

Spring 2020

Managing Multilingualism in India and South Africa: A Comparison

Maddox G. McKibben-Greene
University of South Carolina - Columbia

Director of Thesis: Dr. Stanley Dubinsky
Second Reader: Dr. Michael Gavin

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/senior_theses



Part of the [African Languages and Societies Commons](#), and the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McKibben-Greene, Maddox G., "Managing Multilingualism in India and South Africa: A Comparison" (2020). *Senior Theses*. 355.
https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/senior_theses/355

This Thesis is brought to you by the Honors College at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
THESIS SUMMARY.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
INTRODUCTION	6
COUNTRIES' INDEPENDENCE, CONFLICTS	10
GEOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF LANGUAGE GROUPS.....	15
AN INTRODUCTION TO FORMAL POLICY.....	18
ONGOING LANGUAGE CONFLICTS.....	22
THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA.....	25
EDUCATION POLICY.....	27
LEGAL POLICY.....	32
ACHIEVING EQUITABLE LANGUAGE POLICIES.....	33
CONCLUSION.....	38
REFERENCES	39

To my mom, who has always supported my intellectual pursuits.

And to my kind and patient mentors, who instilled in me confidence.

THESIS SUMMARY

This thesis will compare and contrast the case of multilingualism in two postcolonial states, India and South Africa, and explore the challenges that each nation has faced in managing ethnolinguistic diversity. Through this research, I will also construct a rubric that can be applied to any multilingual country to evaluate its efficacy in managing multilingualism and minority languages rights within the political, educational and legal spheres.

ABSTRACT

With a shared history of British colonialism, India and South Africa are two countries with levels of ethnic and linguistic diversity that have contributed to previous and ongoing language policy issues. Though each country has enacted policies in attempts to combat language difficulties, many of these policies have been largely regarded as ineffective, as they have either not been properly upheld or received repeated pushback from citizens.

It will also be necessary to explore each country's efforts to deal with majority and minority language policies and will evaluate through this how to effectively measure a country's success in managing multilingualism and language rights. Throughout, the essay will focus on policy analysis in the countries' governmental and educational spheres, looking at official efforts (or lack thereof) from the governments to protect the use of certain languages within each country. As a result of this research, using these countries as case studies in linguistic policy management in multilingual states, we will gauge how well these two countries have mitigated issues stemming from their multilingual statuses as well as to evaluate if the two have achieved equitable language policies through their efforts.

Key words: multilingualism, language conflict, language policy, language equity, minority languages, apartheid, independence

INTRODUCTION

In a world that inhabits more multilingual speakers than monolingual speakers, multilingualism itself can be both a source of conflict and an important resource. These conflicts can be everyday or situational, individual or societal, petty or serious – and, as seen in many states, can be the reason behind largely ineffective governmental policy, inequitable educational resources and legal difficulties. At the individual level, multilingualism can be an advantage, as it could make living within a multilingual society easier considering day-to-day tasks. However, at the societal level, multilingualism can pose a threat to national identity, prompting states to either establish an official national language or to advance the society to retain nationalistic pride in ways that transcend language, which is a slow and arduous process. To shed light on some of the problems that governments working within multilingual states face, we can look to India and South Africa, two countries in which many languages are in competition and many citizens are multilingual, that provide insightful case studies considering both language conflict and policy implementation failure.

When looking at the English language specifically, India and South Africa have obvious shared heritages of British colonialism. This established English as a language holding prestige in the countries' administrative and educational sectors. Additionally, the speakers of other indigenous languages desired to retain their own languages, leading to substantial levels of multilingualism within the two states. When a country's population is relatively homogenous, a unified language can lead to a feeling of stability and togetherness; however, in the cases of South Africa and India, there exists much ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity among their populations. This alone has made it especially difficult to establish language policies that give equal language rights to historically disenfranchised groups, or to regional linguistic groups that

speak languages that are not used throughout the country, especially in the political and educational spheres of each country.

Moving beyond the issue of English compared to all other native languages, thus introducing an issue of minority language rights, there is also the problem of hegemonic structures (social and/or political dominance of a particular language), most notably of English in South Africa and of English and Hindi in India. While linguists may consider all languages to be of inherently equal value, the same belief is often not upheld in political, educational and other societal realms as minority or unofficial languages continue to be regarded as inferior around the world (Collins, 1999). For example, in South Africa, indigenous languages were associated with an “inferior” education; in India, globally dominant languages such as English are connected to social and cultural trends. In an increasingly global society where cultural interconnectedness is apparent and expected, language rights issues that arise from multilingualism have become especially vital when considering political ideologies and systems of power in societies.

According to Davies and Dubinsky:

Whether arising through conquest and colonization, immigration, enslavement, or the creation of a political state that ignores “natural” ethnic territories, linguistic minorities have existed at least since the dawn of history, and where there exist linguistic minorities, there also exist language conflicts and issues related to the rights of those minorities to use their languages freely and without prejudice (2018, p. 1).

When considering the issues individuals often face in multilingual societies and tensions that may arise from multilingualism, it is also important to clearly define multilingualism and take into consideration its place in multicultural societies – and the best practices for comparing multilingual countries, which is one of the goals of this study. In Coulmas’ book, *An*

Introduction to Multilingualism: Language in a Changing World, he outlines key distinguishing factors in multilingual countries. For the sake of comparing India and South Africa, I have chosen four of these factors that I believe are vital to consider when performing a comparative study of India's and South Africa's linguistic conflicts: the official statuses of each country's languages, the countries' demographic strength of languages, their minority languages and their wealth.

Countries' official language(s) statuses

As Coulmas states, "An important aspect of the legacy of the colonial period is the use of European languages in education and government" (2018, p. 168). For many South Africans, formal affairs and everyday life require the use of different languages, English or Afrikaans generally being one of these. In India, the same often rings true, with English maintaining a status of prestige in the legal, educational and governmental spheres. There is no question that European languages have had a great impact on countries outside of Europe, both in situations such as South Africa where many languages (11) have been granted official status and in India, where there exists two official languages of Hindi and English but over 20 more official regional languages.

Demographic strengths of languages

Of course, there is often – if not almost always – a disconnection between a country's official language status and the reality of these languages' prominence. As for India, there is the reality of English sharing official status with Hindi, a language that dominates northern India and includes more than 350 million native speakers, when few Indians speak English as a first language. Conversely, in South Africa, two of the country's official languages, Zulu and Xhosa, are among the most widely spoken languages in the country, with 11.6 million native speakers

and 8.15 million native speakers, according to this 2011 census. These numbers are followed by Afrikaans, with 6.85 million native speakers. However, when considering first languages, Afrikaans and English, prestige-holding languages, are the first languages of approximately 13.5% and 9.6% of South Africans, respectively.

Minority languages

Both India and South Africa have certain languages that are more privileged than others in both the formal and social domains. During a 1957 convention of the International Labor Organization (ILO), the ILO Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Populations visited the UN Declaration of Human Rights' comments on similar minority groups' educational and social rights and framed the conversation "in a way which put language front and center" (Davies & Dubinsky, 2018, p. 164). In addition to this Convention, the later 1989 Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries made effort to recognize these indigenous populations as rooted members in their societies, making strides in minority language education and protection in declaring that "Measures shall be taken to preserve and promote the development and practice of the indigenous languages of the peoples concerned." However, the reality of what happens with the less privileged languages is not always representative of these and similar articles due to historical ethnolinguistic conflict that has paved the way for persisting linguistic hegemonies. This inequity, in turn, is only mirrored by inequitable political and governmental structures within a society. In the cases of India and South Africa, this disconnect can be seen in their formal language policy and real-world application.

Since neither India nor South Africa holds a true majority language, even among their indigenous languages, a more useful way of framing the administrative, social and political power structures that surround their linguistic conflict revolves around the concepts of

“privileged” and “non-privileged” languages. For example, in the two countries, English is a privileged language in all of these sectors because it is the language of the law, of commerce and of many global trends. Indigenous languages often take on a less privileged status due to earlier discussed systems of political power.

Countries’ wealth, economic statuses

As Coulmas also points out, modern-day capitalism, as well as other trends such as compulsory education, have harmed minority languages by contributing to the sense of worth and prestige that countries’ citizens apply to languages of power (2018, p. 177). As a nation, India has been able to lift a significant portion of its population out of poverty. However, still, about 60% of India’s 1.3 billion people live below the World Bank’s median poverty line on \$3.10. Additionally, 21%, or more than 250 million people, live on less than \$2 a day (World Bank, 2017). Though India is quickly making strides in economic development, there still exists much economic disparity within the densely populated country (with the top 1% in India owning 58% of the country’s wealth), and less affluent nations can often not afford to enrich minority languages through educational materials and value knowledge of prestige-holding languages even more than wealthier countries may.

In many ways, South Africa seems as though it is a paradox of power and poverty. As mentioned, the nation enjoys one of the most progressive constitutions in the way of not only linguistic recognition but also recognition of personal rights, including socioeconomic rights; however, approximately half of all adult South Africans live in poverty, and the country struggles with a high unemployment rate. According to Chutel, 25.2% of the South African population was living in extreme poverty in 2015 – a marginal decrease from 2006’s 28.4% (2017). Many lingering effects of the apartheid era are to blame for some of these trends, as the

country's majority black population are among the most affected by poverty. Many of South Africa's youth are trapped in a cycle of poverty early on, with 43.5% of citizens below the age of 17 living in households that earn below the country's median income. This persistent disparity affects the ways in which prestige-holding languages – in this case, English and Afrikaans – maintain their superiority over many indigenous African languages.

TWO COUNTRIES' INDEPENDENCE, LINGUISTIC CONFLICTS

First, I will briefly consider historical linguistic conflict within the two countries, starting with South Africa.

South Africa

South Africa has 11 official languages. Native African languages, such as Zulu (which is spoken by nearly a quarter of the country's total population) and Xhosa, are among the most widely spoken, followed by Afrikaans and English. Afrikaans, being spoken by both Afrikaners and non-Afrikaners, is considered the language of the apartheid, as it was imposed on indigenous language speakers; English remains the language of commerce, but it also the first language of only 10 percent of the country's population. South Africa's history of apartheid, lasting roughly from 1948 to 1994, can be looked to in order to understand some of the modern-day linguistic conflicts most pertinent to this study. For example, it was the indigenous African language speaking groups who remained the most socioeconomically disenfranchised under the apartheid system; under this system of institutionalized racism, the white National Party administration segregated black South African indigenous language speakers into territorially based locations called Bantustans in an attempt to disenable them from forming collective political action. All the while, English and Afrikaans remained the languages of power in urban areas. In 1908, D.F.

Malan, a South African politician who served at the country's prime minister from 1948 to 1954, said of the Afrikaans language: "raise the Afrikaans language to a written language, let it become the vehicle for our culture, our history, our national ideals, and you will also raise the people who speak it...The Afrikaans Language Movement is nothing less than an awakening of our nation to self-awareness and to the vocation of adopting a more worthy position in world civilisation" (Monaka, 2010, p. 140). This notion is representative of how political power had become an instrument for the advancement of the language, further widening the cultural and sociopolitical divide between it and English and indigenous languages, even during the pre-apartheid period.

A result of British colonialism, English arrived in South Africa in the early nineteenth century. Following that, it was continued in the area by missionaries, administrators and settlers. During this time, there was an attempt to make English the sole language of power in legal and educational spheres; however, after the Boer War (1899-1902), English was largely considered the "language of the enemy," the enemy being the Dutch Afrikaners. Over time, English came to be perceived as the language of the social elite; it was seen as the "language of aspiration and empowerment" (Silva, 1997) for black South Africans and Afrikaners. Once the National Party rose in 1948, Afrikaans rose with it; and, even though English was the second official language, government business carried on almost exclusively in Afrikaans. Now, the language of South African government is English. According to Vivian de Klerk, "In South Africa language has now become a terrain of struggle, a struggle over the basic human right to express oneself in one's mother tongue. It is all about self-worth and belonging and is underpinned by power: economic interests, political muscle and cultural concerns (1996). Additionally, while English is largely pushed as a language representing upward mobility (as Afrikaans was as well), rural, low-income black South Africans, who were seen as inferior to the white colonials as well as the

white indigenous populations, often have the fewest resources available to learn it. Also from de Klerk, on the pernicious nature of English prevalence in South Africa:

Alongside its growth because of its perceived neutrality and its high status ... and despite a pragmatic recognition of what English can offer, there is a very real possibility that elitism, domination and social injustice, as well as personal language loss could result from the spread of English...and this is particularly true of South Africa.

Overall, English still remains the “neutral” language in South Africa and therefore the language of government and continues to hold dominance and a national level. This is because the white Afrikaners were the ones who challenged and oppressed black Bantu groups, making English the preferred language simply because it was not Afrikaans. As oppression and unofficial segregation, including the official segregation measures of the apartheid era, have cast a shadow on South African society and the power structure embedded into its multilingualism, it is widely understood that the issues of race, ethnicity and language were particularly volatile components of South African society that moved to the foreground during the apartheid era and planted themselves there since.

India

India offers another interesting case study concerning linguistic hegemony and minority language rights. India has declared Hindi as its official language, with English, originally intended to perform as a “bridge” language, as the co-official language of the Indian Union. English is also used in official purposes such as parliamentary proceedings, judiciary, communications between the central government and state government, much like it is in South Africa. However, the Constitution of India also recognizes 22 regional languages (excluding English), including Assamese, Kashmiri, Nepali and Tamil (New World Encyclopedia). India’s

history concerning use of English and its establishment as an official language alongside Hindi evolves in large part from the rule of the East India Company, during which Indian public instruction in English began in the 1830s. This trend spread throughout the 1840s and '50s, with institutions at all levels offering instruction in English for some subjects. Up until the time of India's independence in 1947, English remained the lingua franca in the country. Post-1947, Hindi was declared India's first official language. Included in the Indo-Aryan group, Hindi, spoken as a first language by nearly 425 million people, was chosen as the preferred language of instruction at the elementary level during British colonial rule; largely as a result of this choice, being a speaker of Hindi gives citizens status, as it (as well as English) is considered a language of upward social mobility.

After gaining independence, Indian rulers first saw the opportunity of uniting India by using Hindi as the single national language. Even though Gandhi and other leaders had once supported Hindustani, a compromise between Hindi and Urdu, the movement of persecuted groups such as Muslims and Hindus made political leaders feel that there was no longer a major need to compromise on behalf of the Muslim population. English was largely out of the question due to its status as a colonial language and, to many, a symbol of slavery. In 1950, the Indian constitution declared Hindi in Devanagari script to be the official language, and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru assured people that the language would not be forced on speakers in non-Hindi areas.

Comparison

Whereas India's language policy has evolved and been tested over the 70 years since its independence, South Africa's post-apartheid language policies have only been in existence following 1994, making them relatively untested. This difference offers an interesting pair of

timeframes to assess the two countries' language policies as well as assimilation trends. In India's case, linguistic competition, and regional language conflicts commenced soon after independence in 1946, as did the country's attempts to deal with these issues successfully. In South Africa, the end of the apartheid regime in 1994 marked the beginning of a new, officially equitable chapter in that country's linguistic history. In India, one of the primary concerns from the beginning of laying out official language policy was the fear regional language speakers had about being oppressed by the widespread use of Hindi. South Africa policy makers experienced similar roadblocks both in establishing official language statuses and in mitigating minority language rights.

GEOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF LANGUAGE GROUPS

When overviewing the percentages of different languages' native speakers and the number of second language speakers for each language within the country, it is clear that Hindi dominates as the first language (43.63% of population) and second language for Indian citizens. Overall, there exist more than 691 million total Hindi speakers, or 57.09% of the country's total population. The other official language of India, English, is largely considered the language of business and commerce; however, it is spoken as a native language only by roughly .02% of the country's total population, with more than 129 million more people speaking it as their second or third language. The most popular native languages following Hindi are Bengali (8.03%), Marathi (6.86%), Telugu (6.70%), Tamil (5.70%), Gujarati (4.58%) and Urdu (4.19%).

In South Africa, isiZulu is spoken natively by 22.7% (11.6 million) of the population, with isiXhosa following with roughly 16% (8.1 million) and then Afrikaans (13.5%, 6.9 million speakers) and English (9.6%, 4.9 million speakers). 15.7 speakers learned isiZulu as a second

language, and there are approximately 11 million second language-speakers of both isiXhosa and English, with 10.3 million for Afrikaans.

INTRODUCTION TO FORMAL LANGUAGE POLICY

After the Indian constitution declared Hindi as the country's official language, there was initial concern regarding the continued use of English as well. Unless Parliament decided differently, the use of English for official purposes was to end 15 years following the constitution. The Indian constitution itself, again, only covers the official statuses of Hindi and English. Even after the 1963 Official Languages Act that advocated for the use of English past 1965, in states such as Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Punjab and West Bengal, protests broke out regarding the discontinuation of English use for official purposes. In 1967, the Official Languages Act was amended to guarantee the use of both Hindi and English as official languages.

In South Africa, the dominant languages are Afrikaans and English, which are both languages of the white South Africans. However, this matter of "dominance" is not one based on number of native speakers. Some native African languages, such as isiZulu and isiXhosa, are spoken by more South Africans but remain socially inferior in the formal domain compared to Afrikaans and English. South Africa's constitution gives official status to 11 languages, and the country's provisions on language are considered relatively progressive – however, despite this, English and Afrikaans still dominate as prestige-holding languages within the formal and social spheres in the country. After 1994, there was a goal to promote language equity and bolster diversity, especially regarding awareness of marginalized African language. Additionally, some acts, boards and government programs were initiated to support these goals, such as the National

Language Service (NLS) in 1994 and the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) Act 59 in 1995. In 1997, the Ministry of Education produced a Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP) with the intention to build a “non-racial nation in South Africa” and to “facilitate communication across the barriers of colour, language and region, while at the same time creating an environment in which respect of languages other than one’s own would be encouraged.” Though South Africa did dedicate time and resources to building these organizations, privilege-holding languages have continuing holding dominance, especially in the country’s educational system.

In my rubric intended to assist scholars in analyzing the extent of equitable language policy (introduced and described in “A Rubric for Evaluating Language Policy and Outcomes” on page 34), one of the key factors contributing to a country’s overall “grade” is its attempt at formal policy that promotes the best interests of a multilingual society. However, in order to effectively study and then evaluate any country’s language policy, it is first important to consider how public policy is analyzed and what the best practices for evaluating policy are. Different sections of policy analysis are outlined in Michael Hill’s *The Publicly Policy Process*, covering a few angles that hold the most relevance to what I hope to accomplish through this thesis. Primarily, I am concerned with policy genesis in an attempt to “trace how a policy emerged, how it was implemented and what the results were” (Hill & Varone, 2014, p. 5). Also of importance is study of policy outputs, which relate to the varying outputs of resources from governments and other policy-making bodies – simply put, what intellectual and concrete resources are being devoted to a particular policy, and how does this change over time? Lastly, of course, I am interested in policy advocacy, or assessing how a policy involving multilingualism could be improved, whether through reallocation of funds or efforts to boost the policy’s efficacy. These

three areas of policy evaluation – policy origin, output and potential improvement – will provide the lenses through which I aim to assess multilingual countries’ language policy holistically.

Languages that hold a higher social and political prestige in any given state — can influence speakers of the underprivileged language to shift over to speaking the majority language in order to be afforded the same language rights (Maja, 2008). This is a pernicious issue, as it represents an inherent power imbalance while forming a sort of linguistic hierarchy in which some languages are treated as inferior to others. This issue is especially prevalent in colonized nations, and two examples of nations that have faced extensive language threats are India and South Africa. For example, in the case of South Africa, Maja says, “The cultural world of the colonized was condemned in the names of inferiority and irredeemable primitivism. The languages installed by the colonial overlords dethroned the supremacy of African languages in the affairs of Africans” (2008). Moreover, according to Benedikter, the “gap in [minority] linguistic protection leads to failings in providing adequate coverage of minority languages in the media, educational institutions, and establishments of public administration” (2010) in India. More specifically, post-colonial India has faced similar issues to South Africa, where the necessity to learn English has created an economic divide and difficulty in achieving upward mobility (Anuradha, 2015).

It is also important to note that the language one speaks has the ability to mirror cultural values and experiences, so the violation of human rights also exists as a violation to culture and a threat to one’s perception of oneself (Paz, 2013). Moving from this, “inferior” or underprivileged language threats can make mobility in a society difficult as well. For example, in postcolonial South Africa, the languages of the colonizers have extended into social and political systems, leading to the marginalization of native African languages (Maja, 2008). However, it

can become difficult to differentiate between what is a language right and what is more simply an accommodation – if arrested, do individuals who speak a “minority” language have the right to have the law stated to them in their spoken language? Instinct would often say yes. In a seemingly different situation, is it also a right for individuals who speak this same minority language to be educated in their spoken language? As increasingly complex day-to-day situations are explored using this framework, it becomes more challenging to delineate what makes something a language right or a language accommodation, something that should not be bound to law or formal policy.

In order to ultimately evaluate these two countries’ language policies and analyze their success in achieving equitable language policy, it is critical to first discuss what can and cannot be considered “equitable” in the terms of multilingual states that also have roots in colonialism and racism. First, a “language policy” itself can be understood as “a policy mechanism that impacts the structure, function, use, or acquisition of language” (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p. 509). Considering this definition, any equitable language policy is one that operates to promote fair access to one’s native language in education, legal proceedings and other societal domains. In multilingual societies, equitable language policy seeks to advance citizens’ understanding of multiculturalism and multilingual instruction while creating governmental policies that enforce tolerance, teaching and recognition of languages that are not simply the majority spoken. As for South Africa and India, language issues aren’t always a divide between minority and majority languages spoken; rather, there exist deeply entrenched systems of power connected to the use of certain languages (whether it be English or Hindi in India’s case or Afrikaans or English in South Africa).

This element, of course, is part of what makes attaining equity in language practices incredibly difficult. Looking at provisions laid out in both the Indian and South African constitutions – as well as several other efforts such as the Indian Official Languages Act or South Africa’s Language-in-Education Policy – it is clear that the governmental and societal bodies that created them truly intended to promote understanding of linguistic diversity in their countries. However, is it far more difficult to change a society’s perception of inherent linguistic value while combating historically ingrained power perceptions. Setting aside well-written documents outlining linguistic policy aimed toward promoting a more tolerant, culturally rich society, what is truly important through this study is the practical success of all efforts and their combined effect on forming a more equitable society as a whole.

ONGOING LANGUAGE CONFLICTS

Even though the two countries of India and South Africa have attempted to mitigate language issues – primarily underprivileged language issues and inherent perceptions of power connected to certain languages dominantly used in commerce, education and law – many of the countries’ governmental policies have been met with a mix of success and failure over the years. For example, the Indian Official Languages Act of 1963 and the Indian constitution itself set out to tackle the issue of English language use alongside Hindi. Though the constitution does recognize an additional 22 official regional languages, the parameters of these were not laid out in these documents. However, Article 345 states:

The Legislature of a state may by law adopt any one or more of the languages in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of that State: Provided that, until the Legislature of the State otherwise provides

by law, the English language shall continue to be used for those official purposes within the State for which it was being used immediately before the commencement of this Constitution.

In evaluating these articles, it is evident there is less focus on mitigating minority language issues and instead a primary concern of governing the use of the two official languages, Hindi and English, and deciding in which official domains they are to be utilized.

Educational practices are some of the most important considerations in achieving a state of equitable language practices. In South Africa, there persists an issue with language policy in the educational domain, with the most literate populations tending to be proficient in Afrikaans and/or English. This further contributes to a divide between these two languages and the majority African languages, as many teachers may not speak the native language of their students, leading to further failure to promote indigenous language use in the classroom and creating a greater divide in one's ability to connect to a national identity. It has also been argued that the LiEP has not been properly upheld and that the government has wrongly shifted its focus away from language policy in and out of the classroom. In fact, a 2003 report submitted to the former Minister of Education stated that the "future of the indigenous African languages as mediums of instruction is bleak unless a long-range plan is devised that could be implemented as a concerted effort over the next two to three decades." This plan would have to work at all levels – national, provincial and local – to provide adequate support for these indigenous language populations.

As mentioned, the South African constitution has often been lauded for its seemingly advanced language provisions – and, in looking at relevant articles, it is easy to understand why. For example, Articles 6, 9, 29, 31 and 35 in the constitution all seek to uphold indigenous language protection, protection from discrimination based on language and freedom for any

cultural and linguistic group to exercise their rights of expression. It is clear in these articles set forth by the South African government that there is a goal to encourage multilingualism while acknowledging past diminishments of native African languages. Additionally, PanSALB has an organization has a mission to promote South African multilingualism. According to the Pan South African Language Board Act 59, the purpose of the board is as follows: “To provide for the recognition, implementation and furtherance of multilingualism in the Republic of South Africa; and the development of previously marginalized languages: to establish a Pan South African Language Board; and to provide for matters connected thereto.”

While the establishment of such an organization does show substantial effort from the South African government to extend the progressive language rights laid out in its constitution, there is difficulty assessing its fruitfulness in actually doing so – much of which is rooted in its apparent limitations. For instance, while PanSALB is able to increase language availability in mandates such as conducting legal proceedings in indigenous African languages, it cannot in a democracy mandate which languages individuals *should* use, particularly not in nongovernmental settings. However, it must be noted that members of PanSALB have been aware of this potential issue of valuing utility over intrinsic meaningfulness of language and have released statements concerning the problem, such as its group of “positions” set forth in 1999. According to Position 6.3, “The perception that people who are not proficient in English are somehow deficient must be dispelled if we are to move successfully towards a democratic society where diversity is embraced and the interdependence of communities and different knowledges is cherished.” Though it has remained clear that the purpose of PanSALB has remained to move toward a more equitable linguistic and cultural society, as working to dispel views of intrinsic deficit is key to achieving this goal, no organization can dictate citizens’ actual

perceptions or attitudes concerning either “value” of any language nor ingrained power hierarchy of languages, where indigenous ones may fall lower in this system. In South Africa, there is the primary issue of regarding English and Afrikaans as the “dominant,” prestige-holding languages, though their numbers in terms of native speakers are far lower than other languages throughout the country.

THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA IN SHAPING LANGUAGE STATUS

Of course, a country’s media – and the language(s) in which popular media such as newspapers, television and radio is disseminated – play a large role in citizens’ feelings of connectedness to any particular culture as well as their ability to engage in sociopolitical and cultural discourse within their countries. In Indian media, similarly to much of the world in our highly interconnected and globalized viewpoint, global news is often in English due to the language’s status as a “global language”; additionally, as discussed earlier in this study, English is considered the language of commerce in India and an indication of exceptional education. As stated by Shendurnikar (2011):

The media has indeed glamorized the English language and western content because it is believed that great ideas can be generated only in English. This is of course an incorrect proposition because knowledge does not adhere to language barriers. Because of this, ideas in Indian languages are lying latent...Such is the impact of the English media that youngsters find it to be *uncool* if they are unaware of the latest English language words, songs, movies etc. An advice that would be given to a student keen to improve his/her knowledge of the English language is that he/she should religiously read English language newspapers.

While this idea is representative of the larger battle many countries are facing in the rising trend of Western media, in countries with as much linguistic diversity in India this same idea can also indicate

a threat to local news in regional languages – and this threat is indeed a dangerous one. While English media rising in popularity throughout foreign countries succeeds in including citizens who are already a part of the country’s “deliberative sphere,” as Shendurnikar describes, it often fails to include individuals who are not part of the government, other administrative spheres or who do not reside in urban areas where English is taught and spoken more commonly. When studying media’s function as an agenda setter and as a social institution of advocacy, it is clear that the struggle from regional outlets to keep up with the rise of English-language news paves the way for insidious gatekeeping practices that exclude citizens from important conversations.

As one of Africa’s major media centers, South Africa is able to maintain a considerably diverse collection of publications and broadcasters that do well in representing the nation’s diversity overall. However, it remains true that the most commonly utilized languages in media are English and Afrikaans – and media control and trends during apartheid provide an interesting modern-day structure to observe. During this time, of course, most of South African media was controlled by the white (Dutch) minority that also controlled country politics. Additionally, the National Party used censorship and had the ability to control what the media published. For example, the Publications Act of 1974 gave the South African government the “power to censor movies, plays, books, and other entertainment programs, as well as the right to decide what South Africans could or could not view” (pressreference.com). Currently, English dominates the print media, although there has recently been an attempt to increase television broadcasts in local African languages or to make use of bilingual dialogue to widen the potential audience – there are prominent news programs alternating between some of the nine official African languages and Afrikaans in addition to the news programs shown in English.

LANGUAGE POLICY AND PRACTICE IN EDUCATION

The current constitution of South Africa states the following: “Everyone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions where that education is reasonably practicable.” However, despite the fact that South Africa has 11 official languages, in practice, English and Afrikaans, the languages of the two white minorities in the country, still serve as the only effective official languages. In addition to this and similar conversations surrounding the efficacy of PanSALB, the South African Ministry of Education’s Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP) further presents efforts taken by the South African government to attempt equitable language policy, specifically in the educational sphere. This policy, which like PanSALB, recognizes South Africa’s history in the context of bolstering multicultural and multilingual understanding and states that the “inherited language-in-education policy...has been fraught with tensions, contradictions and sensitivities, and underpinned by racial and linguistic discrimination.”

Additionally, this policy was considered a necessary move to build a “non-racial” South African nation, taking into consideration the normalcy of both societal and individual multilingualism. Other notable points included in this LiEP include the mandate that at least one language – either an official or governmentally approved language – must be passed following Grade 5 graduation, that all language subjects be provided equal resources and equally allotted time during instruction and that students must choose their preferred language of instruction prior to admission to any higher education institution. Much like PanSALB, the main issues with the LiEP are found in real-world practice. The LiEP does set forth several directives that, in conjunction with PanSALB, seek to alleviate past tensions and reinforce the South African constitution’s focus on multilingualism prosperity. Of course, there exist some factors that inhibit

the successful implementation of the policy, including scarce educational resources (most notably teachers, textbooks and various academic resources) as well as possible tensions rising from “affirmative action” measures from native African languages. According to Mda, some African parents do not appreciate the notion of choice laid out in the LiEP due to their own perception that their African language schooling was one of the reasons for their educational drawbacks (1997, p. 372). This is to say that South African parents may simply not be able to see the advantage of their children having the choice to be schooled in historically diminished African languages, further pushing the narrative of dominance for languages such as English and Afrikaans. This worry is seen again in South African universities’ language requirements, which have also historically offered a sense of disparity and difference in intrinsic value in the assessment of language exams. For example, university language requirements mandated languages such as English and Afrikaans to hold more difficult “pass” requirements – often described as “A” subjects – while African languages were designated as “D” subjects.

Additionally, there are specific acts passed by the South African government during the apartheid period that directly contributed to racial and ethnic segregation – and thus linguistic segregation – in education. For example, the Bantu Education Act of 1953 demanded that all black South African Schools (approximately 90% of which were state-aided mission schools) register with the government, thus removing all control of African education from the provincial and church authorities and furthering the effort to keep back South African education separate and inferior from white South African education. Similarly, the Coloured Person's Education Act of 1963 put the Department of Coloured Affairs in charge of black South African education. This act maintained that “coloured” education be separate from white schooling.

Of course, the inequalities that persist from these policies and more are most noticeable in South African classrooms themselves. Since the establishment of the LiEP in 1997, classrooms across South Africa have seemingly only broadened the divide between English and Afrikaans and African languages. As mentioned in an article from the *Daily Maverick*, a South African daily online newspaper, all African language-speaking children must write every assessment in either English or Afrikaans from “grade 4 onwards” (2019) and also receive supplemental instruction materials in English only. Though it is true that LiEP and other governmental strides to promote multilingualism throughout the country, there is a current Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) that does not adequately support teaching in a student’s native African home language beyond grade 3. The reality here is that no departments that actually provide textbooks and other instruction materials provide these in languages other than English and Afrikaans beyond a certain year – with no textbooks beyond a grade 3 level available in any African language. This leads to a disadvantage for students going into the South African school system who are not native speakers of either English or Afrikaans, as a grade 4 child who speaks an African language at home is expected to use the same educational materials and complete the same assessments as a native English speaking child of the same age. Additionally, though most South African teachers are at least bilingual, code switching is something that is not allowed in most schools, furthering a child’s inability to speak their mother tongue during instruction and difficulty learning a new language.

As for Indian education policy, there is perhaps an even more complex focus on minority language rights, as India gives official regional status to over 20 languages other than English and Hindi. In addition to this problem, while much of South Africa’s language rights struggles stem from more prestige and power granted to languages that are actually not spoken by the

majority of the population, India's large number of spoken languages makes for a complex situation regarding minority language rights themselves. To provide an equal condition of language learning in the society and also to enhance the multilingualism in education, the government of India launched the Three Language Formula in 1957. The three prongs of this policy were to allow local language, Hindi or any other language for Hindi-speaking areas and English to be the language of instruction and also to be taught as the school subjects in secondary education. However, due to the obvious application of majority regional language, these three points often did not pan out the way they were planned. Some of the pushback from citizens that this and similar policies have experienced originates from questionable efforts set forth in the constitution to give proper attention to minority language in education rights.

In fact, the Indian constitution does not come to a clear consensus on how exactly a "minority" language should be defined; however, it was decided by members of the Kerala High Court that any linguistic or religious minority that does not meet 50 percent of the total population should enjoy the same rights granted by the constitution as any minority group. That is, the right of any distinctive linguistic group in India to conserve its distinctive language. Articles 29 and 30 of the constitution mention these rights, while Article 350 describes how best to safeguard them. Despite these mentions in the constitution, previous commissions and committees have failed to develop much in the way of a clear-cut policy to regulate minority language education. For example, in the National Policy on Education (in 1968 and 1986), there is only a passing reference of minority groups' education:

Some minority groups are educationally deprived or backward. Greater attention will be paid to the education of these groups in the interest of equality and social justice. This naturally includes the constitutional guarantees given to them to establish and administer

educational institutions and protection to their language and culture. Simultaneously, objectivity will be reflected in the preparation of text books and in all school activities, and all possible measures will be taken to promote an integration based on appreciation of common national goals and ideals, in conformity with the core curriculum.

Considering this policy was one of the most widely known national guidelines on education at the time, this passing glance at minority groups' education policies – or lack thereof, rather – is telling. With no formal policy mentioned, subsequent documents were tasked with outlining what exactly constituted a “minority” in India – and what protections individuals falling into these categories religiously, culturally and linguistically possessed.

Looking at a timeline of India's language-in-education policy, it is clear that early decisions revolved around two goals: 1) to mitigate the tensions from the Hindi vs. English debate and 2) to showcase a heightened need for multilingualism amongst students themselves. For example, in 1948, the Conference of the Vice-chancellors of the Universities recommended replacing English with Indian languages as the country-wide language of instruction at the university level. Then, almost a decade later, the Three Language Formula was suggested and then adopted by state Chief Ministers in 1961. This Three Language Formula was particularly interesting (and polarizing) because it centered around Hindi and non-Hindi speaking areas. By 1968, this formula essentially stated that in Hindi-speaking areas of the country instruction would be presented in Hindi, English and a modern Indian language (preferably a south Indian language), while in non-Hindi areas, it would be in the regional language, Hindi and in English. Though the government was at the time adamant in presenting this guideline, it was and has been highly uneven in practice. For minority language speakers, this three-pronged approach could never be so simple, as they had to add their mother tongues to the mix. As a whole, part of the

Three Language Formula's failure can be attributed to shortcomings in implementation; Hindi regions had not included any south Indian language in its curriculum, and many of the southern states simply were not ready to teach Hindi, taking into consideration the cost for instruction materials and other necessities. However, this formula has since been altered and accepted by many southern Indian states as well as northern ones, where the main three languages taught are English, Hindi, Urdu or Sanskrit. On a theoretical level, this formula can be considered a policy statement that solidly promotes multilingualism across India.

LANGUAGE POLICY AND PRACTICE IN THE APPLICATION OF LAW

Another important area that often showcases linguistic inequity is a country's legal system, as language plays a critical role in legal rights. According to Davies and Dubinsky, language restrictions are often noticeable in multilingual states' justice systems, as "all aspects of the justice system – from law enforcement to courts to penal institutions – are conducted in the dominant or state language, which shuts out or puts at a disadvantage non-speakers (and non-proficient speakers) of that language" (2018, p.162). In 2017, the South African government declared that all court proceedings would be recorded in English only. This decision has been met with mixed reviews. Because English is a language that is understood by all South African judges (and because this was the basis for the decision), some feel it is imbalanced that the decision be weighed based on judges' comprehension rather than the individuals whose lives hinge on the legal results of the legal proceedings.

The language of the law in India is also English. However, in 2019, India's Supreme Court released plans to become the first apex court to designate multiple languages to delivering verdicts. These languages will be Telugu, Assamese, Hindi, Kannada (a Dravidian language

spoken predominantly in southwestern India) and Odia (official language in the state of Odisha). According to the Court, these five additional languages were chosen based on volumes of incoming appeals and were chosen with attention given to non-Hindi-speaking states especially.

A RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING LANGUAGE POLICY AND OUTCOMES

When evaluating the language policies of both India and South Africa, it is clear that both countries' complex historical backgrounds regarding language, most notably the struggle between English and native languages, made achieving equitable language policy in practice incredibly difficult. Through policies and organizations such as the LiEP and PanSALB in South Africa, there was a clear effort to promote multilingualism amongst individuals while retaining awareness of past cultural, racial and linguistic tensions. However, despite South Africa's largely commendable efforts to create policy with the goal of promoting multilingualism, the government has been met with criticism and worry that progress is being made too slowly – a point that the government has, somewhat surprisingly, acknowledged. In 2007, Thabo Mbeki, then-president of South Africa, stated that the fate of African languages, particularly in educational and media spheres, was unsure. Additionally, the 2006 Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, stated that the 1997 Language-in-Education Policy was not “implemented convincingly” up to that point. It seems that when it comes to language policy, South Africa has been caught between its original intention and actual implementation of many plans and promises, making most policies relatively ineffective and therefore not representative of equity in practice. In the long run, it seems that a combination of factors – namely the position of English as a more “powerful” language in South Africa as well as certain negative perceptions of the functionality of native African languages – have caused the South African government to put language issues

on the backburner, despite a progressive constitution and impressive policy plans. Unfortunately, this has led to the status and perceptions of many African languages being unchanged over the years.

In India, acts such as the Official Languages Act of 1963 further widened the divide between Hindi and non-Hindi speakers while upholding official status of English, a language that many Indians felt was a reminder of slavery and colonialism. Additionally, the Three-Language Formula has been largely ineffective due to a lack of interest and support among students as well as a lack in teachers and other resources needed to successfully implement the formula.

In developing a rubric to apply to multilingual states' efficacy in managing minority language rights and other aspects of their multilingual societies, it is first important to establish a theoretical multilingual utopia and dystopia, earning grades of "A" and "F" respectively concerning the three key issues multilingual states face that have been presented throughout this thesis: formal language policy and its efficacy in defending citizens' language rights, how widely multilingualism is accepted in a country's educational domain and the extent of language protection in a country's legal proceedings. I will also include a country's ability to uphold linguistic equity in its media and the effect of wealth disparity on language accommodations. In a multilinguistic utopia, or a country receiving the highest marks in all of these categories, multilingualism would present no obstacles to citizens' cultural, civil or education rights, with all languages being fully and equally recognized by the country's government and respected by the society. There would be no notion of prestige and non-prestige languages because there would exist true formal and socially equity among all speakers. Additionally, the language(s) one speaks would have no effect on their ability to engage with their country's media and would have no socioeconomic effects. Conversely, a country receiving failing marks in these categories

would present itself as a dictatorship, obstructing minority language-speaking and multilingual citizens’ everyday lives. Any country receiving an “F” in any of these categories would result in there being a direct violation and oppression of someone based on their language. The rubric that outlines these grading tiers, much like an academic rubric, is laid out here:

Linguistic Freedom Index

Category	“Free” A	“Mostly Free” B	“Moderately Free” C	“Mostly Unfree” D	“Repressed” F
Formal Policy	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed thoroughly in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is abundant, and it is made clear that no language is more dominant than another	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant. There are dominant, official languages that receive certain levels of prestige	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is absent from most – if not all – documents	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation. There exists oppression solely based on linguistic group identity, and there is no formal legislation to protect speakers of underprivileged languages
Education	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in all spoken languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Teachers are multilingual and encourage students to learn in whichever language is most beneficial. Materials are available in all locally spoken languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages, though they are not always widely provided or encouraged	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged, and students are often forced to speak in a language different from their native tongues. Materials may be available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged. Students not allowed to speak in their native tongues. Materials are not available in multiple languages
Law	The country’s legal system serves documents to citizens in languages of their preference. Court decisions are decided in the language of the citizen’s preference. The language a citizen speaks does not, in any way, obstruct his/her civil liberties.	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including minority/indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties, but it may make navigating the court more difficult	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks could and often does obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks often obstructs his/her civil liberties, as there is tight control on what language(s) can be spoken and formally appear in legal proceedings
Media freedom	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are always translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets do not release information in many languages. There are sometimes translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages	Media outlets do not release information in many languages and strictly adhere to certain language policies. There are no translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages
Wealth disparity	The language(s) one speaks has no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is equally attainable for all, regardless of what language(s) they speak	The language(s) one speaks has little to no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is easily attainable regardless of language	The language(s) one speaks may have an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields may require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields that provide upward mobility often require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country because certain fields that provide upward mobility require knowledge in a privileged language

Evaluating South Africa

As a whole, South Africa earns close to a “Mostly Free” rating in formal policy creation, making studying its language conflict especially interesting. Even though the South African constitution was considered advanced in terms of presenting its language issues and developing subsequent policies, laws and organizations to combat language inequity, much of this inequity still exists in the country’s educational and legal spheres.

Because of South Africa’s large disconnect between South Africa’s education policies that seek to uphold the value of multilingualism in society, the reality of many schools is choice of English or Afrikaans as the medium of instruction rather than instructing in many of the students’ mother tongue. Additionally, the practice of code switching in formal instruction is not allowed in some South African schools. The language policies of many schools are determined by the School Governing Body (SGB), consisting of the institution’s principal and elected members, who are often teachers or the parents/legal guardians of students. Because many parents and guardians desire maximum English language exposure for the students, decisions that are born from SGBs are often laden with bias against African language inclusion. Because of these factors, South Africa receives a “Mostly Unfree” grade on language equity in its educational sphere. The country could benefit in this area from a reallocation of funds while revisiting the goals laid out in previous legislation, such as its LiEP, while promoting the use of African languages as well as code switching in a classroom setting.

In its legal sphere, the English language dominates. Before the country’s shift to democracy, Afrikaans and English were the only languages used in legal and governmental affairs. In 1996, the constitution set out to paint a more equitable picture for all 11 official languages. However, there has been little done since then to make many of this provisions a

reality, upholding the dominance of the English language in South African government and law. For this, South Africa receives a “Mostly Unfree” rating. In order to improve its system and establish a more equitable court system for all citizens, documents must be served and available in multiple languages, increasing accessibility and shifting the focus on the citizens being tried or otherwise involved in the judicial system and not those in positions of power within the government.

In South African media, there is effort to increase broadcaster diversity, with mainstream news outlets utilizing several South African languages. However, English remains dominant in the media realm. For this, South Africa receives a “Mostly Unfree” rating for its media image.

Additionally, there exists great wealthy inequity in South African society, with rural black South Africans being among the most affected. This persistent disparity affects the ways in which prestige-holding languages – in this case, English and Afrikaans – maintain their superiority over many indigenous African languages. For this, South Africa receives a “Repressed” status when studying language effects on economic disparity. The following is where South Africa stands as a whole based on the rubric:

Category	“Free” A	“Mostly Free” B	“Moderately Free” C	“Mostly Unfree” D	“Repressed” F
Formal Policy	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed thoroughly in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is abundant, and it is made clear that no language is more dominant than another	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant. There are dominant, official languages that receive certain levels of prestige	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is absent from most – if not all – documents	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation. There exists oppression solely based on linguistic group identity, and there is no formal legislation to protect speakers of underprivileged languages
Education	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in all spoken languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Teachers are multilingual and encourage students to learn in whichever language is most beneficial. Materials are available in all locally spoken languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages, though they are not always widely provided or encouraged	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged, and students are often forced to speak in a language different from their native tongues. Materials may be available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged. Students not allowed to speak in their native tongues. Materials are not available in multiple languages
Law	The country’s legal system serves documents to citizens in languages of their preference. Court decisions are decided in the language of the citizen’s preference. The language a citizen speaks does not, in any way, obstruct his/her civil liberties.	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including minority/indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties, but it may make navigating the court more difficult	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks could and often does obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks often obstructs his/her civil liberties, as there is tight control on what language(s) can be spoken and formally appear in legal proceedings
Media freedom	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are always translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets do not release information in many languages. There are sometimes translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages	Media outlets do not release information in many languages and strictly adhere to certain language policies. There are no translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages
Wealth disparity	The language(s) one speaks has no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is equally attainable for all, regardless of what language(s) they speak	The language(s) one speaks has little to no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is easily attainable regardless of language	The language(s) one speaks may have an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields may require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields that provide upward mobility often require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country because certain fields that provide upward mobility require knowledge in a privileged language

Evaluating India

The Indian constitution, adopted in 1950, and the 1963 Official Languages Act have the basis of language policy in the country. Even though India recognizes 22 regional languages (plus English), the truth is that there are more than 100 other languages that are prevalent throughout the country. There are languages with billions of native speakers, such as the spoken language of Bhili, that are denied the same status as other regional languages. Due to political intervention, these languages will likely never be recognized in an equal capacity as their prominence in Indian civilization. Because of this factor, India receives a “Mostly Unfree” rating within its formal policy, often falling short in application of equitable language policy as well as effectively and clearly outlining these policies in formal documents.

Much of language policy in India’s education system can be attributed to the implementation of the Three-Language Policy. Though education in India is highly multilingual – with primary schools in Mumbai running in up to nine different languages and those in West Bengal running in 14 – there are many issues with the real-world application of the Three-Language Policy that contribute to the upholding of Hindi and English alone. For example, many states have chosen to adopt the policy only partially, whittling it down to use of English and Hindi. Overall, India receives a “Moderately Free” rating regarding multilingual promotion in its educational sphere.

In India’s Supreme and High Courts, English is used, as it is the language of the law. Additionally, only lawyers who are competent in the English language present to the court at the appellate level. With the 2019 decision by the Indian Supreme Court to deliver verdicts in multiple languages, it is clear that increasing accessibility to the legal system is something that

the country is attempting. With this change, India will receive a “Moderately Free” rating for its language policy in the legal sphere based off the rubric.

India’s media is diverse, as many regions have their own newspapers and media systems in their own languages. One example is the widely read *Malayala Manorama* newspaper published in Kerala, India, which is, according to the World Association of Newspapers, one of the most circulated newspapers in the world. It is also the third largest newspaper in all of India. Because of India’s ability to create media that continuously brings in readership, the country receives a media status of “Moderately Free.”

India’s wealth disparity as affected by language is vast. As started earlier, India is quickly making strides in economic development; however, there still exists much economic disparity within the densely populated country. Less affluent nations can often not afford to enrich minority languages through educational materials and value knowledge of prestige-holding languages over underprivileged ones. Because of this, India receives a “Mostly Unfree” rating. The following presents India’s overall scores according to the rubric:

Category	“Free” A	“Mostly Free” B	“Moderately Free” C	“Mostly Unfree” D	“Repressed” F
Formal Policy	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed thoroughly in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is abundant, and it is made clear that no language is more dominant than another	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant	Potential issues of multilingualism are addressed in country’s constitution and legislation. Language policy is abundant. There are dominant, official languages that receive certain levels of prestige	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation; language policy is absent from most – if not all – documents	Potential issues of multilingualism are not addressed in country’s constitution and other legislation. There exists oppression solely based on linguistic group identity, and there is no formal legislation to protect speakers of underprivileged languages
Education	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in all spoken languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Teachers are multilingual and encourage students to learn in whichever language is most beneficial. Materials are available in all locally spoken languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools promote instruction in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. Code-switching is present and encouraged to boost learning. Materials are available in multiple languages, though they are not always widely provided or encouraged	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged, and students are often forced to speak in a language different from their native tongues. Materials may be available in multiple languages	‘K-12’ schools do not promote instruction in multiple languages. Code-switching is not encouraged. Students not allowed to speak in their native tongues. Materials are not available in multiple languages
Law	The country’s legal system serves documents to citizens in languages of their preference. Court decisions are decided in the language of the citizen’s preference. The language a citizen speaks does not, in any way, obstruct his/her civil liberties.	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system allows for documents to be served in multiple languages, including minority/indigenous languages. The language a citizen speaks does not obstruct his/her civil liberties, but it may make navigating the court more difficult	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks could and often does obstruct his/her civil liberties	The country’s legal system does not allow for documents to be served in multiple languages. The language a citizen speaks often obstructs his/her civil liberties, as there is tight control on what language(s) can be spoken and formally appear in legal proceedings
Media freedom	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are always translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages in equal parts. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets release information in many languages. There are often translations available of major news, and no one citizen is shut out from cultural or social commentary based on his/her language	Media outlets do not release information in many languages. There are sometimes translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages	Media outlets do not release information in many languages and strictly adhere to certain language policies. There are no translations available of major news, and citizens may be shut out from certain conversations based on their languages
Wealth disparity	The language(s) one speaks has no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is equally attainable for all, regardless of what language(s) they speak	The language(s) one speaks has little to no effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country. Upward economic mobility is easily attainable regardless of language	The language(s) one speaks may have an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields may require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country, as certain fields that provide upward mobility often require knowledge in a privileged language	The language(s) one speaks often has an effect on their economic opportunities or wealth disparity within the country because certain fields that provide upward mobility require knowledge in a privileged language

Conclusion

It is true that one country, or one country's administrative body, cannot simply govern away linguistic inequity. It is as pervasive and historically supported as other human rights affronts, and its effects often bleed into discussions concerning civil, intellectual and governmental liberty. Though India and South Africa, along with many other multilingual countries, have attempted to mitigate the struggles a multilingual society can face in everyday life, the reality and complexity of these situations often calls for substantial time, effort and resources to truly make language policy effective and equitable. As a whole, multilingual states can lead to conflict extending beyond the world of politics and threatening peace, civil liberty and individual well-being. For both South Africa and India, official languages have, in many ways, supplanted indigenous ones, contributing to a major issue: the translation of being proficient in an official language to having more prospects in social mobility, which is an especially important factor in countries that experience extreme economic inequality (which both India and South Africa do). There is no doubt that living in a multilingual state can produce tension about ethnic groups across governmental, educational and other realms – but it is not something that is easy to effectively mediate in any case.

Works cited

Anuradha, Kanniganti. "Language and Inequality in India: Language Rights or English for All?"

SASE: The London School of Economics and Political Science. 2 July 2015. Retrieved from: <https://sase.confex.com/sase/2015am/webprogram/Paper3360.html>

Benedikter, Thomas. *Minority Languages in India: An Appraisal of the Linguistic Rights of Minorities in India*. Europe-South Asia Exchange on Supranational (Regional) Policies and Instruments for the Promotion of Human Rights and the Management of Minority Issues. 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.gfbv.it/3dossier/asia/india2013.pdf>.

Chutel, L. (2017, August 25). Post-apartheid South Africa is failing the very people it liberated. Retrieved from <https://qz.com/africa/1061461/post-apartheid-south-africa-is-failing-the-very-people-it-liberated/>

Collins, J. "The Ebonics controversy in context: Literacies, subjectivities and language ideologies in the United States". In J. Blommaert (ed.), *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 201-34. 1999.

Coulmas, F. (2018). *An Introduction to Multilingualism: Language in a Changing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, W. D., & Dubinsky, S. (2018). *Language Conflict and Language Rights: Ethnolinguistic Perspectives on Human Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, M. J. (2014). *The Public Policy Process*. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Public_Policy_Process.html?id=ybcTLtsOv

RUC

- Hornberger, N.H. and Johnson, D.C. (2007), Slicing the Onion Ethnographically: Layers and Spaces in Multilingual Language Education Policy and Practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41: 509-532. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00083.x
- Languages of India. (2020, March 17). Retrieved April 1, 2020, from https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Languages_of_India
- Maja, Innocent. Towards the Human Rights Protection of Minority Languages in Africa, 2008. Hauser Global Law School Program. Retrieved from http://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/Minority_Languages_Africa.html#_3.2_African_human
- Mda, T. (1997). Issues in the Making of South Africa's Language in Education Policy. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 66(4), 366-375. doi:10.2307/2668164
- Monaka, K. C. (n.d.). Mapping Africa in the English speaking world : issues in language and literature. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from <https://www.worldcat.org/title/mapping-africa-in-the-english-speaking-world-issues-in-language-and-literature/oclc/732967716>
- Paz, Moria. The Failed Promise of Language Rights: A Critique of the International Language Rights Regime, 2013. *Harvard International Law Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 1, Winter 2013. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2526534>
- Shendurnikar, N. (2011). Media for the Masses: The changing face of regional languages in Indian Media.
- Silva, Penny. (1997). "South African English: Oppressor or Liberator?" Accessed April 4, 2020. webcitation.org/60W7pbgQ2.