



Rutu Foundation for Intercultural Multilingual Education

Alternative Report in relation to the combined twenty-second to twenty-fourth reports of the Netherlands to the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

101st session (20 April – 08 May 2020)

Language Based Exclusion, Punishment and Discrimination in Dutch Education

submitted 27 March 2020

RUTU FOUNDATION FOR INTERCULTURAL MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

Contribution to the combined twenty-second to twenty-fourth reports of the Netherlands to the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) concerning

Violations of Convention Articles 2, 5(d)(viii) and 5(e)(v), and 7

Language Based Exclusion, Punishment and Discrimination in Dutch Education

submitted for the 101st session (20 April – 08 May 2020)

27 March 2020

Contents

ABOUT THE RUTU FOUNDATION.....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
ISSUES/ THEMES IDENTIFIED BY THIS COMMITTEE.....	5
DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION	6
VIOLETIONS OF ICERD AND OBSTACLES TO ACHIEVING FULL IMPLEMENTATION	12
CONCLUSIONS	18
RECOMMENDED QUESTION FOR THE CERD COMMITTEE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS	18
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	18

ABOUT THE RUTU FOUNDATION

The Rutu Foundation for Intercultural Multilingual Education (www.rutufoundation.org) is a non-profit organization based in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, founded in 2011 to support indigenous children and children with a migrant or minority background who speak a different mother tongue than the school language. We train teachers, develop multilingual materials and raise awareness among education practitioners, parents and policy makers about the benefits of mother tongue and multilingual education.

With the **Language Friendly School** (www.languagefriendlyschool.org), established in 2019, the Rutu Foundation has operationalized our goal to envision a world in which every child has access to a language friendly learning environment, and no child is punished for using his or her mother tongue at school. As of March 2020, there are two Language Friendly Schools in the Netherlands and one in Canada, with ten more schools in the process of becoming a Language Friendly School. Being a Language Friendly School means that the schools have committed in writing that they will not punish, prohibit or exclude students or their parents for using their home language at school; and that they will develop, implement and evaluate their own Language Friendly School-plan within two years.¹

Rutu Foundation for Intercultural Multilingual Education

R.J.H. Fortuynstraat 185
1019 WK Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Phone: +31-20-7892562
email: ellen-rose@rutufoundation.org
website: www.rutufoundation.org

This report was written by Dr. Ellen-Rose Kambel, executive director Rutu Foundation and Dr. Deena Hurwitz, JD, member Rutu International Advisory Board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In every part of the world—the Netherlands included—children belonging to indigenous groups, linguistic minorities, and migrant communities have been and continue to be prohibited from and punished for using their mother tongue in classes or on school grounds. Singling out these children (and their parents) in this way is an act of discrimination perpetrated by the State and state actors in educational settings. Punishments have been physical, including beatings, being placed outside the classroom in a dirt sack (Uganda) and wearing the ‘Not’, a board around the neck with a sign indicating the transgression (India, Haiti, Taiwan and other countries). They have been psychological, for example giving out awards or praising children for not speaking their mother tongue, and asking parents not to speak their home language with their children when they are at school. These are all violations of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) rights to non-discrimination in education and freedom of expression (Art. 5(d)(viii) and (e)(v)).

In the Netherlands, although quantitative data is lacking, there are strong indications that the practice of prohibiting students (and their parents) from speaking a language other than Dutch in school, including

¹ More information available at www.languagefriendlyschool.org.

on the playground, or when dropping off and picking up children, or conversing with other parents, is widespread.

Such discrimination inhibits children’s right to education and identity, protected expressly in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Art. 29—*education should be directed towards respect for the child’s parents, his or her cultural identity, language and values*); and is a key part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Goal 4 on Quality Education).² While the ICERD does not expressly refer to language, it is implied in the definition of racial discrimination (Art. 1), and General Recommendations issued by this Committee.

When children are discriminated against in school, humiliated by teachers and bullies, or regularly punished, their social, economic, cognitive, and emotional development is greatly hindered. They feel greater shame for who they are; they feel even more like outsiders at school; and they perform worse academically than children in schools where such practices do not occur. These children drop out at higher rates, or even are forced out of educational institutions (as in the case of a Dutch-Turkish secondary school student in 2013, *see infra, section on Description of the Situation, Box 3*). This significantly reduces their future earning potential, and deepens the inequities between dominant and minority groups.

Yet, particularly in the Netherlands, the suppression of home languages has become thoroughly internalized because of the persistent belief that ‘forgetting’ one’s mother tongue and speaking the dominant language is the only way to achieve economic and social success.

The Rutu Foundation calls on the Committee to address language exclusion, discrimination and punishment in education perpetrated against students with a migrant, ethnic or linguistic minority in the Netherlands as part of the State’s obligation to eliminate racial discrimination. We ask that the State collect data on language discrimination in education, develop an anti-language discrimination awareness campaign, and institutionalize teacher training on multilingual education.

INTRODUCTION

In 2017, then U.N. Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák-Ndiaye (currently a member of this Committee), published *Language Rights of Linguistic Minorities, A Practical Guide for Implementation* “to assist policymakers and rights holders to understand the full scope of linguistic rights of linguistic minorities for their practical implementation.”³ As she explained,

‘[l]anguage rights’ and ‘linguistic rights’ are human rights that have an impact on the language preferences or use of state authorities, individuals, and other entities. Language is central to human nature and culture, and is one of the most important expressions of identity. Issues surrounding language are therefore particularly emotive and significant to linguistic minority communities seeking to maintain their distinct group and cultural identities, sometimes under conditions of marginalization, exclusion and discrimination.⁴

² U.N. Sustainable Development Goals Knowledge Platform, Targets and Indicators, *available at*: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4>.

³ *Language Rights of Linguistic Minorities, A Practical Guide for Implementation*, UN Special Rapporteur on minority issues, c/o Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (March 2017) [*hereinafter* “Language Rights Guide”], p 3, *available at*: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Minorities/SR/LanguageRightsLinguisticMinorities_EN.pdf.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 5.

The Rutu Foundation welcomes the combined twenty-second to twenty-fourth Report of the Government of the Netherlands [hereinafter “State Report”], and appreciates the State’s concern for addressing and eliminating all direct and indirect racial discrimination, and measures taken towards that end. We note in particular the recognition that “discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity and racism merit specific attention”.⁵

We find, however, that language-based exclusion and punishment in the schools is unnoticed or obscured—if not justified for the sake of “civic integration”—in the Netherlands. For this reason, we appreciate this opportunity to call these issues to the attention of the Committee.

We consider the issues of bilingual education, e.g., using the students’ mother tongue as a language of instruction and as part of the curriculum, to be an important, yet separate matter. This report focuses solely on the right of students (and their parents) not to be discriminated against, excluded, restricted or punished for using their mother tongue on school grounds. We do wish to point out that many children, both in the Caribbean and the Dutch part of the Kingdom, are taught in what is for them a foreign or second language as if it were their mother tongue. They are instructed by teachers who are not trained and receive no support on how to teach Dutch (or English) as a second or foreign language, while the students’ home languages are expected to be left behind and forgotten. We welcome the Committee’s prior Recommendations regarding Aruba and Curaçao⁶, and request for information concerning inclusion of access to education in minority languages in St. Maarten.⁷ We urge the Committee to continue looking into this issue and request information from the State about the role of the language of instruction in all the islands as well as the Dutch part of the Kingdom. For lack of information about the situation on language-based exclusion, punishment and discrimination in the Caribbean islands of the Kingdom, this report will focus mainly on the Netherlands.

ISSUES/ THEMES IDENTIFIED BY THIS COMMITTEE

With regard to institutional and policy frameworks for implementing the provisions of the Convention and the situation of national and ethnic minorities, this Alternative Report addresses the following issues raised by the Committee in the List of Themes:⁸

- measures toward the elaboration of an action plan against racial discrimination and the development of local anti-discrimination policies; their impacts; and resources allocated to municipalities (para. 4);
- data on the prevalence and number of complaints concerning acts of racial discrimination (para. 5);
- impacts of education and awareness-raising measures to combat racial discrimination (para. 6); and
- access to education in minority languages (para. 17).

⁵ *Twenty-second to twenty-fourth periodic reports submitted by the Netherlands under article 9 of the Convention*, U.N. Doc. CERD/C/NLD/22-24, 4 March 2019 [hereinafter “State Report”], para. 19.

⁶ CERD Committee, *Concluding observations on the combined nineteenth to twenty-first periodic reports of the Netherlands*, U.N. Doc. CERD/C/NLD/CO/19-21, 24 Sept. 2015 [hereinafter CERD/C/NLD/CO/19-21”], para. 32.

⁷ *List of themes in relation to the combined twenty-second to twenty-fourth reports of the Netherlands*, U.N. Doc. CERD/C/NLD/Q/22-24, [hereinafter List of Themes”], 17 February 2019.

⁸ *Id.*, para. 17.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

As the former UN Youth Ambassador for the Netherlands, Jahkini Bisselink relates, students with a migrant or minority background who speak an additional language at home are faced with a variety of biases and a lack of understanding among teachers regarding their bilingualism (*see* Box 1). As we explain in this report, they are also frequently prohibited from and sometimes even punished for using their mother tongue in classes or on school grounds.

Box 1. Jahkini Bisselink

This is an excerpt from a statement written in 2016 and published in 2017 when former UN Youth Ambassador for the Netherlands, Jahkini Bisselink was enrolled in a bilingual education programme at a high school (5VWO) in Amsterdam.⁹

[...] My mother is from a small town in the Netherlands, Groessen to be exact, and she speaks Dutch. My father, on the other hand, was born in what is formerly known as British Guiana. In Guyana they speak English. The Guyanese version of English is comparable to Jamaican English, as they both are sometimes grammatically different from standard English. At home I speak English with my father and Dutch with my mother.

In elementary school, my bilingualism soon became a problem for my teachers. In the first grade, they introduced a ‘moon-star-sun system’. Getting a ‘moon’ was the worst, a ‘star’ meant acceptable and a ‘sun’ referred to the best. This system mainly served to indicate the student’s attitude in class and to give an impression of how well the student was able to deal with the curriculum. In the third grade this system became a problem for me.

Despite the fact that my grades were always around 8 [out of 10], I would always receive a ‘moon’. Each year, this system, despite the results obtained in the past, was transferred from teacher to teacher. One day, one of my teachers advised me, in a coercive tone, to stop speaking English at home.

Entering fifth grade was a crucial moment, as this is the year in which the school gives an advice which level of high school education you should follow after elementary school. Because the moon system had been passed on year after year, my teachers told me “we advise you go on to MAVO [the lowest academic level], and, if you work hard, you might be able to go to HAVO”. A year later, I got a new teacher who told me that he would look at the results I had obtained for my exams instead of looking at the moon-star-sun system. Eventually, I received the advice to go on to HAVO/VWO after elementary school and after one year, I moved on to a Dutch/English bilingual programme at VWO level, which is the highest academic level in the Netherlands.

During high school, my bilingualism was naturally encouraged, as I was following a bilingual programme. Teachers, however, noticed that my grammar was not up to standard. They advised me to take a dyslexia test. I followed their advice and the outcome of the test was once again striking. After the test, we received a report stating that: “it seems very unlikely that she will be able to obtain her VWO degree” and “she has a serious language deficiency in comparison to other VWO students”. It stated that I had a language deficiency, but not dyslexia. Not *once* in this test did they ask me whether I was bilingual, or if Dutch was even my mother tongue.

To make a long story short: in my experience people and especially teachers still consider bilingualism a handicap rather than a benefit.

Although there is no data collected in the Netherlands on the number of languages spoken, it is estimated that there are some 2 million people living in the Netherlands who speak an additional language than

⁹Jahkini Bisselink, Hoe meertaligheid mijn schoolcarrière heeft beïnvloed [How Multilingualism Influenced My School Career], in: O. Agirdag & E.R. Kambel (eds.), Orhan Agirdag & E.R. Kambel (editors), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs [Multilingualism and Education: Dutch Plus]*. Amsterdam: Boom Publishers., pg. 131-132.

Dutch.¹⁰ A quarter of the Dutch school population has a migrant background.¹¹ And in the largest cities, it is estimated that the majority of school children have a migrant background and are multilingual. Yet, only Dutch is recognized as the official language in the Netherlands,¹² the education system is geared exclusively towards native Dutch speaking students and few teachers are prepared for teaching in multilingual classrooms.¹³ The languages spoken by Dutch students are almost uniformly ignored in the Dutch education system. The sole focus is on learning Dutch, to the exclusion of their home languages.

Not only are students discouraged from developing their home languages academically, they are also restricted from and sometimes punished for speaking their mother tongues to their friends on the school grounds or in the classroom. Punishments for speaking home languages at school have included writing lines (“I will only speak Dutch”)¹⁴ and, in at least one documented case, have resulted in expulsion from school (*see* Box 3 below). More often, the exclusionary and discriminating practices take the form of warnings and admonishing students to only speak Dutch at school. This also includes parents who are told not to speak their home language with their children when they take them to school or pick them up (*see statement by Dr. Le Pichon-Vorstman*, Box 2).¹⁵

Box 2. Dr. Emmanuelle Le Pichon-Vorstman

My name is Emmanuelle Le Pichon-Vorstman. I am currently Assistant Professor at the University of Toronto and Director of the Centre de Recherche en Education Franco-Ontarienne at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. In 2011, I had just completed my dissertation on plurilingual children in international schools and measured all the benefits on the intellectual, emotional and social health of children and their families. Back in the Netherlands since 2006, my children were attending a school in a village, the eldest being 11 years old, the second 9, the third 8 and the last 5. At that time, I was working as an assistant professor at the University of Utrecht and leading a project on children with a migration background. One day, when I was picking up my youngest daughter from school, I was surprised to hear the teacher make this strange request. She looked embarrassed and gave me

¹⁰ Royal Dutch Academy for Science (KNAW), *Talen voor Nederland [Languages for the Netherlands]*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2018, pg. 6 (available at: <https://www.knaw.nl/nl/actueel/publicaties/talen-voornederland>).

¹¹ Education Inspectorate, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (2019). *De Staat van het Onderwijs 2019 [The State of Education 2019]*, pg. 54. (available at: <https://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl/onderwerpen/staat-van-het-onderwijs/documenten/rapporten/2019/04/10/rapport-de-staat-van-het-onderwijs-2019>)

¹² The minority languages Frisian, Limburgish, Lower Saxon, Yiddish and Sinti-Romanes are recognized as regional languages. In the Dutch Caribbean (Bonaire, St. Eustatius and Saba) Dutch is the official language, while Papiamentu and English are allowed to be used in education, in contact with the government and in the judicial system. Website Government of the Netherlands: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/erkende-talen/vraag-en-antwoord/erkende-talen-nederland>

¹³ National Center for Expertise in Curriculum Development (SLO), *Meertaligheid in primair en voortgezet Onderwijs. Een stand van zaken en curriculaire aanbevelingen [Multilingualism in primary and secondary education. A state of affairs and curricular recommendations]*, 2018, pg. 5 (available at: <https://slo.nl/publicaties/@4625/meertaligheid/>).

¹⁴ K. D., 29 Sept 2018, Personal communication with Executive Director Rutu Foundation. Mr. D. whose parents are from Ghana, recalled that some five years ago he and his friends from Suriname and the Dutch Antilles had to write “punishment lines” (*strafregels*) when they were heard speaking Ghanaian, Sranan or Papiamentu at his primary school in Amsterdam.

¹⁵ See also: university teacher Eowyn Crisfield who said many of her former students with a migrant background told her they were punished at school for speaking their mother tongue (Stop deze kinderen te vertellen dat ze hun eigen taal niet mogen spreken / Stop telling these children that they are not allowed to speak their own language), *in: De Kennis van Nu*, 4 October 2016, available at <https://dekennisvannu.nl/site/artikel/Stop-deze-kinderen-te-vertellen-dat-ze-hun-eigen-taal-niet-mogen-spreken/8524>.) In 2019, a Turkish parent participating in an experiment with bilingual teaching materials stated she was [now] welcome at the school, that she was allowed to use her own language, which had not been the case in the past. E.R. Kambel, *Synthesis Report AVTOR Case Studies*, Amsterdam 2019, pg. 21, available at https://avior.risbo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Synthesis-Report-Avior-Case-Studies-Parental-Involvement-Final_def2.pdf.

this message from the management. She asked me not to speak French with my children in the school yard or in the classroom. I asked her the reason for this decision. She replied after much hesitation that they had made the same request to the Moroccan parents who had replied that if I spoke French with my children, why couldn't they speak their language with theirs. You must also understand that French was taught in this school! I was surprised by the anger I felt at that moment. I also went to talk to the Moroccan mothers who were even more angry than I was. As the discussion continued, the management told me: "You are the guests, we are the hosts. You have to abide by our rules." I even went to a law firm and was surprised to learn that they couldn't/didn't want to do anything for me. I never stopped speaking French with my children, not in the yard, not in the classroom, not anywhere else, but I learned that day that to reject one person's language is to exclude that whole person. In fact, our relationship with the management team never fully recovered from this episode.

Toronto, 20 March 2020

One Dutch school director confessed that only a few years ago, parents would be politely asked to leave the school building if they were 'caught' speaking another language at school:

"...Amsteltaal [a primary school for newly arrived students in the city of Amstelveen] did not always welcome other languages. "A few years ago," the principal remembered, "we genuinely believed that just speaking Dutch really was better." She said she was ashamed to say that a few years ago they would ask parents who were conversing among each other in their own language to either switch to Dutch or continue the conversation outside. However, she also admitted that this happened less frequently when the language spoken was English. But they have completely changed their approach. Now Amsteltaal views languages differently and acknowledges that prohibiting or punishing use of mother tongues creates a poor language environment in which children learn to speak both languages sub-optimally."¹⁶

There is no data on the extent to which these practices occur. The Rutu Foundation has been collecting information in the form of testimonials from teachers, parents and students. Since 2018, we have organized [public meetings](#) with multilingual parents in Amsterdam to discuss these issues.¹⁷ Our research so far indicates that these practices are widespread. A study about teacher beliefs and attitudes on multilingualism in three different Dutch cities found that "the vast majority of teachers would not allow their pupils to speak their mother tongues in class".¹⁸

We believe that singling out students (and their parents) who speak a language other than Dutch in this way is an act of discrimination perpetrated by the State and state actors in educational settings. These are violations of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) rights to non-discrimination in education and freedom of expression (Art. 5(d)(viii) and (e)(v)), as we will discuss more extensively in the next section.

The practices are so ingrained however, that parents and students have come to believe this is the 'normal' way of doing things at school in the Netherlands. Lacking information, parents especially may feel helpless to take action. Because they do not notify institutions charged with protecting children's and minorities' rights (e.g., the Children's Ombudsperson in the Netherlands, Anti-Discrimination Bureaus, national human rights institutions, and NGOs such as Defense for Children International), these organisations and state agencies may be unaware that such practices occur. Parents generally have no knowledge of States'

¹⁶ AVIOR Study Visit Amsterdam Report, 10 -12 April 2019, p. 15, available at: https://avior.risbo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Study-Visit-Amsterdam_def.pdf

¹⁷ <https://www.rutufoundation.org/multilingual-amsterdam/>

¹⁸ M. di Maio, *Teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge on multilingualism in Dutch primary education: a qualitative study*, MA thesis University of Tilburg, 2019, pg. 37.

legal obligations to pursue policies and take concrete measures to ensure the development and protection of all persons against language based punishment and exclusion in education.

Unfortunately, there is also little awareness among teachers and school administrators that such incursions of the rights of students and their parents may inflict harm. In fact, as the Amsteltaal school director stated, teachers are genuinely convinced that they are acting in the best interest of the child. They mistakenly believe that being exposed to and exclusively speaking Dutch is the best way for multilingual students to learn the national school language. Many teachers also share the conviction that if students are allowed to use their home language, they will form closed groups and that this will harm the social cohesion of the school.¹⁹ In a court case brought against a secondary school in Amsterdam that expelled a student for using his mother tongue at school, this was the argument used successfully by the school (*see* Box 3).

Box 3. Court says school permitted to expel student for speaking a language other than Dutch²⁰

In 2013, a student was expelled from a high school in Amsterdam for hanging an invitation to a party in the Turkish language and for speaking Turkish at school. This was in violation of school rules. Because the student refused to abide by this rule, he was removed from school. The student filed a lawsuit, invoking the prohibition of discrimination contained in the Constitution and in international human rights law.

The school argued that each had to be respectful to one another within the school community, which, according to the school, meant “that one communicates as much as possible in the language that everyone knows (...). Only in this way contradictions can be bridged, differences can be grasped, and this is how different cultures actually come into contact with each other (. . .).”²¹

The judge in the first instance ruled in favour of the school.²² According to the Court, the right of each person to speak their own mother tongue should, in principle, weigh heavily. “However, this does not mean that it is an absolute right to do so under all circumstances, certainly not at a school where education is taught in Dutch.” (para. 4.5). The Court agreed with the school that, given its vision of world citizenship, “it is essential that pupils use Dutch as a language both inside and outside the classroom so that there is as little seclusion as possible by origin. At a school with many pupils with different origins this is to be seen as a legitimate interest.” (*id*). In addition, the Court considered the school’s assertion that “the way [the pupil] spoke Turkish on the school grounds often gave the impression of being deliberately provocative” (*id*).

The Court of Appeals convened the pupil and the school to clarify whether it was really the case that the school forbade pupils from speaking their mother tongue in all circumstances.²³ According to the Court, the school meant that “as long as the core values are observed by the pupils, there is room for speaking of the mother tongue.” (Amsterdam Court, 24 March 2015, par 4.7). As neither the pupil nor his lawyer appeared at the hearing, there was no clarification on the Court’s request and the student’s appeal was rejected.²⁴

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Translated excerpt from:* Emmanuelle Le Pichon-Vorstman & Ellen-Rose Kambel (2017), “Meertalige strategieën, taalonzekerheid en rekenen met anderstaligen: voorbeelden uit Suriname” [“Multilingual strategies, language insecurity and math with children speaking a different language: examples from Suriname”], *in:* Agirdag & Kambel (eds.), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs*, *supra* note 9, pg. 35-36.

²¹ Amsterdam District Court, 30 October 2013, para. 3.3 [ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2013:8224: http://bit.ly/2r7gtaA](http://bit.ly/2r7gtaA).

²² Amsterdam District Court, 30 October 2013, [ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2013:8224: http://bit.ly/2r7gtaA](http://bit.ly/2r7gtaA).

²³ Hof Amsterdam, 24 maart 2015, [ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2015:3480: http://bit.ly/2quZMTP](http://bit.ly/2quZMTP)

²⁴ Hof Amsterdam, 25 augustus 2015, [ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2015:3480: http://bit.ly/2qsPabX](http://bit.ly/2qsPabX)

The current regulations of the school in question provide that:

Art. 16. In the school building, in the schoolyard and near the school, only Dutch is spoken, with the exclusion of the language lessons of course. Citizens of the world are aware that it is normal to communicate in a language that is understandable to all those present.²⁵

Had the case been brought before the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights, the designated institution for discrimination cases in the Netherlands, it is highly unlikely the same conclusion would have been reached. The Equal Treatment Law, an elaboration of the Constitution's non-discrimination provision, places very specific constraints in cases involving restrictions on the prohibition of discrimination. There must be a legitimate objective and the means to achieve the objective must be appropriate and necessary. The Court in this case did not address these requirements at all (or indeed the Equal Treatment Law), but simply referred to a 'legitimate interest' of the school without further supporting its judgment.

There is no research evidence that speaking one's home language would cause a breakdown of social cohesion; indeed, many studies worldwide indicate the opposite.²⁶ Allowing children to use their mother tongue in bilingual education programmes or through translanguaging²⁷ helps students better understand academic concepts, improves their confidence, and increases opportunities for parental involvement. The results are improved learning outcomes, less repetition, and drop outs, and ultimately greater opportunities for employment and successful integration into society.²⁸

By contrast, punishing children for using their own language, as a Belgian study found, leads to students feeling less at home, more shame and convinced that they will be less successful in the future. Importantly, they also performed worse academically than their peers who were not punished for using their mother tongue.²⁹

Implicit restrictions

Penalties do not have to be explicit to make their mark; they can be quite subtle. A gesture by the teacher can lead children to feel "othered", ashamed of the language they speak at home, with lasting and sometimes traumatizing impact.

Restrictions on non-Dutch speaking inside school buildings may be by explicit fiat: that notifications must be in official school languages only (Dutch, and English in bilingual programs). Or, they may be passive,

²⁵ Metis Montessori Lyceum School Regulations 2019-2020, Art. 16, *available at*:

https://www.hetmml.nl/images/Schoolregels_2019-2020.pdf (original in Dutch: In het schoolgebouw, op het schoolplein en nabij de school wordt alleen Nederlands gesproken, de taallessen vanzelfsprekend uitgesloten. Wereldburgers zijn ervan doordrongen dat het normaal is te communiceren in een taal die voor alle aanwezigen begrijpelijk is (art. 16).)

²⁶ J. Cummins (2019), *Should Schools Undermine or Sustain Multilingualism? an Analysis of Theory, Research, and Pedagogical Practice*. Sustainable Multilingualism [Volume 15: Issue 1](#); *available at*: <https://doi.org/10.2478/sm-2019-0011>.

²⁷ Translanguaging can be described as a pedagogical strategy where students' entire linguistic repertoire is used to adapt to communication in school settings (O. García and L. Wei, *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education*, Palgrave MacMillan 2014.)

²⁸ See among others: Collier, V.P., & Thomas, W.P. (2017). Validating the power of bilingual schooling: Thirty-two years of large-scale, longitudinal research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 1-15; Herzog-Punzenberger, B.; Le Pichon-Vorstman, E. & Siarova, H., (2017). Multilingual Education in the Light of Diversity: Lessons Learned, European Commission, NESET II report.. *Available at*: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/404b34d1-ef63-11e6-8a35-01aa75ed71a1>; UNESCO, Global Education Monitoring Report (2016). If you don't understand, how can you learn? Policy Paper 24. *Available at*: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000243713>.

²⁹ Agirdag, O., 2017. Het straffen van meertaligheid op school: De schaamte voorbij [Punishing multilingualism in school. Beyond the shame], in Agirdag Kambel (eds.), *Meertaligheid en onderwijs*, pp. 44-52, *supra* note 9.

e.g., when no other language is visible anywhere, and it is not questioned – regardless of the number of non-Dutch native speakers in the school community. Another example of passive discrimination is the lack of interpretation for non-Dutch-speaking parents during parent teacher-meetings. In some cases, this is more intentional, as some teachers even prohibit parents from translating for each other.³⁰ Finally, a more pernicious form of language-based exclusion, restriction and punishment in education occurs in the curriculum, e.g., with textbooks that ignore the other languages spoken by Dutch students, when students are not permitted to discuss subject matter among each other in their home languages; or in writing.

Bullying

Bullying on the basis of language, dialect and accent needs greater attention. According to the European Commission’s Eurydice Report (2019), the Netherlands is among the few countries where students who do not speak the language of instruction at home experience bullying more than their peers who do.³¹

Although the Government of the Netherlands has established a mechanism for submitting complaints of acts of racial discrimination, and even has allocated a budget and process for responding to complaints, discrimination and exclusion on the basis of language in schools is not part of the mandate. Statistics are not collected, so the prevalence of such discrimination is unknown. Such data is needed, and the state has an obligation under the Convention to collect this information and make it available in a disaggregated manner. Research should also be undertaken on whether ‘language’, ‘dialect’ and ‘accent’ are part of anti-bullying protocols at schools, and to what extent teachers are aware of the negative consequences that exclusion and discrimination based on language can have on children.

Accessibility in education

Accessibility in education is recognized as a critical element of the right to education. The first UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, Katarina Tomaševski, emphasized that the challenge of access from a rights-based policy perspective “requires halting and reversing exclusionary policies and practices, not only countering their effects”.³² Another UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, Kishor Singh, noted that equality of opportunity in education relates both to guaranteeing equal opportunities in

³⁰ Interviews with Turkish immigrant parents in the Netherlands revealed that “[M]ost parents are critical that teachers are intolerant of parents who have poor Dutch skills. They do not want Turkish parents to interact in Turkish among themselves, not even to translate what the teacher says; as a result, the possibility of parental involvement decreases. One mother (F14M) criticised teachers because they ‘turn to English easily when somebody does not understand them, but they do not let me do Turkish translations when a mother does not understand what the teacher says.’” Irem Bezcioglu-Göktolga & Kutlay Yagmur, *The impact of Dutch teachers on family language policy of Turkish immigrant parents*. In: *Language, Culture and Curriculum* (15) (2018), pg. 10, available at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326757100> *The impact of Dutch teachers on family language policy of Turkish immigrant parents*.

³¹ European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019. *Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe: National Policies and Measures*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications, Office of the European Union, pg. 44. doi:10.2797/222073, available at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/integrating-students-migrant-backgrounds-schools-europe-national-policies-and-measures_en.

³² Steven J. Klees and Nisha Thapliyal, *The Right to Education: The Work of Katarina Tomaševski*, *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (November 2007), pp. 497-510, citing Human Rights (p. 44), available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/520863>.

access to different levels of education as established by human rights norms, as well as equal opportunities to evolve within education systems.³³

Multilingual children may not fully comprehend content, directions and assignments in Dutch, and may seek explanations from others who share their home language. When they are excluded, reprimanded or punished for this, their comprehension is thwarted. Children play and release tension on playgrounds, in lunchrooms and other places within the school grounds in the language that is most comfortable and familiar to them. When they are excluded, reprimanded or punished for this, they are unable to be themselves, adding stress to an already difficult learning environment. Such situations undermine equal opportunities for them to access education in the present and for the future.

VIOLATIONS OF ICERD AND OBSTACLES TO ACHIEVING FULL IMPLEMENTATION

Language based exclusion, restriction or punishment should be recognized as both a direct and indirect form of racial discrimination

ICERD Article 1 defines racial discrimination as “... any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on . . . descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the . . . economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.”

In its prior (2015) Concluding Observations to the Netherlands, this Committee expressed concern about “continuing disparities in educational achievement and school dropout rates between students from ethnic minority groups and students from the majority group.”³⁴ The Committee recommended “the State party strengthen and implement special measures to increase the level of educational achievement of children of ethnic minority groups and reduce school dropout rates among them. It also recommend[ed] that the State party give adequate recognition to mother tongues and introduce bilingual education in Aruba and Curaçao.”³⁵ Of course, this applies as much to the Kingdom of the Netherlands and all the Caribbean islands.

Under international human rights law, States have the freedom to put in place policies aimed at teaching all students the national language(s). Nonetheless, a “human rights approach focuses on the differences in treatment between individuals, not languages. It is therefore the potential negative impacts, such as disadvantage or exclusion, on individuals rather than languages that are considered in assessing the reasonableness of any language preference in the policies, support or services provided at all levels by state authorities and actions.”³⁶

We are concerned that the State has failed to address the critical role that suppression of mother tongues and home languages plays in the perpetuation of these disparities in education. International human rights

³³ Report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, *The promotion of equality of opportunity in education*, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/17/29, 18 April 2011, para 8.

³⁴ CERD/C/NLD/CO/19-21, *supra* note 6, para 31 (specifically noting “with concern that children in Aruba and Curaçao are educated in Papiamentu and Papiamentu, respectively, only until the end of primary school (art. 5)).

³⁵ *Id.*, para. 32

³⁶ *Language Rights Guide*, *supra* note 3, p. 5.

treaties and norms recognize that respecting language rights is key to promoting equality and non-discrimination, identity, as well as dignity and liberty.³⁷

All persons are entitled to equal and effective protection against discrimination on grounds of language. This means that language preferences that unreasonably or arbitrarily disadvantage or exclude individuals are a form of prohibited discrimination. This applies to differences of treatment between any language, including official languages, or between an official and a minority language. In any area of state activity or service, authorities must respect and implement the right to equality and the prohibition of discrimination in language matters, including the language for the delivery of . . . public education, and even citizenship acquisition.³⁸

In his recent report on “*Education, language and the human rights of minorities*”, the current U.N. Special Rapporteur on minority rights, Fernand de Varennes, noted that “teaching children in a language other than their own is not education of the same quality as that of children who are taught in their mother tongue.”³⁹ He stated that **these disadvantages constitute direct discrimination on the ground of language, or indirect discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity or race.**⁴⁰ Similarly, prohibiting the use of home languages anywhere on school grounds constitutes both direct and indirect forms of discrimination in violation of Article 1 of ICERD.

Absence of policies to eliminate language based discrimination and lack of follow-up and data collection in existing and past anti-discrimination programmes

ICERD Article 2 (1)(a) requires State Parties “... to pursue by all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating racial discrimination... and to ensure that all public authorities and public institutions, national and local, shall act in conformity with this obligation;” With regard to social, economic, and cultural fields, ***Article 2 (2)*** requires State Parties to take “special and concrete measures to ensure the adequate development and protection of certain racial groups or individuals belonging to them ...”

Existing policies for eliminating racial discrimination and ensuring their implementation by public officials and institutions in the Netherlands simply do not consider language as a basis of racial discrimination. The many special measures reported by the Government of the Netherlands do not address the serious issues around the exclusion, prohibition or punishment of children for speaking their home language on school grounds. Nor do they remedy the discrimination against non-Dutch speaking parents who try to have access to their children’s education.

³⁷ *Id.*, p 4, 6, 18 and *passim*; Report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on minority rights, Fernand de Varennes, on *Education, language and the human rights of minorities*, U.N. Doc A/HRC/43/47 (9 January 2020), paras. 34-40.

³⁸ *Language Rights Guide*, *id.*, p 13. We note also:

“Human rights involving language are a combination of legal requirements based on international human rights treaties and standards on how to address language or minority issues, as well as linguistic diversity within a state. Language rights are to be found in various provisions enshrined in international human rights law, such as the prohibition of discrimination, the right to freedom of expression, the right to a private life, the right to education and the right of linguistic minorities including indigenous peoples to use their own language with others in their group.”

Id., p. 5.

³⁹ de Varennes, *supra* note 37, para 48.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, para 53.

For example, the National Anti-Discrimination Action Programme (NAPAD) does not acknowledge language discrimination in its Cabinet Policy on *The role of education in preventing discrimination and promoting awareness* – particularly concerning citizenship education.⁴¹ Appendix 2 to the State Report, *Progress on specific measures from the NAPAD*, also contains no reference whatsoever to language.⁴² This is not because such discrimination doesn't occur.

This omission is particularly conspicuous in the secondary campaign “Discrimination: talk about it in class” (State Report, para. 54) launched in April 2017 “to promote an open conversation about the unacceptability of discrimination at primary and secondary schools” (State Report, para. 58). Similarly, the Safe School policy has blinders if it isn't able to identify, invite complaints, and remediate bullying on the basis of language. (State Report, para. 67) The secondary campaign was launched three years ago; it should have produced some results. How widely is it being implemented? What data is being collected and what indicators for success? How is its progress monitored? Is it an optional programme for schools and school boards? Has it collected any data concerning exclusion, prohibition or prevention of home languages on school grounds? Are migrant parents involved?

The emphasis on municipal and local programs in the NAPAD and other measures (as described in paragraphs 13-29 and elsewhere in the State Report) is important for dealing with problems associated with language rights violations occurring in schools. Especially because in the Netherlands the municipalities are in charge of the public schools. At the same time, the Government has an obligation to ensure that sub-federal activities are effective, comport with human rights, and the outcomes/findings are transparent and available to the public.⁴³ To that end, we note the reference in para. 22 of the State Report to the development of municipal anti-discrimination policy guidelines commissioned by the central government. These guidelines should contain action points for awareness-training, monitoring and eliminating discrimination on the basis of language occurring in public and private schools. We doubt that this has been identified by (m)any municipalities, at least in part because it has not been identified by the central government.

In section *D. Raising awareness and tackling racism and discrimination in education* of its Report, the State notes the importance of education for overcoming inequality of opportunity, and refers to measures and objectives to achieve that goal. These include “[e]fforts to redress educational disadvantages in schools for

⁴¹ State Report, *supra* note 5, Annexe 1, National antidiscrimination action programme, “Broader Cabinet policy,” p. 4, available at :

https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CERD/Shared%20Documents/NLD/INT_CERD_ADR_NLD_33478_E.pdf

⁴² State Report, *id.*, Appendix 2, *Progress on specific measures from the National Action Programme Against Discrimination*, available at:

https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CERD/Shared%20Documents/NLD/INT_CERD_ADR_NLD_33481_E.pdf

⁴³ See also, CERD/C/NLD/CO/19-21, *supra* note 6, para. 8:

“The Committee reminds the State party of the responsibility of the central Government for the implementation of the Convention and for the application of the State party's anti-discrimination policy. It recommends that the State party take the measures necessary to ensure that all municipalities are adequately resourced and have the expertise necessary to effectively implement the Convention at the local level. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the State party ensure that all municipalities establish an anti-discrimination policy to complement the national anti-discrimination policy.”

children who are at risk of lagging behind because of factors such as social surroundings;” and “an equal opportunities alliance, involving local authorities, schools, civil society organisations and central government, targeting children with poorly educated and/or low-income parents.”⁴⁴ This emphasis on socio-economics misses the key factor of language based exclusion and distinction in perpetuating educational disparities.

Introducing a new indicator measuring educational disadvantage to determine school funding and “a more effective approach to disadvantage”⁴⁵ is a helpful step. In addition to taking account of the time the child has lived in the Netherlands, parents’ country of origin, and family debt, the State should be collecting data on home language, and school policies and practices with respect to home language. School funds should be tied to these. The UN Sustainable Development Goals Thematic Indicator 4.5.18 calls on States to report on the percentage of primary school pupils who speak the school’s language of instruction as their first language or mother tongue.⁴⁶

Language based exclusion, restriction or punishment in education violates the right to free expression

Article 5 (d)(viii) protects the right to freedom of expression... and Article 5 (e)(v) applies this protection to the right to education and training.

The exclusion, restriction, or punishment for speaking a home language at school is an obstacle preventing minority groups from enjoying their right to freedom of expression in conjunction with the right to education.

The State Report discusses freedom of expression in terms of political and hate speech, while noting that freedom of expression is interpreted broadly in the Netherlands (para 31). These are extreme manifestations of the problems, and they are the tip of the iceberg. As a measure of concern for “those who are insulted or experience discrimination, and those who feel threatened in their existence in the Netherlands” (para. 32), a Bill to amend the Criminal Code proposes raising the maximum sentence for inciting hatred and violence (para 32).⁴⁷ It is critically important for the Government and state-actors at all levels to understand that migrant children whose home language is not Dutch are insulted, experience discrimination, and sometimes feel threatened (bullying, teachers’ punishments) “in their existence” in the Netherlands.

⁴⁴ State Report, *supra* note 5, para. 60 (b) and (d).

⁴⁵ State Report, *supra* note 5, para 61.

⁴⁶ UNESCO Institute for Statistics, *Laying the Foundation to Measure Sustainable Development Goal 4*. Montreal: UNESCO, 2016, available at : <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/laying-the-foundation-to-measure-sdg4-sustainable-development-data-digest-2016-en.pdf> .

⁴⁷ It is worth noting CERD’s General Recommendation No. 35 on *Combating racist hate speech*, U.N. Doc CERD/C/GC/35 (26 September 2013): “Racist hate speech can take many forms and is not confined to explicitly racial remarks. As is the case with discrimination under article 1, speech attacking particular racial or ethnic groups may employ indirect language in order to disguise its targets and objectives (para. 7).” This includes “ideas or theories of superiority” referred to in Art. 4(a) of the ICERD (para. 11).

An institutionalized and ideological blindspot concerning language-based discrimination in education

In accord with **ICERD Article 7**, the State undertakes “to adopt immediate and effective measures, particularly in the fields of teaching, education, culture and information, with a view to combating prejudices which lead to racial discrimination and to promoting understanding, tolerance and friendship among nations and racial or ethnical groups.”

In its prior (2015) Concluding Observations to the Netherlands, this Committee recommended the State take “specific measures to combat stereotyping and stigmatization of members of ethnic groups, and pay particular attention to addressing indirect discrimination. [In particular]: “[s]trengthen[ing] measures to eliminate racist bullying at school, including by promoting, at all levels of education, general sensitivity to diversity and multiculturalism.”⁴⁸

However, while the many policies, campaigns, laws and regulations included in the State Report are laudable, the issue stems from a blindspot that leads more to acts of omission than commission.

Quashing the linguistic and cultural identity of a child (or adult) from a minority group undermines understanding, tolerance and prejudice, and has the effect (if not the purpose) of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination. In General Recommendation No. 35 on *Combating hate speech*, this Committee pointed out that “[a]ppropriate educational strategies in line with the requirements of article 7 include intercultural education, including intercultural bilingual education, based on equality of respect and esteem and genuine mutuality, supported by adequate human and financial resources.” Of particular note, the Committee made explicit that “[p]rogrammes of intercultural education should represent a genuine balance of interests and should not function in intention or effect as vehicles of cultural assimilation.”⁴⁹

The most significant impediment to achieving full implementation of the ICERD is related to the Netherlands’ approach to civic integration. It is an ideological blindspot in failing to understand how the emphasis on Dutch (and in some cases English) to the exclusion of all other mother tongues ultimately undermines the very objective of integration. If children are ostracized, excluded or punished because they haven’t fully learned Dutch and are more comfortable with their home language *in the process of learning*, they internalize the notion that they are slow or poor learners. It is well settled that children learn best in their home language, and allowed to do so, can more easily learn other languages and subjects. UN Special Rapporteur, Fernand de Varennnes, emphasized just this point in his recent report:

If persons belonging to linguistic minorities have a responsibility to integrate into the wider society, then it would seem that this can be best achieved through effectively teaching them in their own language because of generally better outcomes from education in one’s language, even in acquiring fluency in the official language.⁵⁰

The Diversity Charter and action plans discussed in para. 44 of the State Report as part of the “Inclusive Government” programme seem like obvious places to integrate language-based discrimination. However, the programme appears to be focused on labor market discrimination, which is the end-point, while giving no attention to the causes of discrimination at the foundation – language in schools.

Citizenship education

Citizenship education focusing on diversity, democratic values and the rule of law, as enshrined in the

⁴⁸ CERD/C/NLD/CO/19-21, *supra* note 6, para. 14 (c).

⁴⁹ Gen. Rec. No. 35, *supra* note 47, para. 33 (emphasis added).

⁵⁰ de Varennnes, *supra* note 37, para. 52.

Constitution and human rights documents (State Report, para. 65) is important. But, citizenship can also be used as an justification against inclusion, as we have seen in the court case involving the Amsterdam school (Box 3 above). If citizenship education is geared towards integration into a western European, Dutch and English speaking homogeneous nation, then it isn't genuinely focusing on diversity or human rights. Teaching the history of Dutch colonialism and slavery ("Dutch Canon") must acknowledge and deal with the fact that prohibiting mother tongues is a form of contemporary colonialism.

The specific measures aimed at awareness of and combating anti-black racism, prejudice, negative image-forming and stereotypes (State Report paras. 74-75) are important, but shouldn't be ghetto-ized as only a problem of Dutch history with slavery and colonialism. These very identity issues plague migrant children in educational settings. That the Government has conducted a study to reveal exclusion mechanisms in relation to Afro-descendant peoples (State Report, para. 80) is a positive measure. How widely available is the study methodology and outcome? Is language discrimination included? Such a study, including language in/and education, would be a significant first step to revealing exclusion mechanisms experienced by migrant communities.

We appreciate the Government values active public discourse on matters relating to diversity and ethnicity (State Report, para. 104), and has a strategy of flexible dialogue with diverse partners (State Report, para. 105). This very process should be implemented also at the school level, i.e., involving parents (and children) in a way that enables them to be full participants in the dialogue. With respect to the development of expertise on the causes of discrimination and effective interventions, the study commissioned by the Knowledge Platform on Integration and Society (State Report, para. 123) should include the treatment of home languages in schools and education policy generally.

In addition, the Government acknowledges that specific background factors associated with forms of discrimination must be examined, and mentions periodic reports on integration produced by the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) (State Report, para. 125). These are positive measures, and language exclusion and discrimination could easily be incorporated into these studies.

At the end of her country visit to the Netherlands, U.N. Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Tendayi Achiume, noted that "systematic anti-discrimination and intercultural sensitivity training is . . . necessary across all sectors of national authorities to ensure that frontline staff and even civil service leadership are required to understand and confront ethnic, racial and religious prejudice, as well as implicit biases that affect their treatment of racial, ethnic and religious minorities."⁵¹ She concluded that a deeply held conviction that "equality, non-discrimination and ethnic and religious inclusiveness are inherently Dutch," seems to be one of the barriers to the Government investing in implicit bias training with respect to ethnic and racial discrimination.⁵² We would add language inclusiveness, and recommend that language-based discrimination be included in such trainings.

⁵¹ End of Mission Statement of the Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Tendayi Achiume, at the Conclusion of Her Mission to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague (7 October 2019), para 52, *available at* https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Racism/SR/EoM_MissionNetherlands_7October2019.PDF.

⁵² *Id.*

CONCLUSIONS

There is a lack of data to establish the extent to which school children in the Netherlands are excluded, restricted and sometimes even punished for using their home languages in schools. Our research so far indicates that these practices are widespread, that they have harmful effects on the emotional and social wellbeing of the students and also negatively impacts their learning process. Parents are admonished, sometimes prohibited to speak their home language to their children when they are at school, even when they have not yet learned Dutch, effectively cutting off their participation in the education process of their children.

These practices are so widely ingrained in Dutch society that parents and students believe this is part of the normal school experience. Lacking information, parents fail to notify institutions charged with protecting children's and minorities' rights (e.g., the Children's Ombudsperson in the Netherlands, Anti-Discrimination Bureaus, national human rights institutions, and NGOs such as Defense for Children International). As a result, these organisations and state agencies may be unaware that such practices occur.

Awareness about the harmful effects of these practices is also lacking among educators and education policy makers, who continue to believe – wrongly – that by insisting on a Dutch only policy, they act in the best interest of the students or help parents integrate better into Dutch society. Research evidence has shown that these claims have no basis and may in fact achieve the opposite: students perform worse than their peers in schools that do have inclusive language friendly policies.

Our analysis of the State's obligations under ICERD, in particular articles 1, 2, 5 and 7, indicates that language based exclusion, restriction and punishment constitutes direct and indirect racial discrimination and that the Netherlands has a legal obligation to pursue policies and take concrete measures to ensure the protection of all persons against language based exclusion, restriction and punishment in education.

RECOMMENDED QUESTION FOR THE CERD COMMITTEE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

The government seeks to ensure that the needs of everyone in the Netherlands, regardless of origin, religion or belief, are addressed by mainstream policy in fields, such as education ... (State Report, para. 70). How will the State ensure that multilingual students with a migrant or minority background are not excluded, restricted or punished for speaking their home languages at school, and that all parents are free to use their own language with their children when they visit their schools?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Data collection on home languages and language based exclusion, restriction and punishment in education

- Collect data on the percentage of primary school pupils who speak the school's language of instruction as their first language or mother tongue in accordance with the UN Sustainable Development Goals Thematic Indicator 4.5.18.
- Carry out a survey on existing school policies and practices to exclude, restrict or punish the use of home languages in school settings.

- Undertake research on whether ‘language’, ‘dialect’ and ‘accent’ are part of anti-bullying protocols at schools.
- Undertake research on the awareness among educators and education policy makers of the negative consequences of language based exclusion and discrimination on children.

Teacher training and awareness raising campaigns

- Ensure that teachers develop the necessary skills, knowledge and expertise in teaching multilingual and multicultural classrooms.
- Include language based discrimination in education as part of any anti-discrimination campaign.

Eliminate all forms of language based discrimination in education

- Take all necessary measures to ensure all forms of language based exclusion, restriction and punishment are eliminated; and that respect for all languages, dialects and accents is fostered among students and teachers.