

CHAPTER 14

ETHNOCULTURAL DIVERSITY AND EDUCATION

A Canadian Perspective on India's Policies and Debates

MARIE MC ANDREW

Ethnocultural Diversity and Education: A Complex, and often Uneasy, Relationship

Given its intensity and universality, schooling plays a major role in the production and the redefinition of ethnic boundaries and cultural markers. This contribution can be linked to three central mandates carried by schools systems (Holmes 1981; Ballantyne 1989), in modern pluralistic nations: linguistic and cultural reproduction, which can be assumed for both majorities and minorities, raising the delicate issue of the right balance in this regard; selection and allocation of future human resources, which questions the degree to which equality of access, treatment and results is achieved between groups; and finally, formal and informal socialization, which nourishes a debate on the structural arrangements and the curriculum most susceptible to produce the kind of citizens – and

citizenship – different segments of society consider deemable.

A somehow *politically correct* multicultural perspective (Banks 1995; Dei 1996) argues that it is possible to reconcile these three objectives, i.e. to produce a school system that would, at the same time, treat fairly minority and majority languages and cultures, ensure equal educational performance and mobility to every student and prepare sophisticated citizens, at ease both in their local or ethnic community and in the larger political community. But, on the ground, a comparative perspective on policies, programmes and public debate in various countries shows that things are a little more complex (Mc Andrew 2003a).

On the one hand, everywhere, very little consensus exists on the priority to be given to linguistic and cultural reproduction, equality of educational opportunity and pluralistic socialization, whenever they are conflicting. And in many policy contexts, especially with limited resources, they do. For example, to focus here on one single but widespread issue, minority control of specific educational institutions, a classical example of a high focus on reproduction, has been promoted and contested on multiple fronts. Regarding its relationship with equality of educational opportunity (Homan 1992; Glenn & De Jong 1996; Mc Andrew 1996), it has been presented as often as a positive step¹ than as an obstacle, either for the group itself² or for the bulk of majority students excluded from privileged institutions.³ Moreover, as it regards pluralistic socialization, although common sense would spontaneously consider separate schools as negative, or, at least, not as positive as common schooling (Leman 1999; Mc Andrew 2003b; Gallagher 2005), in many instances, the very control of specific institutions by conflictual groups has been, on the contrary, considered as what kept together, otherwise loosely-linked political communities⁴.

On the other hand, even if one looks only at the debates concerning one of the three mandates, unanimity is neither found there, both regarding the goals that should be set and the policies, programmes and actions most likely to concretise them. The rather general failure of most western meritocratic school systems to answer the needs of low socio-economic background newcomer students from the Third World, whether specific countries value an assimilationist, civic, multicultural, or antiracist educational paradigm, is particularly challenging in this regard (Modood & Werbner 1997; Portes & Rumbaut 2001; Crul & Vermeulen 2003). The widespread perception that, here again whatever the normative framework put forward, schools everywhere in the world experience the same difficulty in the promotion of a sense of belonging

among students of all origins is also of concern (Isser and Schwartz 1985; Shahid & Van Koningsveld 1996; Zine 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Doucet 2003).

In my prior work (Mc Andrew & Cicéri 1998; Mc Andrew 2001, 2003c, 2005, 2006a, b, 2009), I have analysed, in relative depth, past and current controversies in Canada and in other western societies regarding the role of schooling in the dynamic of ethnic relations. I have looked, among others, at those related to the best language formula for linguistic and immigrant minorities and bilingual teaching; the definition of what constitutes *reasonable accommodation* to religious diversity in schools; the competing definition of history teaching among various groups; the relationship between citizenship education and multicultural, intercultural and antiracist education as well as the respective relevance of minority-controlled institutions and common schooling.

In 2005, during a four-month sabbatical visit to India, I collected a vast amount of secondary source data (policies, programmes, research, position papers and media clippings), on five similar issues in the Indian context: the three-language formula, the reservation policy, minority institutions, value education and secularism and the history teaching controversy. My main goal in this regard was to include some of these topics in a book in preparation on *Education and Ethnic Relations: Comparative Case Studies*, aiming at international – and mostly western – audiences, not always familiar with the Indian context. In this paper, I look at my data from a slightly different perspective. Indeed, I would not dare present to Indian readers a mere descriptive approach of topics they are already familiar with and probably more knowledgeable than me. My aim is rather to offer a fresh look on what a comparative perspective can reveal about the extent to which the debate regarding ethnocultural diversity and education in India is specific or shares common elements with others.

The bulk of this paper will thus consist of three propositions about the state of the field in India and its comparability with current trends in Canada and in other western countries. In this regard, I am especially interested in exploring the impact of the fact that India has not yet achieved universal involvement on the importance given to ethnic versus social or gender factors in educational research and on the relative weighing of policy priorities. When relevant, I will also identify areas where the Indian experience in managing diversity within the school system might contribute to the betterment of policies and programmes in other contexts, or conversely, where some of India's weaknesses in the field could benefit from Canadian or other western

societies' reflections, research or practices.

A Canadian Perspective on India's Policies and Debates

As stated above, from a comparative perspective, what is striking in Indian policies and debates in the field of ethnocultural diversity and education, can be synthesized, in my opinion, by three propositions.

- (1) The ethocultural diversity and educational debate in India is, more than in other contexts, highly focussed on the tensions between religious and cultural reproduction and common or pluralistic socialisation.
- (2) Equality of educational opportunity is posed, above all, as a class or a gender problem, or as an issue related to tribal or caste status, and is approached mostly from a compensatory perspective.
- (3) For a country which is probably the most multilingual of the world, language does not seem as contentious as expected as an educational issue.

The tensions between religious and cultural reproduction and common or pluralistic socialisation

When one immerses oneself in the Indian literature regarding ethnocultural diversity and education, whether at the level of academic reflection, policy-making or public debate, it is obvious that the bulk of production in this regard is highly focussed on that very constitutive tension of the field, although the label to name it may vary depending on the issue at stake, such as, for the first term of the opposition, communalism or sectarianism and, for the second, citizenship or secularism. This trend is especially dominant when one limits oneself to ethnicity as classically defined (religious, cultural, linguistic or regional minorities) (Barth 1969; Schermerhorn 1970). But, even if we were to adopt the non consensual theoretical position that caste is also a form of ethnic relations (Oomens 2004), it would stand, although slightly qualified.

The policy controversies generated along this line of tensions are largely similar, although often more interesting, than their counterparts in western nations. As Indian readers are aware, the most visible debate, those last years, has focussed on the teaching of history which has brought a fascinating saga of spectacular swings regarding the definition of national history and the purposes of its teaching in a pluralistic country (Chattopabhyay 2000; NCERT 2003; Aminah 2005). In less than

five years, Indian students have, indeed, been exposed to three successive curriculums (NCERT 2000, 2005a, b), where the centrality of the Hindu components and the place of minorities in national identity vary greatly, as well as the interpretation of various historical events. At the same time, experts were accusing each other of the worst sins in almost all the national newspapers, as well as in many other forums. Without focussing here on specific events, an analysis of arguments brought forward by opposing sides (Hasan 2001; Karun 2001; Malkani 2001; Thapar 2001; *The Hindu* 2001a; Bidwai 2002; Chakrabarty 2002; *The Deccan Herald* 2002; Priyam 2002; Puri 2002; Sharma 2002; Venkatesan 2002a, b), shows that many theoretical and pedagogical issues then raised have a clear resonance in the Canadian and American context, where they were also voiced in similar situations⁵.

In all these contexts, the core issue is that of the relationship between History as a science and competing memories (Stearns et al. 2000; Seixas 2004), especially that of oppressed groups, whether genuinely experienced or politically nourished (or simultaneously both, as it is usually the case). More specifically, the history controversy in India has raised theoretical, political and ethical questions such as:

- Are certain periods more *genuinely* national than others?
- When does Indian history begin?
- To which extent should the core group at the center of the nation (i.e. the Hindu) *own* history and decide who should be included or not in the common narrative?
- How long does it take, for citizens that could be considered as *former colonizers* (i.e. for example Muslims or Christians) to belong?
- Should majority groups take stands on minority experiences?
- Can minority groups exercise a veto on what is said about them in textbooks?

Mutatis mutandi, in Canada, especially in Québec, those questions would be respectively framed as follow:

- How much stress should we put when teaching History, on the pre-colonial period (i.e. native history), the French Regime, the British Conquest or the post 1867 period?
- What should be the place of Anglophones in the Québec collective narrative?
- Should native people and immigrant groups develop their own history and, if so, how can we incorporate it in a common history teaching?

What is striking, though, in many of the documents I have analyzed, is the lack of importance granted to pedagogical issues. Most of the Indian debate appears to have been focussed on competing narratives. Very little attention has been granted to the opportunity that such lack of consensus could represent for the building of historical skills among students, at least until recently (NCERT 2005c). This is a very important line of discussion, in Canada, if not within public opinion, at least among history teachers or specialists (Stearns et al. 2000). The necessity to entangle and balance the two competing goals of history teaching, an instrument of nation-building and political socialisation⁶ and an opportunity to develop critical thinking skills among students, has also not been widely addressed. One is thus left with the impression of a very relevant and current historical debate but a rather limited and outdated pedagogical one.

Although slightly less controversial, the relevance of a new approach, *Value Education*, developed largely to respond to concerns about the loss of the sense of duty and responsibility and of social involvement among youth, has also been the focus of an important social debate. As in many western societies, where traditional civic instruction has been replaced by a wider *Citizenship Education* (Sigel & Hoskin 1991; Sears & Wright 2004), this movement was based on the realization that more than a mere teaching of constitutional principles was needed to insure a sense of belonging and a commitment to national identity among students. Thus, proponents of *Value Education* believed that there was a strong need to develop more curriculum content and pedagogical activities, based on the cultural and ethical heritage of India, especially its Hindu component (Nanda 1997; National Regeneration Project 2000; Rajput 2003).

The *Value Education* controversy has raised a central question, extremely relevant in Canada and in other western nations:

- "How substantive can the values transmitted by School be, in a multicultural, multireligious society?"

In answer to this question, proponents of value education have often denounced the limits of liberalism, setting only a common minimal framework to accommodate diversity, as the imposition of a western concept of social cohesion to the Indian society where communitarian and religious allegiances are intensively and daily experienced by citizens (Jois 1997; NCTE 1999). But Indian readers should be aware that the limits of a *thin* culture (Kymlicka 1995) to ensure the emotional and ethical involvement of citizens in favour of common goals has also

been widely questioned in the West, both among decision-makers and politicians and within the academic and school community (McLaughlin 1992; Taylor 1992; Bourgeault et al. 2002). But, when one indulges into more substantive values, one is faced with the almost impossible task of finding a cultural and ethical content acceptable to various groups of society who may, either for religious or ideological reasons, hold deep-entrenched opposing beliefs. With such a challenge ahead, the temptation to promote majority values in guise of universal or shared values is easily understandable, although not commendable in a genuine pluralistic society.

In the Indian context, given the dominance of the Hindu majority, this has usually meant what has been vividly referred to as *too much safranization of education*. As for the history teaching controversy, based on the documents I have analyzed (Vanaik 1997; Jain 2001; Mody 2001; *The Hindu* 2001b; *The Hindustan Times* 2001; *The Time of India* 2001; Shourie 2001; Das 2002; Rajput 2002; *The Deccan Chronicle* 2002), it would appear that the Indian debate on *Value Education* has been much more polarized, than similar controversies in Canada or in the USA regarding the weighing of majority and minority values in new citizenship programmes (Mc Andrew 2006b). It did mostly oppose strong believers in the possibility of defining *secular/civic/universal/neutral* curriculum content to proponents of an active inculcation of national, i.e. most often majority group, values. But, it should be quite obvious to any long-time observer of the multicultural educational scene, that both positions are untenable. The first one is unrealistic; the second, ethically unacceptable. Transcending the multicultural rhetoric, many ethnographic group studies have shown that public institutions are never neutral, and that majority culture always influences more their ethos than minority's. It is especially the case in education, given the intensive nature of schooling that renders impossible that only civic values would be transmitted there (Guttman 1987; Kymlicka 1995; Bourgeault et al. 2002). Which is why most political philosophers now argue that a certain dominance of majority *ethnic* culture in the curriculum is acceptable, as long as some clear safeguards to protect different views of the world are insured. Thus, if the Indian debate was to be inspired by international reflections, the really fertile question, that may deem some valuable ethnographical research within classrooms, would not be:

- "Do we agree about the safranization of education?" but rather:
- "When does yellowish really becomes *too safran*?"

The last issue reflecting the tensions between cultural reproduction and common socialisation that India shares with Canada and other Western societies is that of the relevance or acceptability of minority institutions. India's Constitution is probably one of the most generous of the world in this regard, a fact that is linked to a strong normative commitment, but also to the specific socio-political situation that existed at independence time (Pandey 2000; Mukhopadhyay & Tyagi 2001). Thus, its long experience of managing structural diversity gives it a comparative edge, reflected by the relative easy coexistence of various school sectors.⁷ Nevertheless, the question of minority institutions, especially when they target relatively socio-economically privileged minorities, such as the Christians, has nourished many questionings in line with those raised elsewhere (Sharma & Aroro 1999; Thakur 1999). Basically, this issue can be summarized by the following challenge:

- "How can a liberal democratic state fund ethnospecific schools without contradicting its ideal of equality of opportunity and of common citizenship?"

With a few exceptions in very strongly republican States, most countries consider that this tension can be accommodated by providing necessary safeguards such as the respect of part of a common curriculum, or the obligation to accept students, or even in some instances teachers, not members of the target group (Mc Andrew 2003b, 2006a).

In India, the weighing of two complementary constitutional articles of the Constitution (29 and 30) has minimized the potential contradictions between the support for minority institutions and the necessity of nation-building through common and pluralistic socialisation (Chandra & Chandra 1993). But this success has also brought concerns, especially from minorities themselves, that this might have been achieved at the expense of their institutional completeness and their capacity to control the very developing of their schools (Siddique 1995; Thakur 1999). India's record on insuring the compatibility of structural pluralism with equality of opportunity has also been much less impressive, both as it regards the plight of under privileged minorities such as the Muslims (Menon 1998; Shukla & Julka 2002), or the access of poor students to elite private schools (Juneja 2001, 2006). But, on these two fronts, recent interesting developments are being foreseen.⁸

From a policy point of view, it would appear that the Indian contribution to problems encountered in Canada or in other Western

societies, would be higher regarding the two last issues than the first. Indeed, the handling of the history teaching controversy by decision-makers of both camps has not been extremely skilful, especially from a pedagogical point of view. As already mentioned, it has focussed too much on competing historical truths and not enough on the potential contribution of the study of contentious issues to the building of skills among students. Moreover, radical curriculum swings have been implemented, without very much regard for history teacher's needs, as exemplified by a recent memo of NCERT proposing that teachers use three (!) different *generations* of textbooks, depending on historical issues, in order to follow the new curriculum (NCERT 2005a). Such proposal would have been met in the West by a revolt from teachers. It does not appear to have been the case in India. Whether this lack of reactions reveals a higher degree of obedience to authorities among India teachers, or simply reflects the fact that they do not follow very much textbooks anyhow, as it is the case in Canada (Lenoir 2001), is open to debate.

The Indian experience of *Value education* seems much more promising, in face of some of the issues raised in the West, regarding the relationship of citizenship education with religious pluralism (Ouellet 1999; Jackson 2007). I am fully aware that this statement will shock some secularist Indian readers who, sometimes, seem to look at *Value education* as the incarnation of the communitarian evil. But based on the analysis of numerous pedagogical guides, practical tools, and activities recently developed in this field (Gursharam 2002; Gulati 2004; National Resource Center for Value Education, 2004; Pandley 2004), it is obvious, at least from a foreign perspective less obsessed with lining up with one or the other national competing ideologies, that *Value education* has shown a remarkably rapid, and probably very Indian, capacity to redefine itself from *safran to rainbow*. It has become, in less than five years, much less linked to Hinduism and largely multi-denominational. Advocating the treatment of all religions on an equal footing and the promotion of a wide religious culture among all students, it now presents a valid alternative to strict secularism, which precludes the inclusion of any religious aspect in the formal curriculum.

Regardless of some of the limits identified above, the openness of the Indian society to minority institutions, as well as the globally favourable impact those have had, both on the preservation of minority cultures and on their integration and sense of allegiance to the Indian national State⁹ should also be studied with greater depth, by many western governments.¹⁰

At a theoretical level, the quality of the Indian debate regarding the tensions between linguistic, cultural, religious reproduction and common or pluralistic socialisation in education is also to be given credit. I would dare to put forward that the sophistication of arguments expressed there is linked to the strength (and equal balance) of the three normative positions that one can bring in such debates: republicanism, liberalism and communitarianism. At the risk of over simplifying a complex reality (Chakrabarty 1990; Oomens 1990; Bose & Ayesha 1997; Nandi 2003), one could say that India is, at the same time, politically republican¹¹, legally and institutionally liberal¹², and sociologically probably the most *communitarian* democracy of the world¹³. In most other international contexts one often encounters only two of these poles, or if the three are present, one is usually clearly dominant: for example, in the controversy surrounding the place of religious diversity in public institutions, republicanism in France, liberalism in Britain and communitarianism in Canada (Pagé & Gagnon 1999; Mc Andrew 2006b). In India, the interplay of these equally central features of national identity, in each of the above controversies, is fascinating. It is also probably easier to understand for a *Québécois*, coming from a society where a similar type of complexity is experienced, although with much less intensity (Juteau 1993), than for an English-Canadian, used to much more univoque way of defining the desirable social reality. Although one may consider that the Indian formula bears instability, the *truth being in the pudding*, it is obvious that it has been overall pretty resilient and that notwithstanding conflicts, the balance achieved in terms of national unity and diversity has been quite remarkable (Narang 2003; Bhattacharyya in this volume).

The rather unexplored "ethnic" dimension of equality of opportunity

Although equality of educational opportunity is widely debated in India as a class or a gender issue (Government of India 2004; NIEPA 2005), it does not represent a part as important as in other contexts, of the debate on ethnocultural diversity in education. In most instances, the bulk of the literature and of policies and programmes, and even of available statistics, is highly focussed on these two main markers and, whenever equality issues related to ethnicity are discussed, they are usually limited to tribal or caste status (Majumbar 2001; Premi 2002). Moreover, the dominant approach is compensatory, i.e. aiming at bridging the gap in terms of specific socio-economic or educational deficits students may accumulate prior and during schooling. Thus, very little attention has been directed to the transformative perspective, i.e. changing school

structures, programmes or practices, at least, within the formal school system¹⁴ (Dyer 2001; Juneja 2001; NIEPA-UNESCO 2003).

Nevertheless, although schooling issues related to scheduled castes or tribes have not enjoyed the same visibility as controversies surrounding the tensions between linguistic and cultural reproduction and common or pluralistic socialisation, they have raised interesting questions, especially as they were embedded in the *Reservation Policy* debate (Chatterjee 2000; Nambissan 2000; Muralidharam 2001). Since the creation of the Indian State, under constitutional protection (article 54), many specific programmes and measures (such as bursaries, reserved sites and hostel housing) have targeted the most underprivileged groups, scheduled castes and tribes, as well as, more recently, other *backward classes*. Almost fifty years of debate and evaluation of such measures, have raised two very central and challenging issues, very much in line with the international questioning in this regard (Tomasson et al. 2001; Rubio 2001; Cahn 2002):

- When do targeted positive measures become reverse discrimination, especially for students not from the target-group but from similar socio-economic background?
- Why do some sub-categories of the target-group benefit more from positive discrimination than others?

These two issues are clearly related in India as elsewhere: the first becomes more and more relevant in light of the reality revealed by the second. Most positive discrimination policies are, indeed, built on the assumption of the existence of a very narrow congruence between socio-economic deprivation and specific ethnic/race/caste status. But, precisely when they are successful, this link becomes less evident, as exemplified by the emergence of a Black *bourgeoisie* in the USA (Frazier 1997) or of *have and have not* backward or Dalit sub-groups (Aggarwal & Sarika 1992). Thus, the objection that positive action is indeed reverse discrimination, which originally can be considered as a mere rhetoric protecting the interest of dominant groups, may turn into a genuine concern among dominated groups, not enjoying the same protection.

Understanding why some sub-categories of specific target-groups benefit more from differential treatment than others, also requires a better understanding of why, originally, different groups participated less in the school system. If obstacles in this regard were mostly external (hardship of living conditions, housing, *de facto* or *de jure* segregation), than, compensatory approaches might do the job. But if different sub-cultures and values, especially as they relate to education, are at stake,

than a more thorough questioning of the nature of school policies, programmes and curriculum may be required.

It is at this cutting edge that the western debate on educational equity and ethno-cultural diversity now stands. It is, indeed, one of the major recent contributions of *critical multiculturalism*, sometimes named *antiracist or heterocentrist pedagogy*, to state that the two functions of schooling, socialization and selection, cannot be analysed separately (Grinter 1992; Banks 1995; Dei 1996). Although it is certainly not the only system of explanation in that regard, we are slowly starting to gather evidence that the relevance of the curriculum plays an important part in the higher school failure among marginalized groups (Cummins 1989; Gillborn 1995, Johnson & Acera 1999).

This relationship seems to have been much less explored in Indian research and debate, which may explain why policy reaction regarding ethno-cultural equity in education appears much more limited. Since the adoption of the *National Policy on Education* of 1986 (Government of India), some lip-service has indeed been paid, and reiterated through various school reforms (NCERT 2000, 2005c), to *cultural adaptation of the curriculum*. But on the ground, although a global evaluation in this regard is still lacking, there is very little indication that *State Council for Educational Research and Training* (SCERT), and especially those in areas of high ethnocultural heterogeneity, would have gone further in that direction than including token elements of local cultures (Malhotra & Najmal 1997; Chugh 2004; Shukla 2004). One is far from dreaming of a history curriculum that would take into account Kashmiri's or Naga's collective memory... but even without being that daring, it is clear that most of the debate regarding the educational problems of officially discussed minorities (tribes, Dalits, etc.) is still focussed on bridging the gap prerequisites in term of schooling and not on challenging the very definition of school curriculum.¹⁵

Two explanations can be brought forward for this rather neglect of educational opportunity as an *ethnic issue* at the policy level and lack of *critical multicultural* dynamism at the programmes and practices level. On the one hand, with a schooling enrolment at the end of primary education of only 63.3 per cent (Government of India 2004), it is expected that access to education would still be the priority, both for decision-makers and the global citizenry. Thus, attention is targeted on the groups which suffer from the highest setbacks in this regard and public action is defined mostly to meet that goal. Compensatory measures are, indeed, more likely to have a positive impact on access than on equality of treatment or of results, where more radical transformative

approaches may be needed. On the other hand, before engaging fully in that direction, political elites must be reassured about the compatibility of *radical multicultural or antiracist* perspectives with nation-building, which may not be an easy task. Indeed, even in the West, it is often argued that the presence of multiple voices and multiple perspectives in the curriculum, although needed to make education more relevant for all, may be a threat to *social cohesion* (Bissoondath 1994; Schlessinger 1998; Bourgeault et al. 2002). But, in most of these contexts, national integration is largely achieved and educational policies target mostly non irredentist immigrant groups, or national minorities who do not radically challenge territorial integrity,¹⁶ as it is the case, in many instances, in India.

Language as a less contentious than expected educational issue

Language should be a major topic of debate in the educational scene in India. There is an unequated number of official languages (22!), of languages actually spoken (114), and of various mother tongues or dialects they actually include (1,561!) (Registrar General and Census Commissioner India 1997). India also distinguishes itself with an ambiguous goal of trilingualism, set forward for each student by the government since more than thirty years (Aggarwal 2000). In Canada, with only two official languages and many, but much less languages actually spoken, language controversies, whether they concern sociolinguistic trends and language vitality (Levine 1990; Jedwab 2002) or educational issues, such as second language teaching or heritage language programmes (Mc Andrew & Cicéri 1998) are one of our main national sports.¹⁷ Thus, from a comparative perspective,¹⁸ I was surprised by the apparent lack of public controversies regarding the role of languages in the Indian school system, as well as by the relative paucity of critical evaluative research I encountered on the issue, when surveying literature and policy documents, especially on two important aspects.

The first one concerns the three-language formula, on paper one of the most interesting endeavours in the area of multilingualism in an emerging country (Shridar 1996; Daswani 2001). There is so little recent non normative literature on that topic that it is difficult to ascertain how far it is actually implemented and, if it is the case, to which extent it is fulfilling its goals of permitting each and every Indian student to master, at a rather similar level, official, regional and maternal languages (Jayaram & Rajyashree 2000). Why it is so may stem from a variety of factors. First and foremost, the extremely multilingual character of India,

as well as the fact that, notwithstanding the attempt at promoting Hindi as the main national symbol, no language can actually pretend to a majority status, may have diluted linguistic tensions¹⁹ (Snehamoy 1997; Aggarwal 2000). But the underdevelopment of critical curriculum studies, especially in relation to the issue of educational equity, as described above, probably also plays a role in this regard (Nambissan 1994). In the light of recent work (Daswani 2001; Jhingran 2005), two issues would appear to warrant deeper scrutiny.

- What relationship exist between school failure or early dropout among some sub-groups of students and the taking into account, or rather the not taking into account, of their linguistic characteristics and competencies?
- To which extent is a wall-to-wall approach such as the three-language formula still adapted to the reality of growing multilingual migration in big cities?

A similar problem is facing bilingual education, both in Canada and in the USA, an approach traditionally focussed on highly territorialized groups but now more and more out of tune for linguistically heterogeneous school populations²⁰ (Mc Andrew 2009).

The second under-studied issue, although discussed more often in newspapers, is the social and educational impact of the popularity of English-medium-only private schools (Riddy 1999; Trilok 2001). Indeed, while policy-makers and curriculum developers are highly engaged in the promotion of multilingualism, parents on the ground, to paraphrase here John Kennedy's classical declaration, seem to be *voting with their feet*. Thus, for anybody who can afford it, even at a relatively high cost,²¹ an instrumental relation with languages is the norm. Again, it would be extremely interesting to critically assess the impact of this more and more popular choice and the school market stratification it does produce on a variety of issues, such as the intensification of interethnic or class differences, the linguistic competencies of students, both speakers of regionally dominant languages and of minority languages and, finally, on the very definition of national identity.

But before research gives us some answers on these questions, the development of a coherent political discourse may be warranted. From a comparative perspective, it is indeed rather surprising that Indian politicians and decision-makers should get at each other's throats for over three years regarding the balanced version of historical events that happened in the thirteenth century, but find very little to say on a

major tendency that may, in the long run, be much more influential on their society.²²

Concluding Remarks

As can be seen by this personal and probably limited assessment, the field of ethno-cultural diversity and education in India holds very promising avenues, as well as some limits, both at the policy and research level. The controversies and issues raised here also exhibit common trends and specificities, in comparison with similar debates in Canada and in other Western nations.

This would make further collaboration very fruitful, as each context could benefit from the strengths found in the other. The aim is obviously not to advocate direct borrowing of best practices. But increased exchanges would favour, on both sides, the development of a more critical perspective on the shortcomings of one's society and schools as well as a renewed questioning of dominant national assumptions regarding ethno-cultural diversity and education.

NOTES

1. For example, the *community control* movement in the American Black community.
2. For example, immigrant minorities in Europe.
3. For example, Afrikaners schools in South Africa or, to use a less drastic example, Christian schooling in many post-colonial States.
4. See for example, the Belgium or the Québec/Canada arguments in this regard (Mc Andrew & Jansen, 2004).
5. For example, in the 90's, during the Afro-centrist versus pluralistic history teaching debate in the USA (Schlessinger, 1993; Fullwinder, 1996) or more recently in the recent controversy regarding the relevance of a Canadian or Québec perspective in history teaching in that Province (*National Post*, April 28, 2006; Zanazanian, 2006).
6. Either to a homogeneous (such as the BGP's) or to a pluralist (such that as the Congress's) blueprint.
7. But this could also be linked to the dominance of private education, a reality that has a less positive impact on equality of access to education, as we will discuss in part 2 of this article.
8. In the first instance, the eventual implementation of some of the recommendations of the National Monitoring Committee for Minorities Education (SCNMME, 2005) and in the second, the judgment of the Supreme Court making mandatory that private schools accept up to 25% of underprivileged children (*Hindustan Times*, 2005).

9. See, in this regard, S. Ray's article 'Understanding Indian Multiculturalism' in this volume.
10. In this regard, the Indian experience holds many similarities with that of Québec, the only Canadian Province which subsidizes the educational institutions of religious minorities. This support originates, on the one hand, from the traditional, although now faded, catholic and protestant character of public schools and, on the other hand, from the Quiet Revolution onward, from the need of the francophone dominated Québec government to build a higher legitimacy among ethno-cultural minorities (Mc Andrew, 2003c).
11. The rhetoric in this regard as well as the level of national pride clearly evokes the golden days of French republicanism...
12. A clear legacy of the British influence.
13. With strikingly high levels of various types of allegiance- religion, language, caste, etc.- within civil society.
14. The non formal and NGO sector, as well as some alternative schools, shows much more dynamism in this regard (Jessup, 1998).
15. Since my stay in India, one has witnessed some advancements in that direction exemplified by new activities and training programmes developed by various departments of NCERT. The current reflection on the impact of the Supreme Court Judgment on the integration of poor children to private schools carried, among others, at NIEPA, also includes elements related to ethno-cultural diversity.
16. Even as militant as Québec nationalism and native people movements may appear, there likelihood of breaking the country is actually very remote.
17. Almost at par with hockey, I mean *real* hockey, on ice.
18. Not to mention here the USA, where bilingual education has been, at the core, of a major public debate for over thirty years (Crawford, 1999).
19. English is still largely the *lingua franca*, but it is not actually linked to any specific linguistic group (just to class distinctions).
20. Based on exchanges with colleagues from JNU, there seem to be signs that these questions might get more attention in the near future.
21. As it is the case for lower-middle or even working class parents.
22. The argument, also heard in Canada, that politicians have no interest to steer a controversy over a school sector most of their children attend, probably explains part of this lack of leadership in promoting public schooling. But it appears to me too cynical to totally cover the spectrum of the root causes of this immobilism.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, S. (2000), *Three Language Formulas: An Educational Problem*, New Delhi: Gian Publishing House.

- Aggarwal, Y. & Sarika, S. (1992), *Educating Scheduled Castes: A Study of Inter District and Intra Caste Differentials*, New Delhi: NIEPA.
- Aminah, M.A. (2005), "Textbooks, nationalism and history writing in India and Pakistan", in B. Benei (ed.), *Manufacturing Citizenship: Education in Europe, South Asia and China*, London: Routledge.
- Ballantyne, J.H. (1989), *The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Banks, J.A. (1995), Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice in J.A. Banks & C.A. M. Banks (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* New York: Macmillan.
- Barth, F. (Ed.) (1969), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Bhattacharyya, H. (2009), "Multiculturalism, Political Autonomy for Ethno-National Groups and Political Unity in India", in Christopher S. Raj and M. Mc Andrew, (eds.), *Multiculturalism: Public Policy and Problem Areas in Canada and India*, Delhi: Manak Publishers.
- Bidwai, P. (2002), "Verdict on NCERT Textbooks, Setback to Secularism", *The Kashmir Times*, September 23, p. 6.
- Bissoondath, N. (1994), *Selling Illusions, The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*, Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Bose, S. & Ayesha, J. (eds) (1997), *Nationalism, Democracy and Development: State and Politics in India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bourgeault, G., Gagnon, F., Mc Andrew, M. & Pagé, M. (2002), "Recognition of Cultural and Religious Diversity in the Educational Systems of Liberal Democracies", in Y. Hébert (ed.), *Citizenship in Transformation*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cahn, S.M. (Ed.) (2002), *The Affirmative Action Debate*, New York/London: Routledge.
- Chakrabarty, B. (2002), "The Many Faces of an Indian", *The Telegraph*, January 10, p. 11.
- Chakrabarty, B. (Ed.) (1990), *Secularism and Indian Polity*, New Delhi: Segment Book Distributors.
- Chandra, S.S. & Chandra, M. (1993), *Religious Minority Educational Institutions*, New Delhi: Aditya Books.
- Chatterjee, S.K. (2000), *Educational Development of Scheduled Castes: Looking Ahead*, New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Chattopabhyay, G. (2000), "Teaching of History and the Challenge of Religious Nationalism", *Man and Development*, December, pp. 102-114.
- Chugh, S. (2004), *Why Children Drop Out: Case Study of a Metropolitan Slum in Delhi*, New Delhi: Bookwell Publications.
- Crawford, J. (1999), *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice*, Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crul, M. & Vermeulen, H. (2003), The Second Generation in Europe, *International Migration Review*, 37 (4), pp. 965-986.
- Cummins, J. (1989), *Empowering Minority Students*, Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

- Das, S. (2002), "Religious and Corrupt Country," *The Sunday Statesman*, January 20, p. 8.
- Daswani, C.J. (ed.) (2001), *Language Education in Multi-lingual India*, New Delhi: UNESCO.
- Dei, G. (1996), *Antiracist Education: Theory and Practice*, Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Dyer, C. (2001), "Nomads and Education for Alls: Education for Development or Domestication?" *Comparative Education*, 37(3), pp. 315-327.
- Frazier, E.F. (1997), *Black Bourgeoisie*, New York: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Fullinwider, R.K. (ed.) (1996), *Public Education in a Multicultural Society, Policy, Theory, Critique*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallagher, T. (2005), *Education in Divided Societies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gillborn, D. (1995), *Racism and Antiracism in Real Schools: Theory, Policy, Practices*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Glenn, J.U. & De Jong, E. (1996), *Educating Immigrant Children: Schools and Language Minorities in Twelve Nations*, New York: Garland.
- Government of India (1986), *National Policy on Education*, Ministry of Education, New Delhi: NIEPA.
- (2004), *Education for All India Marches Ahead*, Government of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development, Department of Elementary Education and Literacy.
- Grinter, R. (1992), "Multiculturalism or Antiracist Education? The Need to Choose", in J. Lynch, Modgil, C. & S. Modgil (eds.), *Cultural Diversity and the Schools*, Vol. One: *Education for Cultural Diversity: Convergence and Divergence*, London and Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Gulati, S. (2004), *Integrated Approach to Value Education in Teaching of School Subjects, Guideline and Exemplar Materials*, New Delhi: Department of Education Psychology and Foundation of Education, NCERT.
- Gursharam, K.J. (2002), *A Study of Value-Based Practices in Some Selected Schools*, Department of Education Psychology and Foundation of Education, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Guttman, A. (1987), *Democratic Education*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hamilton, G. (2006), "Québec Proposes Making History less Anti-English, High School Reform," *National Post*, April, 28th
- Hasan, M. (2001), "It's Story-time, Folks," *The Indian Express*, December 26, p. 8.
- Holmes, B. (1981), *Comparative Education: Some Considerations of Method*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Homan, R. (1992), "Separate school", in J. Lynch, C. Modgil & S. Modgil (eds.), *op.cit.*, pp. 59-72.
- Isser, N. Schwartz, L.L. (1985), *The American School and the Melting Pot: Minority Self-Esteem and Public Education*, Bristol: Wyndham Hall Press.
- Jackson, R. (2007), "European Institutions and the Contribution of Studies of Religious Diversity to Education for Democratic Citizenship", in R. Jackson, S. Miedema, W. Weisse & J.P. Willaime (ed.), *Religion and*

- Education in Europe: Developments, Contexts and Debates*, Munster: Waxmann.
- Jain, M. (2001), "NDA's 'Value Education' is a Sham, say Academics", *The Asian Age*, August 7, p. 3.
- Jayaram, B.D. & Rajyashree, K.S. (2000), *State Official Languages Policy Implementation*, Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Jedwab, J. (2002), *Immigration and the Vitality of Canada's Official Language Communities: Policy, Demography and Identity*, Ottawa: Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages.
- Jessup, T. (1998), *A Model of Best Practices at Loreto Day School, Sealdah, Calcutta*, Occasional Paper 1, Education Sector Group, Department for International Development. Government of India.
- Jhingran, D. (2005), *Language Disadvantage: The Learning Challenge in Primary Education*, New Delhi: APT Publishing Corporation.
- Johnson, J. & Acera, R. (1999), *Hope for Urban Education: A Study of Nine High Performing, High Poverty Urban Elementary Schools*, Report to the US Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Services, The Charles A. Donna Center, The University of Texas at Houston.
- Jois, M.R. (1997), *Human Rights and Indian Value*, New Delhi: NCTE.
- Juneja, N. (2001), *Primary Education for All in the City of Mumbai, India: The Challenge Set by Local Actors*, Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.
- (2006), *Exclusive Schools: The Social Objectives of the School Land Clause*, Position paper, New Delhi: NIEPA.
- Juteau, D. (1993), The production of the Québécois nation, *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 19(2), pp. 79-108.
- Karun, T. (2001), "Why Revising History is not a Question of Tit for Tat", *The Economic Times*, November 29, p. 6.
- Kumar, K. (2002), "Communalised Curriculum, Sowing Seeds of Future Gujarats", *The Times of India*, April 9, p. 12.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Leman, J. (1999), School as a Structuring Force in Interethnic Hybridism, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, Chapter 8, 341-353.
- Lenoir, Y. (ed.) (2001), *Le manuel scolaire et l'intervention éducative: regards critiques sur ses apports et ses limites*, Sherbrooke, Québec: Éditions du CRP.
- Levine, M.V. (ed.) (1990), *The Reconquest of Montreal: Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Majumbar, S. (2001), Educational Programmes for the Disadvantaged Groups, in M. Mukhopadhyay & R.S. Tyagi (eds.), *Governance of School Education in India*, New Delhi: NIEPA, pp. 107-131.
- Malhotra, N. & Najmal, R. (1997), *Source Materials on Education of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes*, New Delhi: Anamika Publishers and Distributors Ltd.
- Malkani, K.R. (2001), History and Nationalism, *The Sunday Statesman*, December, 23, p. 8.

- Mc Andrew, M. (1996), "Models of Common Schooling and Interethnic Relations: A Comparative Analysis of Policies and Practices in the United States, Israel and Northern Ireland," *Compare*, 26(3), pp. 333-345.
- (2001), *Immigration et diversité à l'école. Le débat québécois dans une perspective comparative*, Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- (2003a), "School Spaces and the Construction of Ethnic Relations: Conceptual and Policy Debates", *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 3(2), pp. 14-29.
- (2003b), "Should National Minorities/majorities share Common Institutions or Control their own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Québec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia", in S. Schmitt & D. Juteau (eds.), *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, Berghahn Books, pp. 369-424.
- (2003c), "Immigration, Pluralism and Education", in A. Gagnon (ed.), *Québec : State and Society*, pp. 345-368, 2nd edition, Montréal : Québec/Amérique.
- (2005), "Taking into Account Religious and Cultural Differences within the School Setting: A Canadian Case Study", (Hindi Translation), *Pariprekshya*, December.
- (2009), "Ensuring Proper Competency in the Host Language: Contrasting Formula and the Place of Heritage Languages", *Teachers College Review*, Columbia University, March.
- (2006b), "The Education of Immigrant Students in a Globalized World: Policy Debates in a Comparative Perspective", in M. Suarez-Orozco, (ed.) *Global Understandings: Learning and Education in Troubled Times*, Berkeley / London / New York: University of California Press / Ross Institute.
- (2006c), "The Hijab Controversies in Western Public Schools: Contrasting Conceptions of Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations", in S. Rahnema & H. Moghissi (eds.), *The Making of the Islamic Diaspora*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- & Cicéri, C. (1998), "Immigration, Ethnocultural Diversity and Multilingualism in Education: The Canadian Example", *Zeitschrift für internationale erziehungs- und sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung*, 15(2).
- & Janssens, R. (2004), "The role of schooling in the maintenance and transformation of ethnic boundaries between linguistic communities: Contrasting Québec and Belgium", *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, special issue, G. Bourgeault, M.-H. Chastenay & M. Verlot (eds.) *Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Comparing Belgium and Canada*, 36(3), 61-83.
- McLaughlin, T.H. (1992), "Citizenship Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective", *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- Menon, P. (1998), *Sample Survey to Evaluate the Impact of Area Intensive Programme for Educationally Backward Minorities*, New Delhi: NIEPA Research Studies.
- Modood, T. & Werbner P. (ed.) (1997), *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism Identity and Community*, London: Zed Books.
- Mody, A. (2001), "The new NCERT Syllabus Plays with the Future", *The Indian Express*, April 18, p. 9.

- Mukhopadhyay, M. & Tyagi, R.S. (eds.) (2001), *Governance of School Education in India*, New Delhi: NIEPA.
- Muralidharam, V. (2001), *Educational Priorities and Dalit Society*, New Delhi: Kanisha Publishers.
- Nambissan, G. (1994), Language and Schooling of Tribal Children: Issues Related to Medium of Instruction, *Economical and Political Weekly*, October 15.
- Nambissan, G. (2000), "The Schooling of Dalit Children in India in S. Ghanshyam (ed.) *Dalits and the State*", Center for Rural Studies", New Delhi: Concept Publishing Compagny.
- Nanda, R.T. (1997), *Contemporary Approaches to Value Education in India*, New Delhi Regency.
- Nandi, A. (2003), *Coping with the Politics of Faith and Culture: Between Secular State and Oecunemical Traditions in India*, Working paper, Columbo: International Center for Ethnic Studies.
- Narang, A.S. (2003), *Democracy in India: Issues and Challenges*, New Delhi: NCERT.
- (2000), *National Curriculum Framework for School Education*.
- (2003), *History in the New NCERT Textbooks*, Fallacies in the IHC Report.
- (2005a), *Learning History without Burden: A Note to School Teachers*.
- (2005b), *National Curriculum Framework 2005*.
- (2005c), *National Curriculum Framework Review*, Position papers Teaching of Social Sciences.
- National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) (1999), *Human Rights and National Values: Self Learning Module for Teacher Education*, New Delhi.
- National Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) (2005), *Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand? District Report Cards 2001-2004*.
- and UNESCO (2003), *Different Approaches for Achieving Education for All: Indian Experience*, India.
- National Regeneration Project (2000), *National Regeneration through Peace and Value Education*, Secunderabad Dharma Bharathi, National Institute of Peace and Value Education.
- National Resource Center for Value Education (2004), *Recent Initiatives*, www.ncert.nic.in/sites/valueeducation/recent-initiatives.
- (1990), *State and Society in India: Studies in National Building*, New Delhi/ Newbury Park/London: Sage Publications.
- Oommen, T.K. (2004), *Nation, Civil Society and Social Movement, Essays in Political Sociology*, London/New Delhi/New York: Sage Publication.
- Ouellet, F. (1999), Religious Education as Democratic Education in M. Leicester, C. Modgil & S. Modgil, (eds.) *Education, Culture and Values*, Vol. VI: *Political Education and Citizenship*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Pagé, M. & Gagnon, F. (1999), *Conceptual Framework for an Analysis of Citizenship in the Liberal Democracies, Volume II: Approaches to Citizenship in Six Liberal Democracies*, Report presented to the Department of Canadian Heritage.

- Pandey, B.N. (2000), *Social-Legal Study of Cultural and Educational Rights of the Minorities*, New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Pandley, S. (2004), *Peace Education: Self Instructional Package for Teachers Education*, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut (2001), *Legacies: The Story of the Second Generation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Premi, M.K. (2002), "Access, Equity and Equality in Education with Focus on SCs, ST, and girls", in S. Rao (ed.), *Educational Policies in India: Analysis and Review of Promise and Performance*, New Delhi: NIEPA.
- Priyam, M. (2002), "Textbooks as hate labs", *The Hindustan Times*, May 29, p. 10.
- Puri, R. (2002), "Education and Religion in the New Century", *The Kashmir Times*, September 20, p. 6.
- Rajput, J.S. (2002), *Dimensions of Curriculum Change*, New Delhi: NCERT.
- (ed.) (2003), *Value Education in Indian Schools: Experiences and Strategies of Implementation*, NCERT.
- Registrar General and Census Commissioner India (1997), *Language, India and States*, Series I, Census of India 1991, Paper 1, Table C. New Delhi.
- Riddy, N. (1999), "Public and Private Education in India: A Sociological Analysis", in N. Riddy (ed.), *Public and Private Education: An International Perspective*, University of Hyderabad.
- Rubio, P.F. (2001), *A History of Affirmative Action, 1619-2000*, Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Schermerhorn, R.A. (1970), *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*, New York: Random House.
- Schlessinger, A.M. (1998), *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*, New York, London: W.W. Norton.
- Sears, A. & Wright, I. (2004), *Challenges and Prospect for Canadian Social Studies*, Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.
- Seixas, P. (ed.) (2004), *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Shahid, W. & Van Koningsveld, P. (ed.), (1996), *Muslims in the Margin: Political Responses to the Presence of Islam in Western Europe*, Kampen: Kok Pharos.
- Sharma, A.K. & Aroro, G.L. (1999), *Common School System: Retrospect and Prospect*, New Delhi: NCERT.
- Sharma, N. (2002), "A Fight Over the Colour of History", *The Asian Age*, September 22, p. 15.
- Shourie, H.D. (2001), "New Education Curriculum Evokes Criticism", *The Times of India*, April 28, p. 13.
- Shridar, K. (1996), "Language in Education: Minorities and Multilingualism in India", *International Review of Education*, 44(4), 327-347.
- Shukla, N. & Julka, A. (2002), *A Sample Survey of the Extend of Educational Benefits Derived Out of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes for Minorities (Muslims)*. New Delhi: Department for Education of Groups with Special Needs, NCERT.

- Shukla, R.P. (2004), *Status of School Education in Nagaland*, SCERT.
- Siddique, M.A. (1995). *Management of Education in Muslim Institutions*, New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
- Sigel, R. & Hoskin, M. (1991), *Education for Democratic Citizenship: A Challenge for Multiethnic Societies*, Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.
- Snehamoy, C. (1997), *Sociolinguistic: A Guide to Language Problems in India*, New Delhi: Mittal Publishers.
- Standing Committee of the National Monitoring Committee for Minorities Education (SCNMCME) (2005), *Annual Report 2004-2005*, Ministry of Human Resources and Development, Government of India.
- Stearns, P.N., Seixas, P. & Wineburg, S. (ed.) (2000), *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History, National and International Perspectives*, New York: New York University Press.
- Suàrez-Orozco, C. Suàrez-Orozco, M & Doucet, F. (2003), "The Academic Engagement and Achievement of Latino Youth", in J.A. Banks, C.A. McGee-Banks (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (2nd Edition), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, C. (1992), *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Thakur, R.N. (1999), *Plight of the Minorities : Problems and Grievances in their Education*, New Delhi: Gyan Pub. House.
- Thapar, R. (2001), "Coloured Curriculum", *The Hindustan Times*, August 14, p. 12.
- The Deccan Chronicle* (2002), SC clears BJP syllaby, Says Gandhi also Propagated Religious Studies, September 13, p. 1.
- (2002), SC Clears New School Syllabus, September 13, p. 9.
- The Hindu* (2001a), "Saffronisation" of Education Assailed, July 22, p. 9.
- (2001b), History by Fiat, October 12, p. 12.
- The Hindustan Times* (2001), Intellectuals blast Saffronisation'bid by HRD Ministry, August 25, p. 5.
- (2005), Classroom Struggle, February 7, Editorial page.
- The Indian Express* (2001), Centre Painting Schoolbooks Saffron: Experts, March 21, p. 3.
- The Statesman* (2001), Saffron logic, Joshi Plans Compulsory Religion, August 23, p. 6.
- The Times of India* (2001), Scientists against Vedic Courses, August 14, p. 4.
- Tomasson, R.F., Crosby, F.J. & Herzberger, S.D. (2001), *Affirmative Action: The Pros and Cons of Policy and Practice*, Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Trilok, N.D. (2001), "Role of Local Bodies, Private Efforts and Community Participation in Education", in M. Mukhopadhyay & R.S. Tyagi (eds.) *Governance of School Education in India*. New Delhi: NIEPA
- Vanaik, A. (1997), *Communalism Contested: Religion, Modernity and Secularization*, New Delhi: Vistaar Pub.

- Venkatesan, J. (2002a), "SC rejects NCERT's Plea to Modify Orders on Curriculum", *The Hindu*, April 13, p. 13.
- Venkatesan, J. (2002b), SC Upholds Education Policy, *The Hindu*, September 13, p. 1.
- Zanazanian, P. (to be published 2009), Beyond the Taboos of Historical Consciousness: Understanding French Québécois History Teachers' General Indifference to Québec Anglophone Realities and Historicity, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*.
- Zine, J. (2001), "Muslim Youth in Canadian Schools: Education and the Politics of Religious Identity", *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 32 (4), 399-423.