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Abstract

Recent years have witnessed a growing interest in multilingualism, language maintenance and managing language diversity both inside and outside the educational context. However, much of this work, especially in the educational context, has focused on (minority) languages and relatively little attention has been paid to ‘dialects’. This study explores the status and role of Mewati, a dialect generally subsumed under Hindi (Government of India, 2001) in schools. While Mewati is spoken by most Meos as their first language (Srivastava, 2011, p. 250), there are currently no studies that examine the use and role of Mewati in education in Mewat. This thesis addresses an important gap in understanding what roles are assigned (or not) to local dialects in education.

This project was guided by two research questions: What language-in-education policies (LiEPs) were in place in the two types of schools (rural and urban) chosen for this study; and what role did Mewati play in the overall language policy framework in these schools. The goal of this project was to develop an understanding about how teachers comprehended, negotiated and implemented LiEPs within classrooms. It also aimed at uncovering and critically analysing the underlying ideologies, policies and political processes that informed and influenced these LiEPs in the two schools studied and how these policies, affected the position of Mewati in these schools.

The schools studied differed across multiple dimensions including medium of instruction, board of affiliation, textbooks and curricula, location, infrastructure and the socio-economic background of the students. However, they were similar in that most students in both schools spoke Mewati as their home language. The case study was based on data collected in interviews, informal conversations, artifacts, documents and field notes. The data was gathered from both Meo and non-Meo teachers, who differed across linguistic, ethnic and religious lines, in order to obtain a richer and holistic perspective on teachers’ views and practices. This project took an interdisciplinary approach and drew insights from sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, education and sociology. The study draws significantly on Spolsky’s (2004) model of language policy which was used both as an analytical framework as well as a tool for organizing data.

The study revealed that the LiEP of the rural schools was largely Hindi monolingual and the urban school mostly Hindi-English bilingual. Both types of schools failed to make space for Mewati, the mother tongue of the majority of students. In both school types, Hindi was taught as the first language. The majority of teachers also held negative attitudes towards Mewati. The teachers perceived Mewati as a hindrance for the learning and overall development of students.
There was a significant communication gap between teachers and students particularly in the early years of education. There was also a severe shortage of local Meo teachers. Most teachers in both schools were non-Meos who could not speak Mewati.

A complex mix of inter-ethnic relations between these groups and the socio-historical and political structures greatly influenced language choice patterns and policy decisions. This study has important implications for the role of mother tongue in education for policymakers, government officials, educationists, and teachers as the findings indicate a need for change in language policy and procedures.
Chapter 1 – Introduction To The Study

1.0 Introduction

In recent years, there has been an upsurge of interest in the preservation of languages, the same cannot be held true, however, when it comes to preservation of dialects (Tulloch, 2006, p. 269) or the preservation of endangered dialects in "safe" languages (Alatis, Straehle, Ronkin, & Gallenberger, 1996, p. 252). The scholarship dealing with language endangerment concerns itself with arbitrary decisions relating to the inclusion and exclusion of certain varieties, rather than emphasizing upon the relevance of all types of linguistic diversity (Wolfram 1996, p. 253).

This research stemmed from concern for preserving dialects, particularly those of minority groups. Exploring the role they may play in the education settings can help in terms of achieving and promoting linguistic rights and in improving literacy attainment. The tendency of both language scholars and lay people alike is their consideration of dialect death or dialect loss as somehow less significant than language death or language loss (Ibid). Such a view helps facilitate the loss of many of the world's dialects and the consequent violation of linguistic human rights.

As Wolfram argues, linguists rarely pay attention to endangered dialects of a "safe" language (Ibid). Endangered dialects of a "safe" language are those dialects whose unique status may be threatened by different varieties of the same language rather than other languages (Ibid). This is a particularly important problem in India as Pandharipande (1992) argues, non-standard dialects shift to standard dialects and/or minority languages to dominant regional languages (p. 255). Benedikter (2009) similarly notes that minority language speakers in India are shifting towards regionally dominant languages and thus several smaller languages are facing swift extinction as a result (p. 179).

A major factor contributing towards language shift and/or language loss is education. Fishman contends that "schools are unreliable allies of language maintenance, frequently and appreciably leading to language shift" (as cited in Lo Bianco, 2010, p. 4). Additionally, Abbi (2009) claims that the exclusion of minority languages from schools, either as medium of instruction or as subjects, restricts them to the home domain or leads to a shift towards the more dominant regional languages in India (p. 306). By privileging the more standard and dominant varieties, schools act as a major contributing force in the exclusion of minority languages and dialects. This is accentuated...
when minority languages/dialects lack standardized scripts and are not regarded as 'fully developed' and are deemed ill equipped to be the language of education (Koul & Devaki, 2000, p. 121).

An example of all of these factors is Mewati, a non standard variety which does not have a standardized script and is recognized by the Government of India as a 'dialect' of Hindi, for example in the Linguistic Survey of India, which is part of the Indian Census.

This puts Mewati at risk since minority languages and dialects tend to shift towards dominant regional languages as noted above. In this case, the dominant regional language is Hindi, a relatively safe language, and Mewati is seen as its dialect. The status of Mewati as a minority non-standard language risks further exclusion from education, helping to cause a shift towards Hindi and the possible extinction of Mewati. That said, it should be noted that the aim of this research is not to suggest that Mewati is or is not likely to be endangered and thus does not deal with language endangerment per se. This project rather concerns itself with the question of Mewati's role in education.

Exclusion of Mewati from education may have implications for Mewati's maintenance as well as for students' academic progress. Mohanty, Mishra, Reddy and Gumidyala (2009) discuss exclusion of minority languages from education in India, suggesting "[It] has direct negative consequences for educational performance, socioeconomic wellbeing and sense of identity and empowerment of the speakers of minority and indigenous languages, severely restricting the chances of their development and survival" (p. 285-286). This study attempts to explore the role of Mewati within schools' overall language policy.

It is to be noted that though Mewati is classified as a dialect by the Indian government and has been described as such by all the participants throughout, I would be using the term minority language to refer to dialects in general and Mewati in particular for two main reasons: Since Mewati belongs to an ethnically and linguistically minority group, and since varieties labeled as dialects are often at a disadvantage in society. Also, since other linguists tend to include and extend minority languages to mean dialects, I too would be adopting the term minority language for Mewati dialect so as to remain consistent throughout the thesis. Like other Sociolinguists, I do not make a distinction between a dialect and a language. The distinction between dialects and languages is often political rather than linguistic. This research is a critical enquiry into both political and linguistic concerns. Notably, participants' own description of Mewati, is to refer to it as a dialect. My use of the term 'dialect' in this thesis is intended to remain consistent with participants use of language as well as to highlight the political nature of the language-dialect distinction.
The section below outlines the research questions and the reasons for which this project is taken. Following this, the concept of the vicious circle of language disadvantage is discussed. The next section provides the historical overview of India's language-in-education policy (LiEP) and illuminates briefly the manner in which minority languages and dialects are marginalized. Following this, background information on the region of Mewat, Mewati language and the Meo community is provided. This is followed by an explanation of the purpose and significance of the study. Finally, an outline of the thesis is presented.

1.1 The Problem and Research Questions

The concept of dialect awareness is relevant in teaching and learning and little emphasis is given to this issue. Wolfram claims that knowledge about language and in particular dialect diversity is virtually non-existent from public education system (2008, p. 189). He argues this trend is noticeable among students and teachers, in that neither the learning outcomes nor the teacher training programs incorporate knowledge about language diversity (Ibid). Despite the significance that is usually attached to dialect diversity programs for their role in educational practices, very few linguists and classrooms teachers have been engaged in programs dealing with this issue (Ibid). As a result, dialects usually suffer from linguistic subordination where deep prejudices are normally held against them within the school environment.

This thesis addresses the issues surrounding dialect diversity by investigating:

- What are teachers' attitudes toward Mewati, their views on its place in school, specifically in teaching and learning processes, their overall beliefs on language diversity and if they think Mewati should be maintained at home or at school at all by students.

This question has to be examined from a broader perspective taking into account other languages forming part of the school, including teachers' and students' repertoire. In order to achieve this goal, schools' language policies were examined. The specific questions this research seeks to ask include:

- What language policy is in place in schools?
- What role, if any, does Mewati play?
Answering these questions sheds light on how policies reflect and reproduce social, educational and linguistic inequalities. While there exists a paucity of literature on Indian dialects, this study is the first sociolinguistic study on Mewati in education.

Bhatt and Mahboob (2008, p. 150) citing Paulston (1994) noted the lack of literature describing the plight of minority languages, especially those belonging to South Asia, noting it is “surprisingly small, especially in the area of the sociology of minority languages: the perspective that allows us to ascertain whether and how the declining role of these languages is generally associated with issues of power and control, education and literacy, and demography, development, and planning” (Bhatt, & Mahboob 2008, p.150). This study addresses this gap by approaching questions of power and control in the domain of education and literacy pertaining to a minority language in relation to LiEP. A critical analysis of the intersection of policy, politics and ideology in Mewat and how it may influence LiEP followed inside the classroom is conducted. This research is broadly located within the field of Critical Language Policy research. This perspective will be discussed further in Chapter 2. I call this study 'critical' since my objective is not simply to describe or explain things but to critically examine the underlying language ideologies, policies and practices with the aim to bring about a greater social change and justice in favour of minority languages such as Mewati in the educational domain.

1.2 The Vicious Circle of Language Disadvantage

One of the reasons dialect preservation has attracted less attention is due to the macro approaches to language planning which have traditionally focused on either ignoring or undermining dialectal variation in the pursuit of a shared or common speech form (Tulloch, 2006, p. 269). This situation applies in India with Hindi being the standard language under which dialects are subsumed. This disadvantages and disempowers the dialects, weakening their instrumental significance and affecting their vitality. This process of language disadvantage is best explained by Mohanty et al. (2009, p. 286) in what is termed as a vicious circle of language disadvantage as illustrated by Figure 1.
Mohanty (2009, p. 4) asserts that this disadvantage is brought about by gross social, educational, statutory, official and legal neglect of these varieties in combination with the justification of the poverty of these languages with their so-called inadequacies. These inadequacies may exist in terms of lack of standardization, orthography, literacy and pedagogical materials among other things which further marginalize these dialects, keep them out of schools and other domains of power and deprive them of privileges and resources (Ibid). This social and educational neglect, he argues, further weakens these dialects thereby giving rise to the justification of further neglect (2009, p. 286). To see how this happens in schools, it is necessary to examine India’s LiEP and its historical role in affecting the place of dialects (minority languages) in education.

1.3 LiEP in India: Historical Overview

All India Council for Education in 1956 recommended India’s LiEP, The Three-Language-Formula (TLF) (Vaish, 2008, p. 14). Following a series of modification, the TLF came into effect in 1968 (Ibid). All these series of actions demonstrate the entrenched nature of the TLF and also the sensitive language issues in India, "which the government thinks is best left untouched" (Ibid).
TLF is an educational strategy designed to cope with India’s multilingualism by introducing languages at the national, regional and local levels (Srivastava, 2007, p. 43). The formula suggests teaching of the following languages in schools, “a) The regional\(^1\) language and mother tongue when the latter is different from the regional language, b) Hindi, or in Hindi speaking areas, another Indian language, and c) English or any other modern European language” (Dasgupta, 1970, p. 244).

Pandharipande (2002) claims TLF "had an enormous impact on the minority languages" (p. 9). She emphasizes the role TLF plays in reducing the functional load (a quantitative base for evaluating the notion of power with a language functioning in relatively more domains being considered to having a higher functional load) of minority languages in the public domain causing a shift to dominant languages. As a result, minority languages (especially tribal languages) face language attrition (Pandharipande, 2002, p. 7).

According to Vanishree (2011), TLF failed to be followed in practice as state governments equated mother tongues with regional languages (p. 350). This marginalized minority languages in the educational sphere (Ibid). For example in Haryana, a state with Hindi as its official regional language, most schools (including those of Mewat) use Hindi as the MOI and a compulsory subject until grade 10, despite most students in Haryana using other languages as their mother tongues, predominantly Mewati in the region of Mewat.

Also, minority languages are not the only ones being kept out of the school domain. Urdu, a relatively dominant and standard language meets the same fate. Urdu is unique as in India, it is a language perceived to belong to the Muslim minority, yet it holds a significant place as one of India’s major official languages. While Urdu and Hindi are linguistically quite similar, they make interesting ground for playing identity politics (Abbi, Hasnain, & Kidwai, 2004, p. 1).

Historically, political tension between Hindus and Muslims led to linguistic tension between Hindi and Urdu by linking them with different social roles and group identities - Hindi as Hindu and Urdu as Muslim (Ibid). This sociopolitical context has appeared to have had a bearing on Urdu’s image with Urdu being relegated from a language of the dominant elite to one associated with illiteracy, poverty and backwardness (Abbi et al., 2004, p. 3). Hasnain (2007) attributes this to the covert policies of the states which contribute to the discouragement of Urdu as a media of instruction in schools through lack of educational facilities, teachers, textbooks and teaching materials, consequently forcing children to take instruction in Hindi rather than Urdu (p. 4).

\(^1\) A regional language here refers to the official State language
This sentiment is shared by Mathews (2003) who notes that the State Board Curriculum of the North Indian states is usually blamed for keeping Urdu out of the educational domain, of which Hindi and Sanskrit are mandatory subjects (p. 62). Therefore, he contends that those individuals whose mother tongue is Urdu are denied the basic linguistic human right to have education in their language (Ibid).

With regard to the provision for Sanskrit in the Hindi speaking regions, the intention behind implementing the TLF originally was - for all students - "the study of a modern Indian language, preferably one of the southern languages, apart from Hindi and English in the Hindi speaking states", according to the National Policy on Education of 1968 (Ibid). However, as state governments had scope to allow for the teaching of a classical language such as Sanskrit and thus not a modern Indian language, the policy of TLF failed at the implementation stage as it was not implemented as it was designed.

Overall, Hindi plays a dominant role within the TLF LiEP. Minority languages in states where Hindi is the official language run the risk of being replaced by Hindi. This is further supported by Brass when he declared "Hindi chauvinism and the pressures for Sanskrit education and Sanskritization of Hindi" were among the chief reasons for the failure of the TLF in the Indian North (2005, p. 215).

TLF has failed because of language politics which is reflected in how it has been applied especially concerning Urdu and particularly minority languages. This is best captured in a statement by Mallikarjun (2001, Introduction) when he declares "the Three Language Formula has neither been implemented in letter and spirit nor has it led to the effects its proponents thought that it would".

As part of a religious minority, (the Muslim community in India), Mewati speakers have an affiliation to Urdu. Mewati speakers are thus affected by the conflict between Hindi and Urdu as well as the conflict between Hindi and its related dialects. It is for this reason it would be imperative to examine the LiEP in Mewat. The section below gives a brief account of the region, the language, and its people.
1.4 Mewat, Mewati and Meos

1.4.0 Mewat district

This study was conducted in the Mewat district of the state of Haryana. In development terms, Mewat stands behind all the other nineteen districts of Haryana on every socioeconomic indicator. Based on the 2011 Census, Ministry of Minority Affairs, Government of India identified 90 minority dominated backward districts across the whole country using socio-economic indicators. Mewat was identified as one of them, lagging behind severely in most of those indicators (IRRAD, 2011, p. 7).

Mewat is named after its traditional inhabitants - Meos, and the region shares its boundaries with the states of Rajasthan and Haryana. Although home to many language varieties, Haryana’s official language is Hindi. One of the most widely spoken varieties spoken in the region and identified with Haryana is Haryanvi, which is regarded as a dialect of Hindi.

According to the 2001 Census, Mewat had a total population of 993,000 of which 95.36% of its population is rural and 4.64% is urban (GOI, 2001). The literacy rate recorded was 44.07%, which was lower in comparison to both, the state average literacy rate of 68.59% and the national literacy rate of 65.38% (Ibid). The map in Fig 2 shows the geographical location of Mewat (Maps of India, 2013).
Figure 2 – Mewat Map

1.4.1 Mewati

Mewati, with no official script of its own, is considered a dialect of Hindi in the sense that it is linguistically defined as a Rajasthani language variety (Gusain, 2003, p. 1) and Rajasthani is further considered a dialect of Hindi, by the Government of India as per the Census of 2001. There are eight dialects of Rajasthani, namely, Bagri, Wagri, Shekhawati, Mewati, Marwari, Mewari, Harauti and Dhundhari. Out of these, Marwari is generally considered a dominant and 'standard dialect' of Rajasthani owing to a large variety of literature and research work carried out on its grammar and dictionary (Gusain, 2003, p. 1). Mewati belongs to the Indo-Aryan family. According to the 2001 Census, in India as a whole, Mewati is spoken by 645,291 people as a mother tongue of which the majority lived in Haryana (347,260) and Rajasthan (289,731) (GOI, 2001, p. 248).
1.4.2 The Meo tribe

The Meos are largely a pastoral-peasant Muslim community and are classified as an ‘other backward class’ (OBC) by the Indian government, meaning they are recognized as being socially and economically deprived. In 2001, the literacy of Meo women was estimated between 1.76% and 2.13%, with Meo men estimated between 27% to 37% (Prasad, 2008, p. 52). Historically, the Meo tribe has had a rich history. They have resisted state repression from the Mughal and British Empires, and regional Rajput and Jat kingdoms (Mayaram, 2004, p. 16).

Evidence of this can be gained through their oral history as claimed by Mayaram, an author who has provided an extensive account of Meos’ culture and history (Ibid). Mayaram (2003, p. 338) recounts a key historical event that bears testimony to Meos’ resistance by playing a crucial role in reviving Indian nationalism. The Alwar state disregarded the hardship for the peasantry resulting from the great depression and successive famine years and raised the tax by over 30% (Ibid).

The Meo community in response mobilized one hundred thousand Meo peasants during the peasant movement of 1932-33 and refused to pay the tax (Ibid). Mayaram notes that it is this continuous struggle against state oppression and Meo efforts to resist the state that led to Meos' stigmatized classification as a 'criminal tribe' under British and Mughal rule (Ibid). The effects of this continue to persist till today. This complex and rich history of Meos is what makes the Meos such an interesting group to base this study on. The section below highlights the purpose for which this study was undertaken.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

School is a crucial site where continued negotiation, reproduction and resistance of identities takes place and where different languages compete with each other. It is for this reason, this research sets out to explore questions such as, which languages are being used and at the expense of which ones in schools, are language policies in education leading to maintenance and / or reproduction of language inequalities with specific reference to a minority language variety like Mewati and if so, how are practices, beliefs and ideologies accountable for this.
Generally, local languages and cultures in schools across India, as elsewhere, tend to be ignored and marginalized within the broader LiEPs. This research, therefore, sheds light on the space (or otherwise) provided to minority languages in school settings. It also helps explain the manner in which schools produce, sustain and reproduce inequalities of languages by keeping minority languages out of language policy frameworks and teaching and learning processes. It is anticipated that this study will lead to informed decision making with regard to using and respecting local languages and cultures within schools.

This study provides an analysis of LiEP in a rural setting in India with specific reference to a language spoken by a religious and ethnic minority group. The overarching objective of the research is a detailed sociolinguistic analysis of language practices, beliefs and management, in line with the model proposed by Spolsky (2004) in order to ascertain LiEP. Analyzing and applying the language practices, beliefs and management components of Spolsky’s model will, ensure the research questions are addressed. An attempt is made to provide a broad, holistic, and rich account for Mewati in terms of LiEP, however other languages are also considered and discussed.

Additionally, the main purpose driving this research is to endorse the need for mother tongue in education which would affirm linguistic human rights, ensure equitable distribution of resources, lead to linguistic pluralism, improve democratic participation and increase literacy rate. Ricento and Burnaby (1998) argue that researchers often try to separate “politics” from “policy” in their investigation (p. 342). However, this study is motivated by social change, and rejects the notion that "policy" is separate from "politics". As Cibulka (1995) notes that "the borderline between policy research and policy argument is razor thin" (p. 118), this research attempts to position itself exactly on this borderline.

1.6 Thesis Outline

The study is organized into six chapters. This Chapter dealt with the introduction of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the relevant literature, which helps to locate this study within the Critical Language Policy paradigm, drawing on Critical Theory. This chapter also discusses the theoretical framework of Language Policy of Bernard Spolsky.

Chapter 3 deals with the methodology and procedures used for collecting and analyzing data.
Chapter 4 presents findings, describing participant teachers' practices, beliefs and ideologies and language management strategies used in the selected schools based on the model advanced by Spolsky.

Chapter 5 provides the analysis and discussion of findings along with the theoretical implications of Spolsky's (2004) model and presents a way to build on this model further.

Chapter 6 presents the conclusion of the research study, lists limitations and suggests some recommendations.

1.7 Summary

This Chapter included a historical overview of India’s LiEP, in addition to conceptual discussion of the vicious circle of language disadvantage that helped to frame the research question, and background information on Mewat, Mewati and the Meo community. It also highlighted the purpose of this study.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature relevant to the research inquiry. The focus of review mainly revolves around seven areas. A description of language planning and policy is provided, followed by a historical review on types of language planning. Orientations to language planning are then reviewed with the aim of highlighting and justifying the orientation this research will take.

Approaches to language planning are examined, in particular a comparison between the neoclassical and historical-structural approaches leading to an emphasis on the latter approach guiding this research. This section also underscores the broader framework under which this research is located, namely critical language policy research.

The language policy model proposed by Spolsky (2004) is introduced which is drawn upon as an analytical framework in this study. Literature is then presented which deals with mother tongues in education and examines the important debates in this space. Finally, three case studies are reviewed that illustrate the vital role mother tongues play in education including literature on recent mother tongue based multilingual educational programmes implemented in India.

2.1 Language Policy and Planning (LPP)

Though scholars have frequently used the terms 'language planning' and 'language policy' interchangeably, some scholars such as Baldauf and Kaplan (1997, p. xi) maintain that these two terms denote different aspects of language change processes. They define language planning as an activity undertaken by governments aiming to "promote some systematic linguistic change in some community of speakers" and language policy as "a body of ideas, laws, regulation, rules and practices intended to achieve the planned language change in the society, group or system".

In many cases however, there is no explicit document or a set of rules that is followed, as far as language policy is concerned. Blackmore (2004, p. 97) explains that while policy is often perceived as an official text, it may also be regarded as a process, political decision, a discourse, a program or
even an outcome. Similarly, for Spolsky (2006, p. 87) the term 'language policy' is used in two senses: Firstly, it describes "the customary consensual judgments and practices of a speech community with regard to the appropriateness of a large number of significant choices among all the kinds of variants allowed in speech or writing". Secondly, it refers to "a specific policy adopted and explicitly stated for a defined circumstance and place". The model suggested by Spolsky (2004) indicates language policy consists of language practice, ideology and management (planning) as its key elements. This framework of Spolsky (2004) will be drawn upon for exploring the language policies adopted in schools and to gain a better understanding of teachers' ideologies, language use patterns and management strategies.

2.2 Types of Language Planning

Language planning deals with four aspects and types of planning activities: status, corpus, acquisition and prestige (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004, p. 56). Status planning refers to efforts directed toward the allocation of languages/literacies to various functions in a given speech community such as in the domain of education (Ricento, 2006, p. 28). It also indicates a language's position relative to other languages. Whilst Kloss (1969, p. 15) points to the notion of a language's standing alongside other languages as being the focal point of status planning, other scholars like Fishman (1974b, p.80) link allocation of functions with status planning. Seen in this regard, when speakers of dialects and minority languages are denied the right to gain an education in their language, for example, their language has no status (Ferguson, 2006, p. 20-21).

Corpus planning implies efforts directed toward the adequacy of the form and structure of languages (Ricento, 2006, p. 28). These can include: graphization, standardization and modernization. Graphization involves developing, selecting and modifying scripts and orthographic conventions. Standardization involves developing a norm which overrides regional and social dialects and ends up being the 'best' form of the language. Modernization involves expansion of the lexicon allowing the language to discuss topics in technical and modern scientific domains. Lack of corpus planning for many Indian minority languages is given as a reason to justify their exclusion from the school domain.

The core of acquisition planning (LiEP) is the aim to increase the number of speakers of a given language (Ferguson, 2006, p. 34) by educating speakers to employ it in both spoken and written
forms (Wright, 2004, p. 232). According to Cooper (1989, p. 33), “Acquisition planning is directed toward the increase of the number of users of a language that is speakers, writers, listeners, or readers”. Cooper (1989, p. 40) claims that the goals of acquisition planning may be achieved by designing programs to create or to improve opportunities or incentive to learn. In India, for instance, efforts with regard to the spread and promotion of learning of Hindi and English usually takes place through these mechanisms under acquisition planning (Sridhar, 1996, p. 344). This research explores this aspect of language planning as it is an exploratory case study exploring on the possibility of using the Indian minority language Mewati as language of instruction in education.

Prestige planning was added as a fourth dimension of language planning by Haarmann (1990), referring to efforts directed towards creating a favorable psychological background vital for the long-term success of language planning activities (p. 104). Prestige planning becomes crucial when a low prestige language is promoted for high prestige. Therefore, prestige planning frequently becomes a precondition for status planning. The 'nonstandard' minority languages in India, for instance, suffer from low prestige value and therefore any thought of making a serious change toward using them in education has to bear prestige planning in mind.

2.3 Orientations to Language Planning

Language planning is influenced by the way language planners perceive languages and their role in societies. There are three orientations that form the core of the politics of language diversity and dialects and minority languages in education. These three perspectives affect the way language planning activities are carried out in a particular polity or domain. Ruiz (1984, p. 4) refers to orientation to language planning as a complex of dispositions toward language and its role in society. These orientations determine the basic questions the individuals or language planners ask, the conclusions drawn from the data, and even the data itself (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16). He identified the following three types of orientations:

- Language as a problem
- Language as a right
- Language as a resource
2.3.0 Language as a problem

This orientation views minority languages as an obstacle to overcome. They are seen as a cause of social, economic, and educational problems rather than an effect of such problems (Baker, 2011, p. 377). The school systems are responsible for overcoming this handicap by increasing teaching of a majority/dominant language at the expense of the home language. (Ibid.) This is done to incorporate minority language speakers into the mainstream as language diversity in this orientation is seen as "a threat to unity and social harmony, or threat to national development" (Roy-Campbell, 1999, p. 69). Based on this, language planners deal with language diversity by adopting assimilation as a goal (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004, p. 29).

2.3.1 Language as a right

In opposition to the earlier orientation, this perspective perceives language as a fundamental human right (Ruiz 1984, p. 22). Language planners and policy makers in this approach focus on language maintenance/preservation and even revitalization of minority languages. Macias (1979, p. 88-89) claims language rights include freedom from discrimination based on language and the right to use one's language(s) in the activities of community life, especially a student’s right to attain education in their own language. Mackey (1979, p. 49) adds that language rights include using one's ethnic language in legal proceedings and attaining bilingual education. In addition to these language rights, many other scholars have contributed to this list and this by no means is exhaustive. This kind of orientation to language planning usually reflects linguistic affirmation as its goal (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004, p. 30) or as Hornberger calls it linguistic pluralism albeit of a weak form (2003, p. 133).

2.3.2 Language as a resource

In this orientation, every language is viewed as a resource or an asset. This perspective views language resources as natural resources which should be astutely conserved and developed (McKay & San Ling Wong, 1988, p. vii). The two authors argue that just like natural resources,
languages can also be threatened by competition, consumerism, globalization and new technological advancement (Ibid). Therefore, just as the value of natural resources depend on the ability to exploit them optimally, so do the value of indigenous and other minority languages. This orientation views not only the majority or dominant languages as resources but also the minority languages.

Ruiz (1984, p. 25-26) clearly favours the language as a resource orientation over the other two orientations mentioned above. He points out that his problem with the language as a right approach is that a person or a group's "claim to" the use of a particular language is also a "claim against" someone hindering that right (Ruiz, 1984, p. 24). Ruiz argues that language as a right orientation causes automatic resistance and leads to tension between majority and minority communities. Wiley also (as cited in Cassell, 2007, p. 45) mentions that language as a right orientation leads to many unresolved problems and tensions as it tends to get language planners embroiled in confrontation, advocacy, and activism.

However, I believe that confrontation, advocacy and activism would inherently accompany language as a right perspective due to the differential relations of power and resources between minority and dominant groups. Therefore, a claim made by the minority group within the existing oppressive social structure would inevitably lead to a claim made against the dominant group. This view finds resonance in the comment made by Hornberger (2003) who maintains that "under coercive power relationships in a society, minorities' claim to their language rights is inevitably a claim against majorities and other minorities" (p. 134).

Hornberger also mentions that Ruiz considers the language as a right orientation different from that of language as a resource orientation (Ibid). However, the two orientations can be seen as interrelated and complementary. Accordingly, the orientation language as a right can be seen as a prerequisite for language as a resource (Ibid). As Hornberger argues, without acknowledging, accepting, and respecting others' language rights, perception of language(s) as positive or meaningful resource would not hold much value (Ibid).

As mentioned in Chapter One, the objective of this research is to explore as well as advocate for the role of mother tongue (Mewati) in education. Hence, I make a case in favour of Mewati in the LiEP from the perspective of acknowledging, promoting and respecting language rights and from the perspective of considering it as a resource in attaining literacy.


2.4 Approaches to Language Planning and Policy

In the early decades of LPP research, a large number of models and typologies were developed (Cooper, 1989; Ferguson, 1968; Haugen, 1983; Kloss, 1966; Nahir, 1984; Neustupny, 1974). Hornberger's (1994) 'Integrative Framework of Language Planning and Policy goals' summarized most of these earlier models and made two distinctions - LPP types and LPP approaches. LPP types included status, corpus and acquisition planning as discussed earlier in this chapter. The LPP approaches were further divided into two types - policy planning and cultivation planning. The policy planning approach focused on form and on macro level policy objectives, concerning primarily standard and official languages whereas the cultivation planning approach focused on function and on micro level policy goals such as the spread, revival or maintenance of smaller languages. The earliest approaches to language planning were characterized by the focus "on the formal properties of language and the structural characteristics of language varieties" (Wiley 1996, p. 116).

Early approaches to LPP were motivated by concern for multilingual countries especially the newly independent countries in issues that related to nation building, national cohesion and modernization (Tollefson, 1991). This approach was mainly influenced by the language as a problem orientation to LPP (Cassell, 2007, p.47). In the literature, these early attempts and approaches to LPP were referred to as "the traditional approach" (Ricento, 2006, p. 12, Tollefson, 2002, p. 5 and Tollefson, 2008, p. 3) and also sometimes called as "the neoclassical approach" (Tollefson, 1991, p. 35 and Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p. 510), the “classical approach” (Ricento, 2000, p. 206) or the “positivist approach” (e.g. Ricento & Hornberger, 1996, p. 405).

By focusing primarily on the formal properties of language and on technical aspects of language issues, the neoclassical approach to LPP has come to be seen as apolitical and ideologically neutral (Tollefson, 1991). Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990) also lend support to this claim by indicating that LPP had been focused on maintaining a "veneer of scientific objectivity" and had "tended to avoid directly addressing larger social and political matters within which language change, use and development, and indeed language planning itself are embedded" (p. 27). Tollefson (1991) introduces a distinction between two broad approaches to LPP which he identifies under the labels
of - the neoclassical approach and the historical-structural approach. Unlike the neoclassical approach discussed above, the historical-structural approach is neither ideologically neutral nor ahistorical in nature. Wiley (1996) lists the major differences between the neoclassical and the historical-structural approach as:

1) The unit of analysis employed - While the neoclassical approach focuses on individual choices, the historical-structural, pays attention to relationships between groups.

2) The role of historical perspective - While the neoclassical approach focuses more on the current language situation, the historical-structural emphasizes the impact of socio-historical factors on language use.

3) Criteria for evaluating plans and policies - The neoclassical approach is amoral in its outlook and the way it presents its evaluations. Policies are evaluated by how efficiently they achieve goals, the historical-structural approach is concerned with issues of oppression, exploitation and domination.

4) The role of the social scientist - The neoclassical approach assumes the social scientist can/should approach language problems in an apolitical manner, the historical-structural approach assumes that a political stance is unavoidable as “those who avoid the political questions inadvertently support the status quo” (p. 115).

The historical-structural approach is concerned with ways through which linguistic domination is achieved and maintained. As Tollefson (1991) notes that "the major goal of policy research is to examine the historical basis of policies and to make explicit the mechanisms by which policies' decisions serve or undermine particular political and economic interests" (p. 31).

The chief perspective informing my approach is critical language policy (CLP) research using the historical-structural approach. While the body of CLP research continues to expand rapidly, a critical theory of language policy still remains to be developed (Tollefson, 2006, p. 48). CLP is critical of traditional approaches to LPP like the neoclassical approach which overtly focus on language without taking into account underlying sociohistorical and political forces at play. It is aimed at social change, and draws its influence from critical theory (Tollefson, 2006, p. 42 and May, 2006, p. 256). At the core of critical theory is the objective of human emancipation and the unmasking of underlying power structures. Critical theory generally deals with the processes by which social inequality is produced and maintained, and the relationship between language policy and notions of power, inequality and ideology (Tollefson, 2006, p. 44).
The notions of power, inequality and ideology, takes centre stage in this research. This is because in the school environment, Mewati comes into direct contact with varieties that are regarded as dominant standard languages, namely Hindi, Urdu and English. This study looks, therefore, at the effects of historical and structural factors on language use and policy and its effects on Mewati in schools.

Ricento (2006, p. 8-9) described the following points by which (Critical) language policy can be characterized:

1. Language policy is always about more than language. One is required to take into account insights from subject areas (e.g. political, economic, and social theory) other than linguistics to unravel what is at stake (e.g. hidden ideologies).
2. The way terms are defined and used (e.g. 'language', 'language policy, 'the state' and so on) has consequences for one's analyses and recommendations.
3. Language ideologies have effects on language policies and practices (e.g. monolingualism or multilingualism).
4. Research in LPP must be an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activity. Conceptual and methodological tools from other disciplines need to be borrowed and appropriately integrated and applied to one's research.

This research, thus, is located within the field of Critical Language Policy (CLP) research and in particular draws on Critical Theory, as discussed in Chapter One. The below section describes the framework used in this study.

2.5 Language Policy Model

Earlier models of LPP, were either focused on policy decisions made at the macro level flowing top-down from the state and/or other institutional bodies or largely relied on the technical and structural aspects of languages (Ricento, 2006, p. 12-13). However, what the earlier models, as synthesized in Hornberger’s integrative framework did not reflect, “was that planning for a given language never occurs in a vacuum with regard to other languages” (Ricento, 2006, p. 33).

Recent years have witnessed new frameworks of language policy which have been driven by postmodern thinking and critical theory and have shifted their focus from authoritative top-down to
micro-level processes (Ibid). Unlike other approaches and models of language policy which dealt with explicit texts adopted by legislative bodies, the new frameworks of language policy focussed on broader areas. Spolsky, for instance, argues for a broader definition of language policy because "even where there is a formal, written language policy, its effect on language practices is neither guaranteed nor consistent" (2004, p. 8).

For this reason, Hornberger notes, there is an emerging emphasis on crucial concepts such as ideology, ecology, and agency in LPP (Ricento, 2006, p. 33). As Hélot and Ó Laoire (2011) point out "until recently, the roles of individuals and groups in the processes of language use, attitudes and ultimately policies have been frequently overlooked" (p. xv). It is here where Spolsky's (2004) model is useful as it encompasses all three components.

Shohamy (2008) supports Spolsky's (2004) model by remarking: “[it] introduces a broader concept of language policy, one that incorporates ideology, ecology and management, arguing for a complex relationship among these components and thus providing a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of what language policy really is” (p. 364). Figure 3 portrays the language policy model of Spolsky (2004) as constructed by Shohamy (2006, p. 53).

Figure 3 – Spolsky's Language Policy Model
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2. Language Practices (ecology)
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Spolsky (2004, p. 11-14) contends that language policy consisted of three components, language practices, beliefs and management. Spolsky (2004) distinguishes between these three components:

“...language practices – the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire; its language beliefs or ideology – the beliefs about language and language use; and any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management. (p. 5)”

Spolsky criticizes earlier LPP work claiming inadequate attention was paid to practices and beliefs of groups that were affected by LPP (Tollefson, 2002, p. 419-420). More emphasis was laid on the stated language policy statements than on ideology or actual language choices made. The Spolsky model however, entails not only the overt aspects of language policy (i.e. declared or explicit language policy statements) but also the covert aspects of language policy (i.e. practices and beliefs of group members). This expanded view of language policy gives a more complete picture of the language policy in place.

For this reason I use the Spolsky model as a theoretical framework to identify and analyze language policies of two types of schools by examining the contents of, as well as relations between, all three components of the model concerning all available languages i.e. those that form part of the school and its teachers’ linguistic repertoire, school curriculum and vernacular languages of the region (including Mewati). However, its scope maybe limited by the fact that while it provides a thorough framework for identifying language policy in place, it does not provide space for a transformative approach to language policy concerning minority languages and/or dialects. Nonetheless, this model despite this limitation is able to provide an organizing framework conducive to the answering of the research questions this thesis seeks to satisfy. Among the three components, language beliefs play a central role as they reflect the ideology behind the language policy. They are considered to “both derive from and influence practices. They can be a basis for language management or a management policy can be intended to confirm or modify them” (Spolsky, 2004, p. 14). Therefore, language management can be influenced from the beliefs as well as can influence beliefs and practices. However, according to Spolsky (2004), it is the language practices component that holds the key as the real language policy is more likely to be found in the practices than in management (p. 222).
As Shohamy (2006) states, unless the management is consistent with beliefs and practices, along with other contextual factors at play, explicit policy statements reflect no more than declaration of intent that can be easily manipulated and challenged (p. 53). As difference can exist between the stated policy and actual language practices and beliefs held, it is pertinent to examine all the three components of language policy to get a holistic understanding of language policy. While there is a plethora of research examining language policy from either the practice or belief standpoints, studies tend not to examine all three components of the model. One of the subsidiary aims of this study is to address this gap and examine all the three components of the model.

2.6 Mother Tongue based Education: Concerns, Responses, and Reflections

Schools in India claim to provide bi/multi-lingual education in line with the multilingual fabric of society. The TLF as discussed in Chapter One, is deployed to evidence this claim. However, as Mohanty (2006) insists "[E]ducation in India is only superficially multilingual, and it remains monolingual at an underlying level. The official three-languages formula is more abused and less used" (p. 279). Education does not necessarily extend to students' mother tongue/s (MT) and is not truly multilingual in character.

MTs are seldom part of schools' overall educational framework across India. This is the case across many regions of the world. According to the World Bank (2005), half of the world's out-of-school children do not have access to the languages used in schools in their home lives.

This difference creates a disconnect between home languages and the languages used in schools and plays a crucial role in children's access to education and retention in education. This is supported by the statement from World Bank (2005) where consequences of excluding and non-respect of children's first languages in schools, it states "...this underscores the biggest challenge to achieving Education for All: a legacy of non-productive practices that lead to low levels of learning and high levels of dropout and repetition" (Ibid).

The pivotal role of children's MTs in education is further stressed by UNESCO (2003) that "The choice of the language...is a recurrent challenge in the development of quality education...Speakers of mother tongues, which are not the same as the national...language, are often at a considerable disadvantage in the education system..." (p. 14). This is particularly true in India where of the 122
languages recorded, only 26 languages are used as medium of instruction (MOI) at the primary level (Census 2001). The few languages used as MOI, rarely include dialects and/or minority languages.

This is despite several constitutional safeguards for the protection of the rights of linguistic minorities. For instance, Article 350 (A) clearly stipulates that, "[i]t shall be the endeavour of every state and of every local authority within the state to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother-tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority groups" (Benedikter, 2009, p. 68). However, as remarked by Abbi (2009) in her review of the constitutional rights for linguistic minority groups, these are merely statements on paper (p. 305).

One reason these statements are not carried out in practice is that responsibility for MOI in schools is left with state governments. As pointed out by Benedikter (2009) this creates "a certain margin of discretion for the State Governments in deciding on the recognition of local official languages" (p. 156). The so called non-standard varieties, including children’s MT are often supplanted by their standard variety, normally the official regional language, in the education sphere (Jhingran 2009, p. 275).

For most children, the standard regional language is a second language rather than their MT, particularly in the early primary stage (Ibid). In other words, the MOI employed in schools is generally not the MT of the child. This practice is in violation of Article 350 (A), which states that the primary education of the pupil must be in their MT (Benedikter, 2009, p. 142).

Use of MOI that learners do not speak or understand results in subtractive learning (i.e. second language learning at the expense of first language) for learners who do not speak the dominant language of the classroom (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, p. 582-587). Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) calls this 'linguistic genocide' where efforts are directed at either actively killing a language or passively letting a language die by not supporting it (p. 312). Not only not using learners’ first language results in subtractive learning but also violates linguistic human rights (LHR) of minority language speaking students. Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) defines LHR by means of a formula: "language rights + human rights = linguistic human rights" (p. 484).

Preventing the use of minority languages in education, whether directly or indirectly, is an important factor in Skutnabb-Kangas' concept of linguistic genocide (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, p. 320), although not the only one. As it would be clear in Chapter 4 that schools would employ various means to prevent the use of Mewati. Consistent with Skutnabb-Kangas theory, this situation contains the potential for linguistic genocide. It should be noted however that the broader aim of this research is
not to discern the overall vitality of Mewati, and the extent to which it may be confronting a language death scenario. The question of the vitality of an entire language is beyond the scope of this thesis, the central organizing question of which is not to determine the vitality but rather to determine what kind of LiEP the schools in question adhere to; and, what role(s), if any, does Mewati play in these schools. Hence, this thesis will help establish the extent to which subtractive learning and submersion education are occurring in the schools presented in the case studies. And this will, hopefully, create a possible stepping stone into future research about the vitality or otherwise of Mewati.

Subtractive learning in the form of submersion education also poses great challenges for learners in India, as it does elsewhere. According to Jhingran (2009), "...almost 25% of primary school children face moderate to severe problems in the initial months and years of primary school because their home language differs from the school language" (p. 267). Amongst others, one such group is those "who speak a language that is considered a 'dialect' of the regional language" (Ibid).

Exclusion of MTs in education not only affects students' learning outcomes but also has greater consequences in that it "limits access to resources and perpetuates inequality by depriving language communities of linguistic human rights, democratic participation, identity, self-efficacy and pride" (Mohanty et. al. 2009, p. 291). It is for these reasons that a MT based multilingual education (MLE henceforth) is greatly needed and is thus proposed in this study.

The need for MT in education was expressed as early as 1953, when a UNESCO committee noted many advantages of MT education. In the words of the committee: "It is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue. Psychologically, it is the system of meaningful signs that in his mind works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among the members of the community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium" (UNESCO, 1953, p. 11). In light of the theoretical arguments and evidence, Mohanty asks a valid question both generally and about India, namely "Why then are the mother tongues neglected despite persuasive evidence to the contrary?" (2009, p. 5). One possible explanation is through factors not purely linguistic, but rather social, political and economic in nature.

This explanation is supported by Tsui and Tollefson (2004) when they contend that
"Medium-of-instruction policy determines which social and linguistic groups have access to political and economic opportunities, and which groups are disenfranchised. It is therefore a key means of power (re)distribution and social (re)construction, as well as a key arena in which political conflicts among countries and ethnolinguistic, social and political groups are realized" (p. 2).

Historically, in post-independent India, the MOI became a serious point of contention between groups with different political interests. While established bureaucrats and professionals were in favour of retaining English as the MOI, the emerging elite favoured empowering their own regional languages (Tollefson & Tsui, 2004, p. 12). This perpetuated and exacerbated social inequality between the middle class elite who could benefit from English medium education and the masses who could not (Ibid). Socio-political and economic forces, therefore, have and continue to contribute towards making MT based MLE difficult to be practiced in India.

One of the reasons attributed towards exclusion of MTs in education is that they may cause social unrest, that promotion of minority languages and ethnic diversity while formulating LiEP "might provoke conflict and disharmony" (Baker, 2011, p. 377). This argument is inconsistent with multilingual societies like India where linguistic diversity is generally seen as a resource rather than a problem reflecting the belief it leads to "better integration, harmony and social peace" (Ibid).

Another ground on which the exclusion of MTs is justified is that they lack script leading to stigmatization as dialects (Mohanty et al. 2009, p. 284). The underlying assumption is that languages claiming standardized scripts are more appropriate for educational and scientific use than those which do not (Ibid). This position, however, fails to acknowledge that any language can be written in many scripts and one script can be used to write all languages (Ibid).

Arguments are raised against use of minority languages regarding them as impoverished, inadequate and underdeveloped, hence, unfit for education (Ibid). However, lack of use marginalizes them further, as Annamalai persuasively argues, "the development of language takes place through use, not prior to use" (2004, p. 189). Lack of use marginalizes them further.

It is normally believed that for linguistic minority groups to succeed academically, maximum exposure to the dominant language is required. Attention given to MTs in education is dismissed as "illogical" since it takes the focus away from the dominant language (Cummins 2009, p. 20). This
claim is countered by Cummins’ “interdependence principle”, that any development in a second or dominant language is based on a growth in the MT or the first language. In the words of Cummins (2000), "academic proficiency transfers across languages such that students who have developed literacy in their first language will tend to make stronger progress in acquiring literacy in their second language" (p. 173).

Neglect of MTs in education, results not only in higher dropout and repetition rates and general academic underachievement but it also affects achievement in acquiring second and other languages. Cummins (2000) points out that there are now over 100 empirical studies confirming "a positive association between additive bilingualism [involving continued development and maintenance of the MT] and students' linguistic, cognitive, or academic growth" (p. 37).

A plethora of research supports MTs in education in addition to the theoretical support mentioned above. Owing to space constraints, it is difficult to individually include the vast literature existing on MT based MLE. The next section is a sample of empirical research carried out across the world by examining three cases that illuminate the educational role MTs play.
2.7 Mother Tongue based Multilingual Education Research Studies

2.7.0 Papua New Guinea (PNG)

In one of the most linguistically diverse countries such as PNG with over 800 languages, in 1995, the PNG government established a MT based bilingual education programme in which education was imparted through vernacular languages in the initial years (in kindergarten known as the "preparatory year" and Grades 1 and 2) with a gradual introduction of English as a subject in grade three (Klaus, 2003, p. 106). By the early 2000s, PNG's formal education system was imparting education in over 400 languages. A substantial number of these languages included those which had not previously been written (Ibid).

Klaus (2003) from drawing on his work on education in PNG for over six years noted that children became literate in their MTs more easily and quickly and even learnt English more easily and quickly than their older siblings did under the old system (p. 106). Also, students when learning to read and write their MTs, reported to have easily transferred these skills when entering Grade 3, such as by making use of word recognition, decoding strategies, reading and writing skills. These strategies were then applied effectively to learning English as well (Ibid).

In 2002, an additional series of six educational reform impact studies was carried out to assess the implementation of this programme. The results were mostly positive (Malone & Paraide, 2011, p.714). Paraide (2002) noted among other achievements, that students achieved a higher level in English reading comprehension exercises at the Grade 3 level, showed better understanding of mathematical concepts, and exhibited stronger reasoning and application skills (Malone & Paraide, 2011, p. 714). Likewise, in another study conducted by Paraide (2009), it was found that children were able to easily transfer the linguistic and numeracy skills they learnt in their MTs into English without any difficulty (Ibid).
2.7.1 Nigeria

Like PNG, Nigeria is one of the most linguistically diverse regions of the world and has over 400 languages. One MT based programme that has had the most success has been the Six Year Primary Project (SYPP). It began as an experiment in the province of Ife in Nigeria in the 1970s and lasted for 8 years (1970-1978). This programme was based on the late exit transitional model in which children’s first language Yoruba was used throughout the six years of primary education with English taught as a subject with the aim of gradual shift to English. This programme came into existence due to the fact that prior to the 1970s, most Nigerian children were unable to go beyond the primary level. Most of the students were reported to leaving school without adequate knowledge of literacy and numeracy and lacked any awareness of knowledge about their country from socially, culturally, politically or economically perspective (Afolayan, 1976, p. 115).

Experimental and control groups were established involving both rural and urban pupils. The results of this study indicated that the children in the experimental group who were taught through the medium of Yoruba outperformed (in Yoruba, Mathematics and English) the control group students who were taught through Yoruba only for three years and then exclusively through English (Bamgbose 2005 and Bunyi, 1997, p. 53). Therefore, this programme demonstrated that SYPP provided strong support for MT which helped in learning not just the academic concepts but also in providing a solid foundation for learning a second language (Bamgbose, 2005, p. 245). Follow-up longitudinal studies also lent support to the above finding and indicated that those students who had six years of MT education managed better at the secondary and tertiary levels (Bamgbose 2005 and Desai 2004).

Both of these countries, like India, are characterised by a high degree of multilingualism and multiculturalism, and were therefore significant to this study. The case is normally made against the provision of MTs in education, especially in highly multilingual countries, on the grounds of, for instance, the prevalence of too many languages or the lack of orthographies. However, the above studies clearly demonstrate that such rationales do not hold and that such obstacles could easily be overcome. It is to this end that the next section is directed. Recently, MT based programmes in two states - Andhra Pradesh (AP) and Orissa - have emerged as "positive examples of MLE education for tribal children" (Skutnabb-Kangas et al. 2009, p. 285) in India.
2.7.2 India

As Mohanty et al. (cited in Skutnabb-Kangas et al., 2009) mention that in order to examine the effectiveness of these MT based MLE programmes, two major studies were conducted in AP to evaluate its efficacy (p. 295). Both of these studies revealed that the achievement of students in the MLE programmes for all the eight tribal languages was significantly better than those in Telugu (official state language) medium schools in all school subjects. The MT based MLE programme resulted in improving basic competency in literacy and numeracy for all children, brought a rise in their school attendance and participation, enhanced parents satisfaction and community involvement (Ibid). Similarly, an evaluation was made of the MLE programme in Orissa in 2008. The results showed that students in the MLE programme at the end of Grade 1 performed better than those in the Oriya (official state language) medium schools and this held true for all the 10 tribal languages. These MLE schools like the previous ones in AP demonstrated increase in student attendance and participation, encouraging community involvement and positive parental feedback and better teacher satisfaction (Ibid).

To conclude, therefore, all the above studies show several benefits of using MTs in education and illustrate that it provides the foundation on which the rights and linguistic, cognitive, and academic growth of linguistic minority children is built and/or relied upon. Therefore, the researcher makes a similar argument in the context of Mewat in that Mewati, the mother tongue of majority of the students, must be used in education, as stated at the outset of this study.

2.8 Summary

This chapter presented the theoretical background for this study and located the research in Critical Language Policy. It highlighted the types, orientation and approaches of language planning and policy and the analytical model used in this study proposed by Spolsky (2004). This chapter has drawn attention to the historical-structural approach to language planning, relevant to this study, and has made a case for ‘language as a right’ and ‘language as a resource’ orientations for Mewati.

Literature was reviewed on the use of mother tongues in education, and in relation to this, an overview of some concerns, responses and reflections has been provided. Finally, three significant
case studies have been presented to illuminate the benefits of MT based multilingual educational programmes, which have been carried out in many contexts and countries, including Papua New Guinea, Nigeria, and India. In the following chapter, the methodology of this study is explained.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research design featuring the contextual background of the field research, challenges faced during field work, methods of data collection, approach of sampling, and data analysis. It highlights the position the researcher occupies, and describes the two field sites where the research was undertaken. Finally, an overview is presented of the research participants. It is critical to acknowledge that this research has attempted to incorporate much of the data elicited from all the participants rather than including only a fraction of relevant data from a few. This is done so that a broader, richer and comprehensive account of all participants could be presented.

3.1 Contextual background

The researcher was provided with accommodation by an NGO, the Institute of Rural Research and Development (IRRAD). A school was available for observation within walking distance of the facilities. To anonymize the school, it would be henceforth known as School A. Critical to the research was a chance meeting with a group of coordinators and employees working at the local community radio station, recently initiated by IRRAD. Being part of the local Meo community, these people understood its concerns deeply. The researcher established trust with radio station staff as a result of explaining the research topic and its importance to them. Of the many topics discussed with the radio station workers, the most important was their suggestion that an interview be conducted with a local Meo teacher, writer and activist who would later turn out to be extremely helpful for this study.

The second phase of data collection began after meeting another NGO, SRF Foundation, which was working in Mewat. SRF provided accommodation for data collection to take place in a residential community center the NGO established in 2011 for girls aged 11-14 yrs who never attended schools or left schools at a young age.
This facilitated interaction with young Meo girls about their earlier experiences in government schools and their reasons for leaving them. It also allowed observations about their language usage patterns and their attitudes towards dominant languages like Hindi, Urdu and English. This provided further insight for the research and was useful when approaching School D.

3.2 The Researcher

This research is a qualitative study and in qualitative inquiry "the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and data analysis" (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). This makes it crucial for the researcher to self-reflect and self-evaluate their role within the research. It is important to clearly state the role and position of the researcher, which in this study included both insider and outsider researcher roles. The insider role is a result of having grown up in India, with a shared and an understanding of the cultural context, the ability to speak Hindi and Urdu and my belonging to a teacher's family (with my mother, aunt and uncle having worked/taught in government schools) all helped teachers feel able to divulge data to the researcher. Being alumnus from a government school in Delhi played a crucial role in building a personal connection. Teachers opened up to the researcher more because the researcher was not a product of an elite private unaided school which would have been a barrier in approaching government schools and their teachers.

While the researcher's comprehension of Mewati was reasonable due to the similarities it shares with Hindi, the researcher was an outsider as Mewati was not their native language and they did not belong to the Meo community. Also, every teacher interviewed knew the researcher was based in Australia and Mewat was not their home. This ‘foreignness’ of the researcher made it easier for teachers (and Meos generally) to open up, knowing that participants' anonymity would not be compromised. An outsider’s perspective also allowed for a more objective reflection about the environment and subjects of the research.

Conscious of this outsider status, the researcher tried to overcome this somehow by gaining an insight into the Mewati culture and literature before entering the field. The researcher read literature written by Maya Shailram, an expert on Meo history and culture who has extensively researched the community. The researcher became aware of social, political and economic issues through NGO reports and newspaper articles. This knowledge made it easier to establish trust with Meo participants.
Throughout the fieldwork, the teachers and the general community in Mewat, expressed surprise and curiosity upon meeting a researcher from outside the region. That the researcher was a woman and research was done unaccompanied evoked greater surprise as risks were taken in order to research on Mewati language. This, they stated, showed seriousness on the researchers’ part and the commitment towards the study. This credibility helped strengthen ties with teachers, especially Meo teachers. This was evident in their responses which would freely discuss sensitive topics like ethnic, political and religious issues, issues of discrimination and their concerns for the Mewati language.

3.3 The Research Design

This research employed a qualitative case study approach for two primary reasons; firstly, the case study approach is useful at the exploratory phase of research when little is known about the phenomena in question (Yin, 2003, p. 9). As no prior study explored the LiEP of the schools in the region and with very little information available on Mewati, a case study was considered the best strategy. Secondly, this approach is useful when research questions are oriented to "how" and "why" (Ibid). As the first study exploring and explaining how Mewati is (not) used in classrooms and why that might be so, a case study approach is most appropriate.

This case study is based on comparative design which “entails the study using more or less identical methods of two contrasting cases. It embodies the logic of comparison in that it implies that we can understand social phenomena better when they are compared in relation to two or more meaningful contrasting cases or situations” (Bryman, 2004, p. 53). A comparative case study is considered most suitable as schools in India have different boards, textbooks, curricula, syllabi and media of instruction. Depending on the region and type of school, each follows a different language policy. In the state of Haryana, where this study is located, schools are broadly divided into Hindi-medium and English-medium schools or rural and urban schools. A comparative analysis between examples of these two types of schools is a logical starting point for this study. The way this task is carried out is in the form of a multiple-case study. As Bryman (2004) contends, “Essentially, a multiple-case study or (multi-case study) occurs whenever the number of cases examined exceeds one” (p. 55). Accordingly, two types of schools were chosen, a Hindi-medium/rural school (s) and an English-medium/urban school.
3.4 Challenges

This research presented many challenges. First, the context in which this study was undertaken, the rural setting of Mewat, posed serious mobility issues due to the lack of transport.

Second, a set of challenges were faced during the first stage of data collection, in Ghaghas village. Hostility erupted among religious leaders leading to a protest rally. Seeing the tense situation prevailing in the region, I was advised by the NGO to pursue fieldwork elsewhere to avoid exposing myself to excessive personal risk. As a result, I had to replan my next phase of data collection.

Third, the second phase of data collection, in Nuh, was also not without its problems. On the 29th of March, a riot broke out between the Haryana Police and the locals, only a few blocks away from where I stayed and conducted research. A curfew like situation in the region caused a standstill amidst the violence (HT Reporters, 2012 and IANS, 2012).

These experiences posed great challenges to completing this research and caused abrupt interruptions, meaning I had to continuously assess, adapt and reassess my research plan. Though challenging, it made this research even more interesting and as a result I personally gathered a lot of strength and learned considerably from these experiences.

3.5 Description of Cases

Case 1 comprises of Schools A, B and C. From school A, the researcher collected detailed interviews with four teachers, all of whom were non-Meo male teachers. There were no female teachers and no Meo teachers in the school. The entire teaching staff comprised of Hindus who were not from Mewat and did not speak Mewati. In order to allow for a Meo Muslim voice, data was also collected from two teachers who were local Muslim Meo teachers and spoke Mewati as their first language. These teachers were from School B and C. Both School B and School C were similar to School A in terms of school type, medium of instruction, textbook and curriculum, board of affiliation, infrastructure, student socio-economic background and location. Case 2 comprises of School D. From School D, the researcher collected detailed interviews with three Meo teachers and one non-Meo teacher. The schools are described below.
3.6 Case 1 - Rural Schools

3.6.0 School A

School A was an upper primary (Grades 1 to 8) government (public/state) school located in the village of Ghagas in Mewat and was wholly government funded. It was affiliated to the Board of School Education, Haryana. All teachers confirmed the official language policy of the school was Hindi. This school was built in 1925 and was therefore the oldest in the village and one of the oldest schools in the whole of Mewat. The school consisted of 8 teachers all of whom belonged to the non-Meo, non-Mewati speaking community who got transferred to the school from different parts of Haryana. This posed certain problems, one of which was that some teachers were noticed to sleep within a small room within the school premises itself. The teachers informed me that they typically would sleep on the ground.

All the teachers in the school were non-Meos. The only exception to the other teachers, was the head teacher, who though Muslim and local to Mewat, was however, a non-Meo. Of the 8 teachers, 5 were employed as permanent teachers while 3 were 'contract' teachers. A growing number of teachers were noticed to be hired on contract basis to fill in the shortage of teaching workforce. All the teachers interviewed as well as the some of the general public with whom the researcher had informal conversations confirmed this. This prevailing contractualization of teachers had negative effects on teachers and consequently on education.

One of its direct effects was noticed when the researcher asked questions pertaining to teacher training. The contract teachers responded that their teaching status as “contract teachers” did not allow them to acquire training or attend workshops which are generally made mandatory by the government on yearly basis for other teachers. This meant that only those teachers who were hired on permanent basis were able to attend in-service teacher training and workshops.

Additionally, hiring on a contract basis also seemed to cause a significant psychological impact on teachers with almost all of them confessing their fear and anxiety concerning job security. This, they candidly admitted, also affected their teaching motivation.
Also, many of the teachers expressed discontentment toward being away from their homes and families. Many teachers disclosed that they occasionally travelled 200-250 Kms on weekends to visit their families. Almost all of them expressed a desire to be transferred back to their hometown but felt "trapped" in Mewat stating they had no choice but to follow the orders of the government and authorities.

All of these factors, therefore, affected teachers' psychological wellbeing, personal fulfillment, growth, motivation and ability to teach and therefore had (may have) crucial implications for teaching (and learning outcomes).

According to the teachers, 90% of the school students were Meos with the total number of students ranging between 500 and 550. The average student-teacher ratio was approximately 60:1. This compares unfavourably to government guidelines set under the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE) which stipulate a teacher: student ratio of 30:1.

There was a severe shortage of desks and students were found sitting on the bare floor during the classes. The school also effectively had no library. There were few general magazines or books that students could read during spare time. The school also had no adequate playground equipment. Many of the classrooms were in total despair. All teachers complained of lack of resources in the case of School A as well as in government schools in rural areas in general. Teachers complained of the school being deprived of basic necessities. Teachers also complained of being over burdened by non-teaching tasks such as handling and supervising meals for the students, monitoring construction work, vaccination programs, census surveys etc. Additionally, they covered for the shortfall in teachers at the school.

### 3.6.1 School B

A detailed interview was conducted with a Meo teacher from School B. The school had around 90% Meo students, 2 teachers in total and was located in the neighbouring village of Shahpur of School A. It was a Hindi medium primary government school with 121 students, and was affiliated to the same state board as School A. The students came from lower socio-economic backgrounds, similar to School A.
3.6.2 School C

The researcher visited School C and found it similar to School A in that the school had almost the same number of students, teaching staff and infrastructure, etc. It was also an upper primary school and suffered from shortage of desks and other facilities. This school was located in the village of Uleta and was a Hindi medium school affiliated to the state board like the other two schools above. Similar to School A and B, most school students were also Meos and came from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The teacher interviewed from this school narrated similar stories about increased contractualization of teachers.

3.7 Case 2 – Urban School

3.7.0 School D

School D was a senior secondary school (up to Grade 12) located in the district headquarter of Nuh, a relatively urbanized area in contrast to the rural settings of Schools A, B and C. Approximately 2,500 students attended School D, of which 80%-90% were estimated by teachers to be Meos. There were 53 teachers in total, meaning a 47:1 student: teacher ratio, significantly better than School A. According to Meo teachers who were interviewed from this school, Meo faculty members constituted around 8 to 9 of the total teaching staff of 53.

The infrastructure of this school was impressive, and was significantly better than School A (and other rural government schools). School facilities included a library consisting of 8,125 books according to library records, two computer labs, Physics and Chemistry labs, a big playground with equipment as well as a large space for basketball and badminton courts.

Officials in School D boasted of being one of the best schools in Mewat producing high quality results each year. All the teachers interviewed along with the principal and the education officer mentioned that the official policy of the school was English. The school was funded by an autonomous agency created by the state of Haryana for creating basic infrastructure in the region.
To provide quality education, this English medium school affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) was established as a model for other schools in the region to follow.

The school prided itself on being affiliated to the CBSE which is considered a prestige marker in India. This was evident in that the board outside the school read 'English medium CBSE School'. This line was mentioned across all the documents obtained from the school, including students' diary, prospectus and school magazine.

Interestingly, teachers from all schools mentioned the board of education as being one of the key determinants concerning the prestige schools carry. Teachers shared the general perception that the CBSE board is more prestigious than the state boards such as the Board of Education, Haryana (HBSE), to which Schools A, B and C were affiliated.

In terms of textbooks and curricula, School D participants took pride in being associated with NCERT (National Council of Education Research and Training) which is involved in preparation and publication of textbooks and materials and is perceived as more prestigious than its state counterpart SCERT (State Council of Educational Research and Training).

Students' achievement records were printed on the walls of the school along and featured in the school magazine each year. The school also engaged in an 'admission test' of students that took place even at the nursery level. Teachers confirmed during the interviews that the school had a strict admission procedure which the students had to go through “to ensure only the best students get through”. In this regard, this school differed with the rural schools.

School D did share a similarity with other schools, in the hiring of contract teachers. One teacher explained that teachers could gain 'regular' status only upon completion of 5 years in the school. The teachers mentioned that the only time they attended teacher training was during their induction but not afterwards. Therefore, teacher training for the contract staff was found lacking within all schools.

In conclusion, then, the schools shared a similarity in that the student body was majority Meo. In terms of differences, rural and urban schools differed across multiple dimensions: Medium of instruction (Hindi/English), boards of affiliation (State board and Central board - HBSE/CBSE), curricula and textbooks (SCERT/NCERT), location (Rural/Urban), infrastructure and facilities (Poor/Good).
Data collection methods used included detailed semi-structured interviews, informal conversations, field notes, photographs and documents. Ten in-depth interviews were conducted which equally represented the voices of both Meo and non-Meo teachers working across these schools. Data collection instruments were triangulated and included detailed field notes, memos, school documents, photographs, observation, in-depth individual interviews, and informal conversations with teachers, educational officer and authorities.

Multiple sources of data enhanced the validity and reliability of the research. However, the primary method for data collection was in-depth one-on-one interviews using an interview guide, a semi-structured approach. Bryman (2004) characterized this approach as being where the "researcher has a list of questions or fairly specific topics to be covered, often referred to as an interview guide, but the interviewee has a great deal of leeway in how to reply" (p. 321). The interviews ranged between 30 minutes to 2 hours with most interviews lasting over an hour. The interview guide is attached as Appendix A.

Prior permission was sought to interview teachers and record their responses. Teachers were asked about the venue where they would feel most comfortable, and agreed on the school as the best place. All interviews were audio recorded then transcribed and translated by the researcher. In the beginning of the interview, teachers were required to review and sign the consent form attached as Appendix B. They were also asked about the language in which they would like to be interviewed.

Non-Meo teachers chose Hindi as their preferred language since they claimed to know very little Mewati. The Meo teachers chose Hindi too. Only one non-Meo English teacher in School D used English along with Hindi as the interview progressed.

Before initiating the interviews, participants were assured about the confidentiality of their responses. To break the ice, the researcher had informal conversation sessions with the teachers prior to interview. Throughout the field research, the researcher would chat during teachers' breaks and after school hours, occasionally sharing meals with participants, helping to build a friendly rapport.

School documents collected from School D included the annual school magazine and the annual student diary which contained the school rules and details on the timetable, examination patterns, school disciplinary activities and a list of important prayers, songs, quotes and thoughts. The diary
was primarily in English but included a limited amount of Hindi and Urdu. The prospectus of the school was also obtained from the educational officer and an admission form was attached to this prospectus. The prospectus included details about the school, infrastructure and facilities along with the fee requirements and admission procedures. Both the prospectus and admission form were in English. School A, on the other hand, hesitated to provide with documents when requested. These documents were collected to see schools' preferred languages and implicit language policy. Detailed field notes and memos were written on each subsequent visit and after every interview to note experiences, interesting incidents, thoughts, ideas, hunches, analytical insights and matters to reflect upon. A large number of photographs were taken both inside and outside the schools. The photographs of schools comprised of pictures, maps and writing on the walls and that of blackboards and of classrooms in general. These photographs were taken so as to reflect on schools' implicit language choices and practices. The pictures taken outside of schools illuminated the prevalent language practices and usage across Mewat with the focus being on examining linguistic landscape of public spaces to further shed light on the roles different languages played in different contexts.

Landry and Bourhis (1997) define linguistic landscape as the usage of language in public space that could comprise of language of advertising billboards, commercial shop signs, placards, street names and any other displays of written language visible in public sphere (p. 25). The photographs taken outside of schools included that of road signs, posters, commercial signs, private signs (i.e. those used by individuals, graffiti etc) and religious signs. While the focus was on the photographs taken inside the school premises, the pictures taken outside helped in providing a general feel about the region and provided a broader picture and better insight regarding language use patterns. During the fieldwork the researcher engaged in conversations with the local Meo community ranging from community radio station employees, religious clerics, shopkeepers, out of schools children and the general public. This was done to gain a holistic perspective on the state of education in Mewat, issues faced by Meos as a result to assess general ethnolinguistic vitality of Mewati and to establish other concerns that the Meo community held with regard to education, their language, literature, and socio-economic-political status.

This additional data was collected to shed light on the structural forces responsible for influencing language policies implemented in schools and their implications for the community and their language. This was critical for the overall interviewing process as it facilitated certain crucial
questions driven by the local community itself. Notably however, though very helpful, only teachers formed part of the actual sample group.

Classes at School A were observed during the school visit to examine the medium of instruction used by teachers, their language teaching strategies and student-teacher interaction. The researcher collected data as a non-participant observer sitting at the back of the class taking notes. Class observation, however, was limited to less than two hours, primarily due to teacher unease about non-participant observation in class.

Though the researcher intended to observe classes at School D, the field visit clashed with the school examination session, meaning no observations could take place. While a general observation of the schools was made, owing to these limitations, observation is not a key data collection method, but it provided key information which was used to verify and check consistency of the earlier responses, acting as a guide to the future set of interview questions based on the observations made.

3.9 Sampling Approach

The sampling approach employed involved purposeful sampling by selecting cases that could provide rich information (Patton, 2002). Information-rich cases are "those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry, thus the term purposeful sampling" (Patton, 2002, p. 230). The sample consisted of an equal number of Meo and non-Meo teachers to ensure balance and to bring a variety of views from those who spoke Mewati as their mother tongue to those who did not.

Snowball sampling was also used as a sampling strategy for this study. This is a way to add new and possible participants by asking for recommendations from key participants (Patton, 2002, p. 194). A shortage of Meo government school teachers in School A was resolved by a recommendation from non-Meo School A teachers, which provided a supplement through interviewing one Meo teacher named Rasul from School B. Likewise, the recommendation of Meo community radio station employees led to a key teacher, writer, community member and activist named Aslam from School C.

This sampling continued until informational redundancy was achieved. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that sample selection should continue “to the point of redundancy...If the purpose is to
maximize information, the sampling is terminated when no new information is forthcoming from new sample units; thus redundancy is the primary criterion” (p. 202).

### 3.10 Overview of Participants

Table 1 below summarizes the characteristics of teachers interviewed. Pseudonyms have been used instead of the teachers’ real names to preserve confidentiality.

**Table 1 – Participant Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Names</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>Teaching Experience (yrs)</th>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Grades Taught</th>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td>Rural A</td>
<td>Ahir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA, BEd</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>English, Social Sciences, Science, Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shastri</td>
<td>Rural A</td>
<td>Jat</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>JBT (Junior Basic Training)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>English, Hindi, Maths, EVS (Environmental studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep</td>
<td>Rural A</td>
<td>Jat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BSc, MSc</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>English, Hindi, Maths, EVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseem</td>
<td>Rural A</td>
<td>Ahir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>BA, BEd, JBT</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>English, Hindi, Maths, EVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasul</td>
<td>Rural B</td>
<td>Meo</td>
<td>15 total (8 in Rural B)</td>
<td>MA, BEd, JBT</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>English, Hindi, Maths, EVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslam</td>
<td>Rural C</td>
<td>Meo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>English, Hindi, Maths, EVS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vikram Urban D Jat 10 total (5 in Urban D) MA (Eng), BEd 11-12 English

Murid Urban D Meo 3 MCA, OCA 11-12 Computer Science

Qurban Urban D Meo 3 BA (Urdu), MA (Urdu), BEd 1-8 English, Hindi, Maths, EVS (1-5), Urdu (6-8)

Imran Urban D Meo 5 BSc, MSc (Physics), BEd 11-12 Physics

3.11 Data Analysis

Data collected from interviews was analyzed through comprehensive examination of transcripts. The hundreds of pages were all first transcribed and later translated and coded by the researcher. Artifacts collected from the schools in the form of school magazine, students’ diary and admission form, were subject to thorough document analysis. The intention was to ascertain what languages were used, for what purposes and the number of times each appeared in those documents. To carry out this task, a table was made where corresponding to each type of document, separate entries were noted. These entries were marked on the lines of the language used (Hindi, English or Urdu), the purpose it served and the page number on which they appeared. These were quantified to determine which language looked most dominant. This was carried out to uncover and reflect on schools’ implicit language practices and policies.

As mentioned previously a large number of photographs were also taken inside the schools. Additionally, detailed field notes and memos were written throughout the fieldwork. They guided not just the data collection process but also the analysis process. They were thoroughly analyzed and led to the emergence of many analytical categories.

To organize and structure the data, Spolsky’s (2004) language policy framework was used. This included three components of language practices, beliefs and management, as described in Chapter
2, each of which was elaborated upon across the two schools and their participants. This meant that each participant of each school was separated according to the three elements of Spolsky’s (2004) model. The data was analyzed to develop categories, which emerged both from the framework and the data itself. This included language practices of teachers in the classrooms, teachers’ language beliefs in relation to different languages including Hindi, English, Urdu, Mewati among others and language management strategies employed by the teachers and school authorities to influence students’ language practices and/or beliefs.

Data analysis was carried out in two phases – within case analysis and cross case analysis. The process was iterative and involved moving “back and forth between concrete bits of data and abstract concepts, between inductive and deductive reasoning, between description and interpretation” (Merriam, 1998, p. 178). For phase 1, within case analysis, each case was treated as a “comprehensive case in and of itself” (Merriam, 1998, p. 194). Each case was investigated in detail to provide a thick description and is presented with supporting quotes by the participants. In within case analysis, care was also taken to account for the variation occurring within cases, namely Meo and non-Meo participants within each school. For phase 2, cross case analysis, both the two cases (rural and urban school settings) were compared and contrasted “to build abstractions across cases” (Merriam, 1998, p. 195).

Finally, triangulation strengthened the findings of this study and provided a richer, well developed and holistic perspective as well as provided rigour to the analysis. As Denzin and Lincoln (1998) suggest, “the use of multiple methods (or triangulation) reflects an attempt to secure in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question” (p. 4). Creswell (2002) defines this triangulation as “the process of corroborating evidence from different individuals, types of data or methods of data collection” (p. 280).

In this study, triangulation was achieved through multiple methods of data collection and employing multiple sources of data from different participants based in different settings at a different time. This helped ensure credibility of the findings. The advantage of using triangulation is best put across by Denzin and Lincoln (1998) when they declared that “The combination of multiple methods, empirical materials, perspectives and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, and depth to any investigation” (p. 4).
3.12 Limitations of the Study

This research investigated teachers’ practices, beliefs and LiEPs within the schools; meaning findings apply only to the schools studied and cannot be generalized without additional research. Additionally, the lack of Meo teachers in School A necessitated the use of additional data from school B and C, complicating the case study.

The fieldwork coincided with school examination period which meant that classroom observations could not be conducted. This also meant that when investigating questions on teachers’ language practices within classroom, the data relied on teachers’ self-reports. Additionally, the examination period meant that teachers were also limited in their availability.

3.13 Summary

This chapter described the research methodology employed by the researcher to guide this study. A description of data collection methods and procedures, sampling approach, data analysis and limitations were provided. The researcher’s position and challenges faced during the research were also explored. An overview of the participants and of the schools was presented. The next chapter will cover the findings that will be discussed in detail.
Chapter 4 - Findings

4.0 Introduction

This chapter will present the findings of the two research questions that this study seeks to ask: What kind of LiEP do the schools adhere to; and, what role(s), if any, does Mewati play in these schools. To approach these questions, a comprehensive model proposed by Spolsky (2004) was chosen as a framework as well as a useful tool to organise the data. As a result, the findings below are presented by reviewing each of the two cases studied (rural and urban schools) in relation to the three components guiding Spolsky’s model (i.e. language practice, beliefs and management).

4.1 Description and Understanding of Cases

The following section presents a detailed description of participants' practices, beliefs and management strategies and schools' stated or unstated language policy. The two case studies are compared and contrasted to this end. Key (translated) quotations from participants are provided as evidence.
4.2 Case 1 - Rural Schools

4.2.0 School A

Non-Meo Teachers: Krishna, Shastri, Deep and Aseem

4.2.0.0 Implicit or explicit language policy

In line with Shohamy’s distinction between the stated/explicit language policy and implicit/unstated language policy, an effort was made to investigate school’s LiEP (2006, p. 50). As mentioned in Chapter Three, School A teachers resisted to provide any school documents, when requested, which would have been useful further for investigating school’s unstated language policy. However, of the four teachers interviewed from School A, Shastri, Deep and Aseem mentioned that the official language policy was the usage of Hindi. Although not explicitly stated in any written document, all teachers attributed the use of Hindi to the fact that it was a government school. A link was also observed between Hindi and national identity. As Aseem says: "It is Hindustan (India) so of course Hindi should be encouraged. The language policy of our school is that of Hindi which means ...teach Hindi, speak Hindi and teach through Hindi ...so our school is Hindi medium".

Teachers’ reasoning suggests that the type of school i.e. rural government school and a sense of nationalism are the two key factors that play a part in the adoption of Hindi as an implicit language policy in these schools.

4.2.0.1 Language practice

Questions were asked of teachers to determine the medium of instruction (MOI) and language used in classroom/school to communicate with students and colleagues so as to gain an insight into the language practices. An attempt was also made to ascertain the language students use to
communicate with teachers. All teachers reported use of Hindi as MOI. However, they revealed that Meo students struggled in speaking and understanding Hindi particularly at the primary level of education. Some of the key quotations that best exemplify the language practice of teachers (and students) are from Krishna who remarks:

"There is gap in communication between teachers and Meo students. Students especially at the primary level do not understand Hindi well enough. For example, we would say, sar mein dard ho raho (I have a headache), they won't understand this. So, they would say this as moond bhatak raho ji in Mewati [laughs]. For so many days, we had no idea what they meant".

This demonstrates a significant communication gap between teachers and students with teachers admitting seeking help from others as teachers struggled with Mewati. It also showed that students struggled with Hindi particularly in the initial years. This conversation also revealed teachers’ attitudes in that Krishna was observed chuckling (as were the other teachers) when talking about variations between Hindi and Mewati. Likewise, Shastri states:

"There are many challenges faced when teaching solely in Hindi as students do not understand and learn properly. Students are not that competent in speaking and understanding Hindi particularly in the initial years. And since we lack competence and comprehension in Mewati, sometimes we even have to consult someone so we understand a few words [laughs]".

These statements reflect that teachers and students face significant communication barriers which bear on students’ overall learning process and educational outcomes. This is even more alarming in the case of Mewat where the literacy levels are so low (44% according to the 2001 Census).

As to language used with students and colleagues, all teachers stated using Hindi to communicate with students and other colleagues. All non-Meo teachers belonged to other parts of Haryana, and claimed to use Haryanvi with each other.
When asked about the language used by students to communicate with teachers, all teachers stated that students communicated with them in Mewati especially at the primary level before shifting to Hindi at a later stage.

4.2.0.2 Language beliefs

Each teacher was asked about their views on Mewati and individual languages that were part of the school curriculum and/or of the language repertoire of teachers. The aim of this exercise was to uncover teachers' attitudes and beliefs regarding different languages as it is beliefs which both influence and derive from teaching practices (Spolsky, 2004, p. 14) and therefore will have a significant effect on Mewati and the state of education more generally. These beliefs may also form the basis on which decisions concerning language management may be taken or a management policy may be put in place to confirm or modify these beliefs (Spolsky, 2005, p. 2153). As such, beliefs form the core of this research and hence an effort was made to elicit teachers' beliefs regarding all concerned languages.

This meant that teachers' beliefs regarding 'standard' languages like Hindi and English that were part of the school curriculum were solicited along with Urdu which, while offered as an optional subject to students in Grades 6 to 8, was absent from the schools owing to non-availability of teachers and materials.

Additionally, beliefs concerning teachers' own mother tongues were also collected such as Haryanvi and Bagri which are generally subsumed under Hindi (Census 2001) as 'dialects' and excluded from the school curriculum. Though, not the primary focus of the study, beliefs concerning these languages were nonetheless an important aspect to examine to shed light on teachers' views on minority languages in general.

4.2.0.2.0 Towards Hindi:

Teachers were asked to give their opinion on Hindi and its relevance. While Krishna and Shastri equated Hindi with "Hamaari maatra-bhaasha "(our mother tongue)", Deep and Aseem regarded
Hindi as "hamaari raashta-bhaasha" (our national language). Hindi was seen by all non-Meo teachers as a marker of Indians' identity.

One of the strongest supporters for teaching, learning and promoting Hindi was non-Meo teacher Aseem. He espoused Hindi as a symbol of nationalism, for example:

"Hindi should be given more emphasis as we are Hindustanis (Indians). It is our national language. Every administrative work should be done solely in Hindi. It should be made a truly international language so it could be taught in foreign lands. Wish for a time when other countries are forced to teach Hindi on their lands".

When asked if Hindi was already an international language and whether it was sufficiently promoted, he replied negatively:

"More efforts are needed for its promotion nationally and globally. People focus more on English as their thought process is becoming too westernized. Hindi needs to be promoted more. Not satisfied with the current promotion of Hindi, only when we promote Hindi more, will it become international...By the way, I have done my B.Ed from Hindi Prachaar Sabha."

This was an interesting moment as the conversation slowly drifted to the premier institution which aims at "promoting and spreading Hindi in South India where people generally speak Tamil". Aseem, was asked about his experiences to gain new insights into his views regarding Hindi. Overall, he appeared pleased and proud of his association with the institution and noted that "those who speak Hindi well there have a prestige of their own".

On the whole, a common strand ran through all these views which was that a link was established between Hindi-Hindustan-Hindustani i.e. language, nation and national identity.

School A's non-Meo teachers emphasized 'purity' of Hindi and were seen in favour of a highly Sanskritized form of Hindi. They mentioned that they strived for "Shuddh Hindi" (Pure Hindi) in the
classroom, but acknowledged it posed problems for both children as well as for teachers themselves. As Krishna said: "We try to use pure Hindi, though students do not understand. So what's the use?". Aseem stressed on pure Hindi inside the classroom, but remarked: "We try to speak pure Hindi, but no what how hard we try, we cannot get rid of Haryanvi while speaking Hindi (laughs)...we fail to speak pure Hindi".

4.2.0.2.1 Towards English:

When teachers were asked of their views on the English language and its relevance, Krishna regarded English an international language and he along with the other teachers considered that learning English was must. Deep mentioned that English was a window to the world and guaranteed success. It was clear that all teachers held a very positive attitude towards English and perceived that it had an instrumental value, necessary for upward social mobility and was equated to a global or international language.

Nevertheless, when teachers were asked about the role it occupied in the school, they all stated that it was taught only as a subject and that more emphasis was on Hindi as the latter was the sole MOI. When teachers were asked to rate their proficiency in English, all of them confessed that it was "quite weak" including those teachers that taught English as a subject.

4.2.0.2.2 Towards Urdu:

All teachers were asked of their views and perspectives on two issues: the current condition of Urdu and its relevance in schools and their attitudes and beliefs towards Urdu. In terms of the condition, Urdu occupied an interesting space in government schools across all schools visited in the rural areas. Although there was an option to choose Urdu for the students from grades 6th to 8th out of the other available options that also included Sanskrit, Punjabi, drawing and physical education, all respondents confirmed the acute shortage of Urdu teachers and materials.

For instance, Deep stated that he had never seen an Urdu teacher in the whole of Mewat except in private schools or madrasas. This despite the fact that teachers confirmed students showed more interest in Urdu than other subjects. Teachers noted some of the students were proficient in Urdu
because a reasonable number of children in Mewat were likely to learn Urdu at an early age under the guidance of Maulvis (religious teachers) working in local Masjids (mosques).

When asked what this shortage of Urdu language teachers and resources meant for students, they replied that many students opted for Sanskrit, albeit reluctantly, whose teachers and books were more widely present in schools. As Deep reported, "students naturally opt for Sanskrit when there is no Urdu teacher in the school. So, they study Urdu in a mosque".

Nevertheless, School A’s non-Meo teachers were united in stating that the provision of Urdu teachers in the schools would not only ensure more Meo students would enroll and remain in school but doing so would also significantly increase the literacy rate among Meos.

When asked how teachers perceived students’ proficiency in Urdu and their perception on its relevance in schools, teachers suggested that it was good and providing Urdu in schools would only help Meos further. As Aseem explains:

"Meo students are better in Urdu than even Hindi generally speaking, particularly in terms of reading abilities. We have noticed that their reading speed, accuracy and fluency is better while reading text in Urdu than Hindi...during cultural programmes organised in school, we have noticed that they swiftly read poems and sing songs in Urdu fluently".

This implies teachers' knowledge of students' proficiency was largely based on observation of students during extracurricular activities or cultural programs held in the school.

With regard to teachers' attitudes towards Urdu language, non-Meo Hindu teachers were asked about their opinion on the ownership of Urdu and if they thought it belonged to all. Asking this question was important as Urdu is generally (mis)understood as the language belonging to Muslims. However, all teachers agreed Urdu was a language that belonged to both Hindus and Muslims.

Considering the importance that is usually attached to Urdu within the Muslim community across Mewat, non-Meo teachers suggested Urdu had a special role to play. Deep voiced his concern regarding Urdu and mentioned that the provision of Urdu teachers in government schools was necessary otherwise "the language would further marginalize and may even disappear".
All teachers in some way or another stated that Urdu was a "sweet language", rich in poetry and literature. To sum up, all teachers held a positive attitude towards Urdu and expressed concerns over its non-availability in schools in Mewat, where as they stressed, the majority of the population were Muslims. As the teachers noted, parents, community members and students alike, have been expressing their desire for Urdu to be taught in schools.

4.2.0.2.3 Towards Mewati:

An attempt was made to collect teachers' beliefs regarding the local language variety. Some of the questions that were asked included:

- Should any resources be allocated by the government for the development of the language?
- Should Mewati be introduced as a MOI, at least in the primary stage, considering many teachers previously stated that students had difficulties in understanding and learning?
- Should Meo children be using the language at home and in the school?
- Do teachers think speaking Mewati was a hindrance for students' overall learning process?
- Any general views on Mewati other than what already stated?

Non-Meo teachers held a more negative attitude towards Mewati than Meo teachers, for instance, Krishna's views on Mewati that it was a "Picchdi bhaasha (backward language); Gaali galoch bhaasha (abusive language)". Aseem says firmly "It has no rich history and no literature". This comment from Aseem was in contrast to the Meo teachers from the other rural schools who stressed a rich past and oral tradition in Mewati.

The extent of a negative attitude held by non-Meo teachers could be noticed through the emphasis on the boli-bhaasha (dialect-language) distinction. In the middle of the interviews the researcher was stopped and 'corrected' several times by the non-Meo teachers. This incident occurred each time the researcher referred to Mewati as a bhaasha (language) and the non-Meo teachers asked the researcher to say boli (dialect) instead.

This dialect-language distinction was also one of the reasons the teachers used to justify denial of resource allocation for Mewati's development. For instance, all non-Meo teachers held that no resource allocation was necessary with Deep stating "It does not need any resource allocation; it is just a boli (dialect)".
Another justification for the marginalization of Mewati was social cohesion. As Aseem points out “No need to allocate resources for its development. If done so, the Government will have to incur a heavy cost which will disrupt the social order”. Administratively, Aseem suggests: "It will become a burden on the government". When asked if he thought Mewati could be an optional subject he replies: "There is no need to introduce it as an optional subject as it lacks potential".

Aseem, Krishna and Shastri even discouraged the use of Mewati at home by students, for instance, Shastri expresses “It should not be used at home. At home, it should be replaced by Hindi. It should be discarded slowly”. Deep was the only exception maintaining: "Meos should use Mewati at home otherwise it will disappear, it is their boli afterall". Among the chief reasons cited for discouragement of Mewati at home was that the continual use of Mewati would act as an impediment to learning Hindi.

Asked if they believed Mewati should be used in schools, Aseem and Shastri insisted that it should not by arguing that Mewati was "limited to a small region". Shastri also notes that "it has no instrumental value". Krishna and Shastri declare Mewati "unsuitable to be MOI" and assert that "Meo students should not use it in school as it is incompatible with the school environment". Further, Aseem argues: "These children can understand Hindi and once they can do that, I don’t think there should be any problem".

School A’s non-Meo teachers perceived the use of Mewati in the classroom as a hindrance rather than a resource except Deep who stresses: "I don't see it as a hindrance effecting students' learning. While speaking one's mother tongue one does not think of an advantage or limitation". Nonetheless, during the course of the interview, Deep did claim "students can use Mewati in school until 4th or 5th grade then they should use Hindi".

Krishna, Shastri and Aseem however, were of the opinion that its use in classrooms would act as an impediment or obstruction. As Shastri states: "It is an obstruction to Meos' development". Krishna also says: "It is a hindrance for students' overall learning process".

As seen from these responses, only one out of the four teachers interviewed from School A was of the opinion that Meos’ mother tongue was not a hindrance for their overall learning and that it should be maintained at home (albeit not used in school after the primary stage). Their responses suggested a shift from Mewati towards Hindi was seen positively as something that needed to be encouraged. Overall, School A’s teachers held a negative attitude towards Mewati and seemed unaware of its oral tradition and literature. The teachers also lacked understanding of recent
research pointing to advantages of using/accommodating students' mother tongue in teaching and learning.

4.2.0.2.4 Towards Haryanvi and Bagri:

School A’s teachers spoke languages different to Mewati as their mother tongues (MT). These MTs were also minority languages and were subsumed under Hindi as 'dialects' in the 2001 Census. It was necessary to gather their views on their own languages to see if they were in line with their perception of Mewati or if the teachers perceived their own MTs as superior. The responses suggested that the teachers also relegated their own MTs to 'dialects'. This was similar to their reaction to Mewati, reluctant to acknowledge their MTs as fully fledged languages.

School A’s teachers did however note that, Mewati was 'lesser' in prestige value than their own MTs. For instance, Deep whose MT was Bagri says: "Bagri sounds more respectful." Shastri, a Haryanvi speaker claims: "Mewati is not even equivalent to pure Haryanvi". The reason that Haryanvi is spoken much widely in the state of Haryana as well as has an increasingly growing written literature in Devanagari could have played a part in teachers' assessments.

When asked about their mother tongue and the language they spoke with their parents, siblings, wives and children, each responded that it was Hindi. When prompted further, they admitted it was 'dehati' (village variety), before further admitting it was Haryanvi and Bagri. There was reluctance at first to even acknowledge their MTs.

Later on, all of them reported they spoke their mother tongues with their parents and siblings, but Hindi ('pure' Hindi in Aseem’s case) with their wives and children. Shastri claimed his mother tongue "was a blockage to development" and perceived Hindi as an "improvement brought about by education". Having revealed their mother tongues, School A’s teachers defended their position claiming:"After all, Hindi has now become everyone's mother tongue".

The responses of non-Meo teachers suggested they felt embarrassed and ashamed of their MTs and were more open to shifting towards Hindi in the home domain. This attitude reflected and matched their views on minority languages including Mewati.
4.2.0.3 Language management

The language management strategies employed by teachers and/or school officials play a role in influencing language practices and/or language beliefs of students. The findings revealed the language management measures used by school teachers included using, striving for and encouraging students to use shuddh (pure) Hindi in the classroom. School A’s teachers agreed to have used this strategy.

School A’s non-Meo teachers used and emphasized upon the direct method of teaching inside the classroom, which meant taking no account of students’ MT. The influence of this method was not just limited to teaching and learning processes or outcomes but had far reaching consequences, modifying students’ practices and beliefs. Deep, provided a typical example similar to the other teachers:

"There are two types of methods for teaching students, direct method and bilingual method. We use direct method with students so that they will be good in Hindi and English. If we want to say to a student, "come here!" in English or "yahaan aao!" (come here) in Hindi, then he may not understand the first time, but after a few times and 5-7 days later, they will start to understand that it means teacher is calling them".

The management strategies used by School A’s teachers included using and encouraging standard Hindi with the emphasis on pure/Sanskritized Hindi inside the classroom along with focus on direct method of teaching.
4.2.1 School B and C

Meo Teachers: Rasul and Aslam

4.2.1.0 Implicit or explicit language policy

Rasul from School B reported he was not aware of his school having any explicit language policy although the school’s emphasis on the use of Hindi reflected a covert or implicit language policy and was therefore in line with the responses collected from the other teachers. While Aslam from School C confirmed that the official language policy in his school was Hindi.

4.2.1.1 Language practices

Both Meo teachers confirmed that they used Hindi as the MOI. They also revealed that Meo students struggled in speaking and understanding Hindi particularly at the primary level of education.

Both teachers agreed with teachers from School A when stating that Meo students struggled with speaking/comprehending Hindi. As Rasul put it:

"When they [non-Meo] teachers teach, use their language, or Haryanvi language, for the first few years children just stare at them. The first two-three years just pass by with children figuring out what did teachers mean. They don’t understand them fully...sometimes even we as teachers can’t understand them how would a child then?"
When asked about the language teachers used with students and colleagues, both Meo teachers stated using Hindi with students and other colleagues. Although, with Meo teachers, they reported they used Mewati in addition to Hindi.

When asked about the language students used to communicate with teachers, similar to School A’s teacher responses, both teachers pointed out that students spoke in Mewati especially at the primary level before shifting to Hindi at a later stage.

4.2.1.2 Language beliefs

4.2.1.2.0 Towards Hindi:

Aslam and Rasul both proclaimed Hindi as "Hamaari maatra-bhaasha "(our mother tongue)". Hindi was attached to notions of self respect and a marker of Indian identity. As Rasul mentions: "Hindi is the identity of the nation on a global scale. Our self respect is attached to Hindi. Hindi rules in our hearts and minds. Hindi flows in our veins".

Rasul, like the teachers from School A, stressed using pure Hindi inside the classroom as it had instrumental value. As Rasul said, it was good for students in the long run in case they had to move interstate for jobs or for securing government jobs. Aslam on the other hand did not pay much attention to pure Hindi as the other teachers did.

4.2.1.2.1 Towards English:

Aslam and Rasul both regarded English an international language. Aslam said no future without English was possible. Rasul reported that English was important in the era of globalization, science and computers, that it opened doors to secure jobs in government, multinational corporations and for moving to other states.
Like School A’s teachers, Aslam and Rasul confessed that English had a limited role in the school compared to Hindi which was the sole MOI. When asked to rate their proficiency in English, both Meo teachers also self-reported as quite weak.

4.2.1.2.2 Towards Urdu:

School B and C teachers agreed with School A teachers that schools faced a severe shortage of Urdu teachers, textbooks and materials. They also affirmed School A teachers’ views about students' preference for Urdu over Sanskrit. However, they informed, due to the non-availability of Urdu in schools, students are forced to opt for Sanskrit instead.

As Rasul said: "Most Meo students would prefer to choose Urdu over Sanskrit (if it's available) as it would be relatively easier for them. Usually, it is Hindu students who tend to opt for Sanskrit".

This is in line with Khalidi’s (2010, p. 72) report about the discriminatory attitude toward the inclusion of Urdu in schools in the context of the state of Uttar Pradesh. Khalidi (2010) asserted that students are forced to opt for Sanskrit due to the manipulation of three-language-formula among other factors (Ibid).

Throughout the interview, both Rasul and Aslam maintained that Urdu had the potential to bring and retain more Meo students if made available. As Aslam from School C stated:

"Urdu can help in bringing and retaining Meos to schools. It can improve their literacy rate and increase students' regularity of attendance. Moreover, while Urdu belongs to all, Meos somehow tend to perceive Arabic and Urdu in religious light...as a lot of their literature is written in Urdu".

School B and C teachers opinions on Urdu were sought regarding its perceived association with Muslims. Since these teachers were Meo Muslims as compared with School A’s non-Meo Hindus, their views were solicited for comparison. Both Aslam and Rasul like School A’s teachers saw Urdu as belonging to Hindus and Muslims. Both held a positive attitude towards its rich history and poetic tradition.
One such response from Rasul was:

"Urdu has rich literature, poetry and cultural legacy. Urdu is like shehad (honey). The mithaas (sweetness) that Urdu has is not to be found in any other language. Learning Urdu can be beneficial as you can teach or even travel across other countries. It must be introduced in schools considering it is Mewat".

4.2.1.2.3 Towards Mewati:

Specific questions about the vitality of Mewati were asked of School B and C teachers. This was done firstly, to establish Mewati’s vitality as perceived by the local Meo teachers and to assess their concerns. Secondly, to observe their attitude towards Mewati.

The questions asked if they believed the language was in decline or if any language shift was in progress and if so, which language were Meos shifting to and did Mewati have any (oral) literature.

The responses from School B and C teachers showed concern for Mewati. For instance, Aslam from School C replies: "Most Meos (elders and children) use mixed Mewati now with words borrowed from Hindi, Urdu, etc. Very few Meos can speak/understand typical Mewati. Theth (Typical) Mewati is being lost".

Aslam specifically expressed concern for Mewati’s oral literature and remarks: "There is less community involvement in saving Mewati. Its rich oral literature is vanishing and in danger. Mass media and modernization is responsible for this shift. If its literature is not protected then the new generation might forget about its rich oral tradition".

Rasul from School B also agreed with Aslam and mentions "pure Mewati [Emphasis is mine] is only spoken by less than 5% speakers today. It is slowly declining with Hindi taking its place". However, unlike Aslam, he says Mewati "has no literature and is associated with illiteracy. Educated people prefer to speak other standard languages and not Mewati ".

While Aslam held a positive attitude, praising Mewati’s oral history, literature and traditions, Rasul, thinks:
"Mewati is a mixed boli (dialect). Used for humour. It is like a khichdi \(^2\) with words borrowed from other languages. Mewati has rukhaapan (harshness/dispassionateness) embedded in it and not mithaas (sweetness). It sounds as if one is insulting someone. People don't like to speak Mewati because they think it is too akkhad (rude sounding)."

After detailed interviews, both teachers showed concern towards Mewati's vitality and preserving its history and culture. Aslam held a more positive attitude towards Mewati than Rasul, who saw Mewati as a 'dialect' with negative connotations.

School B and C teachers, however, hinted at a change that Mewati was undergoing and seemed concerned as a result. Interestingly, when non-Meo teachers were asked if more Meos were shifting from Mewati, they too suggested Meos were slowly shifting towards Hindi.

Meo teachers were asked questions to see if they valued Mewati and its use at home and in school. When asked if Mewati should be used at home, Aslam believes: "It should be used at home as it is our language and culture and needs to be preserved and others should also know about it so that the language would spread". Rasul also agrees: "Meo children should speak the language at home because it reflects brotherhood, cultural legacy and oneness".

However, when it was asked if they believed Mewati could be used in school, the responses were less definite/positive. For example, Aslam says: "Mewati can be used in the classroom to explain abstract concepts when Meo students have difficulty in understanding...in these circumstances, I use Mewati at times and they quickly understand". This is to say that Aslam believed Mewati could be used, albeit in a limited way, to explain difficult and abstract concepts.

On being asked in what capacity Aslam would like to see Mewati in school, he indicates: "Perhaps, it could be included in the curriculum as an optional subject". However, Aslam still thinks that "using Mewati as a MOI would act as a hindrance for students as the language does not have any official status". While not completely opposed to Mewati in education, and having expressed a positive attitude towards Mewati previously, Aslam still perceived its use in education as an obstacle.

---

\(^2\) Khichdi is a rice-lentil-vegetable dish. The interviewed participants used this as a metaphor to describe a hybrid variety which mixes linguistic sources.
These responses indicate that while Aslam held a positive attitude towards Mewati and the role it played in Meo identity, culture, oral traditions and history, there were still some apprehensions regarding its usage in the classroom as a MOI.

Rasul, however, disagreed with Mewati’s use as a MOI since Mewati: "...has no instrumental value. Not suitable for securing government or private jobs. Not beneficial for Meo students in any way when all competitive exams are in Hindi or English".

Rasul was also strictly against Mewati gaining any constitutional status declaring that "doing this will create constitutional problems and will lead to regionalism". However, like Aslam, Rasul also believed that “resources should be allocated to develop its literature as oral tradition is filled with stories of Meos bravery and patriotism but it has been kept hidden and needs to be brought to the public eye".

These views reflect that Rasul, like Aslam, stressed preservation and resource allocation for Mewati and its literature, however, he was firmly against its introduction in classroom as a MOI, whereas Aslam favoured Mewati’s limited use.

4.2.1.3 Language Management

In terms of language management strategies, Rasul followed self-prohibition, refraining from using Mewati with other colleagues and communicated in Hindi in front of students so that students follow the lead, explaining: "Since students consider a teacher as their idol, we tend to communicate in Hindi only so that students may follow us".

Rasul elaborated that his and the school's emphasis was on "making students read, write and speak shuddh (pure) Hindi". To achieve this goal, he contends that "shuddh Hindi is used when communicating with students". This is done "so that students get habitual in using shuddh Hindi so they can travel interstate and get jobs in future". This measure was taken in the anticipation of modifying students' practices (and consequently beliefs). Rasul also extensively stressed on the more pure and therefore standard Hindi. This was done since standard Hindi was perceived to have instrumental value.

Aslam on the other hand was the only (Meo) rural school teacher who used management strategies in favour of Mewati. Aslam attempted to resist the hegemony of the regional and official languages
(Haryanvi, Hindi, Urdu and English) in terms of the space these languages occupied in the youth festivals and cultural programmes. He explains as follows:

"There are school competitions...youth festivals held in schools all across Haryana and are generally divided into two categories - general which includes events performed in Hindi/Urdu and regional which includes events performed in only one regional language - Haryanvi. So, if our students want to perform a drama or a musical event in Mewati, they would not be accepted. They would have to perform in either Haryanvi or Hindi or Urdu".

Aslam used promotion as a language management strategy to influence students' practices and beliefs. He actively promoted the usage of Mewati in songs, poetry and other genres among the students taking part in intercultural events in which all the schools of the region competed. The stated goal was to own and reclaim the linguistic and cultural identity of Meo students and to keep the language alive.

When asked if as a Meo teacher he thought this exclusion was a discriminatory practice, he agreed. When prompted further, he replied as follows:

"As a Meo teacher and someone who has great regard for Mewati oral literature, I actively encourage students to participate in dramas and events in Mewati and I help them in preparations myself even though I know that they would not be considered for the first place or be winners".

Aslam’s conscious decision can be seen in the context of his fairly positive attitude towards Mewati and his status as a known and respected member in the community for the work he continues to do for Meos, the local language and its preservation. Moving beyond preservation, he also noted his aim was not just to preserve the rich heritage of Mewati literature, history and folk stories but to revive them and bring into the public eye, stating: "Hum apne haq ki ladaai lad rahein hain ji (We are fighting for our rights)". Conscious promotion of Mewati was deployed, therefore, as a language management strategy by Aslam to alter students' practices and/or beliefs.
To conclude, the rural government schools (Schools A, B and C) primarily followed a monolingual language policy where Hindi played the dominant role, in line with its overt language policy. Mewati played a negligible role in the school, and was used only by students to communicate with teachers in the early years of primary education before they gradually shifted to Hindi in the later years. The only other time teachers reported some use of Mewati was during special cultural events organized by the school and during the weekly *Bal Sabha* (Children’s Council) programme. Both Meo (School B and C) and non-Meo (School A) teachers made no use of Mewati in the classroom with a few exceptions of very occasional and isolated use. On the whole, teachers discouraged Mewati inside the classroom and perceived its use as an obstacle to students' development.

### 4.3 Case study 2 - Urban School

#### 4.3.1 School D

Teachers: Vikram, Imran, Murid and Qurban

#### 4.3.1.0 Implicit or explicit language policy

Teachers were asked to state the school’s language policy during interviews and informal conversations to determine the school’s language policy. This was done in conjunction with documents collected from the school. All four teachers interviewed from the school declared school’s policy as that of English medium.

The documents collected (a copy of the standard diary issued to students by the school, school’s magazine and school's prospectus) also confirmed this. The school’s explicit LiEP of English is clearly stated in its magazine where the vice president’s message highlights the role English has played in giving birth to School D in an area such as Mewat, described in the magazine as "educationally very backward". The school’s magazine clearly states that the school came into existence "to impart quality education through English medium CBSE schools".
The explicit LiEP of English was confirmed in other documents such as the school's admission form and the school's prospectus, both written entirely in English. Nevertheless, a detailed analysis of the school's diary for students revealed that while English was the dominant language, other languages also occupied space. Out of the 48 pages of the school diary, Hindi was mentioned 7 times, Urdu was used 4 times, while English occupied majority of the pages.

The school's annual magazine also used Hindi and Urdu besides English. This document was significant as the magazine was used as a common platform for students and faculty alike which helped in "displaying their creativity through their academic contributions" in the school magazine (Editorial, p.1). This meant the document could be helpful in revealing language preferences and practices of both teachers and students and school officials. Of the total 100 pages, 41 pages were in Hindi, 47 pages were in English and 12 pages were in Urdu.

Though the official policy of the school is to use English, Hindi and Urdu, then, also occupy the school's linguistic space. Nonetheless, teachers' language practices would shed further light on the actual language policy implemented in the school.

### 4.3.1.1 Language practice

For Spolsky, language practice component forms the most important component of language policy. As Spolsky argues that practices are the real policy, although respondents may be reluctant to admit it (2009, p. 4). All four teachers admitted that they used both English and Hindi inside the classroom with the rare exception of using a few words of Mewati if able to do so, when all else failed.

Since the only non-Meo teacher interviewed in School D, Vikram, admitted not knowing any Mewati, the claim of using a few words of Mewati with students, is probably over estimated. Teachers were asked the number of Meo teachers in the school or those who knew Mewati and could speak well. All teachers reported that it was around 10 or so as only those who were Meos and were local were fluent in speaking Mewati as their MT. Therefore there were very few teachers who could speak Mewati in the school as most of them were not from Mewat.

When asked about the classroom MOI, all teachers used "bilingual method of teaching" and "both Hindi and English". This was the standard response that every teacher gave. As the Meo teacher, Murid points out "We use bilingual method. We don't use Mewati. We use Hindi and English".
When asked about the number of school students belonging to the Meo community, teachers responded that Meos constituted nearly 80-90% of the student body. When asked what language they found Meo students using in the classroom/school, they responded students usually spoke Hindi. Imran, a Meo teacher from School D responds: "Students use Hindi the most in school and don’t use Mewati very much, perhaps with the exception of 1-2 words sometimes". The lack of student preference for Mewati was attributed to the school’s socio-economic composition (with majority of students belonging to middle class group as claimed by the teachers) and the school’s overt English language policy.

Teachers were asked about their language preferences with other colleagues and students outside the classrooms. This was done to gain an insight into their language use patterns with students (and colleagues) outside of the confinement of the classrooms. All School D teachers confirmed they used Hindi to communicate with students with the sole exception of non-Meo English teacher Vikram, who added English as well.

When asked what language was used with colleagues at School D, all of them mentioned Hindi, with the exception of Qurban, the Meo Urdu teacher who claimed Urdu was the language he deployed with Meos and non-Meos alike. This statement suggested that he strongly affiliated with Urdu and also perceived it different to Hindi since he could have easily said Hindi considering the similarities between Hindi and Urdu. Therefore, it appeared as if he made a conscious choice when asserting he used Urdu with colleagues. His language beliefs, as would be seen later, would confirm this assumption.

Other Meo teachers, Murid and Imran, admitted on using Mewati with other Meo colleagues. These two Meo teachers were open to using Mewati for in-group communication. Finally, the non-Meo teacher Vikram admitted using Haryanvi with a colleague who also spoke Haryanvi.

Therefore, while the school’s official policy is English, the actual language practices that teachers engage in to communicate with students, both inside and outside the classroom, includes significant use of Hindi. In practice, therefore, there was a difference between the stated language policy and the actual language practices that take place in the classroom.
4.3.1.2 Language beliefs

4.3.1.2.0 Towards Hindi:

Unlike the rural school teachers, teachers in this school put less emphasis on the role of Hindi. All teachers indicated Hindi played a limited role in their school as English was the language since it was used for all official purposes. In the words of Vikram: "Hindi does not play much role in this school because English is used as a MOI and for all official purposes. Hindi is taught only as a subject". When asked about their language practices, they all admitted using a "bilingual method of teaching", using English and Hindi inside the classrooms.

It was noticed that while Hindi was referred to through terms such as "our mother tongue" and "our national language" by all teachers there was less stress upon linking it with the overall national identity as compared to the rural school teachers. For instance, while Meo teachers, Imran and Murid also (mis)associate Hindi with non-Hindi speakers "mother tongue" and as India's "national language" (In India there is no national language - Hindi is regarded only as an official language of the union), when a question was asked to state their mother tongues, these two Meo teachers reported Mewati (and not Hindi).

While there were positive attitude towards Hindi, referring to it as a literary language as Qurban did or a language spoken by majority of people across the nation as Imran did, there was less correspondence observed between Hindi and the broader national identity and there was less emphasis noticed on its spread, than in the rural schools.

4.3.1.2.1 Towards English:

All teachers showed a highly positive attitude towards English. They all referred to English as the international language, a language with high instrumental value for securing jobs within India and overseas and a language that symbolized development. English was linked to high social status and literacy as elaborated by Murid, "When anyone speaks in English, people think that they are well educated. People get impressed." English language was also seen as a way forward to modernity.
As the non-Meo English teacher, Vikram, noted: "Without English, we will stay back in the world and remain backward". Yet, all teachers, including Vikram (The English teacher), confessed that it was difficult for students to cope with English, particularly those students who belonged to the rural areas. He immediately followed it by saying that the school's results, however, were “always good”.

4.3.1.2.2 Towards Urdu:

The beliefs teachers held regarding Urdu were considered important to examine particularly because it was offered by the school D as a third language, which not many schools offer in Mewat. All teachers held a positive attitude towards Urdu, referring to it as a language –belonging to both Hindus and Muslims. The non-Meo teacher, Vikram, for instance says: "No, I cannot say that a certain language belongs to a religion. Language is a language". They all indicated it had a rich history and literature.

Meo Urdu teacher Qurban, for instance felt deeply attached to Urdu, "Urdu is above all languages, even Hindi, for me". He maintains: "Urdu is widely spoken in India and is the lingua franca of the nation" and reported it as "the most important language". They all believed that more students were likely to attend schools if Urdu was offered and Urdu teachers were available and so were in favour of teaching Urdu. For instance, Qurban feels: "Urdu can bring more Meos to schools since they are Muslims". This was similar to the responses generated from other teachers in the rural schools.

Each teacher was asked their thoughts on students' preference for Urdu as a subject since Urdu was offered by the school as a third language. All teachers suggested that students enjoyed taking Urdu and most Meo students opted for Urdu over Sanskrit at the upper primary level. Meo teacher Imran, for instance, indicates: "students in this school are fonder of Urdu than Sanskrit or even Hindi since Sanskrit may not have much value for them but Urdu helps them in reading Islamic books". Therefore, Urdu, according to the teachers had an instrumental value for students.

Murid shares the same sentiment and voices "most students in this school, around 85%, opt for Urdu over Sanskrit. Children and parents both want Urdu to be taught in schools". The non-Meo teacher Vikram also voices the same opinion "considering that Mewat is a Muslim populated area, students are more comfortable with Urdu. Many students also persist with Urdu in the later grades by studying it as an additional subject at the secondary level".
While teachers' personal opinions, similar to teachers in the rural schools, reflected that Urdu did not belong to Meo Muslims alone, they also believed that Meos had more to gain from Urdu. Teachers believed so primarily because of a deeper attachment with Urdu and because it had an instrumental value for Meos (than Sanskrit).

Similar to teachers in the rural schools, all Meo teachers pointed out the shortage of Urdu teachers in schools across Mewat, including their own school. They all agreed that the availability of Urdu and its teachers in schools was a key determinant in student enrolment and retention. Overall, all desired recruitment of Urdu teachers, considering what they frequently referred to as, the social fabric of the region (a predominantly Muslim area).

4.3.1.2.3 Towards Mewati:

As a non-Meo teacher, Vikram's responses were more favourable towards Mewati than his counterparts in the rural schools. He was asked if the state should allocate resources for the language or for its development, and replied "government should allocate resources for Mewati as it does for other languages, spoken by other language groups". When asked if it should be used in school as a MOI, he reported affirmatively, "Mewati should be used as a MOI as mother tongue is the best way to explain the depth of an idea". Despite this, he self reported his skills in Mewati as "poor". During the course of the interview he repeated his proficiency in Mewati was poor three times and admitted he knew "only a few certain words relevant for instruction in the classroom". However, he stressed that he could understand Mewati fully but was unable to speak it fluently since he was not from Mewat.

As for the three Meo teachers interviewed at School D, two showed a relatively negative attitude towards Mewati (Imran and Qurban) with only one Meo teacher (Murid) holding a positive attitude. When asked about which language they used at home, Imran reported using Hindi with his wife and children. On the other hand, Qurban reluctantly declared using Mewati with his parents though stated using "only Urdu" with his children. On the questions that were asked of them, both of them agreed on a few things which were: - a) Mewati had no instrumental value; b) any resource allocation efforts undertaken by the government would be a waste; c) children's knowledge of Mewati is and would be a hindrance for children's overall learning and development, d) the rare times when Mewati should be used is when students do not understand English, Hindi or Urdu, and
in that case Mewati is/may be used "as a last resort", and e) Mewati should not be employed as a MOI in the school.

The extent of the negative attitudes held by the two of School D's Meo teachers towards Mewati could be further gauged by some of their comments. For instance, Imran emphasizes "to educate oneself is to remove Meos from Mewati culture and Mewati language". He further says "Meo students should use Mewati in class only in limited capacity, in scenarios where, for instance, a child has recently left his village to join this school, otherwise not".

Qurban was also against children using Mewati either at home or in schools. He stresses "Meo students should not use Mewati at home. They should rather use Urdu or Hindi as they are literary and thus prestigious languages and widely understood". He further associated children using Mewati at school with bad habits claiming: "Primary students end up speaking Mewati in the school usually due to the bad habit of using it at home with family members".

These statements reveal that these Meo teachers from School D, like majority of the other rural school teachers, do not build on students understanding of Mewati and/or value it. It also shows that teachers are generally oblivious to the benefits of using mother tongue in the classrooms and its role in teaching and learning.

In contrast, Murid held more positive beliefs towards Mewati. He noted Mewati had a rich oral literature and traditions and that they should be preserved. He also stressed the need for greater resource allocation for the development of Mewati and emphasized it should be written so it could be preserved for future.

Murid also believed that Mewati could play a much bigger role in classrooms for teaching/learning purposes as Mewati is the local language of the region and most students are Mewati speakers. When asked what language he used at home for family communication, he declared it was Mewati. He stated positively that he used Mewati to communicate with his parents, wife and children. He underscores that "apnapan (a sense of belongingness) can only be achieved in one's own language".

When asked the role and relevance of Mewati in schools, Murid replies strongly: "Mewati should have a place in school books". When asked in what capacity he would like to see Mewati, he responds: "It should be introduced as an optional subject along with the other subjects such as Sanskrit, Urdu and Punjabi from which students have to choose at the upper primary level". This response of Murid was similar to the one given by Aslam from School C in that some form of Mewati's use in schools was acceptable to both teachers.
Murid advocated for Mewati as a MOI for better communication. As he states: "There exists a communication gap between non-local teachers and Meo students as children arriving from village in particular struggle to understand either pure Hindi or pure English". This communication gap, he believes, also leads to students feeling hesitant to actively participate in the classrooms. As he reveals: "Students usually feel hesitant to ask questions to non-local teachers and find themselves at ease when asking local teachers in Mewati".

When asked why students felt more at ease among local teachers over non-local teachers, Murid attributed it to the shared linguistic and cultural identity that teachers shared with the Mewati speaking students. He insists: "Meo students are more attached to local teachers as they both share the same language and culture and are generally less attached to non-breakfasts". Furthermore, he says: "local Meo teachers understand students' social and psychological problems better than non-Meo teachers". He insisted on recruiting more local teachers.

One aspect on which all three Meo teachers from School D expressed their concern, like the other two Meo school teachers in Schools B and C, was in relation to the vitality of Mewati language. They all believed "Theth (pure or typical) Mewati language was in decline", especially among the more educated and urban Meos. This could be debatable, as Spolsky (2004) mentions, many purists regard borrowing a word from another language to be the first stage of language loss, which is not necessarily the case (p. 10). Further analysis into this matter, however, is beyond the scope of this study.

Another common aspect among all Meo teachers' from School B, C and D is their admission on students shifting from Mewati to Hindi later in schooling. As Qurban indicates: "Students speak Mewati until the primary level but as they progress towards higher classes they start speaking Mewati less". These teachers expressed the concern for recruiting Meo teachers so that along with improving the communication the overall literacy of the region could also be improved.

4.3.1.2.4 Towards Haryanvi:

Unlike the non-Meo participants in School A, Vikram, a non-Meo teacher from school D, exhibited a positive attitude towards his mother tongue, Haryanvi. When asked about the language used at home with parents, wife and children, Vikram reported Haryanvi.
His thoughts on Haryanvi were asked to see how he perceived another minority language which was different to Mewati, and he replied: "Haryanvi is actually a dialect, vernacular of Hindi language. It has its own rich literature, has a unique sense of humour [laughs]. Its own music and dance form". Nevertheless, he maintained that Haryanvi was merely a dialect of Hindi.

Vikram’s concern for Haryanvi could be observed in his statement of distress toward its decline in public space (and claimed possible shift to Hindi) among Haryanvi speakers with the rise in education and modernization. He points out:

"In the last few years, more and more people are leaving, instead of embracing, our language or the vernacular Haryanvi. This is because when we go to cities for work, for interviews, people do not think highly of Haryanvi. They think it is a country language. They do not find politeness in it. It's not that it is a dull language either, just that it does not sound soft spoken. It is a commanding language".

4.3.1.3 Language Management

One of the ways students' language behaviour and practices were managed in the school included explicit instructions. As Qurban described: "Children speak to each other in Mewati, despite [us] instructing them not to".

Unlike the rural schools, Mewati was not used or encouraged during cultural events that took place in this elite school. This was confirmed by Murid, a Meo teacher from School D, when he says: "No emphasis is given on Mewati language (or on Meos) during cultural programmes. Hindi and English get the most emphasis".

Language socialization also plays a part. Teachers, higher educational authorities and the school itself actively influence and manage students' beliefs and language practices, in favour of English. This was best illustrated by the non-Meo English teacher from School D, Vikram:
"My goal and the goal of school authorities, education department and CBSE [Central Board of Secondary Education] is one: to make students comfortable in English, to speak to them in English. A student can feel English or become English only when he thinks in English, language style is in English...everything in English. When we will feel everything in English, only then we will become aware of English".

The scope of this strategy is not simply limited to either socialization 'through' language or 'to' use language but has a broader impact on intervening in the language practices and beliefs of students.

In order to fully achieve this goal of language socialization, teachers used a self-prohibiting strategy for language management. Similar to the rural school teachers, this meant teachers refrained from using their MT in front of students to set an example. This was captured best by Vikram who points out: "The particular region in which this school is...Mewat, we cannot see it separately from the entity of Haryana. So, we also have to distance ourselves from using our vernaculars".

Lastly, it was found that teacher recruitment criterion is used by the school as a tool for language management. The school placed significant importance on hiring teachers who were proficient in English, (and Hindi or even Urdu) but not necessarily in Mewati as Mewati was not part of the core agenda (policy) of the school.

This conscious decision from the school can modify teachers' and subsequently students' language practices and beliefs. This is best exemplified by Vikram who reflects: "[When appointing teachers] authorities see how they [teachers] have the flow of speaking English. Two things the authority basically expects from us: First, a command over the subject; second, the flow of the language...English. And, the third thing...teaching pedagogy".

In summary, School D’s language management strategies included explicit instructions, indifference towards inclusion of Mewati in cultural events and extracurricular activities, active language socialization, self prohibition, and teacher recruitment criteria.

In conclusion, the English medium school (School D) followed a bilingual language policy in which both Hindi and English played key roles. This was in contradiction to the overt English language policy of the school. Mewati played a non-existent role in the school in that neither the students nor the teachers made use of it inside the classrooms. Teachers reported the non-use of Mewati even during cultural events and other school activities. On the whole, both Meo and non-Meo teachers
In School D perceived Mewati as an obstacle and believed that it would hinder students' academic progress.

4.4 Summary

This chapter reported findings that emerged from studying the two cases. Overall, the findings clearly reveal that language policies in the schools have very limited, if any, space for the local variety, Mewati. The findings also indicate that schools differed in terms of their language policies, practices and ideologies. In the next chapter, a detailed discussion and analysis of the findings is carried out.
Chapter 5 - Discussion

5.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings that emerged from the previous chapter. The discussion and analysis in this chapter begins by analyzing the language practices, beliefs and management strategies of participants from the two cases studied, separately, in order to gain a fuller understanding of each case.

Following this, a cross case analysis is carried out. Later, Spolsky's (2004) language policy model is examined in relation to the discussion with regard to the research questions and its theoretical implications are drawn which are then discussed and analyzed. As a result, a key theoretical concept called '(un/dys) consciousness' emerges.

5.1 Case 1 – Rural Schools

An inextricable and inviolable link was found between Hindustan-Hindustani-Hindi, where Hindi was regarded as a national and linguistic identity ’of all Indians’ (Hindustanis) with teachers’ beliefs espousing feelings of Hindi nationalism. This feeling was expressed by participants equating Hindi to "matra-bhaasha" (mother tongue) and "rashtra-bhaasha" (national language). This finding confirms the ethnographic study of LaDousa (2006) who studied Hindi and English medium schools in Banaras commenting that "Hindi medium education derives its nationalistic, community-affirming ethos from the idea that Hindi is the "national language" or Indians' 'mother tongue'" (p. 42).

This idea of Hindi as the "national language" repeated throughout by the teachers is particularly interesting as according to the constitution of India (1950), Hindi is not the national but is only an official language. The constitution therefore does not give a status of national language to any of its 22 regional languages and only recognize Hindi and English as co-official languages.

The status of Hindi, however, has always been ambiguous from its early phase of nationalist struggle particularly after the end of colonial rule and partition days. Das Gupta (1970) notes that "semantic confusion" has persisted to this day where despite the best intentions of constitutional drafters
cautiously choosing one single "official language", the status of Hindi has been ambiguous in the political and social discussions in India (p. 36).

Nevertheless, Hindi nationalist beliefs were internalized and normalized to the extent that teachers conceived the notion of exclusivist language policy of subscribing to Hindi only rule, as legitimate and beneficial for student long-term interests. In the rural schools, Meo and non-Meo teachers alike espoused this notion and the non-Meo teachers, in particular, expressed these views more firmly and sharply. School A’s non-Meo teachers, for instance, staunchly supported Hindi, emphasized upon its purification, justified its hegemonic position as an ideal variety and a standard variety over other dialects, defended its use as MOI within schools and argued for more resource allocation for its development and spread.

This was interesting as none of the teachers interviewed spoke Hindi as their first language. Despite this, they all perceived the use of local dialects in the school curricula, teaching and learning practices as a hindrance for students in acquiring full competency in standard languages, particularly Hindi. This is particularly striking as all the teachers admitted that students struggled to understand Hindi in teaching which posed serious learning problems for students.

The communication gap was even more serious in the case of non-Meo teachers as they along with the Meo teachers (from School B and School C) confirmed that students had particular trouble understanding them and vice-versa, particularly in primary education. This was because School A’s non-Meo teachers did not know Mewati and students did not know Hindi (or Haryanvi - the language spoken by most non-Meo teachers in both the rural and the urban schools).

Another reason for this communication gap was the use of 'standard' variety of Hindi which differed to the other varieties which the students spoke such as Mewati. This echoes Jhingran’s argument when he notes that many primary school children in remote areas of India struggle in classrooms because they lack adequate language proficiency in the standard varieties (2009, p. 264-265). Jhingran insists an overgeneralization is usually made about the multilingual nature of Indians which might be true for adults and children who are slightly older but may not be true for young children, particularly those living in the remote areas of the country (Ibid).

The effects of this communication gap were not limited to the teaching and learning outcomes but also had social-psychological bearing. The Meo teachers from School B and C revealed many students suffered from anxiety and were afraid to approach non-Meo teachers fearing they may not be understood. The possible lack of bond due to socio-cultural-religious differences additionally played a part in students feeling reluctant to approach non-Meo teachers.
In terms of language practice, the results showed that School A was essentially a Hindi monolingual school. This was despite teachers in principle, emphasizing multilingualism and perceiving it as a resource to be deployed. In practice, however, (non-Meo) teachers either looked down upon and/or (Meo) teachers were skeptical of using Mewati and other minority languages in classrooms.

This scenario is similar to what Jhingran claimed in the case of non-tribal teachers working in schools with tribal students. Problems for students are compounded when in addition to coping with unfamiliar language at school, they also feel alienated due to teachers' attitude towards their languages and cultures (Jhingran 2009, p. 268).

Teachers did (albeit hesitatingly) indicate, use of some Mewati in the classrooms in isolated phrase. This was true for both Meo (School B and C) and non-Meo (School A) teachers with the difference being that non-Meo teachers also admitted using some Haryanvi. One reason School A’s teachers used some amount of Haryanvi was their admitted lack of spoken proficiency in Mewati. Another motive could be attributed to the over emphasis on “shuddh” (pure) Hindi, something that teachers like Aseem said, they “always strived for but struggled with because [they] couldn’t get rid of [their] Haryanvi way of speaking/accent”.

This emphasis on the 'purity' of Hindi was observed throughout the study and points toward the nationalist tendency, as Haugen also noted "purism is closely connected with national feeling" (1987, p. 87). Nevertheless, School A’s teachers rated their comprehension abilities of Mewati in comparison at a relatively greater scale owing to Haryanvi and Mewati being quite similar to Hindi.

The same cannot be said for the students, who by admission of teachers, struggled to understand Hindi at primary level as (standard) Hindi is not the language used at home. Interestingly, the findings indicated teachers perceived non comprehension of Hindi as a natural and transitory phase that “children must go through” before "things make sense", as Aseem informed. All teachers comforted by expressing that by the time students are in 6th or 8th standard they start getting better.

This, however, alienates children and leaves them struggling for far too long during the initial years of primary and upper primary education. This is particularly alarming considering one in four children leave school before reaching the 5th standard and almost half leave before reaching 8th standard in India (UNICEF, 2005). If this pattern is widespread, then such alienation could play a role in school dropout rates in Mewat.

The teacher’s views are a matter of grave concern because the initial years are the fundamental years for literacy and gaining education. The LiEP and language practices that lead to excluding
students’ own languages, as is the case in School A, can result in children feeling alienated and socially and educationally excluded. This often results in children ‘dropping-out’, or as Mohanty calls, being pushed out "in an unresponsive system that systematically devalues them - their culture, their languages, and their identities" (2009, p. 3). In the case of remote and rural areas like Mewat where literacy rates are already low 44.07%, this is of great concern (Census 2001).

Overall, teachers practiced and strived for teaching in “standard Hindi” but used a "mix of languages", as School A’s teachers put it. Caution must be exercised here not to overemphasize the phrase of mix of languages because Hindi was the language that was used most often barring a few words of Mewati that teachers claimed to know. Nonetheless, there were not many great inconsistencies between the said language policy and actual practice.

In terms of language beliefs, School A, B and C teachers believed that minority languages do not carry intrinsic, instrumental or in fact any educational value. In general, School B and C’s Meo teachers were seen, at best, expressing concerns over the vitality of their language and loss of oral tradition and literature. While, School A’s non-Meo teachers were seen as showing their disapproval and displeasure towards Meo students’ continuing use of Mewati in the school and home domains.

School B and C’s Meo teachers agreed that some resources needed to be allocated for Mewati’s development, mostly to do with preserving its oral tradition rather than developing Mewati, so it could be used in the classroom. However, School A’s non-Meo teachers disagreed and believed that doing so would be a waste. Further, the non-Meo teachers in School A also claimed that not only was Mewati not relevant, it would go against social cohesion and integration of the nation. In the end, the rural school teachers from Schools A, B and C perceived local languages, Mewati or even Haryanvi, as a handicap or an obstacle to overcome rather than an asset or resource to be deployed towards students’ education and overall development.

Contrary to teachers' beliefs on the use of minority languages in school, however, several studies illustrate that minority languages or ‘dialects’ could aid the process of learning, including Cheshire (2005) who conducted a survey of recent literature on the use of nonstandard varieties and declared that "they are not as detrimental to education success as might be thought" (p. 2346).

Cheshire also notes that even after 40 years of sociolinguistic research, ignorance and prejudice still continue to thrive among teachers who hold deep stereotypes against these nonstandard varieties with the speakers themselves often holding those views (Ibid). This was the case with all the rural school teachers who held negative views and stereotypes regarding Mewati by terming it as ‘rough’, ‘village like’, 'abusive sounding dialect', 'not fit enough to be called a language', among others.
As for the other languages, Urdu, while available on paper as an optional subject at the upper primary level (Grade 6 to Grade 8), played virtually no role in the rural government schools due to the lack of teaching personnel, materials and textbooks. This neglect of Urdu that this research points to also finds resonance with Jhingran (2009, p. 274). Urdu’s neglect occurs despite the fact that most students were Meo Muslims. The non-availability of Urdu in schools has three drawbacks.

Firstly, it deprives students from studying the subject, which by teachers’ own admissions, Meo students are most keen on.

Secondly, as all teachers reported, some of the students have existing proficiency/ aptitude in Urdu owing to their prior and continuing exposure to the language learnt from Masjids and Maktabs i.e. mosques and Islamic schools, of which the students cannot take advantage.

Thirdly, as all teachers confirmed, Urdu plays a decisive role in Mewat in enrollment and retention when it comes to choices parents and community members make.

As for English, rural school teachers reported that while important for socio-economic mobility; its role was limited in the context of rural government schools where it was only taught as a subject. As the teachers claimed, the main emphasis was on finishing the syllabus on time. Therefore, English appeared to play a limited role.

To sum up, Hindi was the only language that played a key role in teaching and learning activities and occupied a broader role in terms of school’s language policy.

The use of Mewati was restricted and virtually nonexistent in that School A’s non-Meo teachers reported their knowledge of spoken Mewati was limited "to a few words". School B and C’s Meo teachers reported not using Mewati given the school's Hindi medium policy and because of teachers' own language beliefs. The Hindi centric language policy of the schools, thus contributed towards subtractive-type submersion education (Skutnabb-Kangas et. al, 2009, p. 301). Further, the ideology that seems to be guiding School A (B and C) can be termed (Hindi) Nationalist language ideology with a largely monolingual language policy in place.

One way rural school teachers and authorities maintained and manifested LiEP was by means of managing languages. Teachers or school authorities deployed these strategies to intervene and modify the linguistic behavior of Meo students.

Language management strategies, according to Spolsky, are "any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management" (2004, p. 5). Furthermore, as Spolsky (2004) contended that language management is influenced by language
beliefs and in turn influences practices. Seen in this light, the most common language management strategies used in the rural schools included:

- **Prohibition** -> Explicit instructions given by teachers so that students do not to use Mewati in school.
- **Self-restraint** -> Teachers prohibited or restrained themselves in front of students from using their language varieties so as to 'set a better example' and so 'students follow their lead'.
- **Restrictive teaching method** -> Teachers overemphasized on using direct method of teaching inside the classroom with the complete exclusion of students’ mother tongue arguing that doing this would benefit students' learning.

### 5.2 Case 2 – Urban School

On the other hand, School D’s explicit language policy was English, overtly mentioned in the documents collected that included school prospectus, admission form, and students’ diary. School D’s strong emphasis upon English could also be gauged by observing other physical artifacts that included posters on display boards in the school. A thorough analysis was also done on the newspapers available in school (mainly English) and the proportion and medium of books available in libraries (mostly English and Hindi). In addition to documents collected and analyzed, one-on-one detailed interviews with teachers confirmed the stated English language policy of the school. On the whole, all the teachers interviewed along with the principal and education officer lent support to school’s English language policy claim. However, there appeared to be a discrepancy between the stated policy and actual practice.

While the school maintained its explicit English language policy, teachers confessed they actually followed a “bilingual language policy using both English and Hindi” inside the classrooms. One of the reasons for this approach was the perception that students may struggle if taught in English alone. Another reason was the demographics of Mewat and the fact the area was largely rural with most of its population still uneducated and many of the students being the first generation students to attain any education. The school was particularly mindful of this fact, as evidenced by the school magazine where the principal’s message in Hindi read “many current students were forming part of the first generation of literate Mewatis” (p. 47). As such, Hindi was used by teachers to bridge the gap that would have otherwise existed if taught solely through English.
Interestingly though, teachers underplayed the role of Hindi by declaring that teaching Hindi was a formality and stressed that the real focus and value lied on using and teaching English. They reported that the role of Hindi within the school environment was confined to merely teaching it as a subject alone. However, this was not a true picture of teachers’ linguistic practices.

In addition to teachers' language practices inside the classroom, Hindi was clearly favored in school documents like student diaries and school magazine and featured along with English.

Teachers’ undermining of Hindi’s role was even more striking considering “the school taught it as students’ first language, as their mother tongue” according to the teachers, and as written on student diaries issued by the school. The notion of teaching Hindi as MT when it is not MT is raised by Benson (2005) noting Pattanayak (2003) when she points out the exclusion of students’ MTs and posits that the regional language (Hindi in this case) is usually taught as if it is the first language of the students (p. 15).

In terms of language practices, therefore, the findings revealed that while the school’s stated policy is that of English but the actual practices and language use is to the contrary. However, regardless of the bilingual traits of the policy and the ample space it provides to other languages like Urdu and Sanskrit (as school subjects), it still fails to take Mewati into account. This bilingual language policy, therefore, is subtractive in nature since it does not include children’s MT. As a result, Mewati continues to be marginalized in School D.

In terms of language beliefs, School D’s teachers viewed Hindi positively and teachers in this school appeared to lack the Hindi nationalist undertones that strongly characterized the teachers in the rural schools. On the contrary, English was unanimously regarded as an international language, with significant instrumental value and more importantly was part of the existential logic of the school as outlines in the school prospectus. This was due to how the school prospectus read that one of the prime reasons for which the school came into existence was to provide "quality English medium education".

Besides academic excellence, according to the teachers, one of the crucial objectives of the school authorities and teachers was to enhance students’ proficiency in English. The overwhelming presence of English on display boards, newspapers, magazines, diaries, library books, were all evidence of the central space English occupied within the school. It was this fundamental role ascribed to English, teachers suggested, that influenced Meo parents’ choice when it came to selecting a school for their children. Besides English, the provision of Urdu also significantly influenced parents’ decision making.
This school boasted of Urdu teachers, textbooks and materials, unlike School A, while the latter expressed an acute shortage of Urdu teachers in its school and in Mewat generally. As the school officials indicated, the provision of Urdu at the upper primary level with a possibility of studying it up to the secondary level guaranteed that more Meos would enroll into their school. This concern was also shared by the teachers in the rural schools, all of whom also suggested that the provision of Urdu in schools, could bring and retain more Meo students into the schools.

There was also a reasonable presence of Urdu in student diaries which ranged from a note for parents, national song, poem, to prayer. Additionally, the school’s magazine in which teachers and students contributed regularly also carved out a space for Urdu. All of these attempts and practices aimed at integrating Muslim students into the school.

However, when it came to making space for Meos’ MT, the use of the language was not considered appropriate by the teachers or school authorities nor was Mewati used inside the classrooms.

Overall, teachers in School D are driven by what I call a national-cum-internationalist ideology. I call this 'national' because Hindi still occupied a key role within the overall language policy implemented in classrooms as it was not only used as a MOI along with English but was taught by the school as students’ “first language”. Moreover, Hindi was still perceived as the "national language" by all teachers, though, was not regarded as an index of nationalism.

I refer to the latter part of the ideology as 'internationalist' for two reasons. Firstly, the term rose from teachers' perception of English--the overt language policy of the school--as an "international language". It was this provision of "quality English medium education" for which the school came into existence in Mewat and "what set it apart from others".

Secondly, the language policy followed by School D moved beyond Hindi centric education and Hindi nationalism and placed an emphasis on other languages including English and Urdu to connect with more people. It attempted to overcome the limits of the largely Hindi centric monolingual language policy as followed in the other schools by moving beyond Hindi and by showing its concern for bonding with other languages such as Urdu. Hence, I call this underlying ideology of School B as internationalist in essence, albeit still retaining subtle national (Hindi) sympathies.

Thus, three key terms that captured the essence of this internationalist worldview included to overcome the limits of - nation/nationalism/monolingualism, moving beyond - state/regional language Hindi, and showing concern for bonding with - other languages and cultures/different than one's own. Therefore, the values held and expressed by the school D and its participants included a more international/cosmopolitan worldview.
This could be best captured in the words of the school principal who used Mahatama Gandhi’s quote to express the school’s motto, ethos, values and beliefs: "I do not want my house to be walled on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any” (School magazine, 2011-12, p. 5). Despite having an ostensibly internationalist outlook, the school however, failed to account for the local language, Mewati.

One way through which, School D maintained its LiEP and/or reflected LiEP was by means of managing languages. Seen in this regard, the management strategies used by School B (as described more in detail in Chapter 4) ranged from:

- **Prohibition** -> Teachers’ explicit instructions to students not to use Mewati.
- **Indifference** -> School’s indifference towards inclusion of Mewati in cultural events and extracurricular activities. However, I argue this indifference is in itself a political act and cannot be called as merely neutral. According to the Meo teachers, the school made little attempt to have any input from the local language and rarely made any space for Mewati or engaged in actively promoting it.
- **Active language socialization** -> As Vikram claimed the school’s and teacher’s agenda was to socialize students in a way so they can ‘think in English’, 'feel English', 'Speak English' and 'Become English'. The school authorities and teachers were committed in actively socializing students in dominant languages such as English (and to a lesser degree Hindi).
- **Self - restraint** -> Teachers refrained from speaking in their own minority languages (Haryanvi, Mewati, etc) in front of students ‘to set a better example' and 'so students follow their lead'.
- **Teacher recruitment criterion** -> School’s teacher recruitment criteria in which knowledge of English on the part of teachers (so teachers could be proficient in using English inside the classroom for example) took centre stage. Teachers repeatedly mentioned the relevance of being “good in English” in order to be hired due to the fact that it was an English medium school. All the teachers counted it as one of the most important factors that played a part in their recruitment and it was something that contributed to the prestige of their school.

All of these strategies were aimed at modifying the language practices and/or ideologies of the Meo students and so significantly affected Mewati’s position within the school.

To summarize, ‘nationalist’ (Schools A, B and C) and ‘national-cum-internationalist’ (School D) were the ideologies of the respective schools. These ideologies, I argue, influenced to some extent the
practices and choices made by the teachers inside the classrooms which ranged from mostly Hindi to both Hindi and English and for this reason could be located on a scale ranging, for the most part, from ‘monolingualism’ to ‘bilingualism’ respectively.

In terms of the central research question asked in this study: **What LiEP are in place two schools chosen and what role, if any, does Mewati play in the policy framework**, it could be said that the rural schools reflected a largely monolingual, Hindi dominated LiEP. Whereas, the urban school showed by and large, a bilingual (Hindi-English) LiEP. Ultimately, both ideologies and their respective policies made little to no room for the local language variety of the region.

Most of the teachers, whether rural or urban, perceived Mewati as a problem and not as a resource to be deployed for teaching and learning purposes. This is alarming as there is a close relationship between language, thought and intelligence. This is reflected in the words of Batibo (2005) for instance, when he claims, "It is through language that we conceptualize ideas, organize our thoughts and systematize our memory" (p. 36).

The fact that language policies of both the schools (and possibly many others) continue to ignore, marginalize and suppress the local varieties, therefore, warrants serious attention, both from the perspectives of linguistic human rights as well as the crucial role mother tongue varieties play in education and literacy.

### 5.3 Cross-Case Analysis

After having analyzed each case comprehensively, this section would deal with comparing and contrasting both the cases. As mentioned above, little to no space was created by rural and urban schools for Mewati.

One factor contributing to non usage of Mewati is the application of the three language formula (discussed in Chapter 1) and how it continues to be used. As previously noted in Chapter 1, the state authorities and school administration conflate the mother tongue of students (Mewati) with the official regional or state language (Hindi) (Vanishree, 2011, p. 5).

The end result is that Hindi is taught as the "first language" of students both in both the rural and urban schools and by extension in other schools across Mewat. As a result, local varieties like
Mewati continue to struggle to be seen and heard. It could be safely said that both school types essentially fail to make appropriate space for the local language Mewati.

Secondly, the usual reason attributed toward Mewati’s non use in the classroom was that it was not well developed and lacked script, thus unsuitable as the language of education. This concern was also shared by Koul and Devaki (2000) who noted that minority languages lacking standardized scripts are excluded from education on the ground of being less developed and are hence deemed ill equipped to be language of education (p. 121). However, as Mohanty argued, it is the gross social, educational, statutory, official and legal neglect of these minority languages in combination with the justification of the poverty of these languages with their so-called inadequacies by which the minority languages are weakened and disadvantage is brought about (2009, p. 4).

Thirdly, the teachers in all the schools opposed Mewati’s use in education on the ground that making space for local language varieties and cultures in education would pose a threat to the established educational system, administration, social cohesion and integration of the nation as well as would affect socio-economic and cognitive development of students.

These concerns shared by the teachers regarding the use of minority languages in education have long been used to argue that MT based education would be "disastrous for national cohesion and identity, and destabilizing for the very people for whom the education is provided" (Ouane, 2003, p. 62). However, as Ouane (2003) states "in reality, what exacerbates opposition is not the plurality of languages but conflicts of interest in conflicting messages" (p. 64).

Pattanayak cites linguistic conflicts that have taken place in South Asia alone and argues that social cohesion, national unity or integrity is threatened not because of linguistic diversity (in education) but either due to the lack of any language policy or a language policy that is not at all in line with the actual ground realities (Ibid).

Fourthly, most teachers in every school were non-Meo teachers who migrated from other parts of the state to make up for the acute shortage of teachers in Mewat. These teachers did not speak Mewati as their first language. There were hardly any local Meo teachers. As such, most teachers lacked the proficiency in Mewati to use it well in the classroom.

Thus, despite every teacher stressing upon the need and relevance of having a local teacher, the severe shortage persists. In conjunction with the fact that majority of the students belonged to the (Muslim) minority religious group who were taught by the non-local majority religious group (Hindus) teachers who further belonged to the dominant ethnic groups (Jats etc) posed further problems for the students.
This linguistic and cultural barrier between teachers and students not only affects their interaction and therefore students' academic progress but also inhibits minority students from being empowered. This view is shared by Cummins who notes that "students from 'dominated' societal groups are 'empowered' or 'disabled' as a direct result of their interactions with educators in the school (1995, p. 105).

Finally, one of the factors that played a major part in the exclusion of Mewati was the prejudices held against Mewati and by extension towards other minority languages dubbed as 'dialects', by both Meo and non-Meo school teachers across all of the schools. This research showed that despite years of sociolinguistic research indicating that all 'non standard' varieties are equally as rule governed, logical and well formed systems as the standard varieties (e.g., Labov, 1969), prejudices still continue to exist among teachers.

As Chambers (2009) says, "prejudices based on dialect are as insidious as prejudices based on skin color, religion, or any other insubstantial attribute, and they have the same result. They unfairly limit self-fulfillment" (p. 268). These prejudices about language variation once absorbed by teachers are likely to do pedagogical damage (Scott, Straker, & Katz, 2009, p. 179). In other words, these prejudices lead to teachers linking students' use of 'non-standard' varieties with that of their lack of school ability (Cunningham, 1976-77).

This was true in the context of this study in that the majority of teachers in both rural and urban schools held prejudices against Mewati and attributed Mewati as one of the causes for children's lack of abilities. Teachers perceived Mewati as an obstacle to overcome rather than a resource and regarded Mewati as an impediment to students' cognitive and academic growth. Some of the teachers went as far as to suggest that students needed to stop using their language at home (and in schools) for their own benefit.

Such prejudices, as Baugh (2000) noted, reduces teacher expectations for the child's abilities (Scott et al., 2009, p. 179). This can lead to self fulfilling prophecy in that as teacher expectations are reduced, student performance is diminished (Ibid). Therefore, the prejudices teachers were found to hold against minority languages labeled as 'dialects' in general and Mewati in particular, may not just cause social, developmental and psychological damage to the student but could also have grave implications for students' education and economic life chances.

Rather than merely describe the existing state of affairs, the purpose of this research was to critically expose, question and challenge them. Therefore, an attempt was made throughout this study to look into the broader questions of access, power and injustice with an overall aim of social change.
Thus, after having described earlier the language policies, practices and ideologies in place, I argue in line with Paulston (1994), that for any language policy to succeed, it is imperative to take into account the socio-cultural realities it finds itself in, the social context of language problems and especially the forces that contribute to language maintenance and shift (p. 4). One way this could be achieved in Mewat is by ensuring sufficient space for local identities, languages and cultures.

Among the many views that were expressed by the teachers, a tendency was found in teachers attempting to undermine students’ home language while valorizing standard languages, perceiving students’ home language, Mewati, as an obstacle. Teachers even went as far as to say that students should stop using it.

Views such as these can have serious impact on students’ cultural and linguistic heritage and similar feelings are shared by Cripper and Widdowson (1978) when they argue that "by conducting education in the standard version of the language one might change the values of the learners, which bind them to their background and thereby cut them off from their cultural heritage" (p. 197). Moreover, teachers' views on the discouragement of Mewati stood in opposition to the fact that if learners' cognitive skills are allowed to be fully developed in their mother tongue, the learning of other subjects later on, along with the other languages, occurs more effectively (Cummins & Swain, 1986, p. 97-98).

The idea that Mewati is considered a misfit in the education sphere has origins in teachers' conceptualizations of so-called dialects in that they consider them somehow simple and inferior. However, Romaine (2000) maintains that it can be easily shown that dialects are just as structurally complex and rule bound as standard languages and are equally capable of expressing logical arguments as standard varieties (p. 214). Many studies have been carried out on the benefits and inclusion of minority languages or nonstandard varieties in education such as Mewati with many experts engaged in research on multiple literacies, biliteracies and local literacies at the forefront of supporting this end (Hornberger, 2002, 2004; Scribner & Cole, 1981; Street 1984, 1994).

Papapavlou and Pavlou (2007) argue that when schools exploit literacy skills of students early (which are based on students' home language even when it is not the standard language) and teachers change their negative attitudes towards the dialect, then subsequent schooling can support the development of students' linguistic and intellectual skills (p. 266). Aside from the linguistic and intellectual skills development, the inclusion of students' home languages in schools provides dignity not just to the language but also to the speakers of those languages. As Annamalai (2005) points out, one of the central purposes of education is to give human dignity to people and this "dignity
cannot be given by condemning the language the people speak and through it the culture the language represents" (p. 30).

5.4 Theoretical Implications of Spolsky's (2004) Model

This study used the model proposed by Spolsky (2004) which is useful in providing a thorough framework which can be drawn upon to recognize language policy in place. However, its scope maybe limited by the fact that while it accounts for identifying language policy, it leaves little room for intervening or transforming the existing conditions in favor of minority languages and/or dialects. This point also finds resonance in Walsh's (2011) observation in the context of another minority language, Irish, when he contends that the usefulness of the model "may be limited by the fact that it is less interventionist and didactic than models of language planning which commit themselves specifically to strengthening minority languages" (p. 132).

Walsh (2011) then goes on to say that the model while provides a useful framework for the analysis of interaction between practice, beliefs and management components but is less concerned with the promotion of minority languages (p. 133). This interaction of the said three components, however, facilitates the recognition and provides a thorough analysis of the LiEPs in place, the key aim of this research. Therefore, the model proposed by Spolsky (2004) provided a useful foundation for this study.

However, while Spolsky's (2004) model highlights language beliefs and describes what they are, it does not concern itself with how well informed the beliefs are and the possible ways in which they could be changed. It is here I argue that in order to understand the true nature of the beliefs guiding the language policy and to gain better insights into the ways in which a transformation in favor of minority languages could take place, it is equally important to touch upon participants' consciousness of those beliefs as the beliefs themselves. During the course of this study, a central concept emerged out of and was grounded in the data which I called ‘(Un/Dys) Consciousness’.

5.5 (Un/Dys) Consciousness as a key concept

During the course of data collecting, coding and analysis a key theme emerged around teachers' consciousness (or the lack of it) with regard to their views, prejudices, attitudes towards other
languages, cultures and especially that of their students as well as their consciousness towards contemporary teaching pedagogy, educational and linguistic research, and it became apparent that it could partly account for their language practices and/or beliefs.

As this study would reveal, reference to consciousness could help explain not only the grounds of teachers’ beliefs and/or practices and how well informed they are but may also pave way for intervention in favour of minority languages. In order to know more about ‘(un/dys) consciousness’ and to see how it relates to teachers, some of the key findings that emerged with regard to this concept are discussed in the section below.

Of the first five findings, the first three below point towards the lack of consciousness on the part of teachers and revealed the fallacies that Phillipson (1992) noted in the context of English language teaching, however, it can easily be applied in the context of this study.

Firstly, early start fallacy: Teachers of both school types believed that the earlier students start learning standard languages like Hindi and English the better they would be. Secondly, maximum exposure fallacy: Teachers also believed the more children are exposed to the standard languages such as Hindi and English the better the results will be. Consequently, the lesser they are exposed to Mewati, the better the outcomes will be. Thirdly, subtractive fallacy: The majority of teachers believed that much use of Mewati would lead to a drop in the quality of other standard languages like Hindi, English and even Urdu.

Fourthly, one of the other key fallacies noticed is what I term written literature fallacy. There was a marked difference between Meo and non-Meo teachers’ perception of what constituted and the role of Mewati literature with the former’s celebration of and identification with Mewati’s historic oral traditions and literature as compared to the latter’s admission of ignorance and in some cases refusal to acknowledge Mewati literature. The findings revealed all non-Meo teachers perceived only written languages could claim to have literature and therefore prestige.

Most teachers, and non-Meo teachers particularly, failed to acknowledge Mewati had a rich and profound legacy of oral literature with almost all of them being completely unaware of the existence of oral literature which played and continues to play a central role in Meo history, traditions and culture. The privileging of written over oral literature on the part of (non-Meo) teachers is what I call a written literature fallacy.

Mayaram (2003) when discussing Meo oral tradition and literature contends: "Orality has often been the linguistic associate of marginality" (p. 42). It is this unconsciousness and/or bias against the oral literature which considerably affected non-Meo teachers' beliefs regarding Mewati, its history and
its speakers. This has implications for education in that since majority of teachers belong to the non-Meo group teaching to students who are predominantly Meos, teachers' prejudices and ignorance with regard to students' history and literature interferes and restricts a healthy interaction and development of teacher-student relationship.

This study has brought to attention that there exists a rich Mewati oral literature, which almost all Meo participants who were interviewed took pride in (as did some of the other people in Mewat that the researcher interviewed) as well as the fact that a great amount of concern was expressed for its preservation and promotion. While it is beyond the scope of this study to delve into a discussion about Mewati's oral literature, future research could engage in corpus planning in order to develop written work based on its oral literature. Once done, this could be utilized for educational purposes which may also play a part in restoring Mewati's literature and maintaining it further.

Fifthly, one of the most significant fallacies noticed among teachers was the standard language ideology. Lippi-Green (2004) defined standard language ideology as "a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, non-varying spoken language" (p. 293). It is the idea that a standard language is somehow ethically or logically superior because of its monolithic and stable characteristics and therefore why nonstandard varieties should conform to this ideal type (Ibid).

Throughout this research, it was noticed that all teachers placed a significant amount of emphasis on language-dialect distinction. They firmly believed in the idea that dialects were fundamentally different from standard languages and lower in prestige. All teachers perceived the standard language Hindi to be the "correct" and "ideal" form and perceived Mewati to be the "deviant" and "substandard" form of the "proper Hindi". The non-Meo teachers in School A, for instance, refused to even acknowledge Mewati as a language. The teachers stressed that Mewati was merely a "dialect" and as such it did not qualify to be called as a language.

The standard language ideology looks at ways which could minimize language variation as variation in language is seen as deviant corrupting the 'ideal' form. This aspect was visible among the teachers who were found sharing a belief that a common and uniform language was a better alternative for the Mewati community. For instance, some non-Meo teachers emphasized that Meo students would be better off if they embraced Hindi. Likewise, some Meo teachers showed affinity towards Urdu and claimed Urdu as their preferred language that Meos should switch to.

When asked about their reasons, they cited that the Urdu speaking and Mewati speaking communities shared a commonality in terms of Islam. Some Meo teachers like Murid from School D
and Aslam from School C, however, resisted this thought and perceived Urdu as a force responsible for Mewati's growing shift. Either way, this tendency reflected that both ethnic groups, Meo as well as non-Meos, were keen on minimizing variation and looked upon a more standard and uniform varieties in the form of Hindi and Urdu as Mewati's ideal forms for future.

Finally, a key finding emerged what I call as dysconscious ethnicism and linguicism. This draws on King's (1991) work on dysconscious racism in critical race theory and Skutnabb-Kangas's (1990) notice of other forms of racism such as ethnicism and linguicism. The latter forms are discrimination based on ethnicity and language. While the former notion of dysconsciousness was introduced by King (1991) who defined it as the "uncritical habit of mind (including perceptions, assumptions, beliefs and attitudes) that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing social order of things as given" (p. 135). She adds that dysconsciousness "is not the absence of consciousness (or unconsciousness) but an impaired consciousness or distorted way of thinking" (Ibid).

King (1991) defined dysconscious racism as uncritical ways of thinking "that tacitly accepts dominant white norms and privileges" thereby maintaining and further perpetuating racial inequity (p. 135). King (1991) argued this dysconsciousness played a part among her university students in terms of how they accounted for and interpreted the subject of racial inequity.

A key theme that featured throughout this research was what King (1991) called as the impaired or distorted consciousness on the part of non-Meo teachers regarding ethnicism and linguicism, the uncritical acceptance of their privileges, of the status quo and tacit acceptance of the dominant assumptions and of the existing social order. In contrast, the Meo teachers were fully conscious of their place within the social order and the ongoing discrimination they felt in the social, economic, political and educational spheres. This was something which the non-Meo teachers did not admit or critically explore.

The fact that non-Meo teachers did not perceive any disadvantage or inequity that Meo students (or for that matter Meo teachers) face in terms of their ethnicity (for belonging to a religious and cultural group which was not part of the mainstream) or language (for speaking a non-standard variety not valued in schools) and implicitly accepted dominant Hindi and Hindu norms and privileges, was how dysconsciousness was exhibited by them.

The non-Meo teachers, for instance, accepted and advocated for standard Hindi norms while failing to acknowledge the privilege that Hindi carried and their own role as teachers belonging to dominant Hindu communities. The non-Meo teachers accepted, in the words of King (1991),
"certain culturally sanctioned assumptions, myths, and beliefs" that justified the social and linguistic advantages Hindi had "as a result of subordinating diverse others" (p. 135).

They invariably attributed the current social, economic and educational problems and inequities concerning Meos, to Meos themselves. By holding Meos solely responsible for their own socio-economic-political and educational problems, non-Meo teachers overlooked their own privileges which helped to sustain the status quo. One of the mechanisms by which this was done was to blame Meos for *choosing to remain in poverty and ignorance*.

This reasoning was used to explain illiteracy among Meo students as well as to justify the shortage of Meo teachers in the region. The non-Meo teachers also held Meo students responsible for not discarding Mewati, which they saw as an obstacle to education and development, and instead used it as a rationale to justify the current status of Meos.

Non-Meo teachers tacitly accepted and justified their presence on the ground that "local teachers were just not good [qualified and trained] enough". This assumption, however, ran contrary to Meo teachers’ perception that institutional prejudices and structural forces were responsible for the shortage of local teachers in Mewat.

Keeping in line with the historical-structural approach and to investigate the above point of dysconscious ethnicism and linguicism in more detail, an effort was made throughout to examine the historical and structural forces at play in Mewat, that could shed light on the issues of inter-ethnic relations, power and access. In light of the above, it is important to take into account the social and historical context of struggle between groups and the manner in which the dominant group treats the minority group (Young & He, 1998, p. 19).

This helped in achieving the subsidiary purposes underlying this study: 1) to uncover and critically analyze the fundamental ideologies and socio-political processes that informed and influenced LiEPs in the two schools, and 2) discover how these LiEPs, in turn, affected the position of Mewati.

### 5.6 Socio-historical and structural forces

All the non-Meo teachers firmly were of the opinion that Meos faced no discrimination and had no ground to claim so. In contrast, all Meo teachers believed the community faced discrimination due to their religion, socio-historical identity and ethnicity.
Owing to their Muslim background, Meo teachers suggested they face ongoing discrimination at the hands of local authorities most of whom belong to the majority Hindu religion and other ethnically dominant communities such as Jats. It was claimed that this also applies to the whole community at large. This sentiment is best captured by the Meo teacher Aslam from School C, when he remarked:

"There [Jat community & other dominant communities' areas] in each and single village, if 15 children have applied for the job then all of those 15 children will have a definite appointment. Whereas, in our case, out of 15 villages, one child gets an appointment, and that too with great difficulty...There is discrimination, we agree to it."

Among other examples given by the Meo teachers included the general inadequacy or mishandling of funds that is allocated for Mewat's development. As the Meo teacher Qurban from School D claimed:

"There, [non-Muslim areas] banks can be found and so can the hospitals while in Muslims' villages, none. Here there are no banks, no hospitals, no water, nothing. MDA (Mewat Development Agency) receives Crores of Rupees from the Minorities commission...[pause] the officers who sit there are Jats, DC [Deputy Commissioner] is a Jat, CM [Chief Minister] is also a Jat, they spend funds according to their own choice. Politics keeps on occurring at the bureaucracy level."

Similar claims were made by all Meo teachers with regard to bias against Mewat in terms of lack of development and against Meos in general throughout this study and invoked strong emotions. As reflected in the above statements there is a general perception by Meo teachers of structural discrimination against the Meo community. Teachers also pointed to the shortage of local Meo teachers. In a majority Meo region, most of the teachers migrate from outside Mewat and belong to the Hindu, non-Meo, non-Mewati speaking community. Meo teachers perceived themselves to face discrimination during recruitment processes.
For example, Aslam hinted this by saying: "Many Meos have completed B.Ed. (Bachelor of Education) and J.B.T (Junior Bachelor Training) but are still jobless". Similarly, the Meo teacher Murid from School D put it:

"Here the people in authority are usually Jats. How many of those [Meo teachers] here [in this school] are involved in the job of teaching? Eight or ten. And, even these have just joined, they were not there before. So the appointments that take place... [pause] in that...[pause] usually one's own people are given more preference."

All the Meo teachers also raised the issue of non-availability of Urdu teachers and text materials in schools. This despite the fact that the government schools are mandated to teach Urdu in that Urdu is offered as an optional subject along with Sanskrit that the students could choose from and despite the fact that the students and community members usually show a great degree of interest. As the Meo teacher Aslam from School C claimed:

"Even though Sanskrit is provided along with other subjects for students to choose from, at the upper primary level in grades 6th to 8th, yet in most schools across Mewat, Sanskrit teacher is easily available. Each school has a Sanskrit teacher as the one who teaches Hindi can teach Sanskrit too, however, Urdu teachers are hard to find. When it comes to Urdu, they have to be specially appointed. All of this forces students to opt for Sanskrit instead."

Throughout this research, a common theme was the detailed discussions with Meo teachers about the historical stigma attached to the Meo community. Mayaram (2003) notes that one reason Meos have been subjected to discrimination is the historical stigma attached to the Meo community, labeled as a "criminal tribe" in the colonial period, the effects of which persist to this day (p. 17). This "left a permanent impress on popular, administrative, and academic imaging of the group" (Ibid). This was evident among all the Meo participants interviewed in the study, in that though they took great pride in their historic past, they were
deeply saddened, however, by their misrepresentation as a community and subsequent denial of space in historical books and records.

Meo participants claimed this social status has continued to marginalize the community and misrepresent them in the eyes of other community members, some of whose past has been glorified at the expense of Meos (a candid reference was made here towards Hindu Ahir, Yadav, etc. ethnic groups but particularly Jat community - to which most non-Meo teachers belong to). Aslam suggested: "Meos' place in history is not well recognized, and if at all it has been mentioned, it attaches the labels of thieves, dacoits and looters to Meos". Mayaram (2003) wrote of the marginalization of Meo history in the broader Indian historical narrative, and this view is confirmed by Aslam's comments as well as those of other teachers in the region (p. 128).

The other basis on which Meo teachers claimed to suffer from prejudice and discrimination was on the ground of inter-ethnic relations, between the politically and economically dominant Hindu Jats and the Muslim Meos. While both groups traditionally belong to pastoral-peasant communities (along with the other ethnic groups such as Hindu Ahirs and Gujars etc. mentioned by the participants), Meo teachers perceived that Jats occupied all the higher authority positions and dominated the labour market, including in education in Mewat.

In the cases studied, this theme emerged several times and this perception was borne out as there were few Meo teachers working in the schools. The competition for scarce economic-political resources along with belonging to different religious-ethnic-linguistic groups appeared to fuel inter-ethnic resentment and had implications for the educational sphere in Mewat.

It seems that a gap exists between the dysconsciousness of ethnicism and linguicism from non-Meo teachers and a perception (consciousness) of ethno linguistic discrimination by Meo teachers. The aforementioned points, therefore, indicated the (un/dys) conscious assumptions that were behind teachers' beliefs and the ways in which these assumptions manifested themselves in teachers' language practices. To sum up, it is suggested, the consciousness would have to be brought about at three levels:

Firstly efforts have to be undertaken to raise teachers' consciousness toward their own beliefs. Teachers need to introspect and reflect on their own beliefs (biases and prejudices) critically before those beliefs could be challenged and negotiated in favor of minority languages.

Secondly, raising consciousness has to be done at the intercultural level so non-Meo teachers could be made aware of the beliefs held by learners as well as their Meo colleagues, on the issues pertaining to their language, culture and history.
Thirdly, teachers' consciousness has to be raised concerning the current pedagogical and sociolinguistic research so that teachers could make use of it. This study found that many teachers were unaware about contemporary pedagogical, educational and sociolinguistic research with many teachers lacking adequate pre and in service teacher training while also possessing limited knowledge regarding a wide range of teaching methods and techniques.

In the end, it is not just the teachers but all educators, administrators and policymakers who would have to play an active part in order to bridge a gap that exists between learners' home and school languages so as to make education more meaningful, just and equitable.

5.7 Summary

This chapter presented discussion regarding the research questions of this study. From the analysis, it was concluded that the schools made no room for Mewati in their formal LiEPs and that the rural government Schools A, B and C followed a monolingual Hindi LiEP and the urban elite School D pursued bilingual English-Hindi LiEP. A new theoretical concept in the form of '(Un/Dys)Consciousness' was proposed which facilitated in illustrating and uncovering the underlying assumptions made by teachers that could at least partly account for teachers' stated beliefs as well as potentially indicate the areas in which a meaningful intervention, in favor of minority languages such as Mewati, could be made. It was highlighted that Mewati suffers from teachers’ deep seated prejudices and biases and a case was made in favour of introducing Mewati in schools. Following this the final chapter draws the overall conclusions from this study.
Chapter 6 - Conclusion

6.0 Introduction

This study set out to examine schools' LiEP and explore the role dialects such as Mewati play in LiEP in schools across Mewat. Spolsky's (2004) model of language policy was employed for this purpose. This model framed an examination of schools' language in education policies--explicit and implicit, teachers' language practices, beliefs and ideologies, and language management strategies, through comparative case studies of two types of schools. In doing so, an effort was made to include both Meo as well as non-Meo teachers in the sample. The comparison of teachers' practices, beliefs, and management strategies was made to identify potential similarities and differences between teachers. The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding about how teachers comprehended, negotiated and applied LiEPs within classrooms.

The central questions this study asks are: What LiEP is in place in the two schools; and What role, if any, does Mewati play in the policy framework.

Following the evidence of this study, it was found that the rural schools followed a largely Hindi monolingual LiEP and were driven by 'nationalist' ideology while the urban school followed for the most part a Hindi-English bilingual LiEP and was driven by 'national internationalist' ideology. On the whole, the LiEPs followed by both schools actively marginalized Mewati. Teachers in both schools, despite significant evidence in favour of mother tongue use in education, continued to perceive the use of Mewati as a problem. Arguably, a case is made in favour of the use of Mewati in education in this research, especially in the early years of education, the use of which would help in improving enrolment and retention rates, addressing the literacy gap, helping students engage in education, strengthening their cultural identity and affirming their linguistic rights.

6.1 Recommendations

There are a series of recommendations that can be drawn from this study. These recommendations stemmed directly from the findings of this comparative case study research and are as follows:
1) Teachers place an extensive emphasis on the demarcation between languages (bhaasha) and dialects (boli). There are some deep-seated prejudices, biases and stereotypes regarding varieties labelled as 'dialects' in the minds of teachers. Appropriate steps must be taken in this direction (E.g. by introducing changes in teacher education and training programs etc) so as to inform and transform teachers' views.

2) There is a significant communication gap, particularly in the early years of primary education, between teachers and students which affects students' learning and cognitive development which has significant bearing on their motivation, self-confidence and psychological wellbeing. The majority of students' mother tongue, Mewati, finds no space in schools' LiEP and is replaced by standard Hindi which poses serious problems in students' understanding.

The fact that language policies of both rural and urban schools continue to ignore, marginalize and suppress the local varieties warrants serious attention, both from the perspectives of linguistic human rights as well as the crucial role mother tongue varieties play in education and literacy.

This study makes a pressing argument in favour of introducing Mewati in education, at least during the primary level so as to build on learners' prior language, knowledge and experiences. This research makes a case that the local language Mewati should be seen not only as Meos' linguistic right but as a useful resource which would help in providing and furthering a truly multilingual education and would also be in line with the vision and spirit of the three language formula which was originally created toward achieving this goal.

3) There is a shortage of teachers in general and particularly an acute shortage of local Mewati speaking teachers in schools. Nearly all teachers in this study stressed upon recruiting more local teachers who could speak Mewati fluently. This study makes a case in favour of recruiting and training local teachers who could be potential role models and/or engage better with the local students inside and outside classrooms.

4) All teachers pointed to the serious shortage of Urdu teachers, materials and textbooks across Mewat. This study presses for introducing more Urdu teachers (materials and textbooks) as well as presses for Urdu to be used in schools.

5) There is a shortage of female teachers, particularly in the remote areas. This is especially alarming as in an area like Mewat where girls’ literacy is exceptionally low especially within the Meo community (estimated between 1.76% and 2.13% in 2001), it is imperative to have local female teachers within the schools. There is a substantial amount of research which shows that recruiting female teachers leads to increase in girls' enrolment, retention and overall literacy outcomes (World
Bank, 2001 and Herz, Subbarao, Habib & Raney, 1991). Female teachers, in particular, are able to address girls' security concerns and serve as key role models (UNICEF 2001).

6) Increasing contractualization of teachers in schools, including government schools across Mewat, has led to a situation where teachers recruited are generally under-qualified, under-experienced, under-trained, under-motivated, and under-paid. This has direct implications for education, policy procedures, and teachers’ professional and socio-psychological wellbeing. This findings of this study revealed that only those teachers who were regularly employed were given an opportunity to attain any in-service training or any professional development opportunities.

Those who were hired on contract basis were denied teacher training. It is recommended therefore that schools must ensure providing adequate and appropriate in-service teacher training and must make it available to all teachers, regardless of their employment status. It is suggested that all teachers must be supported with professional development opportunities to learn more about the local dialect of the region. It is also recommended that teachers should be supported with education/training programs that focus on dialect diversity and dialect awareness and appropriate ways in which the local varieties could be respected, incorporated and promoted in classrooms.

7) Many teachers followed and believed in what Phillipson (1992) termed as early start, maximum exposure and subtractive fallacies which have direct implications for Mewati, literacy and students’ academic progress as all these beliefs undermined and discouraged the use of Mewati in classrooms. This study recommends that teacher education and teachers’ training programs need to be tailored in a manner that incorporates contemporary pedagogical, educational and sociolinguistic research so that teachers are better informed.

8) The majority of teachers, particularly in the rural government schools, complained of feelings of isolation and frustration for being excluded from key policy making decisions. All teachers in the rural government schools, for instance, perceived themselves as mere passive agents, what Shohamy (2006) conceived of as "soldiers of the system" carrying out "orders by internalizing the policy ideology and its agendas" (p. 78).

All teachers expressed their frustration in "carrying out the tasks that they had been instructed to from authorities at the top" (Ibid). As the Meo teacher Rasul articulated: "Policies get made in an air-conditioned room without consultation with teachers who are working on the ground. If any of them [policy makers] asked us or took our advice, we would inform them better".

This study makes a strong recommendation that "teachers are fundamental to the language and literacy educational policymaking process" as it is they who "interpret and modify received policies"
(Evans and Hornberger, 2005, p. 99) and therefore must be included in the policymaking process and inputs given by teachers must be used to inform those policy decisions.

6.2 Suggestions for future research

It would be interesting to get students' perspective on the current LiEPs and their attitude towards Mewati as well as other languages. It would also be interesting to look into the challenges students face in education, how a language plays a part and how students negotiate through different languages inside the classrooms. Meo teachers constantly expressed a concern regarding the decline of usage of Mewati, the possible language shift in progress and loss of "pure" Mewati". Further research is needed in this direction to examine if Mewati is undergoing a language shift or is likely to, and if so, how it could be maintained.

6.3 Implications

This thesis is a contribution to the field of (critical) language policy research. It fills a gap by researching a language variety on which no serious research has been carried out to date (Gusain, 2003, p. 3). This thesis is the first sociolinguistic study undertaken on Mewati in Mewat.

This study contributed towards the area of sociology of minority languages in India. As Bhatt and Mahboob mentioned Paulstonclaimed, there exists a "surprisingly small" literature describing the plight of minority languages, especially those belonging to South Asia, "that allows us to ascertain whether and how the declining role of these languages is generally associated with issues of power and control, education and literacy, and demography, development, and planning" (2008, p. 150). This thesis attempted to touch upon these issues and brought them to light.

There have been few studies, if any, which have integrated and explored all three components of Spolsky's (2004) model, particularly in the context of India, and particularly concerning minority languages and/or 'dialects'. In this respect, this research has demonstrated the manner in which this model could be applied and possibly extended not only in terms of ascertaining LiEP but also
informing policy about minority languages. The concept of 'Un/Dys) Consciousness' was proposed as a means to better understand the issue.

The findings of this research are relevant to language and education policy developers, teachers, educators and other officials. It reveals the current LiEPs as adopted in schools, its limitations and the gap between stated policy and actual practice.

This research may also be beneficial to the Indian government, the Haryana (Mewat) government and other non-governmental organizations working on mother tongue based education programmes in minority languages with the aim to provide education in these languages. In other words, it may help them to make informed decisions as to how best to incorporate Mewati or other minority such languages within the LiEP to build on to children’s existing skills and knowledge that they bring to schools.

The findings of this study also hold relevance to teacher education and training programmes as teachers' views indicated lack of sensitivity to dialect diversity, equality and maintenance. This study, therefore, makes a pressing appeal to teacher educators and trainers to make appropriate changes in their programs to inform and educate teachers regarding these issues.

### 6.4 Conclusion

Minority languages such as Mewati face continued prejudice and stigmatization in the education domain and beyond. This study has shown that within the broader LiEP, minority languages labeled as 'non-standard' varieties or 'dialects' continue to be excluded and as a result pose serious problems for both children and teachers alike. Most concerning was that teachers themselves, appear to have internalized these prejudices, in turn actively reinforcing them through the education system. The maintenance, development and vitality of Mewati faces a significant challenge. MT based multilingual education would not only contribute towards students' educational, linguistic and cognitive growth but will also ensure the development and maintenance of Mewati. Without access to education in their mother tongue, generations of minority language speakers in India will continue to face social hardship from the time they enter a school.
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Appendix A - Interview guide

1) Tell me about this school - when was it founded, what board does it come under, how does the funding occur, how does the hiring process of teachers and admission of students occur, what is the fee structure like, what are teachers' salaries, what kind of students come to this school, what is the total number of students and staff in school, what is an average pupil-teacher ratio in the class, what subjects do teachers teach, how many teachers are local Mewati speaking Meos, what other facilities does the school provide etc.

2) Which language(s) do you speak in school with teachers, principal, administrative staff and students in the classroom? Which language(s) do you speak at home with your spouse and children or parents and siblings (if not married)?

3) Do you use any amount of Mewati in school? If yes, in what occasions and to what extent? How would you judge your proficiency in Mewati?

4) What is your educational and teaching background? Why did you choose to be a teacher?

5) What is the official language policy of the school?

6) What are your thoughts on Hindi language? What are your thoughts on English language?

7) What are your thoughts on Mewati? Do you think Mewati should be used as a medium of instruction (MOI) in schools? If yes, why and at what level? If no, why not?

8) Do you think that Meo students should use Mewati in school? home? why/why not?

9) Which language(s) do you think Meo students generally use in school with teachers, staff members and fellow mates? Which language(s) do you think Meo students use at home with their family?

10) Do you think that the usage of local variety, Mewati in the classroom can help in explaining abstract and complex concepts? If yes, do you use this strategy in your classroom? If not, then what other strategy do you use? What teaching method do you use to teach?

11) How would you rate Meo students proficiency in spoken and written Hindi and English? Why do you think it is so?

12) What kind of challenges have you faced while teaching in the classroom?
13) For those of students who speak Mewati at home or in school, do you think it acts as an advantage or hindrance for them in the overall learning process? Why/why not?

14) What are your thoughts on Urdu? Do you think it belongs to Muslims (as commonly perceived) or all? Why/why not?

15) Do you think Urdu should be introduced in schools as an optional subject for Meo Muslim students who may like to attain education through Urdu? Why/why not?

16) What is the present curriculum of the school or the class that you teach in?

17) Who sets the curriculum? who sets the examination papers? which subjects are in Hindi and English? Why do you think that is?

18) What books do you use and who publishes them? Are you satisfied with those books? What changes, if any, would you like to see in those books?

19) Do you think they are representative of the Meo community with regard to their religion, language and culture? If not, what changes can be made to make them more representative?

20) How important English is for Meo students outside classroom? How important Hindi is for them? Is Hindi equally important as English or lesser important? Why are they important?

21) Does this school provide any space for the use of Mewati or its culture e.g. during school functions, etc ? If not, why? If yes, how? Does the school actively promote Mewati? On what occasions?

22) Why do you think Meo parents choose to send their children to your this school?

23) What kind of problems or challenges does a government school like this face?

24) What challenges do you face as a school teacher teaching in Mewat?

25) What kind of provisions are provided by the school with regard to in-service training and/or workshops to teachers? How important do you think is it for a teacher?

26) What problems do you observe occurring in your class to Meo students when they attempt to learn your subject? Why do you think this learning difficulty occurs? How do you attempt to address this issue?

27) What according to you makes one a good student and what does not? What are the objectives of this school?
28) Do you believe that resources should be allocated for the development of Mewati? Why/why not?

29) Do you feel Meos are discriminated against in schools and generally? If yes then why do you think it is?

30) Is there anything else that you would like to share that we haven't talked about?
Appendix B - Participant Information Statement

Mewati

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a study of Meos of Mewat in which I intend to observe the local language practices.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Prerna Bakshi (Kerswell), research student and will form the basis for the degree of MA by Research (Linguistics) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Ahmar Mahboob, principal supervisor.

(3) What does the study involve?
Photography will include print material in public space only such as billboards, advertisements, road signs etc. This will be done to examine the use and range of languages used in Mewat district. Interviews will take place at participants' chosen sites at their chosen day/time and would be audio taped. The interviews will include a series of questions about the functioning of the school in terms of the followed curriculum, the kind of books used, views of teachers and principal etc. The questions asked would be simple and would not involve any level of risk to participants or the school.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The interviews may last for 45-90 minutes.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?
Being in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent and - if you do consent - you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with The University of Sydney.

You may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
(6) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study.

Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(8) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Prerna will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Prerna Kerswell, at pker8740@uni.sydney.edu.au or via phone at +61431515425.

(9) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep