

Language, Migration and Educational Exclusion Among Children of Brickfield Workers in Tripura

Dr. Dipankar Biswas¹, Dr. Arindam Bhattacharyya²

¹Associate Professor (Education), Dasaratha Deb Memorial College, Khowai, Tripura

²Assistant Professor (Education), Serampore Girls' College

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11080171>

Received: 09 September 2026; Accepted: 14 September 2026; Published: 21 September 2026

ABSTRACT

The schooling of children from migrant brickfield households raises a basic question of educational equality: what does access to school mean when children cannot consistently understand, participate in, or feel recognised within the language of schooling? This paper examines that question in the context of brickfield communities in West Tripura. The study focuses on the interaction of seasonal migration, advance-based labour arrangements, child labour, documentation difficulties, and linguistic diversity, with particular attention to the language of instruction. It draws on a quantitative descriptive-correlational dataset of 120 children of migrant brickfield workers. It interprets the findings through Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and symbolic power, Cummins' work on language and academic learning, and Sen's capability approach. The descriptive evidence indicates a substantial mismatch between children's home languages and the languages used in school. Respondents reported considerable difficulty with the school language, reduced classroom participation, and perceptions that their home languages were accorded low status. Irregular attendance and dropout were also common. The inferential results, however, require cautious interpretation: the reported association between language difficulty and schooling status did not reach conventional statistical significance, while language difficulty was significantly associated with lower perceived cultural inclusion, and documentation problems were significantly associated with schooling status. The paper therefore argues that linguistic mismatch should be understood as one component of a wider structure of educational vulnerability rather than as a single cause of dropout. It proposes multilingual and migrant-sensitive schooling, flexible admission and transfer procedures, language bridging support, stronger outreach at worksites, and closer coordination between education and labour authorities.

Keywords: Migrant Children; Brickfield Workers; Educational Exclusion; Language Of Instruction; Tripura; Multilingual Education; Cultural Capital; Capability Approach

INTRODUCTION

Education is formally recognised as a right, yet formal enrolment does not guarantee meaningful educational participation. Children who move with migrant labouring families often encounter repeated interruptions in schooling, unstable residence, financial insecurity, child labour and administrative barriers. For children living around brickfields, these pressures can operate together. A school may be physically available, but regular attendance, comprehension, participation and continuation can remain difficult.

The situation in Tripura requires attention to language because migration brings children into classrooms in which the language used at home may differ from the language used for teaching, textbooks, and teacher–pupil interaction. The original study focuses on brickfield areas of West Tripura, where the sample includes children from tribal or indigenous linguistic backgrounds and children speaking Hindi varieties. The schooling environment represented in the dataset is predominantly Bengali-speaking, with some Bengali–English bilingual provision.

Language mismatch is therefore examined here as an educational and social issue. When children encounter a school language that they have not adequately mastered, they may find it difficult to understand lessons, ask questions, express ideas, or demonstrate what they know. If their home language is also treated as irrelevant or inferior, the problem extends beyond comprehension. It may affect belonging and confidence. These experiences can become more serious when families are moving between work sites, children are involved in labour, or documentation problems interrupt admission and continuity.

The paper does not treat language as an isolated explanation for educational exclusion. Rather, it examines how linguistic difficulty interacts with economic and institutional conditions. The analysis uses three theoretical perspectives. Bourdieu helps explain how schools can privilege particular forms of linguistic and cultural capital. Cummins provides a framework for understanding the relationship between conversational language and the academic language required for schooling. Sen's capability approach shifts attention from formal access to the real freedoms children have to participate, express themselves, and benefit from education.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the socio-economic and migratory profile of children from migrant brickfield households in West Tripura.
2. To assess the schooling conditions of children of migrant brickfield workers.
3. To examine the relationship between language of instruction and children's learning experience, participation, and schooling continuity.
4. To examine the relationship between linguistic difficulty, cultural inclusion and educational capability.
5. To identify the institutional barriers that accompany linguistic and economic disadvantage.
6. To propose a multilingual and migrant-sensitive framework for improving educational participation and continuity.

Hypotheses of the Study

H1: Language difficulty associated with a mismatch between children's home language and the language of instruction is negatively associated with school attendance and retention.

H2: Higher language difficulty is associated with lower perceived cultural and linguistic inclusion in school.

H3: Higher language difficulty is associated with lower educational capability, including confidence, agency and freedom of expression.

H4: Children involved in brickfield labour report higher language difficulty and lower educational capability than children who are not involved in labour.

H5: Documentation-related institutional barriers are associated with discontinuity in schooling and intensify educational exclusion.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 Language, Cultural Capital and Symbolic Power

Bourdieu's perspective draws attention to the unequal value assigned to different forms of language and cultural knowledge. Schools do not operate in a social vacuum. Particular ways of speaking, writing, and communicating are treated as legitimate, while other forms may receive little institutional recognition. For migrant children, this can produce a gap between the linguistic resources they bring from home and those valued in the classroom. The issue is therefore not simply whether a child knows a language; it is also whether the child's existing linguistic resources are recognised as legitimate educational resources.

4.2 Cummins and Academic Language Development

Cummins distinguishes between everyday interpersonal communication and the more demanding language required for academic learning. A child may acquire enough conversational ability to communicate socially without having the academic language needed to understand textbooks, follow abstract explanations, write answers or participate confidently in classroom discussion. For children who move between linguistic environments, sustained academic language development becomes especially difficult when schooling is interrupted or when there is little support for bridging the home language and the school language.

4.3 Sen's Capability Approach

The capability approach asks whether individuals have genuine opportunities to achieve valued ways of being and doing. Applied to education, school enrolment is only one element of educational opportunity. A child must also have the practical freedom to attend, understand instruction, participate, express ideas and use education to widen future choices. Linguistic exclusion can therefore represent capability deprivation even where a child is technically enrolled.

4.4 Integrated Analytical Perspective

The three perspectives are brought together without treating them as interchangeable. Bourdieu explains the unequal status of linguistic resources; Cummins explains why language mismatch can affect academic learning and participation; Sen explains why formal access may fail to produce substantive educational opportunity. The resulting analytical position is that educational exclusion among migrant brickfield children is produced through the interaction of linguistic, economic, and institutional conditions.

METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

The study follows a quantitative descriptive-correlational design informed by critical social theory. The conceptual discussion draws on secondary literature and policy material, while the empirical component uses a structured dataset of 120 children from brickfield areas of West Tripura. The design permits description of the respondents' circumstances and examination of relationships among language difficulty, cultural inclusion, educational capability, and schooling status. Because the data are cross-sectional, the findings are interpreted as associations rather than proof of causal relationships.

5.2 Sample and Variables

The dataset contains 120 children of migrant brickfield workers. Variables cover migration type and duration, advance-based labour arrangements (peshgi), child labour involvement, school attendance and dropout, language background, medium of instruction, perceived language difficulty, cultural inclusion/exclusion, and educational capability and agency.

Likert-scale items were measured on a five-point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Composite scores were formed by averaging relevant items.

5.3 Measurement of Constructs

Construct	Items	Theoretical basis
Language Difficulty	L17, L18, L20	Cummins
Cultural Inclusion	C21–C25	Bourdieu
Educational Capability	CAP26–CAP30	Sen

5.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarise frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Group comparisons were used to examine differences across schooling and labour-status categories. Pearson correlations were used to examine relationships among language difficulty, cultural inclusion and educational capability. One-way ANOVA, independent-samples t-tests and chi-square analysis were used for the stated hypothesis tests.

5.5 Limitations

The study is limited geographically to West Tripura and therefore should not be generalised automatically to brickfield communities in other states. The cross-sectional design captures one point in time and cannot establish causal direction. The sample of 120 children is appropriate for an exploratory analysis but limits detailed subgroup comparisons. The principal constructs are based on self-reported perceptions and were not supplemented by standardised language-proficiency tests, classroom observations or longitudinal learning records.

A further caution concerns the supplied manuscript itself: some descriptive and inferential statistics reported in different sections are not internally consistent. In this rewritten version, the hypothesis-testing summary is treated as the primary inferential record, and claims of statistical significance are restricted to results for which the reported p-value is below .05. The descriptive findings are retained as evidence of respondents' reported experiences rather than presented as causal proof.

RESULTS

6.1 Migration and Labour Profile

Seasonal migration was the dominant pattern in the dataset. Of the 120 respondents, 82 (68.3%) belonged to seasonal migrant households, 27 (22.5%) to temporarily settled households, and 11 (9.2%) to longer-term arrangements. Forty-five per cent of families had stayed at the brickfield for less than six months. Advance-based labour arrangements were reported by 86 households (71.7%). Child labour was reported as regular for 30 children (25.0%) and occasional for 38 (31.7%), while 52 (43.3%) were reported never to have worked in the brickfield.

Variable	Category	n	%
Type of migration	Seasonal	82	68.3
	Temporary	27	22.5
	Long-term	11	9.2
Duration of stay	< 6 months	54	45.0
	6–12 months	42	35.0
	> 1 year	24	20.0
Peshgi arrangement	Yes	86	71.7
	No	34	28.3
Child labour	Regular	30	25.0
	Occasional	38	31.7
	Never	52	43.3

Note. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place. Peshgi refers to advance-based employment arrangements reported in the dataset.

Schooling Status

The children were between 6 and 14 years of age. All had been enrolled in school at some point, but continuity varied. Forty-eight children (40.0%) were reported to attend regularly, 36 (30.0%) attended irregularly and 36

(30.0%) had dropped out. The figures indicate that enrolment alone does not describe the educational position of migrant children.

Schooling status	n	%
Regular attendance	48	40.0
Irregular attendance	36	30.0
Dropped out	36	30.0
Total	120	100.0

Note. Irregular attendance includes frequent absence attributed in the dataset to migration, labour or language-related difficulties.

6.3 Language Background and Medium of Instruction

The sample was linguistically diverse. Sixty-three children (52.5%) were classified as speaking a tribal or indigenous language, 41 (34.2%) spoke Hindi dialects and 16 (13.3%) were classified under other languages. The reported school languages were different: 67 children (55.8%) were in Bengali-medium schools, 19 (15.8%) in English-medium schools and 34 (28.4%) in Bengali–English bilingual settings. No school represented in the dataset reported using a migrant or tribal language as the formal medium of instruction.

Domain	Languages reported
Home/community	Bhili, Garo, Halam, Chakma, Hindi dialects and other languages
School instruction	Bengali and English
Teaching materials	Bengali and English
Teacher communication	Predominantly Bengali

Variable	Category	n	%
Mother tongue	Tribal / Indigenous	63	52.5
	Hindi dialects	41	34.2
	Others	16	13.3
Medium of instruction	Bengali	67	55.8
	English	19	15.8
	Bengali–English	34	28.4

Note. The dataset reports no formal use of migrant or tribal languages as a medium of instruction.

6.4 Language Difficulty and Classroom Experience

Item	Description	Mean	SD
L16	Understanding classroom instruction	2.41	1.12
L17	Difficulty with school language	4.12	0.93
L18	Shyness/silence due to language	4.05	0.98
L19	Asking questions in class	2.36	1.07
L20	Language barrier affects interest	4.18	0.89

The pattern is consistent with substantial perceived language difficulty. Difficulty with the school language ($M=4.12$), silence or shyness linked to language ($M=4.05$), and the effect of language barriers on interest ($M=4.18$) received high mean scores. By contrast, understanding classroom instruction ($M=2.41$) and asking questions ($M=2.36$) received lower scores. Taken together, these responses point to problems in comprehension

and active participation. More than 60% of respondents were reported as experiencing high or very high language-related learning difficulty.

Note. The scale ranges from 1 to 5. Higher scores indicate greater difficulty except for items L16 and L19, where lower scores indicate weaker comprehension or participation.

6.5 Cultural Inclusion and Linguistic Recognition

Item	Description	Mean	SD
C21	Teachers respect children's backgrounds	2.34	1.01
C22	Child feels included in school	2.47	1.06
C23	School culture matches the child	2.29	0.98
C24	Equal treatment in school	2.51	1.04
C25	Home language considered inferior*	4.09	0.92

Perceptions of cultural inclusion were generally low. The mean scores for teacher respect, belonging, cultural compatibility and equal treatment were between 2.29 and 2.51. Agreement with the statement that the home language was considered inferior was high ($M=4.09$). The dataset therefore indicates that linguistic difficulty was accompanied by a perceived status difference between children's home languages and the languages recognised by the school.

Note. *C25 was reverse-coded for composite analysis. Approximately 55–60% of respondents were reported as perceiving schools as culturally exclusionary.

Educational Capability and Agency

Item	Description	Mean	SD
CAP26	Enjoyment of school	2.38	1.08
CAP27	School builds confidence	2.42	1.03
CAP28	Freedom to express ideas	2.31	1.01
CAP29	Education improves the future	3.89	0.94
CAP30	Language limits the future	4.15	0.88

The capability findings reveal a gap between the perceived value of education and children's experience of schooling. Respondents gave relatively high agreement to the proposition that education improves the future ($M=3.89$), while enjoyment ($M=2.38$), confidence ($M=2.42$) and freedom to express ideas ($M=2.31$) were low. Agreement that language limits future opportunities was high ($M=4.15$). The pattern suggests that children may value education while finding the existing school environment difficult to use as a space for participation and self-expression.

6.7 Language Difficulty and Schooling Status

Schooling status	Mean language difficulty	SD
Regular attendance	3.12	0.81
Irregular attendance	4.01	0.73
Dropped out	4.34	0.69

The descriptive pattern shows progressively higher mean language difficulty from regular attendance to irregular attendance and dropout. However, the reported one-way ANOVA did not establish a statistically significant difference across the three schooling groups, $F(2,117)=2.05$, $p=.13$. H1 is therefore not supported at the .05 level.

The descriptive gradient is still relevant, but it should be interpreted as an observed pattern rather than evidence that language difficulty independently causes dropout.

6.8 Language Difficulty, Cultural Inclusion and Capability

Relationship	Reported statistic	Interpretation
Language difficulty $\times$ cultural inclusion	$r(118) = -.18, p=.049$	Statistically significant negative association
Language difficulty $\times$ educational capability	$r(118) = .12, p=.20$	Not statistically significant

The reported correlation between language difficulty and cultural inclusion is small but statistically significant at the .05 level. As perceived language difficulty increased, perceived cultural inclusion tended to decrease. H2 is therefore supported in the reported analysis. The association between language difficulty and educational capability was weak and statistically non-significant ($r=.12, p=.20$); consequently, H3 is not supported by the reported inferential result.

6.9 Child Labour and Educational Experience

Children involved in labour were reported to have higher language difficulty and lower capability and participation scores than children who were never involved in labour. The independent-samples t-test, however, found no statistically significant difference in language difficulty between labour-involved children ($M=2.78$) and those not involved ($M=2.53$), $t(118)=1.31, p=.19$. Educational capability also did not differ significantly, $t(118)=0.73, p=.47$. H4 is therefore not supported statistically, although the descriptive pattern points to a relationship that warrants further investigation.

6.10 Documentation and Institutional Barriers

Documentation difficulties were associated with educational continuity. Children from households reporting documentation problems had lower perceived cultural inclusion ($M=2.88$) than those without such problems ($M=3.05$), although the difference was not statistically significant, $t(118)=0.94, p=.35$. In contrast, the chi-square test showed a statistically significant association between documentation problems and schooling status, $\chi^2(2, N=120)=6.21, p=.045$. H5 is therefore supported with respect to the relationship between documentation problems and schooling status.

The dataset reports that nearly two-thirds of families encountered documentation-related barriers affecting admission or continuity. This result is important because it shows that educational exclusion cannot be reduced to classroom language alone. Administrative requirements can interrupt schooling at precisely the point when migrant children are already facing linguistic and economic instability.

6.11 Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Test	Statistic	p	Decision
H1: Language difficulty $\times$ schooling status	One-way ANOVA	$F(2,117)=2.05$	.13	Not supported
H2: Language difficulty $\times$ cultural inclusion	Pearson correlation	$r(118)=-.18$	.049	Supported
H3: Language difficulty $\times$ educational capability	Pearson correlation	$r(118)=.12$	.20	Not supported
H4: Labour involvement $\times$ language difficulty	Independent t-test	$t(118)=1.31$	.19	Not supported
H5: Documentation problems $\times$ schooling status	Chi-square	$\chi^2(2)=6.21$	.045	Supported

DISCUSSION

7.1 Migration and the Conditions of Schooling

The results place schooling within a mobile labour economy. Nearly seven in ten respondents belonged to seasonal migrant households, and more than seven in ten households reported advance-based employment arrangements. Forty-five per cent had stayed at the worksite for less than six months. Such mobility makes continuous schooling difficult because children may have to move between places, schools and administrative systems.

Peshgi should be interpreted carefully. An advance can provide immediate resources to households with limited access to formal credit, yet the obligation to repay can also reduce freedom of movement and increase dependence on the worksite. For children, the educational consequence is indirect but important: the household's economic arrangements shape whether the child can remain in one school, attend regularly and avoid work responsibilities.

7.2 Linguistic Mismatch and Educational Participation

The strongest descriptive finding concerns the gap between home language and school language. More than half of the children were classified as speakers of tribal or indigenous languages and another substantial group spoke Hindi dialects, whereas formal instruction was reported mainly in Bengali, English or a combination of the two. No formal use of migrant or tribal languages was reported.

The high scores for school-language difficulty and language-related silence are consistent with Cummins' argument that academic learning requires more than everyday conversational competence. A child who can manage routine social interaction may still struggle with subject-specific vocabulary, written tasks, abstract explanations and classroom questioning. This problem can be intensified by repeated migration because academic language development depends on sustained exposure and continuity.

At the same time, the inferential evidence prevents a simple conclusion that language mismatch causes dropout. The ANOVA result was not statistically significant. The more defensible interpretation is that language difficulty is part of a cluster of disadvantages associated with educational disruption, and its effects may depend on migration, labour, documentation, school responsiveness and other conditions.

7.3 Linguistic Recognition and Cultural Inclusion

The significant negative association between language difficulty and cultural inclusion provides stronger evidence for the social dimension of language. Children who experience greater difficulty with the school language also tend to report weaker cultural inclusion. The high agreement with the statement that their home language is considered inferior further suggests that linguistic difference is experienced as a question of status.

This pattern can be read through Bourdieu's concept of symbolic power. When one language is treated as the normal language of legitimate schooling and other languages remain invisible, children arrive with linguistic resources that have unequal institutional value. The problem is therefore partly one of recognition. A multilingual child does not enter school without language; the child enters with a language that the school may fail to recognise as educational capital.

7.4 Educational Capability and the Limits of Formal Access

The capability findings point to a distinction between valuing education and experiencing education positively. Children reported that education can improve their future, but they also reported low enjoyment, confidence and freedom to express ideas. They therefore appear to recognise the instrumental value of schooling while experiencing barriers to full participation.

The reported correlation between language difficulty and educational capability was not statistically significant. This is important and should not be ignored. The capability interpretation is therefore best presented as a conceptual reading of the descriptive evidence rather than as a confirmed statistical relationship in this sample. The low capability scores nonetheless justify further research using larger samples and stronger measures of agency, participation and learning outcomes.

7.5 Child Labour, Documentation and the Layering of Exclusion

The labour results show descriptive differences without statistical significance. This suggests that labour involvement may contribute to educational difficulty, but the present sample does not provide sufficient evidence to isolate its independent effect. Labour, migration and language should therefore be examined as interacting conditions rather than ranked as separate causes.

Documentation presents a somewhat different picture. Although the reported difference in cultural inclusion was not significant, documentation problems were significantly associated with schooling status. This indicates that bureaucratic barriers can have a measurable relationship with educational continuity. For migrant families, admission, transfer, identity records and access to entitlements may become points at which mobility is converted into exclusion.

8. Major Findings

1. Seasonal migration is the dominant migration pattern in the sample, and many households report advance-based labour arrangements.
2. Thirty per cent of the children are reported as having dropped out and another 30% as attending irregularly.
3. The children's home-language profile differs substantially from the dominant languages of formal instruction.
4. High levels of perceived difficulty with the school language are accompanied by silence, reduced participation and reduced interest in schooling.
5. Children report low levels of cultural inclusion and considerable concern that their home languages are viewed as inferior.
6. The descriptive data show higher language-difficulty scores among irregular attendees and dropouts, but the reported ANOVA does not establish a statistically significant difference.
7. Language difficulty has a statistically significant negative association with perceived cultural inclusion.
8. The reported association between language difficulty and educational capability is not statistically significant.
9. Labour-involved children show descriptive disadvantages, but the reported group differences are not statistically significant.
10. Documentation problems are significantly associated with schooling status and therefore constitute an important institutional dimension of educational exclusion.

9. Policy and Educational Implications

9.1 Mother-Tongue and Multilingual Bridging Support

Schools serving migrant communities should provide structured language-bridging support rather than expecting children to shift immediately from their home language to the dominant school language. Where full mother-tongue instruction is not feasible, bilingual materials, peer language support, bridge courses, visual resources and locally relevant oral-language activities can reduce the initial gap.

9.2 Flexible Admission and Transfer

Migrant children need admission and transfer procedures that recognise mobility. Schools should minimise repeated documentation demands, maintain portable educational records and ensure that a child can enter a receiving school without losing academic continuity.

9.3 Seasonal Learning Support

Because many families move with work cycles, educational planning should include seasonal outreach, temporary learning centres where appropriate, coordination between origin and destination schools, and mechanisms for tracking attendance and learning progress across migration periods.

9.4 Worksite-Based Educational Outreach

Education departments and local institutions should identify brickfield settlements and conduct regular enrolment, attendance and learning-support visits. Such outreach should include language assessment, counselling, documentation assistance and referral to child-protection mechanisms where children are engaged in labour.

9.5 Recognition of Linguistic Diversity

Schools should treat children's home languages as resources rather than deficiencies. Teachers can use multilingual classroom practices, bilingual glossaries, peer translation and culturally familiar examples. Recognition does not require abandoning Bengali or English; it requires creating a bridge through which children can acquire those languages without being asked to abandon the language through which they first understand the world.

9.6 Teacher Preparation

Teacher education and in-service programmes should prepare teachers to work with linguistically diverse and mobile learners. Teachers need practical strategies for language scaffolding, multilingual interaction, inclusive assessment and communication with families who may not share the school language.

9.7 Integrated Institutional Response

Educational responses should be coordinated with labour, child protection and local administrative systems. A language intervention alone cannot address the educational effects of migration, child labour and documentation barriers. The evidence in this study points to the need for an integrated response that reduces the number of obstacles children must overcome simultaneously.

10. Toward a Migrant-Sensitive Multilingual Educational Framework

The evidence supports a framework organised around five connected principles: recognition, access, continuity, participation and capability.

Principle	Core problem	Suggested response
Recognition	Home languages and cultural identities receive limited institutional recognition.	Use children's home languages as classroom resources; include multilingual materials and culturally responsive practices.
Access	Documentation, mobility and poverty interrupt entry into school.	Simplify admission and transfer; provide documentation assistance and active outreach to worksites.
Continuity	Seasonal migration breaks the connection between child and school.	Use portable records, school-to-school coordination, bridge programmes and flexible learning arrangements.
Participation	Language difficulty limits questioning, expression and classroom interaction.	Provide language scaffolding, peer support, bilingual resources and participatory teaching.
Capability	Formal enrolment does not ensure confidence, agency or meaningful educational benefit.	Monitor participation, confidence, expression and learning progress alongside attendance.

This framework keeps language at the centre of the analysis while avoiding a single-factor explanation of exclusion. The purpose is to make schooling usable for children whose lives are shaped by mobility and labour. A migrant-sensitive system must therefore follow the child across institutional boundaries rather than treating each school admission as a new beginning.

CONCLUSION

The educational position of children from migrant brickfield households in West Tripura cannot be understood through enrolment figures alone. The data show a population experiencing seasonal mobility, economic insecurity, labour involvement and documentation difficulties, alongside a substantial mismatch between home languages and school languages. Children report difficulty understanding and using the language of instruction, reduced classroom participation and limited feelings of cultural inclusion.

The statistical findings also require precision. The present data do not establish that language difficulty independently causes dropout, and they do not show a significant relationship between language difficulty and educational capability or between labour involvement and language difficulty. They do, however, show a significant relationship between language difficulty and perceived cultural inclusion and between documentation problems and schooling status. These findings support the argument that language is an important part of a wider structure of educational exclusion.

Bourdieu helps explain why the linguistic resources children bring from home may have low institutional value. Cummins helps explain the educational demands of academic language development. Sen directs attention to the difference between formal access and the real freedom to participate and benefit from education. Together, these perspectives suggest that educational equality requires more than placing migrant children in existing classrooms.

For children living and working around brickfields, an equitable educational response must be multilingual, flexible and responsive to mobility. Language support should be combined with portable educational records, simplified administrative procedures, worksite outreach, teacher preparation and protection from labour-related educational disruption. The central issue is therefore not whether migrant children have access to school in a formal sense, but whether the schooling system enables them to understand, participate, belong and continue learning.

REFERENCES

1. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
2. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
3. Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. California Association for Bilingual Education.
4. Government of Tripura. (2022). *Brick kilns of Tripura*. Tripura State Pollution Control Board, Agartala.
5. Government of Tripura. (2023). *Socio-educational status of children of migrant labourers in West Tripura brickfields*. Directorate of Education, Government of Tripura, Agartala.
6. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India, New Delhi.
7. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
8. Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.