

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Language Policy and Education in the Indian Subcontinent	
Copyright Year	2016	
Copyright Holder	Springer International Publishing AG	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Mohanty
	Particle	
	Given Name	Ajit
	Given Name	K.
	Suffix	
	Division/Department	National Multilingual Education Resource Consortium
	Organization/University	Jawaharlal Nehru University
	Street	HIG-67, Phase VII, SailashreeViharn
	City	Bhubaneswar
	Postcode	751021
	Country	India
	Phone	+91-707-7703139
	Email	ajitmohanty@gmail.com
Author	Family Name	Panda
	Particle	
	Given Name	Minati
	Suffix	
	Division/Department	Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies
	Organization/University	School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University
	City	New Delhi
	Postcode	110067
	Country	India
	Phone	91-11-26742485
	Email	minatipanda@mail.jnu.ac.in

Abstract

The Indian subcontinent constitutes a highly diverse linguistic area, with over 750 languages belonging to nine language families. A large proportion of these languages are endangered. Multilingualism and language-in-education policies and practices in the subcontinent are affected by a hierarchical relationship of languages characterized by a double divide – one between English and the major national/regional languages and the other between the major languages and the indigenous tribal minority (ITM) ones. The declared language policies in the subcontinent emphasize languages of national identity and development of ITM languages. In practice, however, English is the

most dominant language promoted along with the major national/regional languages, while the ITM languages are neglected. Languages in education reflect the linguistic double divide; private schools are English-medium schools, and public schools are in the medium of the dominant regional languages with English becoming increasingly important in the higher levels of education. Submersion education in the dominant language leads to educational failure of the ITM children. Some countries, such as Nepal and India, have started experimental programs of MT-based multilingual education (MLE) to deal with the problems of classroom language barriers. But the burden of the double divide seems to force early exit from the use of MT in MLE programs limiting the scope for development of MT and its egalitarian positioning in the society.

Keywords
(separated by “-”)

Indian subcontinent - Multilingualism - Double divide - Multilingual education - Indigenous/tribal peoples

1 Language Policy and Education 2 in the Indian Subcontinent

3 Ajit K. Mohanty and Minati Panda

AU1

4 Contents

5	Introduction	2
6	Early Developments and Major Contributions	3
7	Languages, Power, and Hierarchy	3
8	Language in Education in the Indian Subcontinent: Policy and Practice	6
9	Education for Linguistic Minorities	9
10	Problems, Difficulties, and Future Directions	10
11	Cross-References	11
12	Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	11
13	References	11

14 Abstract

15 The Indian subcontinent constitutes a highly diverse linguistic area, with over
 16 750 languages belonging to nine language families. A large proportion of these
 17 languages are endangered. Multilingualism and language-in-education policies
 18 and practices in the subcontinent are affected by a hierarchical relationship of
 19 languages characterized by a double divide – one between English and the major
 20 national/regional languages and the other between the major languages and the
 21 indigenous tribal minority (ITM) ones. The declared language policies in the
 22 subcontinent emphasize languages of national identity and development of ITM
 23 languages. In practice, however, English is the most dominant language promoted

A.K. Mohanty (✉)
 National Multilingual Education Resource Consortium, Jawaharlal Nehru University,
 Bhubaneswar, India
 e-mail: ajitmohanty@gmail.com

M. Panda
 Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru
 University, New Delhi, India
 e-mail: minatipanda@mail.jnu.ac.in

24 along with the major national/regional languages, while the ITM languages are
25 neglected. Languages in education reflect the linguistic double divide; private
26 schools are English-medium schools, and public schools are in the medium of the
27 dominant regional languages with English becoming increasingly important in
28 the higher levels of education. Submersion education in the dominant language
29 leads to educational failure of the ITM children. Some countries, such as Nepal
30 and India, have started experimental programs of MT-based multilingual educa-
31 tion (MLE) to deal with the problems of classroom language barriers. But the
32 burden of the double divide seems to force early exit from the use of MT in MLE
33 programs limiting the scope for development of MT and its egalitarian position-
34 ing in the society.

35 Keywords

36 Indian subcontinent • Multilingualism • Double divide • Multilingual education •
37 Indigenous/tribal peoples

38 Introduction

39 Multilingualism and language-in-education policies and practices in the different
40 countries in the Indian subcontinent are affected by a hierarchical relationship
41 between the dominant and minority languages. This hierarchy is characterized by
42 a double divide – one between English and the major national/regional languages
43 and the other between the major languages and the indigenous tribal minority (ITM)
44 ones. The declared language policies in most parts of the subcontinent are guided by
45 priority to the languages of national identity and liberal safeguards for protection and
46 development of ITM languages. In practice, however, English is the most dominant
47 language of popular aspirations, and it is promoted along with the major national/
48 regional languages, while the ITM languages are grossly neglected. Languages in
49 education reflect the linguistic double divide; private schools use English as the
50 medium of teaching-learning, whereas public schools are in the medium of the
51 dominant regional languages with English becoming increasingly important in the
52 higher levels of education.

53 Neglect of minority mother tongues (MTs) and submersion education in the
54 dominant language lead to educational failure of the ITM children. Recent attempts
55 in some countries, such as Nepal and India, to deal with the problems of classroom
56 language barriers for these children through experimental programs of MT-based
57 multilingual educations (MLE) show positive impacts. But the burden of the double
58 divide seems to force early exit from the use of MT in MLE programs limiting the
59 scope for development of MT and its egalitarian positioning in the society.

60 The countries in the Indian subcontinent – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan,
61 India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka – constitute a highly diverse linguistic area
62 with over 750 languages belonging to nine different language families. The region is
63 home to more than 10 % of the languages of the world. It is also noteworthy that a

64 large proportion of these languages are endangered. *Atlas of the World's languages*
65 *in Danger* (UNESCO 2009) lists 344 languages in these countries in different
66 degrees of endangerment. India alone has 197 languages in the endangered category,
67 the highest for any country in the world. The fact that the degree of linguistic
68 diversity is strongly associated with endangerment of languages shows that multi-
69 lingualism entails “unequal division of power and resources” (Skutnabb-Kangas
70 2000, p. 30) and a hierarchical positioning of languages, leading to disadvantage,
71 marginalization, language shift, and loss of linguistic diversity. This is a common
72 pattern across the Indian subcontinent; some languages are associated with greater
73 power and privileges compared to many others, which suffer neglect and discrimi-
74 nation in significant domains of use such as governance, law, education, trade, and
75 commerce.

76 Languages that people use or do not use are associated with their access to
77 socioeconomic resources and chances of upward mobility. This chapter will briefly
78 analyze the sociolinguistic positioning of languages in different countries in the
79 Indian subcontinent to show how these languages are hierarchically organized in the
80 society. We focus on language policy in education of these countries as a critical area
81 of neglect of languages and show how such neglect leads to loss of diversity and
82 cumulative disadvantage to the users of these languages. Recent attempts to deal
83 with the problems associated with educational neglect of languages through policy
84 and practice level emphasis on mother tongue (MT)-based multilingual education
85 are also discussed.

86 Early Developments and Major Contributions

87 Languages, Power, and Hierarchy

88 The multilingual scenario in the Indian subcontinent is characterized by a dominant
89 position of English regardless of its constitutional or institutional status. English has
90 some official status in India as an associate official language, in Pakistan as one of
91 the two official languages and, more recently, in Sri Lanka, which accepted a
92 trilingual policy of Sinhala, Tamil, and English as official languages since 2011. In
93 the remaining countries, English does not have any official status, but it dominates as
94 a language of power and popular aspiration. It is definitely the most sought offer
95 language of education, at least in post-secondary and higher education.

96 During the colonial rule and the movement for independence in India, English
97 was shunned as a language of the colonizers, and it was never a symbol of Indian
98 nationalism. However, primarily because of conflict of interest among several Indian
99 languages claiming a dominant or national language status in the constituent assem-
100 bly, English was bestowed an associate official language status in the Constitution of
101 India (Article 343.2) promulgated in 1950. While no language was recognized as a
102 national language, Hindi was named the official language of the Union of India. The
103 Constitution of India also listed the major languages (including Hindi) in the VIIIth

104 schedule as official languages for all communication between the states as well as the
105 states and the Union of India.

106 Only 14 languages were initially scheduled in 1950, and subsequently other
107 languages were added to the Viet schedule, the latest being in December 2003
108 when the number was increased from 18 to 22 adding, for the first time, two tribal
109 languages – Santali and Bodo – to the schedule. The status as an additional official
110 language was initially given to English for a period of 15 years during which other
111 Indian languages including Hindi were envisaged to develop and replace English.
112 However, following some conflict between Hindi and South Indian languages
113 including Tamil, the associate official language status of English was extended for
114 an indefinite period by the Official Language Act of 1963.

115 English is an official language in Pakistan along with Urdu, the national language.
116 While Urdu is promoted as the language of national identity, English is the language
117 of power. In Sri Lanka the major languages are Sinhala and Tamil with some official
118 status at different points in its several attempts to sort out the issue of languages. The
119 Official Language Act of Sri Lanka, in 1956, introduced a policy of Sinhala as the
120 only official language, and later, Tamil was given an official language status partic-
121 ularly in the northern and southern provinces. The official position of the two major
122 languages in Sri Lanka continued to be debated in recent years, while English
123 became the language of popular choice in education and government policy. A
124 Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) was set up in the aftermaths
125 of Tamil movement and the war. In 2011, the LLRC recommended a trilingual policy
126 of Sinhala, Tamil, and English as the official languages and also languages in
127 education. Amid the changing strategies and policies in respect of the major lan-
128 guages in the country, English has continued as a language of the elites, preferred
129 over the two national languages.

130 English does not have any formal “official” status in the remaining countries in
131 the subcontinent – Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, and Afghanistan. But it is the most
132 dominant language – the language of power and opportunities in the global econ-
133 omy. Bengali nationalism and rejection of Urdu dominance led to the nationalistic
134 movement in Bangladesh for separation from Pakistan. Following its independence,
135 Bengali became the only official language of Bangladesh. But English is still the
136 dominant language of popular aspirations and official use. English has a similar
137 position in Nepal and Bhutan as the dominant language even if it does not have any
138 official standing. The language situation in Afghanistan remains fluid; its 2004
139 constitution (Article 16.1 and 16.2) specifies Pashto and Dari as national languages
140 and few other languages, such as Uzbek, Turkmen, Pasal, Kati, Balochi, and Munji,
141 as provincial statutory languages. But the preference for English is quite evident in
142 education despite the national emphasis on Islamic education. The School Education
143 Curriculum Framework in Afghanistan mandates Dari and Pashto as languages of
144 education with a priority on moving toward English as the language of instruction in
145 higher education. In the 10th to 12th years of education, English is a language of
146 curriculum along with Pashto and Dari.

147 The dominant position of English vis-à-vis the major languages of national and
148 regional identity is characteristic of the hierarchical structure of languages in the

149 Indian subcontinent. While the power of English relegates the major languages in
150 each of the countries in the subcontinent to positions of lesser power, the major
151 languages, in turn, push the indigenous tribal minority (ITM) languages into mar-
152 ginalization. The three-tiered hierarchy of languages show two major power gaps –
153 one between English and the major national and regional languages and, the other,
154 between the major languages and the ITM languages at the bottom.

155 Mohanty (2010) has analyzed this hierarchical structure as a “double divide” in
156 multilingualism. In India, the 22 official languages in the VIIth schedule of the
157 constitution, including state majority languages and some other major regional
158 languages, are under pressure due to the dominance of English which has adversely
159 affected the extent of their use; particularly, the younger generation shows a clear
160 decline in their preference for and proficiency in these languages. In the state levels,
161 the dominance of the major official languages of the state pushes the ITM languages
162 into disuse, neglect, and marginalization.

163 In Pakistan, there is a power divide between English and Urdu, the other official
164 and national language. English is not a first language of the people in Pakistan, and
165 only 8 % of the people use Urdu as their first language, whereas other major
166 language like Punjabi is spoken as the first language by 44 %, Pashto by 15.42 %,
167 and Sindhi by 14.5 % of the national population. Although all these languages are
168 sometimes claimed to be major powerful languages (vis-a-vis other smaller lan-
169 guages), the real language of power is English. Urdu as the national language has a
170 prominent position in Pakistan’s politics and governance. English and Urdu relegate
171 the major provincial languages to positions of lesser power sometimes calling for
172 movements of resistance from Punjabi, Sindhi, and other major regional language
173 speakers.

174 The second divide is between the major provisional or regional languages and
175 nearly 70 other indigenous and minor languages which remain marginalized
176 (Rahman 1998). The same pattern of a double divide is evident in Bangladesh
177 between English and major languages (Bengali as the official language and Urdu
178 as a major language) and between these dominant languages and 39 other ITM
179 languages which remain marginalized. The constitution of Nepal recognizes all
180 languages of the country (nearly 122 languages) as national languages. But English
181 occupies the most dominant status as a language of greater power than Nepali, the
182 major national-level language. While these two languages dominate all major
183 domains of public activity, all other regional and minority languages struggle for a
184 place in the new democratic setup awaiting promulgation of a new constitution. In
185 Sri Lanka there is a clear power divide between English and the other national
186 languages, Sinhala and Tamil, while about five other minor languages are fully
187 neglected in the country’s language discourse and remain completely isolated and
188 marginalized or nearly extinct. Bhutan has 30 languages, most of which are endan-
189 gered. Dzongkha is the national language with a power divide between English and
190 Dzongkha and a second divide between Dzongkha and the other ITM languages.

191 Multilingualism in the Indian subcontinent is characterized by inequality and a
192 hierarchical structure of “double divide.” The role of English as a powerful interna-
193 tional language of the global economy has pushed major languages of national and

194 regional identity into positions of lesser power, and further down the hierarchy, the
195 ITM languages are also pushed and marginalized by the regional dominance of the
196 major languages. Admittedly, while the double divide points to the two major
197 cleavages in the hierarchy of languages in the society, each layer of the three-
198 tiered hierarchy shows other further power gaps between the speakers of these
199 languages. As such, while some users of English (such as the urban elites) are
200 clearly more privileged over others (such as the rural first-generation learners of
201 English), there are power discrepancies between speakers of different major
202 national/regional languages as also between the speakers of the various ITM lan-
203 guages; within each category some languages and varieties have more power than
204 others. This is quite evident in the role of languages in education.

205 **Language in Education in the Indian Subcontinent: Policy** 206 **and Practice**

207 Despite the grassroots level of multilingualism in the Indian subcontinent, the
208 diversity of languages in use is clearly on the decline, as evidenced in different
209 public domains such as the judiciary, law and governance, print and electronic
210 media, business, trade and commerce, and significantly, education. Of over 700 lan-
211 guages in the subcontinent, less than 50 are in use as languages of teaching and
212 learning in formal education. Further, the number of languages sharply declines as
213 one moves up the levels of education from primary to higher and university
214 education.

215 Private English-medium schools are most sought after in the region, and their
216 number and enrolment are growing at a rapid rate. A majority of the 6- to 16-year-
217 olds in India and Pakistan are in private English-medium schools. University
218 education is almost exclusively in English. While the dominant languages have a
219 major place in the public school systems, their place in higher and University level
220 education is less visible. The other dominated and ITM languages are conspicuously
221 absent in the formal systems of school and higher education, except in some recent
222 experimental programs and MT-based early education for the tribal and minority
223 language children.

224 Private schools in India, as in other countries in the subcontinent, are almost
225 exclusively English-medium schools using English as the language of teaching and
226 learning. Barring some schools of the central government and some recent attempts
227 to have English-medium programs in the state government schools, the medium of
228 instruction (MoI) in the public schools is the respective dominant language of the
229 region or the state. In Indian schools, 33 languages, besides English, are used as the
230 MoI. Out of these, 22 are official languages (listed in the VIIth schedule of the
231 constitution). Besides two tribal languages, Bodo and Santali, now recognized as
232 official languages of India, only 3–5 of 128 tribal languages are used as MoI in
233 regular school programs (see Panda and Mohanty 2014 for analysis of India's
234 language-in-education policy).

235 Education in Nepal is also dominated by English-medium private schools which
236 are growing rapidly. Medium of teaching in the public schools is Nepali regardless of
237 the pupils' MT. Except in some recent experimental programs in early school years,
238 other languages of Nepal do not have any educational use (see Skutnabb-Kangas and
239 Mohanty 2009 for details). The interim constitution of Nepal and its National
240 Curriculum Framework of 2007 acknowledge the right to early education in chil-
241 dren's MT (Mohanty and Skutnabb-Kangas 2013), but the situation in Nepal
242 remains quite uncertain and fluid.

243 In Pakistan all private schools are English-medium schools, whereas government
244 schools use Urdu as the MoI (Coleman 2010). The National Education Policy of the
245 Government of Pakistan (GOP 2009) recommends English as a subject from the first
246 year (class I) of schooling and as the MoI for Science and Mathematics from class IV
247 onward in all public schools. Urdu is also recommended to be taught, besides one
248 regional language, from class I. The 2009 policy stipulated a 5-year interim period
249 during which provincial or regional departments of education could select either
250 English or Urdu or an official regional language as MoI for Science and Mathemat-
251 ics. But after 5 years, only English would be the MoI. In practice, teaching of a
252 regional language or a mother tongue has not been implemented except for Sindhi in
253 parts of Sindh province. Thus, English (besides Urdu to some extent) is the most
254 important language in Pakistan's system of education, while the major provincial/
255 regional languages as well as the other minority languages are neglected. In higher
256 levels of education beyond the primary grades, English becomes increasingly
257 significant in the curriculum, and higher/university education is exclusively in
258 English.

259 The language-in-education policy and practice in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and
260 Bhutan are also dominated by national language(s) in early education, and English,
261 which is introduced quite early in primary grades, becomes increasingly important in
262 the higher levels of education. In all these countries, as in rest of the subcontinent,
263 private education is in the medium of English as the only language of teaching-
264 learning (except for other languages) right from the point of school entry (grade I or
265 early childhood education). In Bangladesh, Bengali and Urdu (in some schools) are
266 the MoI from grade I in all government schools, and English is introduced as a
267 language subject during the primary grades. The ITM languages are completely
268 absent in education except in some experimental program in recent years with help
269 of NGOs.

270 Bhutan's Royal Commission for Education manages educational policy and
271 practices in Bhutan. However, early education and primary schools, in most cases,
272 are locally managed. Dzongkha is the MoI in all schools although in some cases the
273 community-managed schools bring in local languages or children's MT into early
274 literacy instruction in an informal manner to facilitate teaching-learning in
275 Dzongkha. English is introduced in school education quite early, targeted as a
276 major language of higher education and global economy. Language in education
277 policy in Bhutan has a clear emphasis on English with promotion of early literacy in
278 Dzongkha regardless of children's MT. There is currently some effort to develop a

279 national framework for education in which some role to the other 29 languages is
280 being debated.

281 In Sri Lanka there is an ongoing effort to restructure education to promote the new
282 trilingual policy of developing proficiency in English, Sinhala, and Tamil through
283 the MT-based MLE system in which early literacy education will be in children's
284 MT (either Tamil or Sinhala) with English and the second national language taught
285 early during the primary stage of schooling. The exact nature of education for
286 trilingual development is to be finalized through ongoing processes of national and
287 international consultation. However, the role of English is considered quite signif-
288 icant in all levels of education, especially in higher education.

289 Education in Afghanistan has been quite unstable through the divergent impacts
290 of Islamic fundamentalists, Soviet occupation, and the new tension-ridden democ-
291 ratic setup under American and Western influences. Since 1992, the system of
292 education has gone through some modernization although the traditional religious
293 conservatism in education has not been completely nullified. The new school
294 curriculum framework seeks a balance between the different forces and orientations
295 seeking to promote Pashto and Dari as languages of early education along with use
296 of ethnic minority languages as MoI and continuation of traditional Islamic educa-
297 tion. However, the modern education in Afghanistan has a clear priority toward
298 using English as the language of instruction in higher education. New universities in
299 the country are developed as English-only universities. Thus, at a broader level, the
300 language-in-education policy in Afghanistan has priorities on English, the national
301 languages – Pashto and Dari – and then the regional languages.

302 Policy and practice in respect of language in education in the Indian subcontinent
303 reflect the linguistic “double divide” between English and major national language
304 (s) on one hand and the major languages and the ITM languages on the other. In
305 public education, while major languages are promoted as languages of early literacy,
306 emphasis on English is quite evident in its presence quite early in school education.
307 The declared policy may provide some scope for early education in children's MT,
308 but in actual practice, ITM languages are neglected. Further, there is a parallel form
309 of private education in English as the MoI, at all levels of schooling. Higher and
310 university level education is in English in public as well as private systems. This, in
311 fact, triggers a wash-back effect generating popular demand for early English and
312 contributing to the rapid growth of private English-medium schools with a major
313 share of school-age pupils. Generally, the quality of English teaching is quite poor in
314 private as well as public schools. A huge number of low-cost poor quality private
315 English-medium schools have started coming up for children from the lower socio-
316 economic strata in rural, semi-urban, and urban slums without much home support
317 for learning English. This is in sharp contrast to the children from higher socioeco-
318 nomic families in high-cost private schools; early learning in English by these
319 children is amply supported in their home environment and early socialization.
320 Such variations in the cost and quality of private English-medium schools for the
321 poor and the affluent and for major language-medium public schools for the rela-
322 tively poor and also the children from linguistic minorities, such as the tribal
323 children, have given rise to a hierarchy of school systems in the subcontinent with

324 the ITM children from lower socioeconomic conditions as the most disadvantaged
325 (Mohanty 2010).

326 **Education for Linguistic Minorities**

327 Private schooling with English as the MoI and dominant language-medium public
328 schools have created a problem of access for the ITM children mostly from the
329 economically weaker sections in the society. Imposition of the dominant languages
330 as MoI creates a language barrier for a large number of children in the Indian
331 subcontinent limiting the chances of their educational success and having a subtrac-
332 tive effect on their mother tongue competence (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000; Skutnabb-
333 Kangas and Dunbar 2010). Neglect of MTs in education has been shown to be
334 leading to educational failure, high “push out” rates, capability deprivation, and
335 poverty for ITM children in India and Nepal (Hough et al. 2009; Mohanty 2008;
336 Mohanty and Skutnabb-Kangas 2013) and in Pakistan (Coleman 2010; Rahman
337 2008).

338 The critical link between submersion education in dominant languages and
339 educational failure of ITM children has led to some experimental programs of
340 MT-based education in minority and tribal languages in parts of the subcontinent.
341 Two states in India have experimental programs of multilingual education (MLE) in
342 which tribal MTs are used as the language of teaching-learning and early literacy
343 development during primary grades (I to V). The dominant state language and
344 English are introduced as language subjects (not as MoI, except in the respective
345 language teaching) in later grades. The program started in eight tribal languages in
346 240 primary schools in Andhra Pradesh in the year 2005 and in Odisha 2 years later
347 in ten tribal languages in 195 schools. The MT of tribal children is used as the
348 language of the classroom till the end of grade V. The teachers are from the
349 respective language communities, and textbooks prepared in these languages follow
350 the state curriculum with special efforts to make the content specific to the indige-
351 nous cultural experiences of the children. From grade VI onward, the major state
352 language, Telugu in Andhra Pradesh and Odia in Odisha, becomes the sole medium
353 of teaching (except other language subjects such as English). In eight of the
354 Government of Odisha MLE schools, a special intervention program called *MLE*
355 *Plus* was implemented in two tribal languages, Kui and Saora, by the authors (see
356 Panda and Mohanty 2011, 2014 for details) from 2007 until 2012. A longitudinal
357 evaluation (Panda et al. 2011) of MLE in Odisha and Andhra Pradesh and an
358 evaluation by the National Council of Educational Research and Training, India
359 (NCERT 2011), of the Odisha Program, besides several other evaluations, have
360 shown positive effects of the MT-based MLE on children’s classroom achievement,
361 improved scores on the dominant state language (Telugu/Odia) and English, school
362 attendance, classroom participation, and positive teacher and community attitudes.
363 The Odisha MLE program is now extended to 1,000 schools in 19 tribal languages
364 and the program in Andhra Pradesh to over 3,000 schools in the earlier eight
365 languages. The Government of Odisha has now accepted a set of policy

366 recommendations (Mohanty et al. 2014) to provide MT-based MLE to all tribal
367 children in the state in a phased manner. With this Odisha is the first state in India to
368 have a policy of MT-based education for tribal children.

369 The Odisha model was followed in Nepal in a small-scale experimental MLE
370 program in eight languages in seven schools (out of 32,000 schools in the country;
371 see Hough et al. 2009; Yonjan-Tamang et al. 2009 for details). Similarly, some
372 experimental MLE programs have started in Bangladesh for indigenous minorities
373 (Rahman 2010). The 2009 Educational Policy of Pakistan recommends use of local
374 mother tongues or early education along with Urdu and English that are targeted to
375 become major languages of teaching by grade 4. As pointed out earlier, Sri Lanka
376 has an official trilingual policy and has plans for use of MLE model for MT-based
377 education in Sinhala and Tamil and development of trilingual competence in
378 English, Tamil, and Sinhala.

379 **Problems, Difficulties, and Future Directions**

380 In her analysis of language-in-education policies, Shohamy (2010) speaks of the gap
381 between declared and de facto policies. The declared MT-based official policies in
382 the countries in the Indian subcontinent seem to be liberal and egalitarian treating all
383 languages as resources and accepting education in the MTs in principle. However,
384 the ground level de facto policies, under pressure to yield a prominent role to English
385 and major national and regional languages, confirm to the hierarchical double divide
386 (Panda and Mohanty 2014). Mother tongues, wherever used for early education, are
387 treated as convenient stepping stones for targeted development of dominant lan-
388 guages including English. There is a widespread attempt to bring English very early
389 into the primary education in the Indian subcontinent – in India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka,
390 Nepal, Bhutan, and Bangladesh. English is taught in the first year of primary grades
391 in the public schools in more than 21 of the 29 states in India. Thus, the dominant
392 languages, including English, are considered more important than the ITM lan-
393 guages in the MLE programs in which development of early literacy in MT is
394 viewed as a necessary condition for development of the major languages. This, as
395 Panda (2012) argues, gives the MT-based experimental programs in the Indian
396 subcontinent an “early-exit” character. As soon as the “major” languages are intro-
397 duced into the MLE programs, MT is no longer viewed as primary, and there seems
398 to be an urgency to drop the MT as early as possible.

399 The positioning and sequencing of languages in education and the tendency to
400 emphasize long-term continuation of the dominant languages dropping the MTs
401 early in the MLE programs seem to reflect the power hierarchy of languages in the
402 society. In the process, English is treated as a vital cultural capital making its
403 prominence in the de facto policies appear to be natural and in the best interests of
404 the children and their communities. In this context, the policy implications of
405 positive evaluations of the experimental programs of MT-based MLE are crucial,
406 even if, given the small-scale nature of the programs and the dominant bias toward

407 education in English and the major national or regional languages, they appear to be
408 too weak to subvert the linguistic double divide in the society.

409 Cross-References

- 410 ► [Language Education and Multilingualism](#)
- 411 ► [Language Education Planning and Policies by and for Indigenous Peoples](#)
- 412 ► [Language Education, Pluralism, and Citizenship](#)
- 413 ► [Linguistic Human Rights in Education](#)
- 414 ► [The Politics of English Language Teaching](#)

415 Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

416 Ahmar Mahboob and Rashi Jain: [Bilingual Education in India and Pakistan](#). In
417 Volume: Bilingual Education

418 References

- 419 Coleman, H. (2010). *Teaching and learning in Pakistan: The role of language in education*.
420 Islamabad: British Council.
- 421 GOP. (2009). *National Education Policy 2009*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education, Government of
422 Pakistan.
- 423 Hough, D., Thapa Magar, R. B., & Yonjan-Tamang, A. (2009). Privileging Indigenous knowledges:
424 Empowering MLE in Nepal. In A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas
425 (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice* (pp. 159–176). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- 426 Mohanty, A. (2008). Perpetuating Inequality: Language disadvantage and capability deprivation of
427 tribal mother tongue speakers in India. In W. Harbert (Ed.), *Language and poverty*
428 (pp. 102–124). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 429 Mohanty, A. (2010). Languages, inequality and marginalization: Implications of the double divide
430 in Indian multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 205, 131–154.
- 431 Mohanty, A., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2013). MLE as an economic equaliser in India and Nepal:
432 Mother tongue based multilingual education fights poverty through capability development and
433 identity support. In K. Henrard (Ed.), *The Interrelation between the right to identity of minorities*
434 *and their socio-economic participation* (pp. 159–187). Leiden: MartinusNijhoff.
- 435 Mohanty, A. K., (Chair), Acharya, B. M., Dash, U. N., Kundu, M. N., Mishra, M. K., Mohanty,
436 M. M., et al. (2014). *MLE policy and implementation guidelines for Odisha*. Bhubaneswar:
437 Odisha Primary Education Programme Authority.
- 438 NCERT. (2011). *Programme evaluation report: Multilingual education, Orissa*. New Delhi:
439 National Council of Educational Research and Training.
- 440 Panda, M. (2012). *Report of the task force on "Issues in education of tribal children" (12th Five-*
441 *year plan)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission of India.
- 442 Panda, M., & Mohanty, A. (2011). *From mother tongue to other tongue: Multilingual education of*
443 *tribal children in India*. New Delhi: ZHCES-BvLF Project Report, Jawaharlal Nehru University.
- 444 Panda, M., & Mohanty, A. (2014). Language policy in education: Towards multilingual education.
445 In R. C. Tripathi & Y. Sinha (Eds.), *Psychology, development and social policy in India*
446 (pp. 103–129). New Delhi: Springer.

- 447 Panda, M., Mohanty, A., Nag, S., & Biswabandan, B. (2011). Does MLE work in Andhra Pradesh
448 and Odisha? A longitudinal study. *Swara*, 1(6–7), 2–23.
- 449 Rahman, T. (1998). *Language and politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- 450 Rahman, T. (2008). Language policy and education in Pakistan. In S. May & N. H. Hornberger
451 (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education vol. 1: Language policy and political issues in*
452 *education* (2nd ed., pp. 383–392). New York: Springer.
- 453 Rahman, T. (2010). A multilingual language-in-education policy for indigenous minorities in
454 Bangladesh: Challenges and possibilities. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4),
455 341–359.
- 456 Shohamy, E. (2010). Cases of language policy resistance in Israel's centralized educational system.
457 In K. Menken & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as*
458 *policy makers* (pp. 182–197). New York: Routledge.
- 459 Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in – Or worldwide diversity and human rights?*
460 Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 461 Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Dunbar, R. (2010). *Indigenous children's education as linguistic genocide*
462 *and a crime against humanity? A global view*. Guovdageaidnu: Galdu Resource Centre for
463 Rights of Indigenous Peoples. <http://www.galdu.org>
- 464 Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Mohanty, A. (2009). *Policy and strategy for MLE in Nepal*. Sanothimi/
465 Bhaktapur: Multilingual Education Program for All Non-Nepali Speaking Students of Primary
466 Schools of Nepal. Ministry of Education, Department of Education: Inclusive Section.
- 467 UNESCO. (2009). *Atlas of world's languages in danger*. Paris: UNESCO. [http://www.unesco.org/](http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages)
468 [culture/en/endangeredlanguages](http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages). Accessed 17 Mar 2009.
- 469 Yonjan-Tamang, A., Hough, D., & Nurmela, I. (2009). "All Nepalese children have the right to
470 education in their mother tongue" – But how? The Nepal MLE Program. In A. Mohanty,
471 M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice*
472 (pp. 241–249). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Index Terms:

Afghanistan 2
Balochi 4
Bangladesh 2
Bengali 5
Bhutan 2, 5
Bodo 4
Capability deprivation 9
Dari 4
De facto policies 10
Declared language policies 2
Double divide 2
Dzongkha 5
Endangerment of languages 3
English 3
High-cost private schools 8
Hindi 3
India 2
Indian subcontinent 3
Indigenous tribal minority (ITM) languages 2, 5
Kati 4
Kui 9
Language-in-education policies 2, 6
Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) 4
Low-cost private English medium schools 8
Marginalization 5
Medium of instruction (MoI) 6–7
Minority mother tongues (MTs) 2
MLE Plus 9
Mother tongue (MT) based multilingual education 2–3, 10
Multilingual education (MLE) 9
Munji 4
National and regional languages 2, 5
Nepal 2
Nepali 5
Odia 9
Official language Act of 1963 4

Official Language Act of Sri Lanka 4
Official languages
 in India 3
 in Sri Lanka 3
Pakistan 2–3
Pasal 4
Pashto 4
Provincial languages 5
Push out rates 9
Santali 4
Saora 9
Sinhala 3
Sri Lanka 2–3
Subtractive effect 9
Tamil 3
Telugu 9
Trilingual policy 3
Turkmen 4
Urdu 4
Uzbek 4

Uncorrected Proof

Author Queries

Query Refs.: 37-1 315624_0_En

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please check if your affiliation(s) and, if applicable, that/those of your co-author(s) are correct and complete.	

Note:

If you are using material from other works please make sure that you have obtained the necessary permission from the copyright holders and that references to the original publications are included.

Uncorrected Proof