversation in Odia. The use of Odia is very specific to informal communication in the home domain mostly for daily social routines and communication of affect. However, when Sami speaks to his parents or grandparents about his studies, school and academic matters, his hobbies and co-curricular activities, he reverts to English. The younger children also speak in Odia, but, since they are still learning to speak in the language, they use more English expressions in their communication. When these children speak in English there is no attempt at all to code-mix or to bring in Odia to supplement their communication; code-switching and some code-mixing happen only when they speak in Odia in their home domain. In her conversations in home, the youngest child, Mira (5 years 11 months) uses English more often than her elder brothers. Clearly, the children display age-appropriate competence in English, whereas their competence in Odia is below the expected level (if one compares them to children who speak Odia as their first and the only language) and is mostly limited to informal social affective communication in their home domain.

However, the usual subtractive effects of learning a dominant language are not quite evident in the case of the three children, since their parents repeatedly encourage them to continue speaking in Odia in home. Siba (7 years 10 months) likes to participate in his parents' telephone conversations with relatives and family friends back in India and uses Odia in speaking to them. He uses some colloquial expressions in Odia that he picked up from such conversations and often repeats such expressions in talking to his grandparents and younger sister to create some fun and humour. In contrast, his use of English is more formal even when he speaks to family members in his home. Siba has started learning some Spanish in

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 592

school, but he never attempts to use the language except when he is specifically asked to translate simple words or expressions from English to Spanish. He always speaks to the Spanish-knowing workers and lawn developers who visit his home in English even if his parents want him to practise speaking Spanish with them. This shows a reluctance to code-switch when one can manage with the dominant language. Unlike multilingual societies, children who grow up as multilinguals in monolingual societies are not subjected to any normative pressure to code-mix or code-switch in presence of interlocutors from a different language community.

The contexts of use of languages by multilingual children in dominant monolingual societies are distinct, and each context clearly defines an appropriate language of communication with very little deviation. Language socialisation of these children sets the contextual boundaries for languages as distinct entities, and children develop the multiple languages as separate systems with little overlap in their use. It seems that the multilingual children growing up in the monolingual social contexts are socialised to use the dominant language (such as English) for wider social and interpersonal communication and native/indigenous languages for family and in-group communication. The monolingual ideology of the wider society seems to override the multilinguality of children regardless of whether their 'other' languages are indigenous or immigrant minority languages. Asked about their preference for using Odia or English, Siba (7 years 10 months) says that he likes speaking in Odia with family members and relatives because it is 'fun', but he is very emphatic that English is 'good' because it can be used 'everywhere'. Mira (5 years 11 months), on the other hand, has no hesitation in saying that she prefers speaking in English, but she cannot say why; 'I like it,' she says. In fact, she makes no attempt to bring in the language(s) of interlocutors from a different language community or enter into communication in a common language, even when the other person does not understand English. When she met a visiting grandmother of her friend from a Telugu-speaking family who did not understand English, she persisted in speaking to her in English even after her friend told her, 'my grandma does not know English'. She failed to accept that some people may not know English and, probed later, she said, 'she (referring to her friend's grandmother) speaks Indian'. Her elder brothers, however, understand that some people may not know English. Of course, these children's preference for using English is quite clear. Sami (12 years 2 months) says that English is a more 'important language and it is spoken worldwide' and, at the same time, he says, 'it's nice to speak Odia and know more languages'.

Contextual isolation of languages in monolingual societies also seems to delay children's awareness of diversity compared to their counterparts in multilingual societies. Children who grow up as multilinguals in monolingual societies do not show the expected or age-appropriate level of awareness of languages. The three children in the Odia immigrant family

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 593

in the USA show limited awareness of languages around them even if they have family friends and regular visitors to their home who speak many languages besides English – Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Malayalam, Marathi, Nepali, Odia, Spanish, Telugu and Urdu. They also visit the family friends and hear the members of the host family often speak to each other in these languages. Besides, these and many other languages are used in social gatherings and parties that the children sometimes attend. Asked to name the languages in the world or languages around them, Mira (5 years 11 months) says, 'English' and names Odia only when she is specifically told to name the languages she speaks. She cannot name the languages spoken by the specific family friends other than that they speak English. Siba (7 years 10 months) is able to name English, Odia and Spanish (which he never uses even when he has the opportunity and is encouraged by his parents). When asked about other languages that the specific family friends use, he is able to name only Bengali. He is aware that some of the family friends and visitors speak other languages, but he is unable to name them. Sami (12 years 2 months) is able to name most of the languages spoken by the family friends and shows his awareness of multiple languages in the world and in the USA, including Native languages of the American First Nations. He specifically mentions the linguistic diversity in India, Africa and Europe. It seems that development of awareness of linguistic diversity among children in monolingual societies is not an aspect of their language socialisation and, hence, development of such awareness awaits curricular learning in schools. Further, differentiation of languages used in their surrounding is not a major challenge for these children: languages they use are very clearly demarcated and isolated in the contexts of their use and, with a dominant monolingual mindset, other non-dominant languages in their surrounding are mostly not perceived until much later in their development.

Multilingual children in dominant monolingual societies are characterised by parallel use of languages as they move between clearly differentiated contexts of their use. The pattern is multiglossic rather than multilingual since, unlike the multilingual societies, the languages do not move across the sociolinguistic contexts of use. Children's communicative competence is distinctly distributed across specific contexts associated with specific languages; typically, the communicative repertoire of these children is a combination of their competences in the languages that they can use. They can aptly be characterised as users of multiple languages in monolingual contexts rather than as multilinguals who grow up with multilingualism as their first language.

Multilingual children do grow up with different worldviews compared to their monolingual counterparts. However, those growing up as multilinguals in monolingual social contexts are constrained by relative isolation of languages or by 'parallel multilingualism' (Heller 1999). This isolation of languages in monolingual societies limits the nature of multilinguality and

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 594

children's perception of languages and linguistic diversity. In multilingual societies, on the other hand, children are more likely to show greater acceptance of diversity and willingness to move across languages and domains of their use. As we have pointed out, early exposure to multiple languages and the sociolinguistic and psychological challenges of switching between them endows multilingual children with early awareness of languages and metalinguistic skills. Multiple languages are resources of multilingual children, more so in multilingual societies (Mohanty 2019). Children's participation in their communities of practice and the wider ecology of the multilingual societies, as in African and Asian countries, enables them to deal effectively with many languages which constitute part of their communicative repertoire. Unfortunately, schools in most of these multilingual societies do no treat children's language skills acquired in home and community as classroom resources. Often, schools isolate and exclude many languages which form part of children's communicative repertoire at the point of school entry and emphasise learning of some dominant languages which may not overlap with those acquired early in development. As we discuss next, formal systems of education in most parts of the multilingual world not only fail to support children's multilingualism but also suppress their mother tongues and, thus, violate their LHRs.

25.4 Formal Education and Violation of Children's Linguistic Human Rights

The inequality and discrimination in education are perpetuated by exclusion of ITM languages in formal education. Panda and Mohanty (2014: 114) show how, due to the social inequalities and the hierarchical power structure of languages, schools become a basis of power, control and discrimination, 'institutionalised instruments for exclusion'. In India, English dominates the formal educational systems, particularly in the higher levels, at the same time as the ITM languages are neglected in all levels. Tribal children constitute over 90 per cent of children in nearly 60,000 primary schools (Grades 1 to 5) and the majority in over 100,000 schools. Still, there is no provision for using their mother tongue (MT) as the medium of education, except in a few special programmes. Of the tribal children joining Grade 1, 35.6 per cent are pushed out by Grade 5, 55 per cent by Grade 8 and 70.9 per cent by Grade 10. Less than 30 per cent of the tribal children joining Grade 1 appear in the High School examination at the end of 10 years of formal schooling. Only 9 per cent succeed. Thus, there is a wastage of 91 per cent in the existing system of submersion education in a non-MT language for the tribal children in India (Mohanty 2019).

Submersion education of ITM children in a dominant language fails to provide high-quality education and enhance their cognitive and intellectual capabilities. It has a subtractive effect on children's MT competence, leads

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:18 Page Number: 595

to loss of their linguistic capital and their cultural and linguistic identity, and limits their choice and freedom. Large-scale educational failure and an inability to move into the higher levels of education and technical training necessary to join the skilled workforce limit the chances of upward mobility for ITM children, thus perpetuating poverty (Mohanty 2019: 141; see Mohanty & Skutnabb-Kangas 2013 for elaboration of capability deprivation).

Besides the ITM children, a large number of other children in multilingual societies are educated in dominant foreign or non-MT language-medium schools, which also leads to loss of languages. In India, besides the tribal children (over 8 per cent of the school-age population), at least 40 per cent of other children are in English-medium schools (Mohanty 2019), meaning nearly half of the 7- to 18-year old children in India are educated in a language which is not their MT. Mohanty (2017, 2019) speaks of five layers of school education in India in English- and vernacular-medium schools associated with social class. While the very rich and the upper- and middle-class children join elite and high-quality English-medium (EM) private schools, respectively, many children from the aspirational poor class join low-cost and very-poor quality private EM schools where they neither learn English well nor develop their MT. Most of the public schools offer poor quality vernacular-medium schools for poor children from vernacular-language MT communities or non-MT medium submersion education for children from disadvantaged ITM communities. Thus, dominant-language-medium education in multilingual societies does not support MTs and multilingualism of many children, including those from ITM language communities.

Research on educational performance indicates that ITM children taught through the medium of a dominant language in submersion programmes often perform considerably less well than native dominant-language-speaking children in the same class, in general and on tests of both (dominant) language and school achievement. They suffer from higher levels of push-out rates, stay in school fewer years, have higher figures for unemployment later on and, for some groups, drugs use, criminality, including incest, and suicide figures are prominent social ills (see Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). There is strong evidence that such children do not benefit from the right to education to the same extent as children whose MT is the teaching language of the school, and that this distinction is based on language.

Worldwide, exclusion of MTs from the education of ITM children and imposition of (a) dominant language(s) lead to educational failure and loss of ITM languages. Those (mostly Asian immigrant minority) groups that show a more positive pattern (e.g., in Canada, the USA, the UK) seem to do this not *because* of the way their education is organised but *despite* it. There is a direct link (both correlational and causal) between the exclusion of ITM languages and educational failure of ITM children (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar 2010). Imposed formal education in dominant languages in

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 596

both 'monolingual' and multilingual societies is a site for educational violation of LHRs. Formal education participates in linguistic genocide.

When what became the *UN International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (E793, 1948, www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/x1cppcg.htm) was being prepared after the Second World War, its final Draft had in Article III definitions of linguistic and cultural genocide; it also saw them as crimes against humanity. Article III was voted down by 16 states in the UN General Assembly in 1948, and *is thus NOT part of the final Convention*. But all states who were members of the UN agreed about the definition of what should be considered linguistic genocide: 'Prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group'.

The present Convention (*UN International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, E793, 1948, www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/x1cppcg.htm) has five definitions of genocide in its Article 2:

> In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
>
> (a) Killing members of the group;
> (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
> (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
> (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
> (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

What much ITM education worldwide is doing is trying (and sometimes/often succeeding) is to forcibly transfer ITM children linguistically and culturally to a dominant group, at the same time as it is causing both mental and, indirectly, at least in the long term, physical harm to members of ITM groups (Article 2e and 2b). Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010) sum up consequences of submersion education for ITM children, using worldwide research evidence and concrete examples:

(1) *negative educational consequences*, in terms of achievement and outcomes;
(2) *negative physical consequences*, both short term and long term: the economic marginalisation reproduced by education in its turn often results in direct *physical harmful consequences* in terms of health-related issues: no or poor maternity care, high infant mortality, undernourishment, dangerous work (e.g., mines, logging, chemicals in agriculture) or unemployment, child labour, and poor housing and health care. Health and other physical effects from alcoholism, abuse of women and children in families, incest, and overrepresentation in suicide and crime statistics are also instances of serious physical harm.
(3) *negative psychological consequences*, shame, low self-confidence, identity challenges, etc;

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 597

(4) *loss of language and in-depth knowledge of culture*: and
(5) *negative socio-economic and other social consequences which influence the life chances of children as adults, and which are long term and can last for generations* (e.g., higher levels of unemployment, lower incomes, economic and social marginalisation, alienation, mental illness).

ITM children should be guaranteed a right to learn both their own languages and at least a/the dominant language in the country where they live, up to a high formal level, through bilingual education of various kinds, most importantly including a right to mother-tongue-based multilingual education (see Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty 2008 for definitions). All children must have the right to access to high-quality education, regardless of what their MT is. Schools should support ITM communities' right to reproduce themselves as Indigenous/tribal peoples/minorities through enabling and encouraging intergenerational transfer of their languages. If not, ITM children do not enjoy basic educational *linguistic human rights (LHRs)* that linguistically dominant group children and their parents take for granted. Given the educational benefits of *Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MLE)* and, as importantly, the educational harm of education of ITM children mainly through another language, it can be forcefully argued that only MLE, at least in primary school, is consistent with the provisions of several human rights documents (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar 2010 and Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2019 for elaboration). No other form of education seems to guarantee the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, nor does it enable children who are subject to non-MLE education to participate as effectively in society. There is much research that shows that maintenance-oriented MLE education (with good teaching of a dominant language as a second language, with bilingual teachers) is often the best way to enhance ITM children's high-level bilingualism, school achievement, a positive development of identity and self-confidence, and their future life chances (see, e.g., May 2017).

Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010) (and our earlier UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues Expert reports) report in great detail what kind of international and regional human rights instruments there are about educational LHRs, and we refer here to them, and to Skutnabb-Kangas et al. (2019), which gives updates on them (using Nunavut, Canada, as an example: almost the whole population speaks Inuktut as their MT, while most formal education is in English, with disastrous results). Indigenous peoples and minorities are provided with some general protections under various UN and regional charters and conventions. The UN and other instruments discussed below are presented in detail in both Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010) and Skutnabb-Kangas et al. (2019); both can be freely downloaded. One of the 'best' is Article 30 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, ratified by more states

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 598

than any other UN Convention (the USA is the only exception). It provides that

> in those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities or persons of indigenous origin exist, a child belonging to such a minority or who is indigenous shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of his or her group, to enjoy his or her own culture, to profess and practise his or her own religion, or to use his or her own language.

The Human Rights Committee has noted (in its General Comment No. 23 of 1994 on Art. 27 of the ICCPR, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the above Art. 30 is based on) that, although phrased in the negative, the Article requires States to take positive measures in support of minorities. Unfortunately, the Human Rights Committee has not spelled out what those measures are, or whether they include measures relating to the medium of education. UNDRIP, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Resolution A/61/L.67, September 13, 2007) provides in Articles 13.1–2 and 14.1 the right for an Indigenous child to learn the mother tongue, and in 14.2 access to the 'education of the State'; the child does not have this access without knowing the State language; hence high levels of at least bilingualism must be a goal in the education of an Indigenous child. But since state education through the medium of the dominant state language is 'free' (although there are school fees even in elementary education in many countries where Indigenous peoples live), most Indigenous children are forced to 'choose' the 'state education'. Their parents are 'free' to establish and control their own educational systems, with their own languages as teaching languages – but at their own cost. How many Indigenous and tribal peoples can afford this? There is nothing about the State having to allocate public resources to Indigenous-language-medium education (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar 2010 for details).

There are still relatively few binding positive rights to MTM education or bilingual education in present international law, including case law. Today most language-related human rights are negative rights, only prohibiting discrimination on the basis of language, as a prerequisite for the promotion of equality. Despite both the positive tone of these and other recommendations, and the high level of awareness and networking of many ITMs, opt-outs and claw-backs in educational provisions for ITMs are significant. In addition, the many possibilities of interpreting even the few existing positive human rights instruments in ways that would support ITM children's educational LHRs have seldom been used adequately. Comparing the various developments in how human rights instruments, courts and various regulations have handled educational LHRs during the last many decades, there seems to be a constant tension in how the place, function and future of ITMs (seen as Other) and their languages has been envisaged. States seem

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 599

to strive towards some kind of unity, wholeness, integration, but ideas about how this can be achieved vary. Segregation versus integration, and multilingual versus monolingual are some of the main polarities here. Homogenisation instead of positive unity and integration has often been a result.

The work to prevent linguistic and cultural genocide in education and to prevent the 'ruining' of the positive early multilingualism of children in multilingually oriented countries, and to start seeing multilingualism as the resource it is, is only at its beginning. Researchers, teachers and parents have a moral responsibility to participate – all the research evidence to back up this work has existed for a long time (see Skutnabb-Kangas 2019b on this).

References

Bear Nicholas, A. (2009). Reversing language shift through a native-language immersion teacher-training programme in Canada. In A. K. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas, eds., *Multilingual Education for Social Justice*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, pp. 200–15.

Bialystok, E., & Barac, C. (2013). Cognitive effects. In F. Grosjean & P. Li, eds., *The Psycholinguistics of Bilingualism*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 192–213.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Luk, G. (2012). Bilingualism: Consequences for mind and brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*(4), 240–50.

Bujorbarua, P. (2006). Socialisation for Multilingual Awareness: A Study of Assamese Children in Delhi and Assam. MPhil dissertation, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, *49*(2), 222–51.

(1984). *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gogolin, I. (1997). The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam*, *13*(2), 38–49.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.

Li, W. (2011). Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code- and mode-switching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95: 307–84.

May, S. (2017). Bilingual education: What the research tells us. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May, eds., *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education, 3rd Edition*. Cham: Switzerland, pp. 81–100.

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 600

Mohanty, A. (1994a). Language socialization in a multilingual society: Analysis of some preliminary data. Paper presented in the International Conference on Early Childhood Communication, Bhubaneswar, India.

(1994b). *Bilingualism in a Multilingual Society: Psycho-social and Pedagogical Implications*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

(2006). Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. Torres Guzman, eds., *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Language in Education and Glocalisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 262–83.

(2010). Language, inequality and marginalization: Implications of the double divide in Indian multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *205*, 131–54.

(2014). Growing up in a multilingual society: Stages and strategies in multilingual socialization. Invited lecture, University of Western Ontario, Canada, 20 October.

(2017) Multilingualism, education, English and development: Whose development? In H. Coleman, ed., *Multilingualism and Development*. New Delhi: British Council, pp. 261–80.

(2019). *The Multilingual Reality: Living with Languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mohanty, A., Panda, S., & Mishra, B. (1999). Language socialization in a multilingual society. In T. S. Saraswathi, ed., *Culture, Socialization and Human Development*. New Delhi: Sage, pp. 125–44.

Mohanty, A., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2013). MLE as an economic equaliser in India and Nepal: Mother tongue based multilingual education fights poverty through capability development and identity support. In K. Henrard, ed., *The Interrelation between the Right to Identity of Minorities and Their Socio-Economic Participation*. Studies in International Minority and Group Rights, Volume 2. Leiden/Boston: Brill/ Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, pp. 159–87.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs, eds., *Language Socialization across Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–13.

Panda, M., & Mohanty, A. (2014). Language policy in education: Towards multilingual education. In R. C. Tripathi & Y. Sinha, eds., *Psychology, Development and Social Policy in India*. New Delhi: Springer, pp. 103–29.

Ryan, C. (2013) *Language Use in the United States: 2011 – American Community Survey Reports*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce: United States Census Bureau.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1984) [1981]. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

(2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education: Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah/London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 601

(2019a). Series Editor's preface. In A. Mohanty, *The Multilingual Reality: Living with Languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. xiii–xv.

(2019b). Freedom of speech denied at the UN, www.tove-skutnabb-kangas.org/en/Freedom-of-speech-denied-at-the-UN.html.

Skutnabb-Kangas T., & Dunbar, R. (2010). Indigenous Children's Education as Linguistic Genocide and a Crime Against Humanity? A Global View. *Gáldu Čála. Journal of Indigenous Peoples' Rights*, 1, www.tove-skutnabb-kangas.org/pdf/Indigenous_Children_s_Education_as_Linguistic_Genocide_and_a_Crime_Against_Humanity_A_Global_View_Tove_Skutnabb_Kangas_and_Robert_Dunbar_grusweb_2010_04_22.pdf.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & McCarty, T. (2008). Clarification, ideological/epistemological underpinnings and implications of some concepts in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger, eds., *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 2nd Edition. Volume 5, Bilingual Education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 3–17.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., & Dunbar, R. (2019). Is Nunavut education criminally inadequate? An analysis of current policies for Inuktut and English in education, international and national law, linguistic and cultural genocide and crimes against humanity, www.tunngavik.com/files/2019/04/NuLinguicideReportFINAL.pdf.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (2013) Bilingualism in Europe. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie, eds., *Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism (2nd Ed.)*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 745–69.

PROOF

Comp. by: 201508 Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 25 Title Name: Stavansetal
Date:23/3/22 Time:10:49:19 Page Number: 602

PROOF