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Contents of the lecture

Aims of the lecture

There are hundreds of models of education that are used for Indigenous/tribal/minority (ITM) children. The lecture discusses the role of mother tongues in the education of ITM children in the light of

- how well various models reach the educational goals;
- to what extent they support the maintenance of linguistic diversity on earth
- to what extent they respect linguistic and educational human rights of children.

Some models for the education of children from linguistic majorities/dominant groups will also be mentioned.
Background:
Disappearing linguistic diversity
Background for a focus on the role of mother tongues in educational models: Disappearing linguistic diversity

- According to pessimistic but realistic estimates, 90-95% of today’s spoken languages may be very seriously endangered or extinct by the year 2100 (Krauss, Maffi & Yamamoto 2004). If this scenario is not counteracted strongly and immediately, the estimate could also be that most languages to go would be Indigenous, and most of the world’s Indigenous languages would no longer be learned by children in 2100 or be completely extinct. The world’s linguistic diversity is seriously threatened. Since much of the knowledge about how to maintain the world’s biodiversity is encoded in the small Indigenous and local languages, with the disappearance of the languages this knowledge (which is often more accurate and sophisticated than “western” “scientific” knowledge, see ICSU 2002) will also disappear; this means destroying many of the prerequisites for human life on earth.

Is this what we want?
Languages are today disappearing faster than ever before in human history.
A language is endangered

- if it has few users (as all 4,000-5,000 Indigenous languages have);
- if it has a weak political status (as all Indigenous and most minority languages have); and
- if children are no longer learning it.

3–600 languages left in 2100? Or 40–50?

- The most 'optimistic realistic' linguists estimate that half of today's oral languages may have disappeared or at least not be learned by children around the year 2100 (e.g. Wurm, ed., 2001).

- The 'pessimistic but realistic' researchers estimate that we may only have some 10% of today's oral languages left as vital, non-threatened languages around 2100, or even 5% (Krauss 1992, 1995).

- or even 40–50 languages, the fully digitalised ones (Rannut 2004).
Parents choose?

- But isn’t it up to parents to choose what language to speak to their children and what language their school should be in? Obviously it is the parents who see that it is better for their children to learn the big dominant language (even at the cost of the mother tongue?). The small languages have not been able to adapt to the modern world and they are useless on the labour market. That is why they are being left behind; they have had their life-span and are giving space to more useful languages.
Wrong! Most parents have no choice!

For a choice to exist

- alternatives need to exist. Mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MLE) does not exist today for most ITMs - they HAVE to accept dominant-language-medium education.

- parents need to have solid, research-based knowledge about the long-term consequences of their choices.

- parents need to know that all languages are fit for education, and that either/or is a false ideology. Children can learn BOTH their own language AND one or several dominant languages well if the education is organised to make this possible.
The United Nation’s 2004 Human Development Report links cultural liberty to language rights and human development.

It argues that there is “no more powerful means of ‘encouraging’ individuals to assimilate to a dominant culture than having the economic, social and political returns stacked against their mother tongue. Such assimilation is not freely chosen if the choice is between one’s mother tongue and one’s future”.
Most linguistic majorities have all educational LRs

- Most linguistic majorities (e.g. native Danish-speakers in Denmark, German-speakers in Germany, English-speakers in the USA) have all educational and other LRs. They take them for granted - but only for themselves.

- Most Indigenous/tribal peoples and linguistic minorities (ITMs) have few LRs, and, especially, none in education.
LRs in education necessary for group maintenance and for linguistic diversity

• When all children attend school, LRs in education are necessary for any group to reproduce itself as a group.

• LRs are necessary for maintaining linguistic and cultural diversity (and, as a mediating factor, biodiversity) on earth.

• The most central LR in education is the right to mother-tongue-medium education in non-fee state schools.
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Language Rights are one way of:

- promoting high levels of multilingualism and school achievement
- promoting integration and defending people against forced assimilation;
- promoting positive state policies towards minority languages
- promoting the maintenance of the world’s linguistic diversity;
- promoting conflict prevention; and
- promoting self-determination.
Background: Violations of human rights
Background for a focus on the role of mother tongues in educational models: Violations of human rights

The education of Indigenous/tribal and minority (ITM) children in most countries today violates the right to education (Magga et al., 2005). It can sociologically and educationally be termed genocide, according to the UN Genocide Convention; legally, it can be seen as a crime against humanity (Dunbar & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008). The maintenance of diversity is counteracted by the increasing dominance of English (Phillipson 2008) and other dominant languages. These are often learned subtractively, at the cost of the mother tongues (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000), instead of additively, in addition to mother tongues. Schools participate, through assimilationist genocidal education, in processes of linguistic capital dispossession (Harvey 2005a, b; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, forthcoming), and reproduction of poverty (Sen 1985; Misra & Mohanty 2000a, b; Mohanty 2000; Mohanty & Panda 2007).

Is this what we want?
The Expert paper contains sociological and legal argumentation where we show that to educate Indigenous and minority (IM) children through a dominant language in a submersion or even early-exit transitional programme violates the human right to education. This right is in many international human rights documents, also in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (Art. 29). The Convention has been ratified by ALL other UN member states except two: Somalia and the USA...
Educational language rights, especially the right to mother tongue medium education, are among the most important rights for any minority.
Without them, a minority whose children attend school, usually has to accept subtractive teaching through the medium of a dominant/majority language. It cannot reproduce itself as a minority. It cannot integrate but is forced to assimilate. The children cannot as a group achieve the educational goals. Even if some individuals may succeed, they do it DESPITE the school, NOT because of the way the school is organised.
What language rights should individual children have in education?
The Hague Recommendations Regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities from OSCE's High Commissioner on National Minorities (<http://www.osce.org/hcnm/>
For minorities, mother tongue medium education is recommended at all levels, also in secondary education. This includes bilingual teachers in the dominant language as a second language (Art. 11-13).
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For minorities, mother tongue medium education is recommended at all levels, also in secondary education. This includes bilingual teachers in the dominant language as a second language (Art. 11-13).

'Submersion-type approaches whereby the curriculum is taught exclusively through the medium of the State language and minority children are entirely integrated into classes with children of the majority are not in line with international standards' (The Explanatory Note, p. 5).
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A UNIVERSAL COVENANT OF LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD GUARANTEE AT AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL, IN RELATION TO THE MOTHER TONGUE(S)

that everybody has the right to

- identify with their mother tongue(s) and have this identification accepted and respected by others;

- learn the mother tongue(s) fully, orally (when physiologically possible) and in writing. This presupposes that minorities are educated mainly through the medium of their mother tongue(s), and within the state-financed educational system;
A UNIVERSAL COVENANT OF LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD GUARANTEE AT AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL, IN RELATION TO OTHER LANGUAGES

that everybody whose mother tongue is not an official language in the country where s/he is resident, has the right to become bilingual (or trilingual, if s/he has 2 mother tongues) in the mother tongue(s) and (one of) the official language(s) (according to her own choice).
A UNIVERSAL COVENANT OF LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD GUARANTEE AT AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL, IN RELATION TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGES

- that any change of mother tongue is voluntary (includes knowledge of long-term consequences), not imposed.
A UNIVERSAL COVENANT OF LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD GUARANTEE AT AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL, IN RELATION TO PROFITING FROM EDUCATION

- that everybody has the right to profit from education, regardless of what her mother tongue is.
The question is then: how should ITM education be organised?

- What are the educational goals that should be reached?
- What kind of models of education have been used, with what results?
- What is the role of the ITM mother tongues in the various models?
- Which models reach the goals?
- What are the principles that should guide the education of ITMs if we build on solid research results?
Educational goals

A good educational programme for both ITMs and dominant group children leads to the following goals from a language(s) and identity 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; and
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.
Prototypes in MLE, multilingual education

- Non-models of MLE
- Weak models of MLE
- Strong models of MLE
Non-models and weak models do NOT reach the goals; only strong models do

- **Subtractive submersion or sink-or-swim programmes** for linguistic minority children and other minoritized children belong to non-models of MLE.
- Majority children also have non-models: mainstream monolingual programmes, maybe with some foreign language teaching as a subject.
The most important pedagogical reason for both languages disappearing and for ”illiteracy” is the wrong medium of teaching. Most Indigenous/tribal and minority children and children from dominated groups are taught through the medium of dominant/majority languages, subtractively, in submersion (sink-or-swim) programmes.
Subtractive *versus* additive
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Subtractive *versus* additive

- **SUBTRACTIVE** teaching through the medium of a *dominant* language replaces Indigenous/tribal or minority (ITM) children’s mother tongues. It subtracts from their linguistic repertoire.

- **ADDITIVE** teaching through the medium of the IM mother tongues, with good teaching of the dominant language as a second language, adds to IM children’s linguistic repertoire and makes them HIGH LEVEL BILINGUAL OR MULTILINGUAL. They can learn their own language and other languages well.
Assimilation is subtractive
Integration is additive
• **Assimilation** is enforced subtractive 'learning' of another (dominant) culture by a (dominated) group. Assimilation means being forcibly transferred to another group.

• **Integration** is characterized by voluntary mutual additive 'learning' of other cultures. Integration means a choice of inclusive group membership(s).
Subtractive dominant-language medium education for ITM children

- prevents access to education, because of the linguistic, pedagogical and psychological barriers it creates. Thus it violates the right to education.
Subtractive dominant-language medium education for IM children often curtails the development of the children’s capabilities, and perpetuates thus poverty (see economics Nobel laureate Amartya Sen).
Subtractive dominant-language medium education for IM children 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.
Our new Expert paper (2008)
Robert Dunbar & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

Forms of Education of Indigenous Children as Crimes Against Humanity?

Dominant-language medium education for ITM children can cause serious physical and mental harm.
Subtractive dominant-language medium education for IM children can have harmful consequences socially, psychologically, economically, politically:

- very serious mental harm: social dislocation, psychological, cognitive, linguistic and educational harm, and, partially through this, also economic, social and political marginalization

- often also serious physical harm, e.g. in residential schools, and as a long-term result of marginalization: poverty, alcoholism, suicides, incest, violence.
Dominant-language-only submersion programmes “are widely attested as the least effective educationally for minority language students” (May & Hill 2003: 14, study commissioned by the Māori Section of the Aotearoa/New Zealand Ministry of Education). 
http://www.minedu.govt.nz/
One way of understanding why subtractive submersion is used:
Some of the scientifically sound and practically proven principles of how to enable children to become high-level multilingual with the support of the educational system are counter-intuitive and go against common sense.
If indigenous or minority children who speak their mother tongue at home, are to become bilingual, and learn the dominant/majority language well, a common sense approach would suggest that (1) early start, and (2) maximum exposure to the dominant language would be good ideas, like they are for learning many other things - practice makes perfect.
In fact, both are false.

What we have is an early start fallacy, and a maximum exposure fallacy.
In fact...

... the longer indigenous and minority children in a low-status position have their own language as the main medium of teaching, the better they also become in the dominant language (even when they have less teaching in and through it), provided, of course, that they have good teaching in it, preferably given by bilingual teachers.
The following main types of programme have been compared:

a) completely **dominant-language medium** education from grade 1; (a **non-model**)

b) **early-exit transitional** programmes, with mother tongue medium education for the first 1-2 years, followed by using a dominant language as the teaching language; (a **weak model**)

c) **late-exit transitional** programmes where the transition from a mother tongue medium programme to a dominant language medium programme is more gradual but is mostly completed by grade 5 or 6; (also a **weak model**)

d) programmes where the **mother tongue** is the main medium of education at least for **the first eight years**, or even longer. (a **strong model**)
Research results comparing academic achievement of these children show unanimously that the children from programme types a) (dominant language medium) and b) (early-exit transitional) are as a group never likely to reach a native-like competence in the dominant language, at the same time as they will not learn their own language properly either (they do not learn to read and write it, for instance, even if a writing system and materials exist) Their academic achievement results are mostly very poor at a group level (even if some individuals may manage). Children in c), late-exit transitional programmes fare somewhat better, but even their results are much below what they could be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Medium of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(submersion, but Spanish as subject)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-exit transitional</td>
<td>Spanish 1-2 years; then all English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-exit transitional</td>
<td>Spanish 4-6 years; then all English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ramirez et al. study, 1991, 2,352 students

The common sense approach would suggest that the ones who **started 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, and 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 more and more behind, and were judged as probably never being able to catch up to native English-speaking peers in English or general school achievement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Medium of education</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English only</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td><strong>Low</strong> levels of English and school achievement; likely not to catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early-exit transitional</strong></td>
<td>Spanish 1-2 years; then all English</td>
<td><strong>Fairly low</strong> levels of English and school achievement; not likely to catch up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late-exit transitional</strong></td>
<td>Spanish 4-6 years; then all English</td>
<td><strong>Best</strong> results; likely to catch up with native speakers of English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early transition to the international language of wider communication/ILWC across Africa (from Heugh, Kathleen, 2009) is accompanied by:

- **Poor literacy** in L1 and L2
  - SACMEQ 11 2005; UIE-ADEA study 2006; HSRC studies in S 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
African evidence shows that only a few succeed in rapid change to second/foreign language medium

Initial MTE bilingual programmes with transition to L2/FL by year 2 - 3 show success over years 1 – 3, sometimes into the 4th year.

This success starts to slow down in years 4 – 5.

No early-exit (from the M-T) bilingual model has been able to demonstrate lasting educational achievement for the majority of pupils in countries anywhere in the world.

More than 50% of learners never get to secondary school in African countries.

In countries where there is a high through rate to secondary school (e.g. South Africa) learners are not developing strong literacy, language or mathematical skills.
Thomas & Collier, 210,000 students

- the largest longitudinal study in the world on the education of minority students,
- with altogether over 210,000 students,
- including in-depth studies in both urban and rural settings in the USA,
- included full MTM programmes in a minority language,
- dual-medium or two-way bilingual programmes, where both a minority and majority language (mainly Spanish and English) were used as medium of instruction,
- transitional bilingual education programmes,
- ESL (English as a second language) programmes, and
- so-called mainstream (i.e. English-only submersion)
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 mother tongue medium education was in both Ramirez' and Thomas & Collier's studies more important than any other factor in predicting the educational success of bilingual students.

It was also much more important than socio-economic status, something extremely vital in relation to oppressed Indigenous/tribal/minority students.
The worst results, 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, i.e. a subtractive learning situation.
Quoting studies and statistics from the USA, Teresa McCarty writes about the consequences of “medium-of-instruction policies” (2003: 74):

“Indigenous and other minoritized students experience the lowest rates of educational attainment, the lowest family incomes, and, particularly among Indigenous youth, the highest rates of depression and teen suicides”.

Consequences of submersion, USA
Tsui and Tollefson conclude in their 2004 edited book *Medium of Instruction Policies*, on the basis of worldwide studies:

The use of a foreign language as the medium of instruction for children who are still struggling with basic expression in that language hampers not only their academic achievement and cognitive growth, but also their self-perception, self-esteem, emotional security, and their ability to participate meaningfully in the educational process (2004: 17).
There are hundreds of smaller studies showing similar conclusions, with many different types of groups and many languages, and from many countries.

And the knowledge is not new...
## VI. RESULTATS AUX EXAMENS OFFICIELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNEE</th>
<th>Nombre d’écoles</th>
<th>Nombre de langues nationales</th>
<th>Nombre candidats présentés</th>
<th>Taux de succès (scolarité de 5 ans, adolescents : 4 ans)</th>
<th>Scolarité en général de 6 ans, sauf redoublement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53,83%</td>
<td>48,60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85,02%</td>
<td>62,90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68,21%</td>
<td>70,01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>94,59%</td>
<td>73,73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>91,14%</td>
<td>69,01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>77,19%</td>
<td>69,91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAUX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>78, %</td>
<td>64,41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.2. – L’ÉDUCATION BILINGUE AU BURKINA FASO : STRUCTURATION

C’est un continuum éducatif pour les enfants de 3 à 16 ans et comprenant les trois (3) niveaux ou cycles de base suivants :

- 1er niveau : l’Espace d’Eveil Educatif (ou 3 E) pour les enfants de 3 à 6 ans : durée 3 ans ;
- 2ème niveau : l’Ecole Primaire Bilingue pour les enfants de 7 à 12 ans : durée 5 ans ;
- 3ème niveau : le Collège Multilingue Spécifique (CMS) pour les jeunes de 13 à 16 ans : durée 4 ans ;
All these studies show both the **positive results of additive mother tongue medium maintenance education**, and the mostly **negative results of subtractive dominant-language medium education**.
Only strong models (for both IM and dominant group children) reach the educational goals

- **Language maintenance (language shelter) programmes for minorities**
- **Two-way programmes and the European Union Schools model for minorities AND majorities**
- **Immersion programmes for majorities**
All strong models (for both IM and dominant group children) use mainly a minority language as the main teaching language during the first many years. The longer it is used, the better the results in terms of high levels of bi- or multilingualism and school achievement.
Mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MLE) is a necessary LR

The most important language right (LR) in education for Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities (ITMs), if they want to achieve the educational goals and also reproduce themselves as peoples/minorities is an unconditional right to mainly mother tongue medium education in non-fee state schools. This education (of course including teaching of a dominant language as a subject, by bilingual teachers) should continue minimally 8 years, preferably longer (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, 2008, in press; Mohanty, Panda, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, in press; Heugh, in press, Heugh & Skutnabb-Kangas, forthcoming). Today, binding educational LRs are more or less non-existent. ITM education is organised against solid research evidence about how it should be organised.

Is this what we want?
Leading principles for strong models: 8 recommendations

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) that language (of the two that the child is supposed to become bilingual in initially) which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level. This is for all IM children their own mother tongue. For majority children, it should be a minority language.

2. Children should initially be grouped together according to their L1. Mixed groups are not positive initially.
Leading principles for strong models: 8 recommendations

3. All children are to become high level bilinguals, not only minority children.

4. All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis the status of their mother tongues and their knowledge of the language of instruction. Nice phrases about the worth of everybody's mother tongue, the value of interculturalism, etc, serve little purpose, unless they are followed up in how the schools are structurally organized and run.

It is possible to equalize the children vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction in several different ways.
Leading principles for strong models: 8 recommendations

- **5. All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual.**
- **6. Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children's mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children's mother tongues.**
Leading principles for strong models: 8 recommendations

7. All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through grades 1-12.

8. Both languages have to be used as media of education in some phase of the children's education, but the progression in how and how much each is used seems to vary for minority and majority children.

The ideal progress has been described in several ways in, for example, Skutnabb-Kangas & García 1995...
AN IMPORTANT REASON FOR MAINTAINING ALL THE WORLD’S LANGUAGES

• Linguistic diversity and biodiversity are correlationally and causally related.

• Knowledge about how to maintain biodiversity is encoded in small languages.

• Through killing them we kill the prerequisites for maintaining biodiversity.

• (see Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, 2002, 2004, in press, for details)
Results of lack of LRs in education for Indigenous and minority children

- Lack of LRs, especially in education, is co-responsible for:
  - illiteracy, lack of school achievement, educational waste, poor life chances;
  - disappearance of groups/nations/peoples (through forced assimilation);
  - killing of the world’s languages and linguistic diversity, and TEK (Traditional Ecological Knowledge) as prerequisites for the maintenance of biodiversity.
Subtractive dominant-language medium education for IM children

- may lead to the extinction of Indigenous languages:
- thus contributing to the disappearance of the world's linguistic diversity.
- A partial result of this can be the disappearance of the knowledge about biodiversity and its maintenance, and, through this, diminishing prerequisites for human life on earth.
Education is the most crucial input in fighting poverty

The question, if we are interested in more equity in the world, in reducing the gaps, is, in Misra & Mohanty's view: "What is the most critical (and cost effective) input to change the conditions of poverty, or rather [in Amartya Sen’s sense], to expand human capabilities?"

There is "a general consensus among the economists, psychologists and other social scientists that education is perhaps the most crucial input" (ibid., 265).
What can governments do in order to promote multilingualism and school achievement?

Both Indigenous/tribal and minority education could be organised so as to promote high levels of multilingualism. **Examples:** Indigenous education in Nepal (Hough et al, Yonjan-Tamang et al, 2009,) and Orissa, India (Mohanty & Panda, 2007, Mohanty et al., 2009), the Saami country in Norway and Finland (Aikio-Puoskari, 2009), Navajo education in Arizona, USA (McCarty, 2009, 2010); national minority education in Ethiopia (Heugh, 2009, Heugh et al. 2007, Heugh & Skutnabb-Kangas, eds, 2010), Burkina Faso (Ilboudo & Nikiema, 2010), Finland (Swedish-speakers); immigrant minority education of Finnish children in Sweden (Peura), etc.
Articles from all over the world on how multilingual education has been and can be organised (2006). See www.multilingual-matters.com/multi/display.asp?isbn=1853598941
“Every child in the world has the right to education through the medium of their mother tongue”