Policy and Strategy for MLE in Nepal
Report by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ajit Mohanty
Consultancy visit 4-14 March 2009[i]

Multilingual Education Program for All Non-Nepali Speaking Students of Primary Schools of Nepal
Ministry of Education
Department of Education
Inclusive Section
Sanothimi
Bhaktapur

List of Contents

List of Contents
List of Appendices
List of Tables
List of Figures
List of Abbreviations

Contents of the report
Page

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Terms of Reference (TOR) for Ajit Mohanty and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas
Appendix 2. Concept paper Multilingual Education and Nepal
Appendix 3. List of participants, Rasuwa Workshop, March 6 2009

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Abbreviations

BICS	Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills
CALP	Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency
ELT	English Language Teaching
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IK	Indigenous Knowledge(s) and Indigenous Knowledge Holders
ITM	Indigenous/ tribal and minority
L1	first language, mother tongue
L2	second language
LHRs	Linguistic Human Rights
MT	mother tongue
MTM	mother tongue medium
MLE	(mother-tongue-based) multilingual education
NCF	**National Curriculum Framework for School Education in Nepal**
TEK	Traditional Ecological Knowledge
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples

1. Introduction: placing language in education issues in Nepal in a broader societal, economic and political framework

Issues on language in education are part of a broader societal framework. First we present our framework and attempt to place Nepal in it. Peace researcher Johan Galtung (1988) discusses various basic material (somatic, bodily, physical) and non-material (mental) needs, where some are direct (intended) and some structural (built into the way a system functions) (see Table 1). He also lists the main impediments/barriers that make their satisfaction difficult or impossible. During the last year or two Nepal has made decisive moves from *Repression* towards the *Freedom* which is implied in a democracy. If the Constituent Assembly succeeds in writing a positive new Constitution, basic *Freedom* and hopefully also *Security* might be guaranteed. As long as there is as much physical *Violence* as today (March 2009), schools cannot function optimally. Many schools are not even open, due to serious interruptions and many are delayed: "the courses had not been completed due to the bandh" [demonstrations/strikes] and "district-level examinations have to be postponed" because of them (e.g. in Rupandehi, **The Himalayan Times**, March 13, 2009, p. 5, "*Bandh hits schools' calendar*"). It will take a long time before *Well-being* spreads to most of the population (editorial "*Belly shrivels*", **The Himalayan Times**, March 13, 2009, p. 6). And before Indigenous/Tribal and (linguistic) Minority (hereafter ITM) parents and children (who form around half of the population of Nepal) will have the same standard of living as the rest of the population, and be less marginalized, even more time will elapse.

Table 1. TYPES OF BASIC NEEDS vs <u>Impediments to their satisfaction</u>

	DIRECT (intended)	STRUCTURAL (built-in)
Material needs (SOMATIC)	SECURITY vs <u>violence</u>	WELL-BEING vs <u>misery</u>
Non-material needs (MENTAL)	FREEDOM vs <u>repression</u>	IDENTITY vs <u>alienation</u>

Source: based on Galtung 1988: 147.

All people of Nepal will hopefully experience less material *Misery* in the years to come. Having at least some of the basic needs of housing, food, health care, etc. met is a prerequisite for parents to be able to send children to school, for children to be able to learn and for teachers to be able to teach. This is equally true for any kind of formal (and non-formal) education.

Language in education issues, especially mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MLE), belongs specifically in the fourth quadrant in Table 1. Many ITM parents and children have experienced strong *Alienation* both in society in general and, especially, in relation to schools, which have been using Nepali as the only or main teaching language. Their *Identity* has not been accepted or respected. Many of the "ethnic" conflicts today have to do with the

non-acceptance of people's ethnic, cultural and linguistic *Identities*. A new constitution, based on federalism, acceptance of various ITM *Identities*, and the linguistic and cultural rights that should follow, can go a long way to solve some of the conflicts. Mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MLE) is an important part of this solution.

But language in education issues should also be connected to still broader issues of choices that all countries have to make when we face today's global large-scale socio-economic, techno-military and political structural choices. These choices are particularly relevant for new democracies such as Nepal. There are alternative responses to these choices. Figure 1 presents a simplified flow chart of consequences of these choices. Even if the choices and responses are here presented as straightforward alternatives, they obviously represent endpoints on several continua.

Nepal needs to choose the direction it wants to follow. In several senses, the choices so far seem to lie somewhat closer to the diversity end. It is important, though, to acknowledge that educational choices (e.g. strong or weak MLE models) are linked to all the other choices. If there are too many socioeconomic, nature-related or political choices which point in a homogenising market-oriented direction, prerequisites for good MLE also deteriorate, both attitudinally and structurally. This is an important consideration in language policy and planning (see Figure 1; source: Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 656).

Figure 1. Alternative responses to socio-economic, techno-military and political structural choices

Alternative responses to changes

BACKGROUND REASONS

Socio-economic, techno-military and political structural changes

RESULTS in

Environmental degradation	Linguistic and cultural genocide	Growing gaps between haves and have-nots

CREATES STRESS UPON

NATURE	P E O P	L E
·.	Languages and cultures	Socio-economic conditions of life

THESE RESPOND, ALTERNATIVELY,

THROUGH MARKETS & MONOCULTURAL EFFICIENCY: Economic efficiency first priority;larger and more centralized economic and political units; OR	THROUGH DIVERSITY: Sustainability through diversity first priority: flexible, resilient and democratic economic and political units

WHICH RESULTS, ALTERNATIVELY, in

Biodiversity disappears	Linguistic and cultural diversity disappears; homogeni-	Living conditions deteriorate	Biodiversity maintenance	Linguistic & cultural maintenance, development	Living conditions sustainable, political & economic

				sation				democracy

Our last Table (Table 2) in this broader framework is related to somewhat similar choices, which connect the earlier consideration and relate them to a centralisation vs decentralisation issues, relevant for the discussions about federalism. A bioregional paradigm is more conducive to decentralisation of power and decision-making, especially in a multiethnic multilingual multicultural biodiversity-wise rich state such as Nepal, than an industrio-scientific paradigm.

Table 2. Basic tenets of the bioregional and industrio-scientific paradigms

Basic tenets of the bioregional and industrio-scientific paradigms

	BIOREGIONAL PARADIGM	INDUSTRIO-SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM
Scale	Region Community	State Nation/World
Economy	Conservation Stability Self-Sufficiency Cooperation	Exploitation Change/Progress Global Economy Competition
Polity	Decentralization Complementarity Diversity	Centralization Hierarchy Uniformity
Society	Symbiosis Evolution Division	Polarization Growth/Violence Monoculture

adopted from Sale (1996, 475)

2. Broader Language Policy and Planning Perspectives and Issues

2.1. STEP 1 in Language Policy and Language Planning: Broad-based political debates about the goals of language policy

Broad-based political debates about the goals of language policy should ideally precede decision-making, and be informed about language policy and language planning theories (as, for instance the Nepali **The Report of National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission** 1994, eds. Yadava & Grove, English translation 2008, is). Usually three kinds of language planning are listed:

1. **Status planning**: actions that formalise or elevate the status of languages; in Nepal, for instance deciding what constitutional status the various ITM languages are to have in which areas.
2. **Acquisition planning**: actions that promote the learning of languages and the acquisition of literacy, in Nepal for instance planning good mother-tongue-based multilingual schools.

3. **Corpus planning**: actions to standardise languages, write grammars, create new words, e.g in Nepal extending the resources of ITM languages for textbooks and for teaching various subjects in ITM mother tongues.

To these, the architect of Australian language policy, Joseph Lo Bianco (2009), has added three more:

4. **Usage planning**: actions that extend the domains and usage of a language, e.g. in Nepal extending MLE from lower to higher elementary and to secondary education.
5. **Prestige planning**: actions that elevate the prestige and esteem of a language (connected with e.g. English-medium schools in Nepal; often English may be taught more for its prestige than anything else).
6. **Attitudinal planning**: actions that modify the discourse and attitudes towards language. It may be both a consequence of implementing good Acquisition planning because positive results of MLE in Nepal will influence people's attitudes towards MLE and towards ITM languages. Attitudinal planning is also needed for state-wide advocacy campaigns for MLE.

Lo Bianco (2009) also differentiates between **three dimensions of language policy, intended, implemented and experienced**. In the *intended* policy we can ask for Nepal what the government (or district or school) claim that a certain type of MLE policy intends to accomplish. On the practical arena, the *implemented* policy tells what is in fact done? Which MLE models are chosen? Do the prerequisites, the measures and the funding correspond to the intentions/aims? The *experienced* policy gives evidence about how the children, the parents and the teachers experience the policy in practice. Do they see the promised processes and the expected results? When evaluating language policy, all three dimensions should be included.

It is also important to acknowledge that **language planning is always political planning**. Language is often invested with emotional and ideological power, with cultural values and historic associations, with group and individual identity. This can be very clearly seen in the Nepalese context, and we saw it on our field trip to Rasuwa, in the various workshops and seminars, and in meetings with various organizations and individuals.

The link to politics is inevitable when the distribution of resources is one of the main outcomes of policy making processes, involving a range of often incompatible social, economic, cultural and symbolic interests. Language planning is always aiming to advance SOME interests and retard OTHER rival interests. Therefore we have to ask the question *whose interests*. It is vital to analyse and acknowledge **whose interests various models of MLE serve and whose interests are NOT served or are served less well**. Centralised homogenising assimilatory models, with no or very few years of mother tongue medium education (and with early English) may serve the interests of some Nepali-speaking elites. Decentralised diverse and diversifying integrative models, with minimally 6-8 years of mainly mother tongue medium multilingual education (MLE) serve the interests of the whole population, not only the interests of Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities.

2.2. STEP 2 in Educational Language Policy and Language Planning: realistic language proficiency goal/aim in relation to the baseline

When planning an educational intervention that includes language, one needs to decide what a realistic future language proficiency goal/aim is, in relation to the baseline, i.e. the present language competence of learners, families and communities, teachers, school directors, teacher trainers and curriculum developers, and also educational administrators at various levels. Some of these factors have been enumerated in Table 3.

Table 3. Illustration of language competence for planning

	Language A L1=a tribal or minority language in Nepal		Language B L2 = Nepali		Language C L3 = English	
	List/Spk	**Read/Wr**	**List/Spk**	**Read/Wr**	**List/Spk**	**Read/Wr**
Learners Incoming	High	---	Low	---	---	---
Families and communities	High	---	Low	---	---	---
Teachers	High	Moderate	High to moderate	Moderate	Low	Low
School directors	High	Moderate	High	High to moderate	Moderate	Low
Trainers and curriculum developers	(*Varied*)	(*Varied*)	High	High to moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Aim	**High**	**High**	**High**	**High**	**High**	**High**

List/Spk= Listening/Speaking; Read/Wr = Reading/Writing; L1, L2, L3= first, second and third language. Based on Benson (2009, Table 4.2.). We have changed the languages from Nigeria to Nepal.

When planning what a realistic short- and even middle-term linguistic competence goal in Nepal would be for school children after the first 8 years of formal education, we need to think of Nepalese Indigenous/tribal/minority mother tongue students who start school. What is the language competence goal/aim? Which languages should the child learn, and how well? Of course one might wish that all or at least most ITM children would reach the highest competence in all three languages, as indicated in Table 3.

In STEP 2, planners need to estimate the present linguistic competence of the school-starting child and all the other categories in the left column, and discuss how to get to the aim, given the starting point. What input is needed? How many years and what kind of teacher training, curriculum and materials development etc are needed for the aims in Table 3 (HIGH in listening/speaking and reading/writing) to be reached? If, for instance, teachers' competence is not high in all three languages, we cannot expect that the children's competence will become higher than that of the teachers, before the teachers have had much more training. Do the aims need to be modified, in the light of the present linguistic competence of teachers and all the other categories? If so, how? What would be more realistic goals? What kind of input is needed for the more realistic goals? By whom? Here one needs to list the various agencies and their tasks and their present competence for doing what is needed.

The costs for doing the upgrading may initially seem high, but as compared to today's wastage, they may not be impossible (see later under Section 2.5 which is mainly on economics). Everything is not possible at the same time; thus priorities have to be discussed.

High competence in the mother tongue is a must from an identity and self-confidence point of view – we need roots to be able to have a future. The mother tongue is also the basis for *all* learning, including the good learning other languages.

High final competence in Nepali is also a must, for further education, for the labour market and for democratic political and other societal participation.

In the short- and mid-term it might be necessary to lower the expectations for *competence in English*, though. Most Nepalis will not participate much in the kind of international cooperation where the highest possible competence in reading and especially writing English is necessary – for most, learning English has much more practical goals. Languages are learned at a high level through using them for these high-level functions. Thus a solid basic knowledge that can be expanded later might be a more realistic mid-term goal.

Carol Benson (2009) suggest likewise that the English goals should be lowered for Nigeria. Under present circumstances where teachers, school directors and teacher trainers do not themselves have High competence in English, neither in Listening/Speaking nor in Reading/Writing, the aim cannot be "High" competence in English for students, before teachers etc have had MUCH more training, she writes. Would this be true in Nepal too? What would a realistic aim be? For how long? And what has been suggested for Nepal in relation to English? We expand the discussion about English somewhat more in section 5.1.

2.3. STEP 3 in Educational Language Planning: ideal goals and prerequisites compared with characteristics of present schools

Once the goals have been clarified, the means to reach the goals need to be discussed and decided. Here too, one has to look at ideal models and conditions and strive towards them, at the same time as the ideal models (and there are many) have to be adapted to the various contexts and realities on the ground, in different parts of the country, different districts and different schools. No models can be transferred directly. Still, we know from research worldwide what some of the ideal conditions are for reaching the four goals in the education of ITM children. These goals are listed in Table 4 (from Skutnabb-Kangas 2000):

Table 4. Educational goals

A good educational programme for both ITMs and dominant group children leads to the following goals from a language(s), identity and competence point of view:
1. high levels of multilingualism
2. a fair chance of achieving academically at school
3. strong, positive multilingual and multicultural identity and positive attitudes towards self and others
4. a fair chance of awareness and competence building as prerequisites for working for a more equitable world, for oneself and one's own group as well as others, locally and globally

Knowledge of as many characteristics as possible for a successful programme in each locality/school, in advance is vital for planning the implementation of an educational language policy, before looking at "ideal" characteristics and prerequisites; these two will then have to be matched. Table 5, inspired by Sushan Acharya's and the MLE project's Expert & Research Team's draft report (which we had access to at the end of February) presents a preliminary checklist for mother-tongue-based MLE of characteristics in elementary (1-6) or preschool classrooms.

Table 5. Characteristics of elementary (1-6) or preschool classrooms

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
Students	all S. have the same MT		S. from two MT groups		S. from 3 or more MT groups	
Grades	1 grade per class		2 grades per class		Multigrade classroom	
Language of teaching	One language only		Two languages		3 or more languages	
Language of learning; (S. answer in it, interact with each other in it)	One lg, same as teaching lg	One lg, , different from tea-ching lg	Two lgs, same as teaching lgs	Two lgs, one different from teach-ing lg(s)	3 or more lgs, same as teaching lgs	3 or mo-re lgs, some different from teaching lg(s)
Teacher's language competence	T knows all S's MTs		T knows some S's MTs but not all		T knows Nepalese but no other MTs	
MTs taught as subjects	All MTs are taught		Some MTs are taught		Only N is taught as subject	
Nepali taught as a L2: second/ foreign language	N taught as a second/ foreign lg subject		N is taught as if it were all S's MT			
Teaching materials	TM in all lgs for all subjects (incl. N. as L2)		TM in some lgs for some subjects		TM in Nepali only	
Content culturally appropriate, adjusted to local context	Yes; materials locally created, not translations from N.		Some content & materials local & some translated		All materials & content centrally created	
Use of IK holders and other locals as teachers	Yes, much, and they get a salary	Yes, much, but no salary	Some are used; they get a salary	Some are used; no salary	Not used because no salary	Not used
Parents well informed & agree on MLE goals	Well informed, agree	Informed, but may prefer private school?	Somewhat informed, probably agree	Somewhat informed, may not agree	Not (well) informed but agree	Not informed, do not agree
School principals and district level school authorities, as above						
Central school authorities, as above						

S = Student; T = Teacher; MT = mother tongue; lg = language; L2 = second or foreign language; N = Nepali; TM = teaching materials; IK = Indigenous knowledge

When looking at the characteristics of various factors that are important for MLE to succeed, A1 might seem the ideal situation. But how many schools in the MLE project, or in Nepal, have those characteristics? When describing various schools, even in the MLE-project one can see various combinations, e.g. Students: C1, Grades, C1, Language of teaching, A1, and so on. Here one can already see that if a school has a combination of students with several different mother tongues in a multi-grade classroom, teaching in one language only (as in A1) is NOT good! Sunsari in the MLE project has this challenge, and the methods chosen at the point of writing pose a big challenge for both teachers and students. Planning then has to start by listing characteristics that one can NOT change immediately (e.g. what kind of students a school has), and then planning what combination of the characteristics one might be able to change to have a better situation. If the school, for instance, has students with many mother tongues, one has to teach in several languages for it to be mother-tongue-based. Would several multigrade classrooms, based on language, be better than having one mixed-mother-tongue grade per classroom, if it makes it possible to have all Tharu-speakers (grades 1-5) in one class, all Urau speakers in another, and all Nepali speakers in a third? Which characteristics would one try to change first? And next? Why? Several other important characteristics might need to be added to Table 5 locally or in general.

2.4. STEP 4 in Educational Language Planning: what has characterized programmes with high versus low success?

When planning many of the details, it is useful to know more about what has already been tried, with what results. No models or programmes can be transferred to other contexts without localising them, but general principles about what characterises programmes with high success and programmes with low success can be deduced from experiences in many parts of the world. Tables 6 and 7 present some of these generalizations of characteristics.

In Table 6, the central factor is the dominant medium of education, the mother tongue (L1) or another language (L2). The next factor is either a low or a high degree of success (LDS or HDS). These have been defined according to the goals in Table 4 above. Children who participate in a programme can come either from a linguistic majority/dominant group, or a minority. It is clear that it is NOT necessarily so that teaching through the medium of an L2 always leads to a low degree of success: dominant group members can be taught through the medium of a foreign language, with a high degree of success (immersion programmes). But when we combine these factors (L1 or L2, high or low degree of success, majority or minority group), this should give 8 possible programmes, and for each of them, a specific group has been mentioned. In the table there are, however, only 7 programmes. One is missing: teaching a minority group through the medium of a foreign language, with a high degree of success. Why is it missing? Because there are no examples in research of high degree of success at a group level where ITM children taught in an L2 would have succeeded. Those who have succeeded, have done so DESPITE the school, NOT because of the way their education has been organised.

Table 6 then lists factors important for success, and gives each programme a plus (+) or a minus (-) depending on whether the demand in the factor has been fulfilled or not. It also lists what the linguistic goal and the societal goal have been for each programme. It is easy to see that the goals in the LDS have been negative for the group concerned whereas the goals in the HDS have been positive from the group's point of view.

Table 6. Characteristics of multilingual education

Name of programme	SEGREGATION		MAINTENANCE		SUBMERSION		IMMERSION
Degree of success	LOW (LDS)		HIGH (HDS)		LOW (LDS)		HIGH (HDS)
Dominant medium of education (ME)	L1				L2		
Linguistic goal	dominance in L1		bilingualism		elites L2-do-minance masses: L1-dom.	domin-ance in L2	bilingualism
Societal goal	apart-heid	repatri-ation	equity and inte-gration		perpetu-ate strati-fication	assim-ilation, margin-alization	linguistic and cultural enrichment, benefits
Majority/minority	maj	min	maj	min	maj	min	maj
EXAMPLE	Africa	Europe	Asia	Europe	Africa	World	Canada
	Bantu Namibia	Turks in Bavaria	Uzbek-istan	Finns in Sweden	Zambia	Western European minorities	Canada
Organisational factors							
1 alternative programmes available	−	−	+	+	−	−	+
2 pupils equally placed vis-a-vis knowledge of ME	+	+	+	+	−	−	+
3 bilingual (B), trained (T) teachers	B	B or T	BT ?	BT	B	T	BT
4 bilingual materials (eg dictionaries) available	−	+	+	+	−	−	+
5 cultural content of materials appropriate for pupils	−	−	+	+	−	−	+
Learner-related affective factors							
6 low level of anxiety (supportive, non-authoritarian)	−	−	+ ?	+	−	−	+
7 high internal motivation (not forced to use L2, understands & sympathetic with objectives, responsible for own learning	−	−	+	+	−	−	+
8 high self-confidence (high teacher expectations, fair chance to succeed)	−	−	+	+	−	−	+
L1-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors							
9 adequate linguistic development in L1 (L1 taught well(W), badly (B) or not at all(−) in school)	B	B	W	W	−	−	W
10 enough relevant, cognitively demanding subject-matter provided	− ?	+ ?	+	+	− ?	− ?	+
11 opportunity to develop L1 outside school in linguistically demanding formal contexts	+ ?	−	+	−	+	−	+
12 L2-teaching supports (+) or harms (−) L1 development	+	+	+	+	− ?	−	+
L2-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors							
13 adequate linguistic development in L2 (L2 taught well(W), badly(B) or not at all(−) in school)	B	B	W ?	W	B	B	W
14 L2 input adapted to pupils' L2 level	+	+	+	+	− ?	−	+
15 opportunity to practise L2 in peer group contexts outside school	+	+	+ ?	+ ?			
16 exposure to native speaker L2 use in linguistically demanding formal contexts	−	+	+			+	

LDS = Low Degree of Success; HDS = High Degree of Success; From Skutnabb-Kangas 1988: 24-25

Table 7 (3 pages; from Skutnabb-Kangas & García 1995, pp. 247-249) presents similar characteristics for 4 strong models of MLE, all with a high degree of success, and 2 weak forms of MLE where especially the last one, an early-exit transitional model, is relevant for

Nepal. Submersion models, where ITM children are taught entirely through the medium of a dominant language (the most common model today for ITM children in Nepal, have not even been presented in this Table, because it tries to list in great detail what characterizes successful models. The "European Schools" here are NOT ordinary schools in Europe, but the special European Union Schools (14 at the moment) for children whose parents are employed by the EU, regardless in which level of position; see Baetens Beardsmore 1995 for a thorough description of them). In the 2-way bilingual schools (over 300 in the USA; see Dolson & Lindholm 1995 and Lindholm-Leary 2001 for them) approximately half of the students are native English speakers and half represent one ITM group (most are Spanish but many other groups are also involved). The children are initially taught through the medium of the ITM group's language. The model thus represents an immersion programme for the English-speakers and a mother tongue maintenance and development model for the ITM children. Both have their own MT as a subject, and they are also ideally taught their L2 (e.g. English for Spanish-speakers and Spanish for English-speakers) as a second language subject. This might be a possible model for schools in Nepal where some children are Nepali-speakers and others represent one ITM group. (See Table 7, from Skutnabb-Kangas & García 1995, pp. 247-249).

Table 7. Comparison of Educational Programmes

Name of programme	European Schools	Immer-sion	2-way biling.	Mainte-nance		Interna-tional	Transi-tional
TYPES·	strong	strong	strong	strong		weak	weak
TYPICAL CHILD	Heter Maj	Homog Maj	Maj.& Min	Homog. Min		Heter. Ma&Mi	Min
MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION							
Initially	L1	L2	Min L1 Maj L2	L1		L2 for most	L1
Subsequently	Both or all	Both	Both	L1 or both		L2&FL	L2
				F	S		
D. Progressively multilingual students							
1. Expect to become multilingual	+	+	+	+	+	+?	−
2. Informed, responsible for own learning	+?	+	+	+	+	+?	−
3. Organised for real influence	+?	+	+	+	+	−	−
II EDUCATIONAL CULTURE A. Multilingual surround outside classroom							
1. Goal bi/multilingualism for all	÷	+	+?	+	+	+?	−
2. Goal encompasses 1-12 grades	+	−	−	+?	+?	+	−
3. All languages used 3a. - in all spaces in school	+	+?	−	+	+	−	−
3b. - in correspondence	+	−?	+	−	−	−	+
3c. - in signs	+	−?	+?	+?	+?	−	−
3d. - on bulletin boards	+	+?	+?	+	+	−	−
3d. - in assemblies	+	−	−?	+	+	−	−
B. Multilingual languages policy							
1a. L1 has important core subject functions	+	÷	+	+	+	−?	−?
1b. link to identity: same group	+	−	+?	÷	+	−?	−?
1c. L1 used as medium 1-12	+	−?	−?	+?	+?	−	−?

Table 7 continued

Name of programme TYPES TYPICAL CHILD MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	European Schools	Immer-sion	2-way biling.	Mainte-nance		Interna-tional	Transi-tional
TYPES	strong	strong	strong	strong		weak	weak
TYPICAL CHILD	Heter Maj	Homog Maj	Maj.& Min	Homog. Min		Heter. Ma&Mi	Min
MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION Initially	L1	L2	Min L1 Maj L2	L1		L2 for most	L1
Subsequently	Both or all	Both	Both	L1 or both		L2&FL	L2
				F	S		
1d. L1 taught as a subject 1-12	+	+?	–?	+	+	–	–
1e. linguistically homogeneous groups for L1 language arts	+	+	–	+	+	+	+
1f. Expose students to different varieties of L1	+?	–	+	+	+	–	+
1g. Protect L1 from majority language encroachment	+	+	+	+	+	–	–
2a. L2 has important core subject functions	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2b. link to identity: same group	+	–?	+?	+	+	+?	+?
2c. L2 used as (one of the) media 3/4-12, according to monitored plan	+	+	+	+	+	+?	+?
2d. L2 taught as a subject 1-12	+	–	–	+	+	+	+?
2e. linguistically homogeneous groups for L2 language arts, and, for many years, for L2-medium instruction	+	+	–	+	+	–	–?
2f. Expose students to different varieties of L2	+?	–	–?	+	+	+?	+
2g. Silent period allowed	+	+	–	+	+	–	–
C. Inclusive pedagogical strategies							
1. Inquiry-based, problem-oriented	–	–?	+	+	+	–	–
2. Student-centred, interactive	–	–?	+	+	+	–?	–

Table 7 continued

Name of programme	European Schools	Immer-sion	2-way biling.	Mainte-nance		Interna-tional	Transi-tional
TYPES	strong	strong	strong	strong		weak	weak
TYPICAL CHILD	Heter Maj	Homog Maj	Maj.& Min	Homog. Min		Heter. Ma&Mi	Min
MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION Initially	L1	L2	Min L1 Maj L2	L1		L2 for most	L1
Subsequently	Both or all	Both	Both	L1 or both		L2&FL	L2
				F	S		
3. Whole language strategies	–	–?	+	+	+	–	–
4. Use of writing processes	–	–	+	+?	+	–	–
5. Authentic communication	+	+	+	+	+	–	+
D. Varied teaching materials							
1. Rich and varied materials	+	+	+	+	+	+?	+
2. Produce own materials with community & students	+?	+?	+	+	+	–	+?
3. Materials bi/multilingual	+?	+?	+	+	+	–	+?
4. Orature & literature equally valued	–	–	+?	+?	+	–	+?
E. Authentic & fair multilingual assessment							
1. Not compare native and L2-speakers	+	+	–	+	+	–?	–
2. Criterion-referenced/ performance- based; use portfolios	–?	–?	+?	+?	+	–?	–
3. Language of assessment same as medium of instruction, or chosen by student	+	–?	–	+?	+?	+?	–

+ Model generally has this feature

– Model does not generally have this feature

F = A Finnish School in Sweden (Upplands Väsby)

S = A Spanish School in the U.S.A. (La Luz, Dade County, Florida)

It might be useful when looking at Tables 6 and 7 to think of which factors Nepal can influence immediately? Which require more thorough reorganization of schools? With limited resources, where would Nepal place the emphasis? One can use both Tables as a check-list. What has been done already in Nepal, in general or in the MLE Project? What needs still doing.

Since no models can be transferred as such, it is also useful to modify the Tables for Nepalese purposes. What, for instance, is impossible for financial reasons? Capacity reasons? Because there are many one-teacher schools? Because one classroom has students with several mother tongues (Table 5, Students, situation C1)? Because of the gap between policies and implementation? Which factors can be influence now? In 5 years? 10 years? Making a long-term plan, based on the knowledge in Nepal of the conditions and of Nepalese priorities is necessary.

When thinking of the priorities, it is also useful to probe into the thinking and attitudes in Nepal around the explanations that have been and are today given for the low degree of success of ITM children in school. Who or what have been blamed? In many other countries, the children themselves, their parents and their communities have been and are blamed: they are seen as deficient in relation to what school success demands; they are claimed to suffer of various "handicaps". Depending on what "handicap" one sees as the main one, various measures have been suggested and taken. All of them have in this deficiency-theorising phase been trying to change the child, parents and community to fit the school and the state, instead of changing the school so that it changes to accommodate ITM children and so that the school sees them, their parents and their communities as resourceful people and starts from building on the strengths that they have. During all stages in deficiency-based theorizing the dominant group sees assimilation of the ITMs linguistically and culturally as one of the goals of their education: the children should become dominant-language-speaking as soon as possible or at least in the next generation. This is obviously completely against a goal of respecting and protecting the multilingual and multicultural nature of a state.

A suggestion is to place Nepal in Table 8 (next page), in relation to the most common explanations for why non-Nepali –speaking students as a group do not succeed well in school, and the remedies most commonly suggested and used. One could then ask if some Nepali thinking might still be in the Deficit theory phases even if there is constitutional support for a non-assimilationist policy, and/or if the lack of implementation so far of the very positive constitutional protection of multilingualism and multicultural might be partially explained by assimilationist attitudes? During our stay we heard a few high-placed people claim, with approval, that ITM children were ultimately going to be switching over to the dominant language Nepali. We hope, of course (and heard many of the Ministry of Education and Sports and Department of Education representatives express their wish in this direction) that Nepal has started, with MLE, moving towards Enrichment theories.

To sum up this part, then, we recommend that the linguistic goal in Nepal to be reached at the end of Grade 8 would be highest possible competence in both the mother tongues of ITM children and in Nepali, in understanding, speaking, reading and writing, and a somewhat lower but still solid basic competence in English, in at least understanding and reading, with maybe slightly lower competence in speaking English together with some basics in writing English. As soon as teacher etc competencies in English in Nepal become higher, the goals in English could be increased. At the same time the societal goal will hopefully follow the constitution so that education does not in any way participate in forced assimilation but implements fully the positive goals of maintaining and supporting the multilingualism and multiculturalism of the country. This education can also support the maintenance of the diversity, including local linguistic, cultural and biological diversities.

Table 8. Stages in the development of minority education

REASON FOR PROBLEMS	MEASURE	GOAL
Deficit theories		
1 *Linguistic L2-related handicap, learning deficit* (the child does not master L2 well enough)	*More teaching of MaL* (auxiliary teaching, ESL, introductory classes etc); compensatory	MI is to become MaL speaking as fast as possible
2 *Social handicap, socially linked learning deficit* (the child's parents come from the lowest social classes)	*More social and pedagogical help* (aids, tutors, psychologists, social workers, career advisers etc); in addition to measure 1; compensatory	Same as 1
3 *Cultural handicap, culturally linked learning deficit* (the child has a "different" cultural background; the child has low self-confidence; the child is discriminated against)	*Inform* MI-children about MA culture/about their own culture; inform all children about MI-cultures/start multicultural/ intercultural educational programmes; eliminate discrimination/racism in teaching materials; attitudinal courses for teachers; in addition to measures 1 and 2; compensatory	MiL in the family 1-2 generations; MI-children need help to appreciate MI-culture (until they become MaL speaking)
4 *Linguistic L1-related handicap, learning deficit because of L1 deprivation* (the child does not know her own L properly and has therefore poor grounding for the learning of L2 CALP) (the child loses content while learning L2)	*Teaching of L1 as subject; elementary education through the medium of L1 with as fast a transition to L2-medium as possible.* MiL has no intrinsic value, it is therapeutic; compensatory (more self-confidence, better co-operation with home, gives better basis for MaL learning, functions as bridge for transmission of content during L2-learning); in addition to measures 1 and 3	Same as 3
Enrichment theories		
5 High levels of bilingualism beneficial for the individual but difficult to attain, demands much work and energy. The primary goal is to learn MaL properly; it is a prerequisite for equal opportunity	Teaching through the medium of MiL for several years inside MA-school; obligatory teaching of MaL; transition to MaL-medium teaching after elementary education	MiL is allowed to be maintained for private use; bilingualism necessary; MiL is allowed to exist (in a diglossic situation) as long as demographic basis exists
6 Bilingualism enhances development. If problems arise, the causes are similar to those of monolingual children; some problems may be caused by racsim/discrimination	Separate, equal school systems for MI and MA children, L1 is medium for both and L2 obligatory (or possible to study) for both. Positive discrimination of the MI economically (smaller units allowed)	Existence of minorities is enriching for the whole society. MiL has (at least some) official status and its use is encouraged, also for MaL children

MI = minority; MiL = minority language; MA = majority; MaL = majority language.

Source: Skutnabb-Kangas 1988: 34-35.

2.5. STEP 5 in Educational Language Planning: does it pay off to maintain ITM languages?

We need new codified Linguistic Human Rights (LHRs), especially in education. These might be developing through UNESCO's latest plans. But LHRs are "only" a necessary but not sufficient prerequisite: we need implementation of the existing good laws and intentions in Nepal. In most of the world, the political will for implementation is mostly lacking. Neville Alexander's analysis of reasons for it in Africa (2006: 16) states:

The problem of generating the essential political will to translate these insights into implementable policy … needs to be addressed in realistic terms. Language planners have to realize that costing of policy interventions is an essential aspect of the planning process itself and that no political leadership will be content to consider favourably a plan that amounts to no more than a wish list, even if it is based on the most accurate quantitative and qualitative research evidence.

What would, then, be reasonable costs for maintaining indigenous/tribal and minority languages, respecting children's LHRs, and should it be the state that pays them? François Grin offers through his discussion of 'market failure' (2003) excellent arguments for resisting market dominance for public or common assets/goods like cultural products:

Even mainstream economics acknowledges that there are some cases where the market is not enough. These cases are called "market failure". When there is "market failure", the unregulated interplay of supply and demand results in an inappropriate level of production of some commodity (Grin 2003: 35).

In Grin's view, many public goods, including minority language protection, 'are typically under-supplied by market forces' (ibid.). The level becomes inappropriately low. Therefore it is the duty of the state(s) to take extra measures to increase it.

Grin (http://www.geneve.ch/sred/collaborateurs/pagesperso/d-h/grinfrancois/francoisgrin_eng.html)and his team are just finishing a Swiss National Science Foundation project on the economics of the multilingual workplace:

One significant finding of the project is that we can, for the first time, provide estimates of the share of GDP [Gross Domestic Product] due to bi-/multilingualism. As far as I know, this is a world premiere -- the often mentioned ELAN study is confined to the effects on the export sector. But this is only a very indirect approach, because exports are only a part of GDP (which roughly varies from 10% to 50% in most economically important countries), and language is used for many more purposes than only selling exports (e.g. for accessing supplies, for internal communication, etc.) and language increasingly matters domestically (clearly in multilingual countries like Switzerland, but also in any country [with large-scale] multilingualism). I can mention that even after controlling for the input of capital and labour (taking account not just of hours worked, but also of the work experience and educational level of the workforce), the net contribution of multilingualism to the Swiss economy probably represents about 9% of GDP, which is considerable. This opens up new ways to assess the relevance of investment in multilingualism (essentially macroeconomic, as distinct from the microeconomic perspective applied in rates-of-return estimation procedures). One of the advantages is that this approach, though technically more complex, is less data-hungry than the microeconomic approach, which is based on so-called "Mincerian" equations requiring micro-data that are expensive to collect. The offshoot is that estimates could in the future be produced for less affluent countries". (from a personal email from Francois Grin, 20 Oct. 2008).

When assessing the empirical question of why one should maintain minority languages, Grin uses both 'positive' and 'defensive' (or 'negative') arguments, but both are then used within a welfare-considerations based paradigm (i.e. not within a moral considerations based argumentation, such as violations of human rights). He asks both what the costs and benefits are if minority languages ARE maintained and promoted, and what the costs (and benefits) are if they are neither maintained nor promoted. Some of Grin's promising conclusions are as follows:

- 'diversity seems to be positively, rather than negatively, correlated with welfare'
- 'available evidence indicates that the monetary costs of maintaining diversity are remarkably modest'
- 'devoting resources to the protection and promotion of minority cultures [and this includes languages] may help to stave off political crises whose costs would be considerably higher than that of the policies considered' [the peace-and-security argument].
- 'therefore, there are strong grounds to suppose that protecting and promoting regional and minority languages is a sound idea from a welfare standpoint, not even taking into consideration any moral argument' (Grin 2003: 26).

We agree. The question whether states can afford MLE should rather be: can states afford *not* to implement MLE? Mother-tongue medium MLE for Indigenous/tribal/local children and national minorities, for **at least the first 8 years** of education is necessary for the access to education and for EFA. MLE is cost-effective, both in short-term and in long-term. MLE is necessary for maintenance of linguistic and cultural diversity on earth and for creativity, and, through them and Traditional Ecological Knowledge, for the maintenance of biodiversity. Biodiversity is necessary for any future for humans on the planet. The costs of NOT implementing mother tongue-based MLE properly NOW are catastrophic for humanity. The practicalities CAN be solved.

3. Scenarios

3.1. Introduction
In this part we present some of the results of the massive research results on various educational options for ITM children. We have divided them in three types; A. those where the results of the education can be (and often are) directly harmful to ITM children as a group (mainly dominant language medium models); B. those where the results are somewhat better initially but not sufficiently good (early-exit transitional models); and C. those with good results in terms of one or mostly several of the educational goals in Table 4.

3.2. Models with often harmful results: dominant-language-medium (subtractive assimilatory submersion)
Two Expert papers for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (Magga, Nicolaisen, Trask, Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas 2005 and Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas 2008; see also Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, forthcoming) have shown convincingly that mainly dominant language (e.g. Nepali) medium education (= submersion programs) for ITM children can (and often does) cause serious physical and mental harm and transfer the children to the dominant group, i.e. assimilate them forcibly. It prevents access to education, because of the linguistic, pedagogical, cognitive (CALP-related) and psychological barriers that it creates. Thus it violates the right to education. It often curtails the development of the children's capabilities, and perpetuates thus poverty (see economics Nobel laureate Amartya Sen, and Mishra & Mohanty 2000a, b).

Subtractive dominant-language medium education for IM children can have harmful consequences socially, psychologically, economically and politically. It can cause very serious mental harm: social dislocation, psychological, cognitive, linguistic and educational harm, and, partially through this, also economic, social and political marginalization. It can often also

cause serious physical harm, e.g. in residential schools, and as a long-term result of marginalization (e.g. alcoholism, suicides, incest, domestic and other violence). It is organized against solid research evidence about how best to reach high levels of bilingualism or multilingualism and how to enable these children to achieve academically in school. It may lead to the extinction of Indigenous/tribal/local languages, thus contributing to the disappearance of the world's linguistic diversity.

Dominant-language-only programmes "are widely attested as the least effective educationally for minority language students", May & Hill write (2003: 14), in a large study commissioned by the Māori Section of the Aotearoa/New Zealand Ministry of Education (http://www.minedu.govt.nz/).

In many countries around the world children from ITM groups are forced to go to schools which do not use their mother tongues (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000 for a discussion of the global scenario). These children are subjected to schooling in a dominant language which they do not understand. Such forced submersion education in a dominant language has a subtractive effect on their mother tongues while the development of proficiency in the language of schooling remains slow and limited. Due to the inadequate development of L1 and L2 and limited bilingual proficiency, children fail to benefit from the usual cognitive and metacognitive advantages associated with bi-/multilingualism. Problems of non-comprehension in the classrooms cumulate to school failure and large scale 'push-out'[ii].

In Nepal, as in India and many other countries, a large proportion of ITM children joining school are pushed out during the early years of primary education. The National Language Policy Recommendation Commission in Nepal pointed to this problem as early as 1994 (Yadava and Grove (eds) 2008: 24). The children enrolled at primary level tend to "drop out" from the schools. In some cases, the students leave the school and enrol again. For these students it takes nine to twelve years to complete the primary education (National Education Commission 2049 VS). This is an indication of a great educational loss. "The majority of the school dropouts are found in grade (1-2)", Yadava and Grove state (p. 24). This indicates that they find school life to be not only unfamiliar but often unbearable and useless. One of the reasons given for this for ITM children is the difference in the language they use at home and in school. It would therefore be appropriate to educate the children in their mother tongue in order to make the break between home and school as small as possible. Neglect of children's home language or their MTs in the school programs is thus a major factor in the large-scale school failure of ITM children.

In India, public education is offered mostly in the major languages of the states/provinces which are the ones recognized as 'official' languages in the Constitution. Only 26 languages out of over 350 languages are used as languages of teaching in primary education classrooms. Except for 6 tribal/indigenous languages in the North-Eastern states in India, only official languages are used as languages of teaching (Jhingran, 2009). Jhingran (2009) estimates that nearly 25% of primary school children in India face moderate to severe learning problems due to these dominant-language-only programmes. Over 84.3 million tribal peoples in India constitute 8.2% of the national population and they speak 159 tribal languages (Singh 2002). Over 99% of the tribal children are deprived of access to schools where their MTs have a place. A number of studies in India (see Mohanty, Mishra, Reddy and Gumidyala 2009, for a discussion) show poor learning achievement and low representation of the tribal students compared to the other groups of children who do not face learning problems due to the mismatch between their home language and school language.

Language barriers for children in the dominant-language-only programmes are also a major contributing factor in capability deprivation and poverty in India. A large number of schools have a majority of tribal children; still, in all these schools the medium of education is the

dominant language of the state. There are 165,869 schools with over 50% and 103,732 with over 90% tribal children (Jhingran 2009). All these children are taught in forced submersion programs in L2 (majority language) medium with subtractive effects on their MT. Absence of MT-based MLE has serious consequences for education of these children, contributing to capability deprivation and poverty not only in relation to the individual children but also their communities (Mohanty 2008, Mohanty et al. 2009). The push-out rate for the tribal children is 51.57% by grade 5 and 80.29% by Grade 10 (Mohanty et al. 2009). This means that fewer than 20 out of 100 tribal children entering schools survive to appear for the high school examination at the end of 10 years of schooling, and of these only about 8 pass the high school examination. Thus, there is a wastage of 92% in the dominant-language school education for the tribal groups in India. Even among those who pass the high school final exam, most have a very low level of performance, and therefore they cannot even try to get to higher and technical education. As a result, despite the provision of reserved quota in admission for tribal students in India, the proportion of such students in higher and technical education is less than 5%, far below their 8.2% share of the national population. This, as Dreze and Sen (2002) argue, ensures that the tribal communities remain in the unskilled labour category which contributes to their capability deprivation and poverty. Thus, absence of MT-based MLE (except for some experimental programs which we discuss later) is a major factor in school failure and poverty among the tribal communities in India. This is also true of other South Asian countries such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Bhutan (see Mohanty's Introduction to Skutnabb-Kangas 2007). We suspect that the situation in Nepal is similar to India in terms of capability deprivation and poverty.

3.3. Somewhat better but not good enough results: early-exit transitional models

Early-exit transitional programs teach ITM children mainly through the medium of their mother tongues for one, two or three years, with the dominant language as a subject. At the latest in grade 4 most teaching is in the dominant language. Often the mother tongue does not continue even as a subject after grade 4. Initially the children seem to manage quirt well, but as soon as the mother tongue medium education finishes, it transpires that it was not enough. Two central large-scale studies (Ramirez, Thomas & Collier) and one small Indigenous/tribal study (Saikia & Mohanty 2004) will be summarised.

Since Indigenous peoples in most cases are demographically very small, there are few if any large-scale comparative studies where the role of the teaching language can be seen clearly. An extremely well controlled study is Saikia & Mohanty's (2004) study of indigenous/tribal Bodo children in Assam, India. After strong campaigning they have just managed to get MTM education going. Saikia and Mohanty compared three Grade 4 groups, with 45 children in each group, on a number of achievement measures in languages and mathematics. "The three groups were matched in respect of their socio-economic status, the quality of schooling and the ecological conditions of their villages". Group BB, Bodo children, taught through the medium of the Bodo language, performed significantly better on ALL tests than group BA, the indigenous Bodo children taught through the medium of Assamese. Group BA did the worst on all the tests. Group AA, Assamese mother tongue children taught through the medium of Assamese, performed best on two of the three mathematics measures. There was no difference between groups BB and AA in the language measures. "The findings are interpreted as showing the positive role of MTM schooling for the Bodo children."

There are hundreds of small-scale studies like this, from most continents, which show similar results[iii], and the results agree with research on (autochthonous and immigrant) minority children.

The Ramirez et al.'s 1991 study, with 2,352 students, compared three groups of Spanish-speaking minority students. The first group were taught through the medium of **English only** (but even these students had bilingual teachers and many were taught Spanish as a subject, something that is very unusual in submersion programmes); the second one, **early-exit** students, had one or two years of Spanish-medium education and were then transferred to English-medium, and the third group, **late-exit** students, had 4-6 years of Spanish-medium education before being transferred to English-medium.

A common sense approach would suggest that the first group, the ones who started English-medium early and had most exposure to English, the English-only students, would have the best results in English, and in mathematics and in educational achievement in general, and that the late-exit students who started late with English-medium education and consequently had least exposure to English, would do worst in English, etc. In fact, the results were exactly the opposite. **The late-exit students got the best results**. In addition, they were the only ones who had a chance to achieve native levels of English later on, whereas the other two groups were, after an initial boost, falling progressively further behind, and were judged as probably never being able to catch up to native English-speaking peers in English or general school achievement.

Thomas & Collier's study (see bibliography under both names) is the largest longitudinal study in the world on the education of minority students, involving a total of more than 210,000 students, including in-depth studies in both urban and rural settings in the USA, and with many different types of educational models. Across **all** the models, those students who reached the highest levels of both bilingualism and school achievement were the ones where the children's mother tongue was the main medium of education for the most extended period of time. This length of education in the L1 (language 1, first language), was the strongest predictor of both the children's competence and gains in L2, English, and of their school achievement. Thomas & Collier state (2002: 7): "the strongest predictor of L2 student achievement is the amount of formal L1 schooling. The more L1 grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement."

The length of MTM education was in both Thomas & Collier's and in Ramirez et al.'s large study more important than any other factor (and many were included) in predicting the educational success of bilingual students. It was also much more important than **socio-economic status**. This is extremely vital when reflecting on the socio-economic status of many indigenous peoples. The worst results, including high percentages of push-outs in both studies were with students in regular submersion programmes where the students' mother tongues (L1s) were either not supported at all or where they only had some mother-tongue-as-a-subject instruction. This is also important for Nepal when thinking of a suggestion that we often heard, namely that teaching ITM children's mother tongue as a subject only might be enough. It is not.

In many countries, there are educational programs in which ITM children's MTs are used for few initial years of schooling with a clear goal of facilitating their early transition to the dominant language medium education. Most of these programs do not continue with the MTs beyond grade 3, not even as a school subject. Such early-exit transitional programs of MLE may be somewhat better than the non-MLE submersion programs in dominant languages but they are not very effective. In India, experimental MLE programs have started in two states – Andhra Pradesh and Orissa (see Mohanty et al. 2009, for details). These programs begin early literacy instruction in tribal children's MTs (10 tribal languages in Orissa and 8 in Andhra

Pradesh) as L1 and introduce L2 (Telugu in Andhra Pradesh and Oriya in Orissa) for development of oral communicative skills in grade 2 and for literacy instruction in grade 3. Both the state programs envisage a complete switch to L2 as medium of instruction from Grade 6. The initial evaluation of the programs shows that the children in the experimental MLE schools perform better than their counterparts in the dominant L2 medium programs. But in the absence of any clear policy in respect of the continuation of the MTs beyond grade 5 - ideally as a medium of teaching, and, at least, as a school subject – these MLE programs in India seem to be heading towards developing as weak and soft assimilative forms of MLE. Such early transition to L2 go against the research evidence which make a strong case for at least 6 – 8 years of use of children's MT as the main medium of instruction in the MLE programs. This is particularly crucial since the conditions of the classrooms, the teacher preparations, and quality of the teaching-learning transactions in India as well as Nepal are quite likely to remain below the optimal levels due to severe resource constraints and several other limitations. Even in countries that do not have such constraints, the early-exit transitional programs of MLE show limited and short-term benefits, at best.

3.4. Even better results: late-exit transitional models

Do we KNOW, then, how dominated group children should be educated? YES: MT-based MLE Research results about on the one hand, the **negative consequences** of subtractive education through the medium of a dominant/ foreign language and from most early-exit transitional programmes, and, on the other hand, the **positive results** of mainly mother tongue medium education for many years for Indigenous/tribal/local and minority children are solid and consistent. The existing (fewer and fewer) counterarguments to MLE are political/ideological, not scientific. ("Minority" means here a group with little power. In many especially African countries ALL groups are often minorities demographically – no group or nation forms over 50% of the population).

ALL strong successful MLE models for ITM children use mainly the mother tongue as the teaching language during the first MANY years, with good teaching of the dominant language (which in Nepal would be Nepali) as a second language subject, taught by bilingual teachers who know the children's mother tongue. Solid research results show that the longer Indigenous/tribal and minority children in a low-status position have their own language as the main medium of teaching, the better the general school achievement and the better they also become in the dominant language, provided, of course, that they have good teaching in it, preferably given by bilingual teachers. In addition, they learn their own L1.

We present some positive examples. In Sápmi (the Saami country) in the core Saami administrative areas in Norway and Finland, Indigenous Saami children have the right to have their first 9 years of education through the medium of Saami. There are 10 Saami languages; maximally 120,000 ethnic Saami altogether, and probably fewer than 40,000 speakers totally of the ten Saami languages. The Saami are the only Indigenous people in the European Union (see www.galdu.org and links there). The Saami children learn Norwegian/Finnish as a second language, and English and other languages as foreign languages. There are some Saami-medium upper secondary schools, and a Saami-medium University College (http://www.samiskhs.no/). As compared to earlier (with similar results as in India, push-out, assimilation and language shift, shame for using the mother tongue, low self-confidence, etc), the results are excellent linguistically, academically, in terms of identities. See Aikio-Puoskari (2009), Skutnabb-Kangas & Aikio-Puoskari (2003), Aikio-Puoskari & Skutnabb-Kangas (2007), and references to Aikio-Puoskari in http://www.tove-skutnabb-kangas.org/en/Tove-Skutnabb-Kangas-Bibliography.html[iv].

A typical example of the many very small-scale studies with similar results is one among Finnish working class immigrant minorities in metropolitan Stockholm in Sweden (Skutnabb-Kangas 1987). The students in this study were in mainly Finnish-medium classes for 9 years. They were compared with Swedish control groups in the parallel classes in the same schools, and also with Finnish mother tongue children in Finnish-medium schools in Finland, i.e. "normal" majority children. A difficult Swedish language test, of the type where normally middle-class children do better than working class children, measured their Swedish competence. After 9 years of mainly Finnish-medium education, and good teaching of Swedish as a second language, these working-class Finnish students got somewhat better results in the Swedish language than the Swedish mainly middle-class control groups (see Table 9; maximum points 13 – the fact that the means were around 5 shows how difficult the test was). It is interesting that their own evaluation of their Swedish competence (maximum points 5) was somewhat lower than the assessment of the Swedish youngsters of their own competence – still, the Finnish children did better in the Swedish test. It is also remarkable when thinking of schools as democratisers that all the Finnish children's Swedish was at a high level, they were closely clustered around the average (they had a lower standard deviation than the Swedish children), whereas there was more variation among the Swedish children's competence in Swedish. This also shows that the medium of instruction is important as a socio-economic equaliser even in relation to competence in the second language. In addition, the Finnish of the Finnish children in Sweden was almost as good as the Finnish of Finnish control groups in Finland.

Table 9. Swedish test results and subjects' own assessment of their Swedish competence

	TEST RESULT (1-13)		OWN ASSESS-MENT (1-5)	
	M	sd	M	sd
Swedish control group	5.42	2.23	4.83	0.26
Finnish co-researchers	5.68	1.86	4.50	0.41

M = mean; sd = standard deviation; Finnish working class immigrant minority youngsters in Sweden, after 9 years of mainly Finnish-medium education; Swedish control group: mainly middle class youngsters in parallel classes in the same schools; Swedish test: decontextualised, CALP-type test where middle-class subjects can be expected to perform better (Skutnabb-Kangas 1987).

Ethiopia has an innovative and progressive national education policy, based on 8 years of mother-tongue medium (MTM) education. Regions have the authority to make their own decentralized implementation plans. Some regions transfer to English medium already after 4 or 6 years. A study across all the regions was commissioned by the Ethiopian Ministry of Education (Heugh, Benson, Berhanu & Mekonnen 2007). There is an efficient collection of system-wide assessment data. These show very clear patterns of learner achievement at Grade/Year 8, 10 and 12. The Grade 8 data show that those learners who have 8 years of MTM education plus English as a subject perform better across the curriculum (including in English) than those with 6 years or 4 years of mother tongue medium (see Heugh 2009).

Burkina Faso's bilingual programmes have similar good results (see Paul Taryam Ilboudo's and Norbert Nikièma's article in Heugh & Skutnabb-Kangas, forthcoming).

3.5. Strongest form: self-evident mother tongue medium models with no transition

The strongest form of minority education that no Indigenous or Tribal peoples have is a mother-tongue-medium model with no transition, i.e. the MT continues to be the medium in a self-evident way and protected by strong laws, from preschool to university, with other languages, including the state's dominant language and international languages studies as second and foreign languages. Only Swedish-speakers in Finland and French-speakers in Quebec, Canada, have this kind of education. Of course one might also see the education of native English and Afrikaans speakers in South Africa as representing this model too, but the colonial apartheid conditions and the fact that many Black Africans have been forced to or have chosen to start using these languages as their home languages too and that most classes taught through these languages also have non-speakers and non-native speakers, make them different.

The results in, for instance, Finland, of this education are extremely good in terms of learning the (Swedish) mother tongue fully. Finnish is also learned at a native level by many, especially in urban contexts where it is used outside school, but less well in Swedish-dominant villages in the country. The school achievement in Swedish-medium schools is at the same level as in Finnish-medium schools. Students in these schools usually start learning English two years later (in grade 5) than students in Finnish-medium schools; still their results in English are as good as or better than the results in Finnish-medium schools. This can be explained by both English and Swedish being Indo-European languages and closely related, whereas Finnish, a Finno-Ugric language, is not related to either Swedish or English. But an important reason is also that the Swedish-speaking children are already bilingual and biliterate, often at a high level, when they start studying English. High-level bilinguals learn additional languages faster and often better than corresponding monolinguals (e.g. Swain et al. 1990).

One might imagine, though, that both the Finland Swedish and the Quebec French schools could get an even higher level of multilingualism as a result, i.e. a native-like competence in two languages and a very high competence in additional languages, if they were to use the dominant national language (Finnish, English), as the medium of instruction in upper secondary school for one or two subjects, depending on teacher qualifications in each school. These minority languages (Swedish, French) are so strong, with such good legal protection, that they would not suffer but would benefit from the transfer of knowledge from a well developed mother tongue to the second language. The same is true for at least English and possibly also Afrikaans in South Africa: native English. Or Afrikaans speaking children in mother tongue medium schools could learn some subjects through the medium of Zulu or Xhosa or some other African language in upper secondary school, instead of having one of them as a subject only (and even this is rare). Likewise, Nepali mother tongue children could use Tamang, Limbu, Rai, Magar, etc to learn some subjects in upper secondary school, when enough materials have been developed and competent teachers are available (the latter may already be the case even if these teachers are today teaching through the medium of Nepali).

4. Experiences from Nepal: the situation today

The Nepal MLE project schools so far represent an early-exit transitional model. It seems that there are hopes and plans that MLE will be expanded both horizontally (more schools and more languages – this is what the cascading plan promises) and vertically (more grades to be included, e.g. grades 4-6). A baseline study by the Expert & Research Team, is being written up by dr. Sushan Acharya. When writing this report, we had access to a first draft[v]. It describes in detail visits to the various project schools; we will not repeat anything from it here. We have also read dr. Shelley Taylor's report and endorse all her conclusions, also supporting a

formative (and maybe also summative?) evaluation study of methodologies (her suggestion is that dr. Vishnu Rai might be a good person to do it). Since professor Taylor has discussed teacher training at length, we will not touch upon it in our report.

We visited ourselves the Sri Bhimsen Primary School, Thulobarkhu (5 March 2009), one of the two project schools in Rasuwa district (both started MLE in March 2007). We were welcomed by, among others, teacher Pema Wangmo Tamang and head teacher Ram Sundar Yadav. We visited a Social Studies (geography) class with older students who had not been taught through the medium of Tamang. Then we sat in a first and a second grade classroom (mathematics, and mother tongue lessons, respectively) where the medium was Tamang. In these classes, taught by Yamlal Pamaya and Urmila Lama, we saw superb and sophisticated pedagogy and interested, motivated, eager, really happy children, with their eyes shining, competing to participate. When the cascading starts and schools to be modeled are chosen, this school is an obvious candidate.

In the workshop 6 March 2009, teachers from Sri Bhimsen School told about results from and challenges in the project school. Positive results mentioned were:
- the students now come regularly to school
- drop-out rates are decreasing
- students are joyful
- students are more inquisitive
- students are learning more
- student self-confidence is increasing
- school management has improved
- students and teachers are focusing on cleanliness of the school too
- the teachers are now more trained and more efficient than earlier
- parents were initially somewhat negative and suspicious towards MLE; now they feel good about it
- MLE has started in two additional cascading schools and it runs smoothly in thos schools too
- more resources have been given to those schools

The main problem that was mentioned was:
- it is difficult to translate textbooks from Nepali to Tamang; they would like to have their own textbooks in all subjects.

Teachers from the other project school in the Rasuwa district, Sri Saraswoti Primary School, Thade, echoed to a large extent their colleagues, telling about children now attending school regularly, etc.. In addition, they also told that:
- the children feel at ease and understand the classroom practices
- using Tamang helps the children to understand subject matter (social studies and creative arts, mathematics, science, health and physical education, all is in Tamang in grades 1-3); their confidence improves
- children will be able to transfer their knowledge to other languages
- there is a lot of local involvement: the community participates, inquires about school
- a local subject curriculum has been developed.

Challenges and problems mentioned included:
- the initial phase was difficult; there were problems in switching from Nepali medium to Tamang medium
- there is interference from other languages (mainly Nepali but also English) in the Tamang language used
- there is a need for more Tamang-speaking teachers
- time and resources for MLE need to be increased

-    the head teacher has an additional work load.

Teachers from both the project schools and the cascading schools also told that they and the communities are committed to preserving their mother tongues and also reflecting on the role of Nepali. They want a committee to mobilize Tamang-speaking teachers. A student (grade 5 or 6?), Santimaya Ghale Tamang was also present during the whole workshop; she presented a short piece that she had rehearsed; when she got stuck, the whole audience enthusiastically supported her. There was a very lively discussion about challenges in the workshop.

   In the next subsection we present some of the challenges and questions that we read, heard and observed. These include issues from the Rasuwa workshop, the two-day workshop on 8-9 March, and the National seminar 11 March. In addition, we have looked at suggestions in some planning reports of various kinds. We also indicate some of the answers given at the workshops, and our reflections on both these and some of the suggestions in reports.

5. Specific challenges in Nepal: implementation strategies

5.1. What has been suggested for Nepal in various reports in relation to mother tongues, Nepali and English?

We start with English. Many studies show that the *demand for English*, which is obviously real and growing in most countries, nevertheless is something that has been partially constructed by a conglomeration of agents (see Phillipson 1992, 2009, and all references to his writings on English on his home page www.cbs.dk/staff/phillipson). In "developing countries" (itself a hierarchising term) these in most cases include not only language-related state and para-statal agencies in countries where English is the main native language (UK, USA, Australia) and most "development aid" international agencies, including NGOs, but also the countries' own elites, even in cases where the country has not been colonized, officially or de facto. Stephen Clayton (2008) is interested in the "unasked question… how has this high demand for English come about" (2008: 146). He shows convincingly for Cambodia how "the construction of the demand for English and English language teaching" was coarticulated with the neoliberal "reconstruction and development" of Cambodia (2008:143). Similar arguments about "the 'need' for Cambodia (and Cambodians) to be able to access global free markets and global knowledge" (ibid., 145) have been aired in Nepal. Such an "external orientation within Cambodian education" with English as "an essential requirement for successful rebuilding… has repeatedly failed to meet the needs of the rural majority". The country has been portrayed "as economically and socially homogenous, assuming English and ELT [= English Language Teaching] is accessible to all regardless of class, gender, ethnicity, age or geographic location, and that the external goods English provides access to are similarly beneficial to all" (ibid., 148). In fact, "access to English remains restricted to a minority of Cambodians and is closely related to their socio-economic position. Likewise, the fruits of an externally-oriented economy, under contemporary globalization, are far from evenly distributed" (ibid., 148). Thus what is presented as if it was a rational choice (people 'choose' English freely) "often masks the fact that 'choice' is a marker of economic privilege. The more distant subjects are from economic necessity, the more 'choice' becomes a possibility. 'Choice' is guaranteed to those who can afford to choose" (Reay & Lucey 2003, p. 138, quoted in Clayton 2008: 144). Instead of choosing a language policy with, for instance, mass literacy campaigns, the Cambodian language planners have "chosen" a path, with unsustainable English, that has led to "leaving the majority of Cambodians functionally illiterate" (Clayton 2008: 143).

The main issue for ITM children is to what extent the goal of the school is to enable the children to add to their linguistic repertoire instead of subtracting from it so that they have a chance to become high-level bilingual (or multilingual), with maintenance and thorough development of their own language as a self-evident goal, but adding a high competence in the dominant language too. We can compare this with how children in Asia who have English (instead of one of the dominant national languages) as a medium of education fare. Andy Kirkpatrick (2009: 4) thinks that

> "lessons must be learned from south-east Asia's push for English" and warns that if "English is adopted as the medium of instruction for certain subjects across whole primary school system [which he thinks is "too early"] … can have its dangers" (ibid.). Analysing several countries, his conclusion is, for instance for the Phillippines where "maths and science are taught in English in primary school [since 1974] … we encounter a common problem that the early introduction of CLIL [Content and Language Integrated Learning] can cause. Children whose mother tongue is not Tagalog (and that is the majority of Filipinos) enter primary school having to learn in two alien languages, Filipino [= Tagalog] and English. The result is that *many Filipino children graduate from schools as semilingual in Filipino and English and unsure in their mother tongues.* The introduction of English as a medium of instruction in primary school takes curriculum time from local languages, a phenomenon that can be seen across the region. The children who benefit most from this policy are Tagalog speakers from wealthy families" (emphasis added).

Most Indigenous and Tribal children in the world who attend school in the first place are in a situation similar to the one Kirkpatrick describes. If Tribal and minority children in Nepal have to learn both Nepali and English in primary school, using Nepali as the main medium of instruction and possibly even having a few subjects in English, a situation similar to the one described above is likely – no firm competence in any language, except, maybe, for Nepali mother tongue elites from Kathmandu. This can be counteracted by teaching ITM children through their mother tongues, with Nepali as a second language subject and English as a foreign language subject. There are many similar experiences for Nepal to learn from.

What has been suggested in Nepal, then? In the older (1994; English translation 2008) National Languages Policy Recommendations (Yadava & Grove, eds) English is hardly mentioned. Likewise, in Group Report B from the Workshop on 'MLE Policy and Strategy Development' in Nepal (see Appendix 6 for this report; the group was chaired by professor Yadava), English is mentioned but no time for starting it is specified.

On the other hand, the report from group A (chaired by dr. Acharya) suggests starting English as a subject in grade 4. The **Review of non Nepali speaking children's learning environment, Submitted by MLE Research and Expert Team** (Final Draft, April 2009) suggests, though, in its *Future directions* section, under Point 2, <u>Level and approach of MLE implementation</u> that "Foreign language which is English will be introduced from grade one but in limited extent and at oral level only" (p. 8 in the final draft report). The final draft report also states: "In most of other private schools except for one Newari-medium school] children are taught to read, write and speak in English from kindergarten. Nepali is taught as a subject. Use of other languages of Nepal in such schools is not considered" (p. 37 in the final draft report). There are no suggestions to change this situation in the draft report.

The **National Curriculum Framework for School Education in Nepal** (NCF) (2007) also suggests in its Summary (p. 3) that English should be started in grade 4 and made a compulsory subject (whereas ITM languages only appear under "**Optional first**: Language/ Others", and local subjects under "**Optional second** : Local subject (vocation, business and

trade and others)". On the other hand, in part **3.3.5, Medium of instruction**, the NCF has the following a bit puzzling formulation (p. 34):

> Mother tongue will be the medium of elementary education. *The medium of school level education can be in Nepali or English language or both of them.* However, in the first stage of elementary education (Grades 1-3), the medium of education will generally be in mother tongue (emphasis added).

In part 5 where the suggestions are concretized in a table about the implementation of the proposed Framework, the same puzzle reappears under point *11, Language* (p. 65). Thus it seems that teaching from grade 4 onwards could also be conducted in English, and the teachers, materials, etc should be ready for this within 2 years from when the (2007) report was published, i.e. in 2009. To us the implementation timing seems in any case completely unrealistic. But more seriously, if English were to be the medium of instruction from grade 4, one can predict the same very negative results that have appeared in many similar countries: some elite children might make it, thus increasing the gap between elites and ordinary people, but for most Nepalese children it would be a disaster.

Activities	Existing Condition	Expected Change	How to achieve that	When to start
11. Language	▪ No teaching learning in mother tongues	▪ Teaching learning (of grades 1-3) will be in mother tongues ▪ Medium of instruction in Nepali or in English or in both	▪ Formulate a policy for teacher preparation and act accordingly	Within two years

Suggestions for mother tongue medium teaching in the Nepali documents mentioned vary. There seems to be full agreement about mother tongue medium teaching for ITM children for minimally the first 3 years of elementary education and a commitment to trying to organize it for as many groups as possible as soon as possible. Suggestions for teaching after grade 4 vary, from NCF's "Nepali or English" to suggesting partial MTM teaching in grades 4 and 5 (with Nepali from grade 6). If mother-tongue-medium teaching does not continue at least up to grade 6, we have an early-exit transitional model.

The limitations of the early-exit models of MLE are quite evident from analysis of the consequences of various early-exit programs in different countries across Africa (see Heugh 2009, for a review; see also Alidou, forthcoming, Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, forthcoming). Early transition to the international language of wider communication across Africa is, according to Kathleen Heugh's summaries (2009) accompanied by:

- Poor literacy in L1 and L2 (SACMEQ 11 2005; UIE-ADEA study 2006; HSRC studies in South Africa 2007);
- Poor numeracy/mathematics & science (HSRC 2005; 2007)
- High failure and drop-out rates (Obanya 1999; Bamgbose 2000)
- High costs/ wastage of expenditure (Alidou et al 2006).

An ITM child can learn to use a second/foreign language fairly fluently for BICS purposes (BICS = Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills), for talking about concrete everyday things in face-to-face interaction where the context makes understanding easier. This takes a

relatively short time (1-3 years, depending on exposure, the distance between the languages, and several psychological factors – see Table 6, "Learner-related affective factors"). Teachers, parents and sometimes even the child herself may think that this is enough for using the language for school purposes. It may suffice for the first dew grades – but after grade 3, requirements for language competence in school change, when everything becomes more abstract, much more reading is required, and teaching distances itself from here and now. And it is here that ITM children really start failing if they cannot continue to develop their thinking and problem solving skills through the language they know best, their mother tongue(s). It is clear from research that it takes between 5-7 years (there are also credible suggestions of 5-9 years) for a child to learn to use a second or foreign language (in this case Nepali, and even more for English) well enough for CALP purposes (CALP = Cognitive-Academic Language Proficiency), so that it can be used as a language of instruction in cognitively and linguistically demanding de-contextualised situations where one cannot use the immediate context for understanding. History, mathematics, geography, social studies, etc are examples of subjects which are heavily CALP-loaded: they are more abstract, talk about issues and phenomena which the child cannot see, touch, smell, or try out immediately. They also require a much larger vocabulary, both receptive (understanding) and productive (speaking/writing). As we have shown in earlier sections, 6 years of mainly mother tongue medium education is an absolute minimum, and 8 years would be preferable if one wants the ITM children to reach high levels in at least their mother tongues and Nepali. All proposals which suggest less are costly compromises, repeating mistakes that have been made earlier in many countries.

Many of the Nepali reports mentioned above have constructive suggestions on how to deal with other challenges, such as classrooms with several mother tongues, issues around non-formal and adult education, etc. One issue that has not been dealt with adequately in them is private schools. From a scientific point of view, there is no difference between demands that should be made on state schools and demands on private schools, in relation to the importance of ITM children's mother tongues and general school achievement. It should be possible to mandate mother-tongue-based MLE also for private schools. Having ITM mother tongues as optional subjects as is suggested in some of the reports is a symbolic act with few consequences for language learning or school achievement.

5.2. Developing a State language policy in the context of a federal polity

All languages are resources of a nation. Preservation and development of the multilingual and multicultural character of a country requires multipronged approaches, founded on respect for diversity and egalitarian social structures. The manner in which the system of education is organized in any society is among the most important factors, which strongly influence cultural and linguistic maintenance. Development and maintenance of languages are critically related to their planned use in education. Therefore, it is necessary to have a clear languages-in-education policy in Nepal. There are already many positive features in the provisions variously made in the principles and processes of governance in Nepal, which show Nepal's commitment to a multicultural and multilingual society. Declaration of all languages of Nepal as National Languages and commitment to impart early education in children's mother tongues (which we heard several times from the highest level of educational administration) are positive steps in this direction. The National Language Policy Recommendation Commission constituted in 1993 has made clear recommendations for mother tongue based bilingual education in Nepal.

Education in a multilingual society in a globalizing world must cater to the needs for all children to develop their mother tongues for local, regional, national and even international level communication. In the context of the present day Nepal, its democratic federal structure and aspirations for an egalitarian welfare society and economic developments of the nation, the educational system in Nepal needs to strengthen the mother tongues and, at the same time, foster high levels of competence in Nepali as the official language and at least one international language (such as English) for wider communication. Therefore, educational policy must plan for quality multilingual education for the whole country.

In a federal structure it is necessary to have a balanced blend of centralized and decentralized structures and responsibilities. Often a top-heavy centralized structure is ineffective in catering to the regional diversities and community aspirations. A complete decentralization, on the other hand, runs the risk of fragmenting the national mosaic, yielding to chaos, unplanned divergences and the risk of local power struggles influencing the educational outcomes negatively.

At the *national level*, education must have a broad vision for fostering meaningful participation in the country's democratic processes, responsible citizenship and empowerment of all communities.

At the *regional level* it must transform the communities for more effective realization of the societal goals and foster planned long-term educational development.

Decisions about materials development, including many of the content issues which have to be sensitive to and use local Indigenous Knowledges (IK) and Indigenous Knowledge Holders, including Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), are to a large extent best left to the *local levels*. Local availability of bilingual teachers with good knowledge of the students' mother tongues will also influence the speed of both horizontal and vertical extension of MT-based MLE.

However, all the levels duality of responsibility in a federal structure may lead to ineffective planning and implementation. In planning for multilingual education in Nepal, it would be necessary to have a broad national policy framework for planned development of multiple languages throughout the education system. It is also necessary to define the curricular objectives at all levels of such education. "Regions" can in a federal system be enormously varied, but regardless of what the principles for forming the regions will be in Nepal, none of them will have a "monolingual" population, with representatives of one language only. This fact will also necessitate a national educational framework, with clearly articulated principles about educational language rights for a region's dominant group(s) and both absolute and relative (depending on the size of the minority) rights for all ITMs.

Within such a national framework of uniformity, state and regional levels of educational planning and administration can foster healthy diversity, frame specific pedagogical and transactional processes to meet community aspirations.

A federal system of structured and well-defined sharing of functions at all levels, with delineated responsibilities, can be envisaged to foster integration through promotion of diversities. Peace and conflict researcher agree that ITMs who have basic human rights, here including basic educational linguistic human rights, are much less likely to initiate or participate in conflicts. One reason for educational LHRs promoting peace and integration is the poverty reduction that these rights lead to in the middle- and long term. When ethnic and linguistic divisions do not follow divisions in terms of economic and political power, they cannot be used to mobilize people along ethnic and linguistic lines, something that is often a grave risk in multilingual societies[vi]. Paul Collier, professor of economics at Oxford University and former head of research at the World Bank, warns in his 2009 book *Wars, Guns & Votes: Democracy in Dangerous Places* (according to Glenny's 2009 review of it, 'The problem with

'kumbaya' politics') that "elections alone do not amount to a strong democracy. Without institutions that promote accountability, they are exploited by cynical, greedy elites" (p. 39). Unless the citizens are well educated, they can neither demand nor understand how accountability and elite exploitation work. Good MLE works also in this way for democracy.

More specifically, a national educational structure will, as mentioned above, require a National Policy Framework for multilingual education in Nepal that defines the broad curricular framework setting targets for all levels of education and rights for every group. Within this framework, development of specific teaching-learning strategies, preparation of text materials and activities for classroom transactions and teachers can be left to the regional (and local) levels of planning and implementation, ensuring community participation and sharing, to foster children's identity and cultural rootedness.

5.3. Curriculum and materials

Development of curricular materials for MT-based MLE in a linguistically diverse country such as Nepal would require a lot of organized effort. The MLE team in Nepal has done an excellent job of developing quality reading material of stories taken from the ones narrated by community members to the children in community gatherings organized by the MLE team. Children were asked to draw pictures based on the stories they heard and selected drawings have been used to illustrate the stories in the books (see Hough, Thapa Magar & Yonjan-Tamang 2009, Yonjan-Tamang, Hough & Nurmela 2009). This is an exemplary step, which can be replicated for all Indigenous languages.

There are concerns, however, about textbooks and other curricular materials. In the workshop in Rasuwa teachers expressed concern about such materials being directly translated from the available Nepali language texts, something that has been done centrally for over a dozen languages in some areas. This appears superficially to be an easier method of developing materials and ensuring some uniformity across different linguistic regions, but it does not meet the philosophy and principles of MLE. Many teachers rightly stressed the need for such materials to be culturally relevant and appropriate.

Two questions are important in this context: how does one, on the one hand, ensure uniformity across different languages and regions (and is this necessary, for instance for quality control?), and how can the curricular materials be embedded in the everyday experiences of children on the other hand?

These issues can be dealt with by making a *distinction between the curriculum, and text materials*. The curriculum provides a broad framework of teaching-learning objectives in any educational programme. It sets the goals for achievement at different levels of education. Thus, a curricular framework must specify the teaching-learning standards and objectives to be targeted at different grades in school education. It is necessary for these objectives to be comparable across different schools, languages and MLE programmes so that all children are enabled to develop comparable levels of proficiency in different curricular areas and school subjects. But the goals can be reached in many different ways, through different methods, and with the help of different tools, including textbooks.

The question of the curricular objectives to be meaningful and culturally relevant to children's daily life experiences is related to the linking of the processes and of the materials required and used for context specific school and classroom teaching-learning transactions. The textbooks, children's reading materials, various teaching-learning activities in and outside the schools and the classroom transactions need to be directly related to children's experiences. Thus the twin questions relating to curricula, texts and classroom transactions can be addressed by a policy of uniformity with diversity. A national curricular framework suitably developed, and modified from time to time, is necessary so that all programmes of the "mainstream" as

well as mother-tongue-based ITM education – Nepali, English, Indigenous mother tongue and other language programmes – can target comparable levels of achievement for all children at different grades. Besides specifying teaching-learning targets for each grade level in school programmes, the curricular framework must also emphasize the nature of multilingual proficiency and the goals for MT, Nepali and English (see Section 2.4), the placing of languages and their use as instructional media and school subjects, and broad approaches to and methods of curricular transactions in the classrooms. Such a national framework would effectively ensure uniform quality education for all children in Nepal without entailing disadvantages to the ITM children and other today disadvantaged segments of the national population.

Children's classroom learning can be contextualized within this common framework. Preparation of curricular materials, textbooks, other teaching-learning materials and activities and methods of classroom transaction need to be decentralized to ensure that children's learning remains rooted in their culture and daily life experiences.

The pilot programme of MLE in Nepal has made substantial headway in bringing in IK and IK-holders to the classrooms. This approach must be followed to its logical limit. It must be recognized that school learning is a collective and collaborative process rooted in children's cultural experiences. Children come to schools with a vast knowledge base about the physical world, the flora and fauna, ecology, family and community relationships, cultural knowledge systems in respect of numbers, measures, quantities and a variety of other aspects of the reality.

Such knowledge is jointly constructed through mutual participation of children and adults in cultural activities enabling the children to develop a variety of everyday concepts. For example, children's everyday cognition of numbers, systems of counting and measurement are embedded in cultural practices such as folk games, market experiences, household and agricultural activities and many other community events, such as traditional festivals, etc.

The conceptual development of children need to be seen as an effective interaction between spontaneous every concepts and the organized system of scientific concepts which school education seeks to promote (Vygotsky 1978). The challenge for school education lies in establishing effective linkages between children's cultural experiences and classroom learning so that they can move from the everyday to the scientific concepts, which the school curriculum seeks to develop. Text materials, classroom activities and transactions can be planned at the local levels so that such linkages can be established. In an experimental programme of MLE in Orissa (India), called *MLE Plus*, teaching-learning materials were developed within a theoretical framework of cultural psychology, to relate everyday cognition of children as an epistemic system to the classroom system of mathematics so that the movement to the scientific school concepts can be facilitated through multiple points of contact between cultural experiences and organized school practices (see Panda & Mohanty 2009, for details). The cultural psychological framework offers a sound theoretical background system for MLE:

(T)hrough formal instruction, children are given access to scientific concepts that enable them to reconceptualise their everyday experiences. In this sense, scientific concepts replace children's everyday concepts and they can begin to work within the more formal and generalised conceptual framework associated with schooling. But this is possible only if children's own knowledge systems, beliefs and values are used as the basis for development of more formal scientific knowledge. The interaction between scientific and spontaneous concepts can also be described as an interweaving process where scientific concepts grow

downward through spontaneous concepts, while spontaneous concepts grow upward through scientific concepts. (Panda & Mohanty 2009: 302)

This approach necessarily requires that the task of materials development, preparation of textbooks and other reading materials, planning of classroom activities, teaching-learning materials and classroom transactions in MLE programmes in different languages must be decentralized and left to the local school authorities, teachers and communities guided by the national curricular framework and a pool of experts and resource persons to ensure uniformity amid diversity. In addition, teachers, IK-holders and others participating in this work must be paid for these efforts.

For such a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches to be more effective, it would be necessary to reorient teacher-training practices and to offer teacher training in mother tongues.

Another issue in respect of language planning and pedagogical practices in MLE relates to the use of different writing systems for the languages in Nepal. We heard several claims for indigenous language specific writing systems and emotional pleas for their use in teaching children to read and write in the mother tongues. The current practice in general is to use Devanagari script to write all the language in Nepal. The development and use of indigenous and unique systems of writing are questions of identity and aspirations of linguistic communities and cannot be denied.

However, while it is unfortunate that absence of a writing system is often taken as a sign of inadequacy of a language, resulting in its stigmatization and reduction to an inferior status of a "dialect", it must be realized that writing systems are not essential and inseparable characteristics of languages. Many languages of the world use a single orthographic system (such as the Roman system which is used for writing English, German, French, Finnish, Italian, Spanish and many other European and non-European languages, including indigenous languages). Sometimes a single language is written in several different scripts; Santhali, for instance, is written in Devanagari, Bengali, Oriya and Ol Chiki scripts.

Thus, development of a language-specific writing system for each language need not be insisted upon. It can at best be viewed as an expression of linguistic aspirations of a community associated with the political processes of identity formation and assertion.

This process needs to be separated from the pedagogical aspects of teaching children to read and write. In MLE children are required to make positive transfers of linguistic and reading-writing skills across different languages. In most MLE programmes for ITM children in different parts of the world, in the absence of a writing system for the indigenous language, a common orthographic system is used to write the indigenous as well as the dominant languages. Usually the writing system of the dominant language is adapted to write the indigenous language. This facilitated transfer of reading and writing skills developed in the indigenous L1 to learning of L2 and makes it easier for the child to read and write both L1 and L2. Often people are not even aware that different scripts can be used – there is no "ownership" connected to the script that people are used to seeing.

Without any prejudice to the question of development of indigenous writing systems, a child-perspective can be recommended for MLE in Nepal. In this perspective, in most cases, the Devanagari script can be used for teaching children to read and write indigenous languages (L1) so that transfer of skills to learning of Nepali (L2) can be facilitated. It can be pointed out that this is suggested only as an effective pedagogic strategy and that once a child learns to read and write a language using one orthographic system, she/he can also learn, at a later stage, to use another writing system. Such learning of a second writing system for a single language is not very uncommon.

In addition, we would also like to point out that lack of written materials in a language need not postpone the starting of teaching through the medium of this language. There are good experiences of oral teaching, and teaching where the children write their own "textbooks" as the need arises. For instance many Steiner schools[vii] (including the one where TSK taught one year and which her daughters attended for 13 years) do not use textbooks in anything else except foreign languages, for the first 6 years.

Before schools can be established that teach children through every language in Nepal, one might also try out the possibility of very early reading for those children who have to accept primary education in an L2, if the language has been written down and if parents or preschool teachers can read it. It is relatively easy to teach interested 2-3-year olds to read, with short sessions of less than 10 minutes daily or every second day, and where the materials (e.g. 20-30 15x10 centimeter cards that the parent of preschool teacher makes, with crayons) cost next to nothing. One of us has taught many parents to do this; the initial training takes one evening; after that, only some very short support sessions are needed. There is a wealth of literature on how to do this. If a child already knows how to read in the mother tongue when starting school in an L2, the skill of reading can easily be transferred to the L2 when the child has learned some of it. In this way, only the school language itself is new, but the child does not need to learn again the process of reading.

5.4. Evaluation & research

Implementation of successful MLE programmes require effective monitoring, continuous policy advocacy at all levels of governance down to the parents and community, formative programme evaluation and action research. It will also be necessary to establish mechanisms for coordination, documentation and resource sharing among the stakeholders of all the MLE programmes in Nepal, very importantly including organizations representing the Indigenous peoples. When ITM parents choose to participate in these MT-based MLE programmes, their choice must be based on the prior informed consent that is emphasized in the UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples). This presupposes thorough information to parents on research results and the basic framework for MLE. These information and advocacy efforts also need to be emphasized at all levels of the management and governance of MLE in Nepal. While a National Resource Centre for MLE is necessary to organize research, evaluation, monitoring, advocacy and coordination, the local school systems also have to be empowered to participate in this process.

6. Summing up and recommendations

The question of MT-based MLE for ITM children is one linked to their identity. This is, according to Galtung (1988), a psychological need related to the broader social system (see Table 1). Therefore, ITM communities and parents experience alienation if their languages are neglected in society and in schools. Many of the "ethnic" conflicts today have to do with the non-acceptance of people's ethnic, cultural and linguistic *identities*. A new constitution, based on federalism, the option to preserve and promote diversity, an acceptance of various ITM *identities*, and the linguistic and cultural rights that should follow, can go a long way to solve some of the conflicts. Mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MLE) is an important part of this solution.

The Report of National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission (1994, English translation 2008) of Nepal is a good beginning for language planning in the country. However, it is important to acknowledge that the first step in language planning is necessarily political

planning which involves setting priorities among the various socio-economic, cultural and symbolic interests. The political decisions and policy-making processes must recognize that different models of educational language planning do serve different interests. Both a centralized dominant-language-medium model of education which ignores the mother tongues or one that offers a few years of transitional instruction in the MTs are assimilatory and homogenizing in nature and may, at best, promote the interests of some Nepali-speaking elites. On the other hand, decentralized, diverse and diversifying integrative models of MT-based MLE with minimally 6-8 years of mainly mother tongue medium education serve the interests of the whole population. In addition, they promote integration of the population and democratic participation, and are important factors in the reduction of poverty.

The next step in planning for educational language policy involves setting realistic short- and even middle-term *linguistic competence goals* for what school children in Nepal should have achieved after the first 8 years of formal education. These have to be based on realistic estimates of the present linguistic competence of the school-starting children, their families and communities, teachers, educational authorities, teacher trainers, textbook writers and curriculum developers.

Keeping in view the present levels of linguistic competence of children and different groups associated with school education in Nepal, it is recommended that *high competence in the mother tongue* must be targeted for quality learning as well as for fostering sense of identity and self-confidence. In respect of *Nepali*, school education must aim at *high level of final competence*, fit for higher education and effective participation in the democratic, political, economic and social processes in Nepal.

However, *somewhat lower expectations for competence in English* may be a realistic short- and middle-term target in view of the present circumstances where teachers, school administrators and teacher trainers do not themselves have high competence in English, neither in Listening/Speaking nor in Reading/Writing. Since requirement of high international levels of reading and writing competence in English is unlikely in the near future for most people in Nepal, a solid basic knowledge in English that can be expanded later might be a more realistic mid-term goal. The goals in respect of English could be increased later when English competencies of teachers and educators in Nepal become higher.

Once the linguistic competence goals are clarified, the next step in educational language planning involves implementation of ideal models of MLE suitably adapted to various ground conditions for reaching *educational goals* of appropriate levels of classroom achievement. These include high levels of multilingual competence, strong, positive multilingual and multicultural identity and positive attitudes towards self and others and a fair chance of awareness and competence building as prerequisites for working for a more equitable world.

As Sushan Acharya's and the MLE project's Expert & Research Team's draft report (by the end of February 2009) shows, the ground conditions of early school education across different regions and communities in Nepal are quite diverse and many classrooms do have different combinations of students from different mother tongues. It is therefore necessary to plan different contextualized approaches such as multi-grading of children from one language and having single grades comprising of students from different languages (also discussed in more detail in Shelley Taylor's report for the MLE project). It is possible to follow a collaborative classroom pedagogy focused on development of high levels of metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness as a prerequisite for multilingual competence among all the students. Specific strategies can be worked out keeping in view the feasibility of different approaches[viii]. Educational language planning needs to view languages as resources rather than problems and to work out models of MLE for complex sociolinguistic contexts.

While models of MLE cannot be transferred to other contexts and have to be localised, experiences from different parts of the world suggest some broad principles about the characteristics of highly successful and less successful MLE programmes. It is necessary to heed the lessons from the international experience with respect to MLE, so that education in Nepal can support maintenance of multilingual and multicultural and biological diversity and an egalitarian social order.

Yet another step in educational language planning is ensuring *protection of Linguistic Human Rights (LHRs) in education*. It must be noted that LHRs are necessary but not sufficient conditions for quality education and for maintenance of ITM languages and cultures. From an *economics point of view*, there are strong grounds for protection and promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity in Nepal; the question is not whether Nepal can afford MLE, rather it is WHETHER NEPAL CAN AFFORD *NOT* TO IMPLEMENT MLE? Mother-tongue medium MLE for Indigenous/tribal/local children and national minorities, for at least the first 8 years of education is necessary for the access to education and for EFA. Even when there are initial "extra" costs, MLE is cost-effective, both in short-term and in long-term.

Analyses of massive *research findings on the results of various models of education* show that mainly dominant language (e.g. Nepali) medium education (= *submersion programs*) for ITM children can cause serious physical and mental harm and assimilate them forcibly. It violates the right to education, preventing access to education and denying equality of educational opportunity. It curtails the development of the children's capabilities, and perpetuates poverty. On the other hand, teaching ITM children in Nepal *mainly through their mother tongues*, with Nepali as a second language subject and English as a foreign language subject prevents educational failure, guarantees their rights to education and empowers them for economic development.

Early-exit transitional programmes teach ITM children mainly through the medium of their mother tongues a few years, with the dominant language first taught as a subject and then becoming the only language of teaching latest by grade 4. Often the mother tongue does not continue even as a subject after grade 4. Such early-exit programmes lead to poor literacy both in L1 and L2, low achievement in mathematics, science and other curricular areas, high rate of school failure and push-out and high cost due to wastage.

Successful models of MLE for ITM children use mainly the mother tongue as the teaching language for at least 8 years, with good teaching of the dominant language (which in Nepal would be Nepali) as a second language subject, taught by bilingual teachers who know the children's mother tongue. Research results show that *the longer the ITM children have their own language as the main medium of teaching, the better the general school achievement as well as the proficiency in the dominant language* (provided that they have good teaching in it, preferably given by bilingual teachers). In addition, they learn their own L1.

The *strongest form of minority education* is a mother-tongue-medium model in which the MT continues to be the medium from preschool to university without any transition. Other languages, including the dominant language of the state and international languages are studied as second and foreign languages. However, such MT-only programmes are rare for the Indigenous or Tribal peoples.

The present MLE project schools appear to follow an early-exit transitional model but there are plans for both horizontal (more schools and more languages – this is what the cascading plan promises) and vertical (more grades to be included, e.g. grades 4-6) expansion of the MLE programme. Our visits to some of these MLE classrooms and discussion with the teachers revealed excellent teaching strategies, very enthusiastic responses from the children in the classrooms and many other positive outcomes for children, communities as well as school management although there are minor problem areas and challenges, which can be sorted out.

Developing *a State language policy including a clear languages-in-education policy* in Nepal in the context of a federal polity is perhaps the foremost challenge. Nepal's commitment to a multicultural and multilingual society is evident from the declaration of all languages of Nepal as National Languages. It is also clear in the commitment to impart early education in children's mother tongues, and the recommendations for mother-tongue-based bi-/multilingual education by the National Language Policy Recommendation Commission constituted in 1993.

Educational policy in Nepal must plan for quality multilingual education for the whole country, focusing on strengthening the mother tongues and, at the same time, fostering high levels of competence in Nepali as the official language and English as an international language for wider communication. At the *national level*, education must foster meaningful participation in the democratic processes, responsible citizenship and empowerment of all communities. At the *regional level* it must transform the communities for more effective realization of the societal goals and foster planned long-term educational development. However, it is necessary to guard against possible problems associated with duality of responsibility in a federal structure, which may lead to ineffective planning and implementation.

In planning for multilingual education in Nepal, it would be necessary to have a broad national policy and curricular framework and to define the curricular objectives at all levels of education. Decisions about materials development, including many of the content issues, which need to be sensitive to and use local Indigenous Knowledges (IK), Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) and Indigenous Knowledge Holders, are best left to the *local levels*. Local availability of bilingual teachers with good knowledge of the students' mother tongues will also influence the speed of both horizontal and vertical extension of MT-based MLE.

Thus the questions relating to curricula, texts and classroom transactions can be addressed by *a policy of uniformity with diversity*. A national curricular framework suitably developed, and modified from time to time, is necessary so that all programmes of the "mainstream" as well as mother-tongue-based ITM education – Nepali, English, Indigenous mother tongue and other language programmes – can target comparable levels of achievement for all children at different grades. Such a national framework would effectively ensure uniform quality education for all children in Nepal without entailing disadvantages to the ITM children and disadvantaged segments of the national population.

Preparation of curricular materials, textbooks, other teaching-learning materials and activities and methods of classroom transaction need to be decentralized so that children's learning remains rooted in their culture and daily life experiences. It is also practical and pedagogically defensible to use a common writing system such as Devanagari for the indigenous languages (L1) in the MLE programmes in Nepal. Both mainly oral teaching (where written materials do not yet exist) and teaching reading very early (2-3-year-olds) where written materials exist but the languages are not yet used in school as teaching languages, are also useful tried-out approaches.

Teacher training needs to be reformed to reflect the fact that most teachers will have ITM children in their classrooms. *Experts in MLE* need to be trained, and the plans to start this kind of training at Tribhuvan University (Department of Linguistics, Professor Yadava) are commendable.

It will also be necessary to establish mechanisms for *evaluation, research, coordination, documentation and resource sharing* among the stakeholders of all the MLE programmes in Nepal, particularly including organizations representing the Indigenous peoples. Choices by ITM parents for MT-based MLE programmes must be based on their prior informed consent. This requires appropriate dissemination of information, research results and the basic

framework for MLE. These *information and advocacy efforts* also need to be emphasized at all levels of the management and governance of MLE in Nepal. *A National Resource Centre for MLE* needs to be set up to organize research, evaluation, monitoring, advocacy and coordination, and to collect information about MLE research and practices from around the world - networking is vital. At the same time, the local school systems also have to be empowered to participate in this process.

Nepal has made a very good start with the MLE project and activities around it. As Appendix 2 (Concept paper; one of the results of an earlier consultancy by one of us) and Appendix 6 (working group report, chair professor Yadava) show, there is a wealth of knowledge, enthusiasm and commitment. This knowledge was also eminently presented in the Yadava & Grove (eds, 1994/2008) report. This makes us hopeful in relation to the future in Nepal's attempts to maintain and develop further its enormous riches of diversities.

References

Aikio-Puoskari, Ulla (2009). 'The Ethnic Revival, Language and Education of the Sámi, an Indigenous People, in three Nordic Countries (Finland, Norway and Sweden)'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 216-237.

Aikio-Puoskari, Ulla & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2007). When few under 50 speak the language as a first language: linguistic (human) rights and linguistic challenges for endangered Saami languages. In *Revitalizing the Periphery*. Raporta/Report 1/2007. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi Instituhtta, 9-63. [ISBN 978-82-7367-013-7].

Alexander, Neville (2006). Introduction. In *Intergovernmental Conference on Language Policies in Africa. Harare, Zimbabwe, 17-21 March 1997. Final Report*. Paris: UNESCO, Intangible Heritage Section, 9-16.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo (1995). The European School experience in multilingual education. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.). *Multilingualism for all*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 21-68.

Baker, Colin (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, Colin & Prys Jones, Sylvia (1998). *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Benson, Carol (2009). Designing effective schooling in multilingual contexts: going beyond bilingual models. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 60-76.

Clayton, Stephen (2008). The problem of 'choice' and the construction of demand for English in Cambodia. *Language Policy* 7:2, 143-164.

Collier, Virginia P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes, *TESOL Quarterly* 21, 617-641.

Collier, Virginia P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language, *TESOL Quarterly* 23, 509-531.

Collier, Virginia P. & Thomas, Wayne P. (2002). Reforming Education Policies for English Learners Means Better Schools for All. *The State Educational Standards* 3:1, 30-36.

Collier, Virginia P. & Thomas, Wayne P. (2007). Predicting Second Language Academic Success in English Using the Prism Model. In Cummins, Jim & Davison, Chris (eds).

International Handbook of English Language Teaching, Parts 1-2. New York: Springer, 333-348.

Collier, Virginia P. and Wayne P. Thomas (1999). 'Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 2'. *TESOL Matters*, *9*(5), 1, 6.

Cummins, Jim (1989). *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento, California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, Jim (1989b). Language and literacy acquisition in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10:1, 17-32.

Cummins, Jim (1996). *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Ontario, California: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, Jim (2007). 'Rethinking Monolingual Instructional Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms'. In Lyster, Roy and Sharon Lapkin (eds). Theme Issue: Multilingualism in Canadian Schools. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 10, No. 2, 221-240.

Cummins, Jim (2009). 'Fundamental psychological and sociological principles underlying educational success for linguistic minority students'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 21-35.

Dolson, David & Lindholm, Kathryn (1995). World class education for children in California: A comparison of the two-way bilingual immersion and European School model. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.). *Multilingualism for all*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 69-102.

Dreze, Jean & Sen, Amartya (2002). *India: Development and Participation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dunbar Robert and Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 2008. *Forms of Education of Indigenous Children as Crimes Against Humanity?* Expert paper written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII) New York: PFII. [In PFII' system: "Presented by Lars-Anders Baer, in collaboration with Robert Dunbar, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ole Henrik Magga"]. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/E_C19_2008_7.pdf [can also be downloaded from www.Tove-Skutnabb-Kangas.org, under UNPFII]

Galtung, Johan (1988). *Methodology and Development. Essays in Methodology*, Vol. III. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

García, Ofelia, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Torres-Guzmán, María (eds) (2006). *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization*. Clevedon, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters. Also published in 2009, New Delhi: Orient Blackswan http://www.orientlongman.com/display.asp?categoryID=26&isbn=978-81-250-3654-8&detail=3.

Glenny, Misha (2009). The problem with 'kumbaya' politics. Review of Collier, Paul (2009). *Wars, Guns & Votes: Democracy in Dangerous Places*. New York: HarperCollins. *The Guardian Weekly* 030409, p. 39.

Grin, François (2003). Language Planning and Economics. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(11), 1-66.

Heugh, Kathleen (2009). 'Literacy and bi/multilingual education in Africa: recovering collective memory and knowledge.' In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local***.** New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 95-113.

Heugh, Kathleen, Benson, Carol, Berhanu, Bogale & Mekonnen, Alemu Gebre Yohannes (22 January 2007). Final Report. Study on Medium of Instruction in Primary Schools in Ethiopia, Commissioned by the Ministry of Education, September to December 2006.

Hough, David, Ram Bahadur Thapa Magar and Amrit Yonjan-Tamang (2009). 'Privileging Indigenous Knowledges: Empowering MLE in Nepal.' In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda,

Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 146-161.

Huss, Leena (1999). *Reversing Language Shift in the Far North. Linguistic Revitalization in Scandinavia and Finland*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 31. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Huss, Leena, Camilleri, Antoinette & King, Kendall (eds) (2003). *Transcending Monolingualism: Linguistic Revitalisation in Education*. Series Multilingualism and linguistic diversity. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.Jhingran, Dhir (2009). 'Language contexts in India: Implications for primary education'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 250-267.

Kirkpatrick, Andy (2009). Extra language risks losing the children. *Guardian Weekly 27.03.09, Learning English Supplement*, page 4.

Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn J. (2001). *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto & Sydney: Multilingual Matters.

Leontiev, Alexei A. (1995). Multilingualism for all - Russians? In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 199-214.

Lo Bianco, Joseph (2009). A Friendly Knife? English in the Context of Sri Lankan Language Politics. In Farrell, L., Singh, U. N. & Giri, N.A, (eds)*. English Language Education in South Asia: From Policy to Pedagogy*, New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India. In press.

Magga, Ole Henrik, Nicolaisen, Ida, Trask, Mililani, Dunbar, Robert and Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2005). *Indigenous Children's Education and Indigenous Languages. Expert paper written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues*. New York: United Nations. [can be downloaded from www.Tove-Skutnabb-Kangas.org, under UNPFII]

May, Stephen & Hill, Richard (2003). *Bilingual/Immersion Education: Indicators of Good Practice*. Milestone Report 2. Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Waikato.

May, Stephen. (ed.) (1999). *Indigenous community-based education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 180 pp. ISBN 1-85359-450-4 (hbk). Also available as Vol. 11, No. 3 of the journal *Language, Culture and Curriculum*.

Misra, Girishwar & Mohanty, Ajit K. (2000a). Consequences of Poverty and Disadvantage: A Review of Indian Studies. In Mohanty, Ajit K. & Misra, Girishwar (eds) (2000). *Psychology of Poverty and Disadvantage*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 121-148.

Misra, Girishwar & Mohanty, Ajit K. (2000b). Poverty and Disadvantage: Issues in Retrospect. In Mohanty, Ajit K. & Misra, Girishwar (eds) (2000). *Psychology of Poverty and Disadvantage*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 261-284.

Mohanty, Ajit K. (2007). Introduction. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2007) [1984]. *Bilingualism or not – the Education of minorities*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 5-17.

Mohanty, Ajit K. (2008). 'Perpetuating Inequality: Language Disadvantage and Capability Deprivation of Tribal Mother Tongue Speakers in India'. In Wayne, Harbert (ed.). *Language and Poverty*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 104-124.

Mohanty, Ajit K., & Panda, Minati (2007). *From mother tongue to other tongue: facilitation transition in multilingual education of tribal children in India*. Delhi, India: Project Proposal submitted to Bernard van Leer Foundation.

Mohanty, Ajit K., Mahendra Kumar Mishra, N. Upender Reddy and Ramesh Gumidyala (2009). 'Overcoming the language barrier for tribal children: MLE in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, India'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-

Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 278-291.

Mohanty, Ajit K., Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds) (2009). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Mohanty, Ajit K., Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2009). 'Foreword'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Panda, Minati and Ajit Mohanty (2009). 'MLE Plus: Culture to Classroom'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 295-312.

Phillipson, Robert (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued.* Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Ramirez, J. David, Pasta, David J., Yuen, Sandra D., Billings, David K. & Ramey, Dena R. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority children (Vols. 1-2).* San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Ramirez, J. David., Yuen, Sandra D. & Ramey, Dena R. (1991). *Executive Summary: Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children, Submitted to the U. S. Department of Education.* San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Reay, D. & Lucey, H. (2003). The limits of choice: Children and inner city schooling. *Sociology* 37:1, 121-142.

Saikia, Jayashree and Ajit K. Mohanty (2004). *The role of mother tongue medium instruction in promoting educational achievement: A study of grade four Bodo children in Assam (India)*. Manuscript.

Sale, Kirkpatrick (1996). Principles of Bioregionalism. In Mander, Jerry & Goldsmith, Edward (eds). *The case against the global economy and for a turn toward the local.* San Francisco: Sierra Club, 471-484.

Sen, Amartya (1985). *Commodities and capabilities.* Amsterdam: North Holland.

Singh, Kumar S. (2002). *People of India.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1987). *Are the Finns in Sweden an Ethnic Minority? Finnish Parents Talk about Finland and Sweden.* Research Project "The education of the Finnish minority in Sweden", Working Paper nr 1. Roskilde: Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI. 116 p..

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1988). Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children. In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Cummins, Jim (eds) (1988). *Minority education: from shame to struggle*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, 9-44

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education - or worldwide diversity and human righs?* Mahwah, NJ & London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 818 pp. South Asian updated edition in 2008, Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2007) [1984]. *Bilingualism or not – the Education of minorities*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2009). 'MLE for global justice: Issues, Approaches, Opportunities'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Aikio-Puoskari, Ulla (2003). Exclusion or inclusion - linguistic

human rights for a linguistic minority, the Deaf Sign language users, and an indigenous people, the Saami. In Lee, Philip (ed.). *Many voices, one vision: The Right to Communicate in Practice*. Penang, Malaysia: Southbound & London: WACC 59-88.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Dunbar, Robert (forthcoming (2009). *Indigenous Children's Education as Linguistic Genocide and a Crime Against Humanity? A Global View*. Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino: Galdu, Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (http://www.galdu.org)

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & García, Ofelia (1995). Multilingualism for All - General Principles? In Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (ed.). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, Series European Studies on Multilingualism, 221-256.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Kathleen Heugh (eds) (forthcoming). *Successful multilingual education - from Ethiopia to the world*. Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Maffi, Luisa and Harmon, Dave (2003*). Sharing A World of Difference. The Earth's Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing. UNESCO, Terralingua, and World Wide Fund for Nature. 56 pp. (ISBN UNESCO 92-3-103917-2). Download at www.terralingua.org/RecPublications.htm

Swain, Merrill, Lapkin, Sharon, Rowen, Norman, Hart, Doug (1990). The Role of Mother Tongue Literacy in Third Language Learning. *VOX, The Journal of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education*, 4, 111-121.

Thomas, Wayne P. and Collier, Virginia P. (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language minority Students' Long Term Academic Achievement*. George Mason University, CREDE (Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence).

Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich 1978. *Mind and Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Yadava, Yogendra P. & Grove, Carl (eds.) (2008) [1949]. *The Report of National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission*. Kathmandu: Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan university, Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Yonjan-Tamang, Amrit, David Hough and Iina Nurmela (2009). 'The Nepal Multilingual Education Program: Year one of planning and implementation'. In Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 241-249.

Notes:

[i] Our Programme was as follows:

4 March Arrival in Nepal, briefing with Päivi Ahonen, Amrit Yonjan-Tamang and Lava Deo Awasthi; meeting with them at the Ministry of Education, with Joint Secretary Arjun Bhandari; meeting with Arun Tiwari, Deputy Director, Inclusive Education Section, Diwakar Chapagai, CDC, Maya Rai, Deputy Director, NCED' and Sushan Acharya, Expert and Research team.

5 March Travel to Rasuwa, visit at MLE piloting school Sri Bhimsen Primary School, Thulobarkhu, together with Ahonen, Yonjan-Tamang, Djeerah Jung Gurung and Ganesh Paudel from DoE, Maya Rai, NCED, Deputy Director, Sushan Acharya, Expert & Research Team, Jayanti Subba, the Finnish embassy. Observing classes, a meeting with the teachers, dinner with them and others, including Chief District Officer Rabi Raj Kafle, Local Development Official Bhuwan Aryal and District Eduction Officer Rama Panthi, also present at the Seminar 6.3.

6 March Full-day seminar on MLE policies and strategies in Rasuwa district, teachers from piloting and cascading schools, education authorities etc., dinner with some of the participants.
7 March Travel back to Kathmandu, preparations for the Workshop
8-9 March Two-day Workshop on Policy & Strategy formulation and recommendations, planning meetings after both days.
10 March "Free" Day, National Holiday, Holi; report writing, writing Power Points for 11 March, planning meeting for 11 March.
11 March National Seminar
12 March Debriefing with representatives from MOE, DOE, CDC, and MLE Team
13 March Lectures for NeFIN; Lectures at Tribhuvan University Linguistic Department; meeting with UNESCO Kathmandu director Colin Kaiser; dinner organized by NeFIN.
14 March Debriefing with Päivi Ahonen and Amrit Yonjan-Tamang; planning meeting with Päivi Ahonen. Travel from Nepal

[ii] These are called "drop-outs" in deficiency-based theories which blame the students, their characteristics, their parents and their culture for lack of school achievement.

[iii] See summaries and references in, e.g., Baker 1993, Baker & Prys Jones 1998, references to Cummins in the bibliography, Dolson & Lindholm 1995, García, Skutnabb-Kangas & Torres-Guzmán, eds (2006), Huss 1999, Huss et al. 2003, Leontiev 1995, May & Hill 2003, May, ed. (1999), Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, Skutnabb-Kangas, ed. 1995, and the 8-volume series *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, especially Cummins & Corson, eds, 1997. All these references can be accessed in the bibliography at
http://www.terralingua.org/Bibliographies/MultilingLingHRBib.html

[iv] In general, this bibliography (313 pages, over 5000 entries) is a good source for MLE references.

[v] After we had finished our main report, we got the MLE Research and Expert Team's Final Draft Report, April 2009. We have incorporated some of our observations of it in Section 5.1.

[vi] One could here use theories about secure vs insecure majorities and minorities. A **linguistic MAJORITY, secure** in its identity, can afford to grant LHRs to minorities, without feeling that this is a threat. A **secure linguistic minority** accepts a minority status. It is secure in its identity and does not feel any threat towards its future from the majority; its loyalty is with the state it lives in. Full linguistic and cultural human rights and a fair economic and political representation, with affirmative action, are prerequisites for this. As opposed to this, an **insecure MAJORITY** believes in myths about monolingualism being normal, desirable, inevitable and enough (monolingual reductionism). It sees, falsely, minority LHRs as a threat to the state's unity and integrity and does not trust the minority. An **insecure minority** is threatened by forced linguistic and cultural assimilation and unequal economic and political rights.

   The worst combination is an insecure majority (behaving as a majorised minority) and insecure minorities (behaving as minorised majorities). We can then ask what the situation is in Nepal? Are both ethnic Nepalis and ethnic/linguistic ITMs still to some extent insecure, so that the Nepali-speaking "majority" is afraid that granting a federal status, with corresponding educational language rights, to ITMs is seen as leading to a disintegration of the state? And the ITMs may, if they feel insecure about their present and future status, make more vocal and disrupting demands than they might if they felt sure that their human rights, including the right to self-determination AND educational and cultural languages rights, will be met. In that case, both ethnic Nepalis and linguistic ITMs lose out, and so does the state.

[vii] See, e.g. http://www.steinerwaldorf.org/whatissteinereducation.html and links from there.

It may be mentioned that innovative programmes of MLE for complex multilingual classrooms with students from many different language backgrounds are being developed for schools in Koraput District in Orissa (India) where children from different ITM communities in multilingual contexts of 4 to 5 languages.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR AJIT MOHANTY AND TOVE SKUTNABB-KANGAS

Proposal for International Consultancy:

Areas:	Support to MLE policy & strategy development
	Support to initiate the formulation of MLE implementation guidelines
Time:	13 days
Period of time:	2.3 -15.3.2009
Qualifications	
of Consultant:	Master's degree in a relevant field
	Knowledge of MLE theory
	Knowledge of language policy and planning in multilingual contexts

Terms of Reference

Background

MLE program aims at strengthening and building the capacity at central, district and community levels to implement MLE and to create models of learning environments that facilitate the non-Nepali speaking students' learning. Sharing knowledge of multilingual and mother tongue education and research findings worldwide with all stakeholders to design the best possible models for MLE in Nepal is an on-going process.

The MLE interventions are implemented in six model building districts in eight languages. Model building has been done in the following areas through a bottom-up approach:

- Involving IK holders in designing and implementing MLE,
- Writing MLE material and designing a process to write textbooks locally,

- Utilization of teacher resources to implement MT based MLE

Indigenous/minority values, knowledge, teaching methodologies and other cultural aspects have been explored in relation to curriculum, textbooks and teaching.

Extensive consultations have taken place in different forums and with different stakeholders about the best practices in relation to Linguistic Human Rights and children's rights to mother tongue education. Different policies, guidelines, rules and regulations have been reviewed by the TA team with representatives from line agencies. Model building in MLE schools based on national and international research findings will give perspectives on how MLE can be implemented in Nepal. Nepali as a second language is one of the issues that need addressing.

Another example of these perspectives for future is a Concept paper on MLE written by a core group of representatives from different line agencies such as NCED, DOE, NFEC, MOES and also from Tribhuvan university, NFDIN, CNAS and Parliament. The work has been supported by Dr. Skutnabb-Kangas, a renowned expert in this area. For consolidation and improvements of this concept paper, there is a need for sharing and consultations with the heads of line agencies and with other important decision-makers and implementers in the system. This will be one of the important aspects for consolidating MLE policies and building appropriate models in Nepal.

Purpose of the Consultancy
The consultants will:

- Discuss issues raised in the Concept paper with decision-makers and implementers and provide support to further formulation of the paper through presenting relevant international research findings and best practices in both MLE policy and implementation.
- Support the review, analysis and elaboration of issues, practices and preliminary recommendations raised by the MLE Research and Expert Team with relevant national stakeholders.
- Present international models for federal language policies and discuss different options in the case of Nepal with relevant decision-makers and implementers and connect them to the recommendations made in the Concept paper, and the preliminary recommendations of the MLE Research & Expert team.
- Support to the analysis, elaboration and formulation of a draft MLE policy based on the above-mentioned recommendations, models and both national and international research findings.
- Support to the preliminary development of MLE implementation guidelines including (a) policy recommendations, (b) the MLE context of Nepal, (c) MLE strategies, (d) roles and responsibilities of different national agents in the implementation of MLE
- Present together with the people involved in the above-mentioned processes, the core themes, recommendations and implementation models to a wider audience including I/NGOs, researchers, employees of education sector both from central and district levels and other networking partners in MLE.

Outcomes/ deliverables:

1. Finalize the MLE Concept/Policy paper with policy & strategy recommendation and the role of the different education line agencies in implementation the MLE strategy/guidelines.

2.   Initiate the process of analyzing the organizational readiness and the enabling conditions of the education line agencies to apply the recommended MLE strategies based on the recommended MLE policy.

3.   Initiate the process of the MLE expansion strategy for the education authorities to continue MLE development in Nepal education system. Draft the preconditions and minimum requirement into the MLE expansion strategy.

4.   Based on the draft analyzes and MLE the draft expansion strategy give recommendations to DOE MLE Coordination Committee for developing the MLE Implementation Guidelines with the MLE Program Team

Appendix 2. Concept paper Multilingual Education and Nepal

Multilingual Education and Nepal

This Concept paper is one of the results from the 3-day intensive course *Language Policy, Mother-tongue-based Multilingual Education and Linguistic Human Rights* which took place in Kathmandu in February 2008, with Dr. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas as the teacher ("Guruma"/"Didi"), under the auspices of the *Multilingual Education Program*.

Bajracharya, Pradeep, Bhattarai, Prem, Bhattarai, Toya, Dahal, Madhav, Gautam, Geha Nath, Pant, Hari Ram, Ray, Maya, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Shrestha, Ramhari, Thapa, Fatik & Tuladhar-Ashan, Nirmal Man[viii]

1. Introduction. Nepal: Demographic, linguistic and socio-cultural background
2. What is MLE? Why is MLE required in Nepal?
3. MLE yes – but how? A few examples
4. MLE-related international law and human rights obligations
5. Current policy, practices and efforts related to MLE in Nepal
6. Possible future directions for MLE in Nepal (long-term and short-term)

1. Introduction. Nepal: Linguistic and socio-cultural background

According to the latest census (2001) Nepal has a population of 23,151,423. Nepali people belong to several different languages, cultures, social, "caste" and ethnic backgrounds due to geographical variations in the country. The census 2002 noted 102 social groups and Yadava & Turin (2006: 7), quoting the census, say "59 officially recognized caste and ethnic groups". The census recorded 92 languages (while the Ethnologue, 15th edition claims 123 living languages and Yonjan-Tamang (2006) claims over 143 languages. The Indo-Aryan language group is the largest in terms of the number of speakers (some 80% of all speakers) while the Tibeto-Burman branch has the largest number of languages (57). The rest are Austro-Asiatic and Dravidian, with one linguistic isolate, Kusunda (Yadava & Turin 2006: 7). Most languages have fairly few speakers; fewer than 20 have more than 100,000 speakers. Cultural and linguistic diversity are one of Nepal's national treasures. Nepal has a responsibility to conserve a rich linguistic and cultural heritage.

Each community shall have right to receive basic education in the mother tongue as provided by the law. Considering the multilingual and multicultural society, mother tongue medium education will be employed as an integral part of instruction at early grades of basic education. Since Nepali, the official language, is also been taught and will be used as the medium part of the time, education necessarily needs to multilingual.

2. What is Multilingual Education (MLE)? Why is MLE required in Nepal?

Multilingual Education (MLE) is the use of three or more languages as languages of instruction, in subjects other than the languages themselves, at a single school in a multilingual community.

South Asia is home to incredible linguistic diversity (Kosonen 2007) and so is Nepal. This diversity brings with it many challenges. Both older and recent research (see Skutnabb-Kangas 2008 for references) shows that education mainly through the medium of the mother tongue is a must for educational success. A multilingual approach to education paves the way for students to the languages they need. Multilingual education begins with the mother tongue.

Statistics and research shows that learners from Indigenous and minority (IM) language communities are at an educational disadvantage when they are taught using a dominant/majority language as the medium of teaching (Skutnabb-Kangas 2008, McCarty 2009, Bear Nicholas, 2009). Teachers do not speak or understand the language of students from minority communities – therefore it is difficult for students to learn. High repetition and drop-out rates of minority language speaking students are common, likewise alienation from their cultural heritage, the language of the parents and the home community. It is educationally and economically wasteful to have schools where children do not learn.

Based on the opinion of a UNESCO Expert group in 1953, the UNESCO book **"The use of vernacular languages in education"** (1953) recommends that the mother tongue should axiomatically be the best medium of education at least during the first 6 years. Two recent Expert papers for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (Magga et al. 2005, Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas 2008) analyse official-language medium education for IM children as genocide, according to two of the five definitions of genocide in the United Nations' 1948 *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*[viii] (the "Genocide Convention), and also as a crime against humanity.

Large-scale overviews and studies (e.g. May & Hill 2003, Ramirez et al., 1991, Thomas & Collier 2002) show the importance of mother tongue medium teaching, and the disastrous results when it is not done. The length of mother tongue medium education was in all studies more important than any other factor in predicting the educational success of bilingual students. In terms of both general school achievement and the learning of the dominant language, those students were best who had the longest number of years of learning content in their mother tongue, taught by bilingual teachers and with a go

MLE in Nepal is required to prevent the situation of genocide and to explore, preserve and expand the IM languages and culture, and to offer quality education to all children.

3. MLE yes – but how? A few examples

3.1. Multilingual Education in India

There are many mother tongue medium and MLE schools in regional official languages, but very few in "tribal" languages. In 2001, the **Orissa** government started the planning process for mother tongue

based education for tribal children. A model textbook was prepared for classroom instruction at the primary level, teacher training modules and manuals were developed and teachers were trained. In 2007, the government launched a MT based multilingual education program for 10 tribal languages in 200 schools. Another 16 languages will be added in 2009. Many of the materials are based on local folklore collected in the areas concerned and on essays by children. A similar project was started in **Andra Pradesh** already earlier (the oldest children will be in grade 6 in 2008-2009) but the materials and teacher training are much more streamlined. In **Assam**, the Bodo language is used as a medium of teaching for 12 years, Assamese is taught as a second language from the third/fifth year onwards. Hindi and English are introduced between the fourth to sixth year of school.

3.2. Swedish and Saami medium schools in Finland and Saami in Norway

According to the Finnish Constitution, the citizens of Finland have the right to use their own mother tongue, Finnish or Swedish, in courts and with administrative authorities. Municipalities with both Finnish- and Swedish-speaking students must offer basic education (the first 9 years) in each language. Children get all their education in their respective mother tongues, and study each other's languages as second languages, and English as a foreign language. In addition, the Indigenous Saami children have the right to mother tongue medium education in the Saami administrative areas. There are three Saami languages in Finland and two of them have fewer than 500 speakers. In Norway, Saami children have the right to education in Saami in the whole country, not just in the north in the Saami administrative areas.

3.3. Bilingual education in Peru

Peru, with an estimated 42 Indigenous languages, in addition to Spanish and more recent immigrant languages offers bilingual/bicultural education for some of the Indigenous students only even if the laws state it as a right. Thus the situation is similar to Nepal. Some very promising teacher training is in place where many of the false conceptions and misunderstandings about mother tongue medium education are discussed in depth. Questions are asked about how education could be done in "Indigenous" ways, partially with the help of postcolonial theories, and how to move from weak multilingual education to strong multilingual education (where mother tongue medium continues during the whole primary education and beyond). The teacher training wants to move beyond technical and methodological issues, to reflecting on the ideological and economic historically developed power relations behind the choice of educational and other language policies.

These are just some examples of successful educational MLE models that might be relevant for Nepal.

4. MLE-related international law and human rights obligations

4.1. Central International Instruments

Many international and regional human rights documents (instruments) regulate the right to education in relation to language. Most demand "only" that nobody should be discriminated against on the basis of language. The relevant international (United Nations) instruments which mention the right to education and language and that Nepal has signed and ratified are as follows:

- International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, 1966;
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966;
- Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966;
- Convention on Rights of the Child, 1989.

In addition, the following instruments are relevant for the right to education:

- Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict 2000;
- Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography 2000

4.2. International Policies

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948
- The UNESCO Convention Against Discrimination in Education 1960
- The 1990 Jomtien World Conference on Education for All (EFA)
- The Dakar Framework of Action 2000
- The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966 (Article 13 and 14)
- The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (Article 18)
- The Convention on the Rights of the Child (Article 28)
- The Millennium Development Goals 2000
- The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007

In addition to the instruments and policies mentioned, there are countless Recommendations, Declarations, etc, which condemn subtractive education of IM students through the medium of the dominant state language and recommend MLE and bilingual teachers.

5. Current policy, practices and efforts related to MLE in Nepal

5.1. The legal framework

The Interim Constitution of Nepal 2007 incorporates the following provisions regarding Multilingualism and Multilingual Education (MLE)[viii] :

Articles 5, 13 and 17 state the rights of citizens to equality, education and culture. They set the language policy with all languages as national languages and Nepali as the official language. They include the right to basic education in mother tongues as well as the right to preservation and promotion of languages, scripts and cultures.

Articles 33, 34, 35 and 138 describe the responsibilities of the State in maintaining cultural diversity and equal promotion of all languages and cultures bringing en end to all forms of inequalities and discrimination.

Section 7 of the Seventh Amendment of the Education Act of Nepal states that Nepali Language shall be the medium of instruction in the schools. Provided that mother tongue can be used as a medium of instruction at the primary level (Section 7.1). Notwithstanding anything contained in the above provision, while teaching language as a subject, the medium of instruction can be the same language.

The Three year Interim Plan includes a trilingual policy: Nepali language as the official language, mother tongue, and English as an international language. Basic education can be provided in the mother tongue(s). The **EFA Core Cocument** and the **EFA National Plan of Action** along with the **Tenth**

Plan and the **Interim Development Plan Documents** of Nepal Government, recognize multilingual education by incorporating mother tongue education in their policies and programmes.

5.2. Recent practices of MLE in the education sector

The report of **Language Policy Commission** (LPRC) 1994 recommended that the mother tongue should be included in the education system as the medium of instruction as well as the subject. The languages should initially be prioritized on the basis of two criteria: the population demographics and the existence of a writing system. The writing system and script should also be developed and included in the education system.

The **Curriculum Development Centre** (CDC) has, on a priority basis, as of 2007, developed curriculum and textbooks for grades 1-5 in 12 different mother tongues as optional subjects : Maithili, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Newari, Limbu, Tamang, Tharu, Magar, Rai- Bantawa, Gurung, Sherpa and Rai-Chamling (completed). The textbooks for grades 1-2 in Sunuwar & Rajbanshi and for grade 1 in Rai-Yakkha are being written. Moreover, CDC has also developed Guidelines for the development of reading materials in mother tongues as optional subjects. Children's reference materials for grade 1 (biographies, culture and stories) have also been prepared in 7 different languages (Maithili, Bhorpuri, Awadhi, Newar, Limbu, Tamang and Tharu) and for grade 2 in 3 different languages: Magar, Gurung and Doteli. CDC has translated the textbooks (Social Studies, Science, Math etc) for grade 1 into 7 languages (Maithili, Bhorpuri, Awadhi, Limbu, Tharu, Magar and Gurung) and for grade 2 into 3 languages (Maithili, Limbu and Tharu), but these have not been published yet (June 2008).

Primary level curriculum proposes Nepali language as the medium of instruction. Local languages can be used as the teaching languages. A local language is provided as the optional subject with FM 100 and weight 4. Curriculum for the local language can be developed locally. **The Secondary level curriculum** has provision for Nepali language as the medium of instruction. An opportunity to learn own mother tongue with is provided as an optional subject.

The **Non-formal Education Centre** (NFEC) has developed Basic Literacy Primers and Guide books in six mother tongues (Tharu, Maithili, Bhojpuri and Tamang, Doteli and Awadhi. During 2008, a literacy primer in the Khas (Jumli) tongue will be prepared for the adults in Karnali region. Books in six mother tongues (Tharu, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Tamang, Doteland Awadhi) are being prepared. In 2008, a book in the Khas language will be prepared for the adults in Karnali region. In 2008, a pilot test of the Awadhi language materials in Kapilvastu and Bara and in Tamang language in Ramechhap districts will be implemented. - Guidelines for teaching materials in mother tongues are being prepared.

5.3 Mother Tongues in Media

News and programs in various mother tongues are broadcasted through Radio Nepal, FM and TV channels. Radio Nepal broadcasts news in different languages: Sanskrit, Newar and Maithili through central transmission and Tamang, Bhojpuri, Rai-Bantawa, Tharu, Limbu, Gurung, Mager, Pashchhima Tharu, Rana Tharu, Awadhi, Doteli, Magar Kham, Urdu and Sherpa through reginal transmission. Different TV programs broadcast several mother tongue programs. NTV 2, for example has Newar, Bhojpuri, Urdu, Limbu and Maithili programs and Nepal1 has Madesh news. Image Channel has Newar news and other Newar program. The Government owned daily newspaper **Gorkhapatra** publishes news and reading materials in 19 different languages (Newar, Magar, Rai, Limbu, Tamang, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Tharu, Sunuwar, Gurung, Sherpa, Baram, Urab, Dhimal, Majhi, Thami, Maithili, Urdu and Jirel). Daily / weekly papers are published locally in various mother tongues. According to the Department of Information, the total number of registered newspapers and journals are

4871/2008,Feb. Among them, 265 newspapers are published in various mother tongues (28 in Newari; 15 in Maithili; 14 in Hindi; 5 in Tharu; 3 in Bhojpuri; 2 in Sanskrit; 2 in Urdu; 2 in Limbu; 2 in Doteli; 2 in Tamang, 1 in Tibetan; 1 in Rai, and 202 in other languages).

The **Department of Education, DOE**, is implementing a **Multilingual Education (pilot) project** in six districts in seven primary schools with non-Nepali speaking students. The mother tongue of the indigenous students will be the medium of classroom teaching. The implementation plan for the project covers development of locally based MLE & MTE materials, MLE capacity building, cascading, raising the awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity.

The following lists efforts and projects that the **Ministry of Education and Sports** (MoES) is involved in at present (2008) in addition to supporting and supervising the programmes of the line agencies such as CDC, DOE, NCED and NFEC:

- Policies concerning use of mother- tongues as medium of instructions in primary level (i.e. grade 1 to 5) and non- formal education.
- Advocacy and capacity building on MLE by DoE.
- News and adocacy on SLC (School Leaving Certificate) materials of DEOL in Radio and Television
- News and awareness programs in newspapers especially Gorkhapatra
- Partnership on ML with NGOs/INGOs like Summer School of linguistics, UNICEF etc
- Incentives given to non-native teachers teaching via ML in government schools

6. Possible Future directions for MLE in Nepal (long-term and short-term)

6.2. A Long- term Goal

Access to good basic education must be ensured for all citizens of Nepal (the EFA goal), with curricula, materials and methods that are based on and respect local cultures and linguistic variation. For all IM children and children with mother tongues other than Nepali, access to good basic education must be ensured mainly through the medium of the mother tongue for at least through primary level but preferably for the first 6-8 years, and with teaching of Nepali as a second language, given by bilingual teachers, and likewise with curricula, materials and methods that are based on and respect local cultures and linguistic variation.

6.1. Issues and Challenges

- **Policy and Regulations**: The lack of policy and regulations relating to mother tongue as medium of instruction must be addressed, clear policies to facilitate the implementation of MLE must be formulated.
- **Financial Resources**: It is shown by international experience that MLE does not increase the overall costs in the education sector. However, in the beginning phases of implementation, the government may need to make larger investments in material production and teacher training.
- **Material Development**: Mechanisms to develop materials locally in different mother tongues must be developed. The supply of MT/MLE books everywhere must be ensured.
- **Human Resources**: Urgent attention needs to be given to the redeployment and appointment of mother tongues speaking teachers. In-service and pre-service teacher training programs must be developed both for mother tongue as a subject and for medium of instruction.

- **Sensitization and Orientation**: Information through various media on the value and outcomes of mother tongue based multilingual education should be offered to guardians, teachers, headmasters, education officers and other concerned parties at all levels. Meeting the expectations and priorities of communities should be a priority.
- **Ensuring MLE in all language scenarios**: MT and MLE should be promoted and strengthened from monolingual to multilingual school settings and in all languages, whether they have a script or a written tradition or are based on an oral culture.

6.3. Short-term Goals

1. **Background data**

   a. Conduction of school catchment area surveys to identify the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of all teachers, students and resource people to see if they match or if mother tongue speaking teachers are required.

2. **State language policy**

   a. Development of a comprehensive language policy for Nepal with an educational language policy as an important part of it. This should take advantage of all the positive aspects which are already in the Interim Constitution and in the Education Act with its amendments, and to include budget lines that match the policies.
   b. Include in this language policy aspects such as:
      i. The use of IM languages as official languages parallel to Nepali language
      ii. Encouraging MLE in all federal states in the future,
      iii. Plans to expand mother tongue based education in primary school to secondary and tertiary education.
   c. Setting up structures to monitor the implementation of the policy, including complaint procedures.

3. **Teachers**

   a. Provision of appropriate training to teachers for classroom instruction using the various mother tongues.
   b. Provision of appropriate training to teachers in Nepali as a second language for both IM teachers and Nepali speaking teachers.
   c. Recruitment and deployment of teachers in accordance to the needs of education in the various mother tongues. Priority should be given to IM language teachers in future recruitment, deployment and training. Linguistic competence in languages other than Nepali should be financially rewarded.
   d. In-service training of teachers with various modules on different aspects of MLE (multi-grade teaching; research on MLE; best practices in MLE and their compatibility with the Nepalese context; transfer of skills from one language to another, how to employ local communities as knowledge bearers and teachers in school; how to advocate for MLE and discuss misunderstandings that parents/colleagues/administrators etc might have; strategies for monitoring progress in language learning and use).

4. **Curricula and materials**

a. Development of locally based curricula, textbooks, teachers' guides and other supporting materials in all the languages of Nepal both for formal and non-formal sectors. The curriculum should also give incentives to madrasas, gumbas, gurukuls and others to promote MLE.

b. The curriculum should include a new subject "Nepali as a second language" for those students whose mother tongue is not Nepali.

c. Curricula should also be developed as a matter of urgency for those highly endangered languages where the parents no longer speak the language to their children. These models can be called Indigenous revitalization immersion models.

d. Curricula should likewise be developed for Nepali-speaking children who want to learn an IM language. There are several models available for this.

5. **Evaluation and research**

a. Supervision, monitoring and evaluation of the programs/activities on a regular basis, including appropriate adjustments of the programs/activities in accordance to new research findings in Nepal and internationally, and with a mandate from citizens and their organisations.

b. Plans should be developed and incentives given to conduct research on MLE. This should include MLE both in monolingual and multilingual settings.

c. Partnerships with other institutions working with language policy, MLE and linguistic human rights should be promoted, both nationally and internationally.

d. Universities should have MLE-related subjects where students can major. A MLE chair should be established.

e. In language description, in addition to support for writing grammars, dictionaries, etc, so that languages which are/will be used in schools as teaching languages/as subjects in the beginning, there should be an emphasis on the most marginalized languages before they are extinct.

- Formation of an internal consortium of NCED, CDC, DOE, NFEC to consolidate and strengthen the activities, strategies and implementation arrangements related to the language policies

References:

Aikio-Puoskari, Ulla (2005). **The Education of the Sámi in the Comprehensive Schooling of Three Nordic Countries: Norway, Finland and Sweden/ Sámeoahpahusa sadji golmma Davviriikka vuođđoskuvlavuogadagas**. Series Gáldu čála, 2/2005, ed. Magne Ove Varsi, Guovdageaidnu: The Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples [http://www.galdu.org]. [two separate publications, one in North Saami, one in English].

Aikio-Puoskari, Ulla (2009). Language and Education of the Indigenous Sámi in three Nordic Countries (Finland, Norway and Sweden). In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 216-237.

Awasthi, Lava Deo (2004). **Exploring Monolingual School Practices In Multilingual Nepal**. PhD thesis. Copenhagen: Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitet/ Danish University of Education.

Bear Nicholas, Andrea (2009). A Native Language Immersion Teacher Training Program in Canada. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 200-215.

Benson, Carol (2009). Designing effective schooling in multilingual contexts: The strengths and

limitations of bilingual "models". In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 60-76.

Cummins, Jim (2009). Fundamental Psycholinguistic and Sociological Principles Underlying Educational Success for Linguistic Minority Students. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 21-35.

Dunbar, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2008). **Forms of Education of Indigenous Children as Crimes Against Humanity?** Expert paper written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII). New York: PFII. [In PFII' system: "Presented by Lars-Anders Baer, in collaboration with Robert Dunbar, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ole Henrik Magga"]. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/E_C19_2008_7.pdf

Education for Tribal Children in Orissa (2007). Bhubaneswar: UNICEF & Orissa Primary Education Programme Authority.

Evans, Stephen 2002. Macaulay's Minute revisited: Colonial language policy in nineteenth-century India. **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 23/4, 260-281.

García, Ofelia, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Torres-Guzmán, María (eds) (2006). **Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization**. Clevedon, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Heugh, Kathleen (2009). Some implications of recent case-studies and evaluations of literacy and bi/multilingual education in Africa. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 95-113.

Hough, David, Yonjan-Tamang, Amrit, Thapa Magar, Ram Bahadur (2009). Privileging Indigenous Knowledges: Empowering MLE in Nepal. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 146-161.

Kosonen, Kimmo (2007). Language-in-Education Policies in China & South-East Asia. In **Proceedings of The Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the National Language Policy Conference, January 30, 2007**. Bangkok: The Royal Institute of Thailand, 44-54.

Magga, Ole Henrik, Nicolaisen, Ida, Trask, Mililani, Dunbar, Robert and Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2005). **Indigenous Children's Education and Indigenous Languages. Expert paper written for the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.** New York: United Nations.

May, Stephen & Hill, Richard (2003). **Bilingual/Immersion Education: Indicators of Good Practice**. Milestone Report 2. Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Waikato.

McCarty, Teresa (2009). Empowering Indigenous Languages — What Can Be Learned from Native American Experiences? In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 114-127.

Mohanty, Ajit K. (2000). Perpetuating Inequality: The Disadvantage of language, Minority Mother Tongues and Related Issues. In Mohanty, Ajit K. & Misra, Girishwar (eds) (2000). **Psychology of Poverty and Disadvantage**. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 104-117.

Mohanty, Ajit K. (2006). Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In García, Ofelia, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Torres-Guzmán, María (eds). **Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Glocalization**. Clevedon, Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 262-283.

Mohanty, Ajit, Mishra, Mahendra Kumar, Reddy, N. Upender & Ramesh, Gumidyal (2009). Overcoming the language barrier: MLE in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, India. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 278-291.

Mohanty, Ajit K., & Panda, Minati (2007). **From mother tongue to other tongue: facilitation transition in multilingual education of tribal children in India**. Delhi, India: Project Proposal submitted to Bernard van Leer Foundation.

Nurullah, S. and J.P.Naik 1951. **A history of education in India**. Bombay: Macmillan.

Perez, Susanne Jacobsen (2009). The contribution of postcolonial theory to intercultural bilingual education in Peru: an Indigenous teacher training programme. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 183-199.

Phillipson, Robert (2009). The tension between linguistic diversity and dominant English. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 77-94.

Ramirez, J. David., Yuen, Sandra D. & Ramey, Dena R. (1991). **Executive Summary: Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children, Submitted to the U. S. Department of Education**. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2000/2008). **Linguistic genocide in education - or worldwide diversity and human righs?** Mahwah, NJ & London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 818 pp. South Asian updated edition in 2008, Delhi: Orient Longman.

Skutnabb-Kangas Bibliography: Bibliography on multilingualism, bilingual and indigenous/minority education, linguistic human rights, language and power, the spread of English, etc. by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. http://www.tove-skutnabb-kangas.org/en/Tove-Skutnabb-Kangas-Bibliography.html

Thomas, Wayne P. and Collier, Virginia P. (2002). **A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language minority Students' Long Term Academic Achievemen**t. George Mason University, CREDE (Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence). http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html.

Tollefson, James W. & Tsui, Amy B.M. (eds) (2003). **Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?** Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tsui, Amy B. M. & Tollefson, James W. (eds) (2007). **Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts**. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Yadava, Yogendra Prasad & Turin, Mark (2006). Indigenous Languages of Nepal: A Critical Analysis of the Linguistic Situation and Contemporary Issues. In Yadava, Yogendra P. & Bajracharya, Pradeep L. (eds) (2006). **The Indigenous Languages of Nepal (ILN). Situation, Policy Planning and Coordination**. Lalitpur: Natinal Foundation for Development of Indigenous Nationalities (NFDIN), 6-46.

Yonjan-Tamang, Amrit (2006). **Languages of Nepal: Present Situation and Language Planning in Nepal** (in Nepali). Kathmandu: Indigenous Linguistic Society of Nepal (Adivasi Bhasabigyan Samaj).

Yonjan-Tamang Amrit, Hough, David & Nurmela, Iina (2009). "All Nepalese children have the right to education in their mother tongue" – but how? The Nepal MLE Program. In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). **Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Loca**l. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 241-249.

Notes:

[viii] This Concept paper is one of the results from the 3-day intensive course *Language Policy, Mother-tongue-based Multilingual Education and Linguistic Human Rights* which took place in Kathmandu in February 2008, with Dr. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas as the teacher ("Guruma"/"Didi"), under the auspices of the *Multilingual Education Program* (a joint effort on the part of the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) of Nepal and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) of Finland. The participants suggested towards the end of the course

that they write a concept paper, discussed and decided on the content and divided the work between themselves. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas put together the various parts and added some issues. Iina Nurmela, the Young Technical Advisor of the project, organised, with support from the rest of the project team but especially Sangmo Yonjan-Tamang, the course with enormous efficiency and dedication. Without Iina nothing would have happened – many thanks.

viii E793, 1948; 78 U.N.T.S. 277, entered into force Jan. 12, 1951; for the full text, see http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/x1cppcg.htm. Paragraph (b) of Article II defines genocide as "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group", and II(e) as "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group".

viii Unofficial translation of the articles and sub-articles below has been done by Toya Bhattarai, for the purposes of this concept paper.

APPENDIX 3, LIST OF PARTICIPANTS , RASUWA WORKSHOP

MLE WORKSHOP ON MLE POLICY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL

VENUE : DHUNCHE, RASUWA, DATE : MARCH 6TH ,2009

S.NO	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	POSITION/ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS
1	Kalu Tamang	Chairman	Sri Saraswoti Primary School, Dhunche
2	Khap Gyalpo Ghale	Member	Rasuwa Indigenous Peoples Dev. Committee
3	Pasang Mendo Ghale	Member	"
4	Urja Ghale	Member	"
5	Pasang Deki Ghale	Member	"
6	Lhakpa T Tamang	Head Master	Sri Saraswoti P School, Thade, Dhuche
7	Rikki Lahmu Tamang	Teacher	"
8	Pratima Lama	Teacher	"
9	Sugu Shrestha	Child Teacher	"
10	Karsang Tempa Tamang	Chairman	NEFIN, Rasuwa
11	Suku Bahadur Tamang	Chairma	Bhimli P. School, Bhimli, Dhunche
12	Mohan Giri	Head Master	"
13	Jon Kumar Thokra	Teacher	"
14	Dawa Lamho Tamang	Teacher	"
15	Sunita Giri	Teacher	"
16	Kippa Chiring Tamang	Chairman	Gaun Farka Rastriya P. School, Dhunche-3
17	Tulu Singhi Tamang	Teacher	"
18	Ram Gyalbo Ghale	Teacher	"
19	Durga Gurung	Teacher	"
20	Bhim Bdr. Thapa Magar	Lower Sec. Teacher	Sri Rasuwa Higher-Secondary School
21	Lama Norbu Tamang	Vice Chairman	Forum for Human Rights & Social Transformation, Rasuwa
22	Prem Tamang	Member	Sri Nava Jiwan P. School, Yarsha
23	Lanam Ghale	Head Master	Sri Pleph P. School, Pleph

24	Santa Bahadur Tamang	Chairman	Gyan Jyoti P. School, Shyabru
25	Urmila Lama	Teacher	Sri Bhimsen P School, Thulo Bharkhu
26	Ram Sundar Yadav	Head Master	"
27	Pema Wangmo Tamang	Teacher	"
28	Kanchi Ghale	Teacher	"
29	Bomo Neema Ghale	Member	"
30	Shanti Maya Ghale	Student	"
31	Shailendra Kumar Dev	Head Master	Sri Haki Lower Sec. School, Thulo Haku
32	Ram Bahadur Tamang	Head Master	Sri Komin P School, Shyabru
33	Karma Chenjom Tamang	Teacher	Sri Gyan Jyoti P School, Shabru
34	Rama Panthi	District Education Officer	District Education Office, Dhunche
35	Rabi Raj Kafle	Chief District Officer	CDO Office, Dhunche
36	Bhuwan Kafle	Local Development Officer	LDO Office, Dhunche
37	Bire Tamang	Assistant	District Development Office, Dhunche
38	Paivi Ahonen	MLE Program	
39	Amrit Yonjan Tamang	MLE Program	
40	Tove Skutnabb-Kangas	ST Consultant	
41	Ajit K Mohanty	ST Consultant	
42	Ganesh Poudel	DOE, Sanothimi	
43	Diwakar Chapagain	CDC, Sanothimi	
44	Tekendra Karki	Translator	
45	Maya Rai	NCED, Sanothimi	
46	Jayanti Subba	Embassy of Finland	
47	Sushan Acharya	MLE Res/expert Team	
48	Dheeraj Jung Gurung	MLE Program	

Appendix 4, LIST OF PARTICIPANTS , MLE WORKSHOP ON MLE POLICY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL

VENUE : DOE HALL, SANOTHIMI, BHAKTAPUR, DATE : MARCH 8TH - 9TH ,2009

S.NO.	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	ORGANIZATION	CONTACT NO/ADDRESS/EMAIL
1	Diwakar Chapagain	CDC	chapagaindiwakar@yahoo.com 9841365966(m)
2	Mana Thapa	Teacher, Palpa district	Nawajagrit Primary school, Palpa
3	Urmila Lama	Teacher, Rasuwa Dist.	9741086413(m)/Rasuwa District
4	Zahid Parwez	CERID, Trivhuwan Univ.	9841777719(m)
5	Nirmal Man Tuladhar	CENAS,Trivhuwan Univ.	nirmal_tuladhar2006@yahoo.com
6	Nawaraj Niroula	DOE, Incl.Edu. Section	nawarajbrt@yahoo.com 9841883040(m)
7	Maya Rai	NCED	mayasujcha@yahoo.com 9841296336(m)
8	Vishnu S Rai	Trivhuwan Univ.	9841465223(m)
9	Dinesh Kumar Shrestha	CDC	9841377735(m)
10	Indra Bdr. Kunwar	MOE	9841413226(m)
11	Hari Pd. Dahal	Head Teacher, Dhankuta	9842062362(m), Dhankuta District

12	Fatik B Thapa Magar	Freelancer	fatik.thapa@gmail.com / 9841478262(m)
13	Vikram Mani Tripathi		vikramt@wlink.com /9803882448(m)
14	Raj Kumar Chaudhary	Teacher, Sunsari District	9804075509(m)
15	Chiranjibi Poudel	NFEC	poudel05cp@gmail.com /9841398825(m)
16	Babu Ram Gautam	NFEC	Baburam25@hotmail.com /9841758971
17	Geha Nath Gautam	MOE	9841314579(m) / genag3@yahoo.com
18	Renuka Pandey		renukapady@yahoo.com /9841681273(m)
19	Sushan Acharya	Trivhuwan Univ.	4473730(r)
20	Yogendra Pd. Yadava	Trivhuwan Univ.	ypyadava@gmail.com /4331210(r)
21	Lok Bdr. Thapa Magar	NEFIN	9803448976(m)
22	Hari Bole Khanal	Exec.Director, CDC	6630588(O)
23	Til Bikram Nembang		
24	Chitra Prasad Devkota	Director, DOE	
25	Paivi Ahonen	MLE Program	
26	Ajit K Mohanty	Prof. ZHCES, JNU, New Delhi, India	
27	Tove Skutnabb-Kangas		skutnabbkangas@gmail.com
28	Amrit Yonjan Tamang	MLE Program	

APPENDIX 5. List of participants, National Seminar on MLE Policy And Strategy Development in Nepal

VENUE : HOTEL MALLA, LAINCHAUR, KATHMANDU, DATE: MARCH 11TH ,2009 , WEDNESDAY

S.NO	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	POSITION/ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS/CONTACT NO./EMAIL
1	Ganesh Rai	Reporter, Kantipur Daily	raiganesh@gmail.com
2	Karna B Buda Magar		ksmagar@yahoo.com
3	Surendra Pun		Sitapaila, Kathmandu
4	Surbindra Kumar Pun		mynepal.surbindra@hotmail.com
5	Prakash Sharma	Radio Sagarmatha	prakash_adhikari2007@yahoo.com
6	Maya Rai	NCED	9841296336(m)
7	Aliza Shrestha Dhungana	UNESCO	a.shrestha@unesco.org / 5554396(O)
8	Goma Banjade	CDL	gbanjade@yahoo.com / 4334079(O)
9	Tej Maya Rai (Dumi)	CDL	meatloverai@yahoo.com
10	Shanti Kala Rai (Dumi)		Pulchowk, Lalitpur / 2104036
11	Shankar Shah		9849032390(m)
12	Uddhav Bhandari	World Bank	4226792
13	Sanjog Loaphaa Magar		laaphaa@gmail.com /9851063490(m)
14	Uddhav Raj Poudel	ILO	uddhav@ilo.org / 5555777
15	Shiva Kumar Sunwar	NGO-Fonin	ngofonin@gmail.com /4433606 shivasunuwar@hotmail.com
16	Ninam Lowatti Kulung	Nepal Kulu Gushkar	9841927528 / 4470200

17	Rajendra Manandhar		kabule@mos.com.np
18	Himal Dhan Rai	CPN(Maoist)	Jawalakhel / 9841410299(m)
19	Dev Narayan Yadav		devnarayan_yadav@yahoo.com / 9840248094 / Imadole-8
20	Ram Kisun Uranw		9841768387/ rkuranw@yahoo.com
21	Bhiuman Gharti	MIC Nepal	Rukum – 9741058159
22	Frank Jensen	ESAT	MOE, Keshar Mahal
23	Kamla Bisht	Norwegian Embassy	9851014313(m)
24	Jayanti Subba	Finnish Embassy	
25	Sushan Acharya	FOE / Tribhuwan Univ.	
26	Nawaraj Niroula	DOE	nawarajbrt@yahoo.com
27	Kamal Sunuwar	LCDSN	lifelight@yahoo.com
28	Jean Dobbing	UMN	Jean.dobbing@umn.org.np
29	Raj Mukut Bhusal	UMN	rajmukut@gmail.com
30	Buddhi Kumar Shrestha	ERDCN	Bshrestha18@yahoo.com
31	Karna Khar Khatiwada	CDL, Tribhuwan Univ.	karnakhatiwada@yahoo.com
32	Krishna P Parajuli	Central Dept of Linguistics, TU	parajuli2025@yahoo.com / 9841426782
33	Bhuvan Acharya	Radio Nepal	bhuban_acharya@yahoo.com
34	Amar Tumyahang	KYC	9841095981
35	Bhesh Kumar Tamang	SAGUN	9841277251
36	Arbinda Lal Bhomi	CERID, TU	9851107294 / arbinda_bhomi@yahoo.com
37	Mitranath Gartaula	DEO	DEO office, Bhaktapur
38	Manorama Sunuwar	SWS	manorama_07@hotmail.com /9803384027
39	Kiwang Hang Rai		raikiwang@hotmail.com /9851067569
40	Shakya Suren		9841354867
41	Bikram Subba		lngwabs2005@gmail.com
42	Stephen Massey	VSO	melandsteveweb@gmail.com
43	Naranadiswar		5524502
44	Manju Yamphu		2121042
45	Hemasawati Kurmi		hansa_kurmi@yahoo.com
46	Buddha Lama Tamang	Mharmen Weekly	Hetauda, Nepal
47	Man Bahadur Thapa Magar		9841261240
48	Vikram Mani Tripathi	ACDC	vikramt@wlink.com.np
49	Bhauch Pd. Yadav	Bhojpuri Language Culture Dev. Center	yadavbhauch@yahoo.com
50	Bhagwan Yadav	TU	ydv.bhagwan@yahoo.com
51	Dig Vijaya Mishra	ACDC	9841383631
52	Eluin Graner	South Asia Inst.	9803964709
53	Prem Shanti Tuladhar	Central Dept. of Newari	
54	Vishnu Nath Pathak		Boudha, Kathmandu
55	Surya Bahadur Chaudhary		Jorpati, 9841842428

56	Fatte Bahadur Chaudhary		9841557173
57	Dilli Chaudhary		9841533241
58	Lakhpa Sherpa		4419356
59	Govinda Bdr Tumbahang	CNAS, Kirtipur	
60	Fatik Thapa Magar		fatik.thapa@gmail.com / 9841478262
61	Soma Rai		mrs.somarai@gmail.com
62	Bume Kumari Buda Magar		4312310
63	Babu Ram Gautam		9841758971
64	Chiranjibi Poudel	NFEC, Sanothimi	9841398825
65	Dinesh Kumar Shrestha	CDC	9841377735
66	Chitra Prasad Devkota	DOE	9841581899
67	Arun Kumar Tiwari	DOE	9741149098
68	Diwakar Chapagain	CDC	9841365966
69	Gagan Dev Mahato		9803552407
70	Nirajan Rai	CDL, TU	9841849246
71	Krishna Bantawa	Journalist	98419842038708
72	Padam Kumar Rai		9841260350
73	Sulochana Sapkota		9841505825
74	Buddha Yonjan Lama	Tamang Dajung	9841395906
75	Indira Yonjan		9841402427
76	Tulasha Waiba		9841402426
77	Sangdmo Tamang		9841742450
78	Tekendra B Karki		016209506
79	Ashok Kumar Aryal		9841240949
80	Krishna Raj Chaudhary Sarbahari		ksarbahari@gmail.com / 9841700223
81	Ramdhani Chaudhary		rd_nishan2006@yahoo.com
82	Pabitra Rana Magar		9841289540
83	Raj Nath Pandey	UGC, Nepal	9841257736
84	Dilli Hang Sabegu (Limbu)	TU, Kirtipur	9841937283
85	Dil Bhakta Chamling(Rai)	TU	9841981759
86	Padam Limbu	TU	9841947495
87	Muskan Rai	TU	9841538343
88	Ang Nima Tamang	SBP Representative	9841889194
89	Krishna Kumar Sah		9841359181
90	Bijay Singh Lopchan		9841366094
91	Ajit Man Tamang		9741067841
92	MD Kulung	Journalist	9801087742
93	Sarwajit Lama	Education Network	9841371874
94	Bipana Shrestha		9849107845
95	Bayani U Almacin	MOE	9803683093
96	Pratik Tamang	ABC TV	9841210428
97	Jagat Man Lama		9851054104

98	Sizar Tamang		9841208723
99	Lok Bahadur Thapa Magar	NFDIN	9803448976
100	Nirmal Man Tuladhar		9851070045
101	Sangam Lama		9841768978
102	Pradip Bajracharya	NFDIN	9841469971
103	Sangita Budathoki	HKI	9851060958
104	Mohan Thapa Magar		9847029910/9747030352
105	Deepak Aryal	Radio Sagarmatha	9841249407
106	Deepak Tuladhar	Newa School	9851075915
107	Bhim Narayan Regmi		9741047488
108	Dibya Gosai Buda Magar		014312310
109	Dr. Nobel Kishore Rai		
110	Til Bikram Nembang		
111	Janardan Nepal	MOE	
112	Mahashram Sharma	DG, DOE	
113	Paivi Ahonen	MLE Program	
114	Amrit Yonjan Tamang	MLE Program	
115	Yogendra Pd Yadava	Dept. of Linguistics, TU	
116	Sushan Acharya	TU	
117	Tove Skutnabb-Kangas	ST Consultant	
118	Ajit K Mohanty	ST Consultant	
119	Ram S. Sinha	MOE	
120	Arjun Bhandari	MOE	
121	Ganesh Poudel	DOE	
122	Arun Bhattarai	MOE	

Appendix 6, Workshop on 'MLE Policy and Strategy Development' in Nepal
Group B's Report on MLE Implementation Strategies
Group leader: Yogendra P Yadava

MLE policy: Transitional multilingual education policy, <u>Suggestive framework</u>

S.No.	Strategies	Activities	Remarks

1.	Develop MLE database	1. Conduct mother tongue school mapping in collaboration with DoE and other related agencies 2. Explore the possibility for integrating the survey with the GIS database that exists in Nepal.	We should be grateful if you could suggest how MLE database can enter into the GIS database which is crucial for both demographical information and pedagogical interventions.
2.	Select mother tongues for MLE	1. Conduct awareness drive for stakeholders including language communities, parents, children and teachers 2. Translate and adapt advocacy materials such as *MLE Advocacy Kit* and *First language First*	
3.	Formulate a national curricular framework for MLE	1. Follow this hierarchy: Mother tongue > (Provincial language) > (Central language) > International language	For achieving proficiency in language(s) of wider communication for higher education and official transactions and in international language (obviously English as colonial legacy) for science and technology and global communication.

4.	Introduce mother tongue as medium of instruction	1. Introduce mother tongue as medium of instruction from Early Child Development (ECD) and gradually shift to LoWC and IL.	Better to delay the introduction of languages other than mother tongue
5.	Introduce mother tongue as subject.	1. Introduce it after MLE.	
6.	Introduce sign language for children with impaired hearing	1. Carry out a basic study of Nepali sign language. 2. Adopt appropriate strategies for teaching through sign language	
6.	Launch language revitalization programme.	1. Introduce it for children who have not acquired their mother tongues due to language shift such as Baram and several other minority languages spoken in Nepal.	Note: 1. In many cases people have little or no proficiency in their ancestral languages. 2. Despite it they consider them as their mother tongues. 3. Need to redefine mother tongue as not only a first language but also an ancestral language even if they do not know it.
7.	Develop teaching materials.	1. Prepare an inventory of local customs through interaction with local communities. 2. Develop teaching materials reflecting local culture. 3. Develop supplementary reading materials including folk tales, poems, songs, etc.	

8.	Teachers	1. Deploy/recruit mother tongue/sign language teachers from related language communities. 2. Conduct appropriate training for them. 3. Engage members of local language communities as teachers on full or part-time basis.	
9.	Carry out evaluation to ensure quality.	1. Carry out continuous evaluation. 2. Arrange written tests for mother tongues with written traditions and oral tests and knowledge festivals for evaluation for the mother tongues confined just to their oral traditions. 3. Adapt the existing legal provisions accordingly.	
10.	Design joint management	1. Develop joint partnership and ownership among stakeholders such as School management Committee (SMC), Parents-Teachers Association (PTA) and Mother Tongue Teachers' Association (MTTA).	

11.	Develop supervision and support system	1. Devise it with participation of joint ownership and local experstise. 2. Set up resource centres at local levels with MLE Centre as the apex body located at DoE. 3. Align local resource centres to clusters of MT schools established through MT school mapping. 4. Establish rapport between MLE principles and practices in conjunction with Central Departments of Linguistics and Education at TU and other universities in order to combine both academic and practical aspects of MLE. 5. Explore support from NGOs and INGOs such as UNICEF and UNESCO.	
12.	Explore financial resources	1. Explore financial resources from Government, NGOs/INGOs, and local communities.	Local communities need to take a lead role as MLE is after all in their interests.
13.	Establish resource centres	Set up central and local MLE resource centres to regulate the MLE provisions and mobilize additional resources for the effective implementation of the MLE strategies.	This is intended to bring uniformity in implementing MLE strategies on an institutionalized basis.