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ABSTRACT

Pakistan is a multilingual state where the majority of educated people can speak three languages: English, Urdu (the national language) and a regional vernacular (Pashto in the case of this study). While the state’s official policy supports the regional vernaculars in education at school level, the de facto language policy privileges English and Urdu and neglects the regional languages. English-medium schools, especially those of the elite category, are instrumental in the acquisition and prestige planning of English. This study takes a holistic view of understanding the elite schools’ language-in-education (L-i-E) policy. As such, in addition to investigating how L-i-E is viewed and practised and unravelling the complex interaction between the official policy and its micro-level implementation, the study also explores the students’ perceptions about L-i-E, their attitudes towards the three languages, and their domain-wise language use and shift patterns.

Two elite English-medium schools in Peshawar, the capital of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan, were the cases and context of this investigation. Data were collected over a period of three months, employing ethnographic case study approach. The study adopted a mixed-methods design in which qualitative methods and data outweigh the quantitative data (i.e. QUAL+ quan). The qualitative data tools included observations, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and documents review; the quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire.

Findings reveal that the elite English-medium schools enjoy significant power in their L-i-E planning. At the same time, the tacit approval of the official language policy—a product of political, ideological and global forces—is also evident in the language practices and beliefs of the actors at a grassroots level. Owing to their unchallenged authority, the schools strictly adhere to an English-only assimilationist L-i-E policy. The students were found to have positive attitudes towards the status, prestige and instrumental significance of English. Whilst they viewed Urdu as a symbol of national identity and Pashto as a symbol of ethnic pride and identity, they disregarded the role of these languages in educational and professional spheres. The students also reported significant domain shrinkage vis-à-vis their mother tongue. The findings of this study confirm that the schools’ L-i-E policies contribute significantly to the process of subtractive bilingualism.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

During my Master of Professional Studies (Language Teaching and Learning) program at the University of Auckland (2008-2009) I carried out a small-scale research project in which I interviewed a young Afghan immigrant to New Zealand. The aim of the study was to understand his and his community’s first language (Pashto) maintenance practices in New Zealand. As a Pakistani Pashtun I was highly impressed by his mother tongue (MT) fluency as well as by the effort he, his family and his community put into preserving their language, values and culture. Speaking both English and Pashto with native-like fluency, he embodied the image of a true bilingual. At the same time, I felt ashamed of my own Pashto, as I was not as fluent as he was even though I had been living in my own country for most of my life.

During the same time, I studied sociolinguistics and began to realise that all languages, whether big or small, are equally important in general and in the education realm in particular. The study of sociolinguistics, and more specifically bilingualism, revealed that using the first language for learning strengthens students’ identity and group empowerment (Cummins, 2000), promotes successful literacy acquisition (Benson, 2002), and enhances motivation and self-esteem (Dutcher, 1995). The new knowledge and awareness stirred me to reflect introspectively and retrospectively on the ways languages are perceived, treated and positioned in terms of prestige and status, and in terms of acquisition (learning) in Pakistan. In a way, the very foundation of my perspective on languages was shaken. During my entire education I was told that English is indispensable to success in education; it opens the door to success, both at home and abroad. At the same time, I was told that learning Urdu is essential for all Pakistanis because it is our national language. As such, when I read the poetry of scholars and poets like Allama Iqbal and Mirza Ghalib in Urdu classes (from Classes 1 to 12) and when I grew up watching TV mainly in Urdu, I held Urdu in high esteem. On the contrary, it was inculcated in me, whether explicitly or indirectly, that Pashto, like other local languages such as Punjabi, Hindko and Balochi, is not worthy of being a medium of education or even worthy of being taught as a school subject; anyone educated in Pashto alone would be deprived of the above-mentioned advantages.
It must have been this widespread belief that forced my father, like many other parents who could afford private education for their children, to uproot me at the age of thirteen from my village and enrol me in an elite English-medium school in Peshawar, the capital of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province. The new school was an altogether different world: the glamour of the building, the well-furnished and finely decorated classrooms, the female teachers elegantly dressed with impressive accents and fluency in English, and the Cambridge University approved books of high quality content, paper and colours overwhelmed me. Of all the various kinds of shocks that I faced, it was the language shock that I found most hard to cope with. The teachers did not utter a single word in Urdu or Pashto (except Urdu in the Urdu class), and students were not allowed to use any language other than English. Almost all of my fellow classmates were fluent in English, some very good and some average, as they had already been in English-medium schools for some time. Feeling linguistically handicapped, unable to perform in my studies, my confidence and self-esteem were at rock bottom. Even when, with time, I tried to speak in English, I would face ridicule from my fellow students for my English accent.

“You always seem to think in Pashto while trying to speak English”, was the remark that I had to face every now and then. The association of Pashto with the predicament that I was facing made me feel ashamed of my mother tongue. I started to perceive it as a liability, the root cause of my problems, and an insurmountable barrier to my desire of acquiring proficiency in English and on a par with my fellow classmates. Pashto appeared to me as something that symbolized backwardness and something detrimental to progress in the modern educational system. After a year or so, when I settled into my studies, gained confidence and started to speak English (though not as fluently as my friends), it was my turn now to take pride in my proficiency in English, look down upon Pashto and even Urdu, and on students in the government schools. The attitude continued for years, only to be reshaped, as I mentioned above, during my postgraduate sociolinguistics course in 2008.

The events that I have described above and their influence on my attitudes towards languages inspired me to undertake research that takes a critical look at language planning and policy (LPP) in Pakistan. I became curious to understand what lies beneath the LPP in
which two languages from the ‘outside’, English and Urdu\(^1\), are accorded such a high status and prestige, while the majority of the population’s own languages are neglected and degraded. Since it was the English-medium school that I believed was instrumental in shaping my language attitudes, I strongly felt I should go back to these schools and gain a sense of the language attitudes that prevail now (22 years later), understand the dynamics of the language-in-education (L-i-E) policy at this micro-context, and explore what lies beneath these attitudes and practices. In the following sections I discuss the specific purpose of my study, its rationale and the specific goals expressed through the research questions. I also give a brief overview of the theoretical framework with which the study is aligned, and the way the study is designed to achieve its goals.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to critically examine LPP with particular focus on its micro-level implementation. More specifically, the study seeks to understand the way the L-i-E policy is envisioned, contested and implemented at elite English-medium schools, School A and B. To get a holistic and in-depth understanding of this micro-level LPP, I explore the stakeholders’ language attitudes and practices with regard to English, Urdu and Pashto.

1.3 Rationale for the study

Pakistan is a multilingual state where the majority of educated people can speak three languages: English, Urdu (the national language) and a regional vernacular (Pashto in this case). While the state’s official policy supports regional vernaculars in education at the school level, the de facto language policy privileges English and Urdu and neglects regional languages. Private English-medium schools, especially those of the elite category, are instrumental in the acquisition and prestige planning of English at the school and college levels. Education at the higher level is mostly in English in both government and private universities. The English-only policy of the elite schools is mainly assimilationist (Corson, 1999; Spolsky, 2009). Like all regional vernaculars, Pashto which is the main language in the KP province and mother tongue of the majority of students in English-medium schools, is completely excluded from the curriculum.

\(^1\) Urdu is the first language of only 7% of the Pakistanis who migrated from India at the time of partition and settled mostly in Karachi and Hyderabad in the Sind province.
LPP as described above impacts Pakistani society in three ways. First, it gives advantage to the students from affluent and elite families who do well in education by virtue of their high proficiency level in English as compared to students from mainstream government schools where Urdu is the main medium of education. When students from mainstream schools reach a higher level of education they struggle to cope with the challenge of English. The use of languages other than the students’ first language is cited as one of the reasons students drop out of schools in Pakistan (Coleman, 2010; Coleman & Capstick, 2012). The elite school students, who are bestowed with quality education and are relatively fluent in English, find it easier to get lucrative jobs, such as in the Civil Service, the armed forces, and the private corporate sector. This fact is also acknowledged by the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009): “A major bias of the job market for white collar jobs appears in the form of a candidate’s proficiency in the English language” (p. 8).

Second, the policy contributes towards the social stratification of society. English, and to some extent Urdu, has become a symbol of social status. Calling students at elite schools “social snobs”, Rahman’s (2004a) book Denizens of the alien worlds, portrays the students of English-medium and government schools as belonging to entirely different worlds. In this regard, the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 17) observes that the “existence of insulated parallel systems of public and private education in Pakistan remains a cause for concern as it creates inequitable social divides”. Pakistan's commitment to using Urdu as the medium of instruction in government schools and its ambition to widen access to English language teaching are creating barriers to effective education, limiting economic mobility and undermining social cohesion (Coleman, 2010).

Third, LPP is leading to a serious decline in the status of regional languages such as Balochi, Hindko, Pashto, Punjabi and Sindi. These languages are neglected even though the constitution of Pakistan and various commissions on language policy have provisions for their preservation and promotion. Rahman (2006, p. 84) is quite critical of the mere “lip service” paid to the indigenous languages and contends that as long as “we create such market conditions that it becomes impossible to gain power, wealth or prestige in any language except English and, to a lesser extent, Urdu”, the regional languages will continue to decline. Due to the pragmatic and status values of English and Urdu, the
speakers of the regional vernaculars are developing negative attitudes towards their languages. Mansoor (2005) has reported a growing tendency of negative attitudes towards, and in certain cases obvious shift from, Punjabi towards Urdu among university students in the urban areas of Punjab. I have observed a similar tendency among the educated youth in Peshawar, whose patterns of mixing Urdu and English bear symptoms of language shift.

Due to the high prestige and pragmatic values of English, the number of English-medium schools is increasing at a higher rate. This trend is particularly dominant in urban areas where most of the middle and the affluent elite classes of society live. According to the National Education Policy of 2009, overall share of the private sector in total enrolment is around 36%. Its enrolment share in pre-primary education is 42%. At the primary level of education it is 13%, at the middle level it is 58%, at the secondary level it is 45%, and at the higher secondary it is 34%. Even though these figures are for all English-medium schools, of which the elite schools represent a small proportion, the general trend of preference for English is significant. More seriously from the indigenous languages point of view, these private schools are not bound by the education policy, officially or tacitly, to teach an indigenous language. I have not seen or read about any English-medium school teaching an indigenous language. The policy with regard to private education is quite vague; in certain respects the policy does not seem to exist. The consequence of such a policy is that the English-medium students not only have negative attitudes towards their MT, as evidenced in their preference for using Urdu and English, they also show signs of MT loss and shift. This study aims to explore this phenomenon in greater depth in the context of School A and B.

In view of the problems that underlie LPP in Pakistan, this investigation is expected to contribute to the efforts of language activists and members of ethnic minorities to improve the status of indigenous languages in LPP in Pakistan. Moreover, my personal inspiration to investigate what lies behind the language beliefs and practices of all stakeholders associated with elite schools would serve as a useful contribution to the field of LPP in our part of the world. A search of related literature on LPP, language attitudes and maintenance reveals a dearth of empirical data. Only a few studies have been conducted to investigate

2 In chapter 3 I discuss how the elite schools are different from non-elite English-medium schools.
3 While I was collecting my data, the provincial government of KP passed legislation which made the teaching of indigenous languages compulsory even for private schools. As for now, the program has been hit by implementation snags. I discuss this in Chapters 3 and 5 in detail.
the LPP situation in Pakistan (Abbas, 1993; Abbas, 2003; Coleman, 2010; Coleman & Capstick, 2012; Khalique, 2008; Mahboob, 2002, 2003, 2009; Mansoor, 2005; Rahman, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2007; Siddiqui, 2012, 2013). Among them, some, such as Rahman (2004a, 1996), are geared to looking at language policy mainly as an official and macro-level initiative and emphasize the historical, social and political influences that have shaped it. Others such as Mansoor (2005) focus on both the macro- and micro-level policy and target the language attitudes of university students in Punjab. No study exists to date that takes a holistic view of LPP, one that explores the complex interaction between official policy and its micro-level implementation and involves prolonged engagement in the research setting to get an in-depth understanding of the language attitudes and practices of the students both as an integral part and outcome of the L-i-E of the schools. Finally, this investigation is unique because it applies a mixed-methods design and validates findings through methodological and participant triangulation (Dörnyei, 2009).

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are the dynamics of language-in-education planning in the micro-level context of the elite schools in Pakistan, and to what extent does the schools’ L-i-E policy reflect the official language policy of the government?

2. What are the stakeholders’ attitudes towards languages (English, Pashto and Urdu) in general, and the L-i-E policy in particular?

3. What are the students’ language use and proficiency patterns? What are the implications of these patterns for the students’ language maintenance and/or shift?

1.5 Theoretical Background

Classical work on LPP was based on the premise that language planning processes, which took place at the level of the nation-state, were geared towards a policy of monolingual hegemony based on a single national language and a rejection of any serious role for minority languages (Spolsky, 2009). The underlying assumption was that “linguistic diversity presented obstacles for national development, while linguistic homogeneity was associated with modernism” (Ricento, 2000, p. 198). This entailed the kind of language planning that viewed the development of a single national and standard language that was capable of the nation’s “social and technological advancements” as the only panacea for
the language problems of the former colonies, such as those in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. The indigenous languages, on the other hand, were assigned informal roles in local domains. As a former colony of the British Empire, Pakistan too has been pursuing a policy of giving a dominant role to English in education and in the administration of state institutions such as the armed forces and the judiciary. The status of Urdu too was enhanced by making it the national language. While the hegemonic LPP of the classical age has been rolled back in most of the world, Pakistan’s indigenous languages have yet to see any serious and substantial measures for their preservation and promotion.

LPP in the 1980s, however, saw the beginning of a paradigm shift under the influence of critical and postmodern theories. Questions were raised about the social, linguistic and economic inequalities (Ricento, 2000), the education system devoted to standardizing the linguistic behavior of students (Harris, 1981), and the language practices and attitudes of communities being ignored in the national language policy (Tollefson, 2002). While some scholars termed the dominance of English in the post-colonial world as “linguistic imperialism” and called for safeguarding “linguistic human rights” (Phillipson, 1997; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994), others saw language shift, and its subsequent loss and death, not as a natural phenomenon, but “a manifestation of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups – and their languages – hierarchically within a society” (Ricento, 2006). Indigenous languages were increasingly seen not only as a personal resource but also as a societal and national resource in the face of globalisation (Brecht & Ingold, 1998).

Recent approaches to LPP are characterized by the historical structure approach and governmentality (Tollefson, 2006). The historical structure approach emphasizes the role of socio-economic class and political ideologies in shaping language policy alternatives. The governmentality approach (Foucault, 1991; Moore, 2002; and Pennycook, 2002a, 2002b) is more concerned with the “indirect acts of governing that shape individual and group language behavior” (Tollefson, 2006, p. 49-50). Tollefson notes that researchers who follow these approaches to LPP examine the techniques and practices of politicians, bureaucrats, educators and other state authorities at the micro-level. The view of micro-planning of language is also taken up by Baldauf (2008, pp. 19) who relates micro-planning to:
cases where businesses, institutions, groups or individuals hold agency and create what can be recognized as language policy and plan to utilize and develop their language resources; one that is not directly the result of some larger macro policy, but is a response to their own needs, their own language problems, their own requirement for language management.

Subscribing to this view of LPP, Spolsky (2004, p.5) presents a model of language policy which is characterized by three aspects, i.e. “its practices, its beliefs and any attempts to influence practices by any type of language intervention, planning or management”.

Other scholars who subscribe to the idea of attitudes as essential to the formulation and implementation procedures of LPP include Baker (2006), Choi (2003), Giles, Hewstone and Ball (1983), O’ Riagáin (2008) and Youssef (2002). Language attitudes have been found to correlate with language proficiency (Fishman, 1991; Young & Gardner, 1990), motivation to learn a language (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Lukmani, 1972) and language practices (Vassberg, 1993). This implies that language attitudes hold the key to language maintenance and shift (Fishman, 1991; UNESCO, 2003).

In view of the theoretical framework that this study aligns with, both the historical and the governmentality approaches to investigating LPP are relevant. This micro-level ethnographic study of elite English-medium schools examines the schools’ L-i-E, beliefs and practices that in turn shape the language beliefs and use patterns of the students. At the same time the participants’ self-assessment of their language proficiency in their complex multilingual situation involving English, Urdu and Pashto (MT) are expected to offer insights into their language maintenance and shift patterns. Similarly, as an outcome of the events of the past—from British colonial rule to the establishment of Pakistan and the framing of the constitution to policies of successive governments—the current language policy clearly depicts an alliance of the historical forces of the past and current socio-economic forces, particularly those in the context of globalization. The approach in this study, therefore, is dualistic (Ricento, 2006 & Hornberger, 2004) in that it views LPP as the product of its history and social context, which combines the past with current language policy and practices, both at the macro and micro-levels.
1.6 The research site and participants

Two English-medium schools of the elite category, School A and B, were selected as research sites in Peshawar. Pashto is the main language of the community; hence it is also the MT of the majority of students in the schools. Following the criteria of purposive sampling I believe that the two schools “can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomena in the study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 125). In addition to purpose, convenience was also a criterion on the basis of which I selected the schools. As a former student at School A, when I approached the Principal for the purpose of my study, he was delighted to know my past association with the school and offered me all out support. In School B, I have a close friend serving in a senior teaching position. He also offered to extend cooperation and showed a keen interest in my study. Adhering to my ethics commitment the two contacts served only as “gatekeepers” as I neither used them to influence my participants (students, teachers and parents), nor asked them to make any special arrangements to facilitate my study to the extent that it may risk the credibility and naturalness of my inquiry.

The two schools are similar in terms of curriculum, language teaching philosophy, teacher qualifications and the socioeconomic background of the students. As such they represent two cases based on literal replication (Bengtsson, 1999), which implies that the cases selected are similar as are the predicted results. The schools are affiliated with the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (O Level and A Level) and the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education Peshawar (Matriculation and Intermediate). The student participants were from either of these levels. In addition to students, I also interviewed teachers and parents.

1.7 Design of the study

To explore answers to my research questions I adopted a mixed methods design following interpretivist paradigm of inquiry. I employed ethnographic case study approach spanning three months to collect the data. An overriding attribute of ethnography is its cultural interpretation and understanding of a phenomenon in its natural setting. As such it is “ideally suited to critically examine these language policy processes, exposing ground manifestations of explicit and implicit policy-making at multiple levels of the system”
The qualitative data was collected through observations, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. A questionnaire was also distributed among the students to corroborate the qualitative findings and to get a general picture within the context of the two schools or, in other words, internal generalization (Duff, 2006). Since data in this study are mainly from qualitative sources and since both the qualitative and quantitative data was collected at the same time, the study adheres to the principle of triangulation design (Creswell et al, 2003) based on the $QUAL + quan$ mode (Dörnyei, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). “QUAL” suggests qualitative as the primary data, “quan” suggests quantitative data as the secondary data, and “+” suggests both types of data were collected concurrently.

I used the Computer Aided Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) NVivo 9 to manage my data. NVivo helped me to manage, sort, classify and analyse the unstructured, non-numerical or qualitative data. The questionnaire data was analyzed through descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel, and the qualitative data was analysed following the procedures of holistic content analysis which involves coding for themes, looking for patterns, making interpretations and building theory (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Findings are presented through diagrams, tables and conceptual maps in the appropriate discussion of findings sections. Such a presentation not only makes it easy for the reader to understand the concepts and conclusions, it also helped me to clarify and articulate my interpretations and draw conclusions (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). In addition to the visuals, I also display qualitative data in the form of direct quotes from respondents. When used in combination, both forms of these data display add to the credibility of the research (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005).

1.8 Organization of the thesis

The thesis is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study. It gives an overview of the study’s goals, rationale, the theoretical and methodological framework, and the organization of the thesis. In Chapter 2, I review literature to establish the theoretical foundations of the study. Language planning and policy (LPP) is the main theoretical construct on which this study is based; the other theoretical constructs, i.e. language attitudes and language maintenance and shift, are seen as linked to and influenced by LPP in the context of this study. Chapter 3 serves two purposes. First, it extends the
review of literature and specifically focusses on literature and documents that relate to LPP in Pakistan and the KP province; it also reviews sources that illuminate information about the historical, political and ethnic forces that played a role in shaping LPP from the pre-partition British colonial era to the current situation. Second, it describes the sociolinguistic milieu of Pakistan, the demographics of the Pashtuns and the prevailing education system in Pakistan and the KP province. Chapter 4 explains the methodological framework of this study. Starting with the research paradigm with which the study is aligned, it gives a detailed account of the strategies of inquiry. Case study and mixed methods are justified as the appropriate modes of inquiry. In addition to this, the chapter gives in-depth information about the research sites, participants, research instruments and the data analysis procedures. In Chapter 5, I discuss findings related to the dynamics of L-i-E at the micro-level. I examine the elite schools' vision and implementation of the L-i-E policy, explore the extent of autonomy the elite schools enjoy vis-à-vis official LPP, and identify the key actors and their power. Chapter 6 takes the investigation of micro-level LPP to a more specific and deeper level. The stakeholders' perceptions about the three languages are analysed in depth using qualitative and quantitative data. The language attitudes themes are discussed under the two broad categories of instrumental and integrative attitudes. Chapter 7 reports and discusses findings related to the domain-wise language practices of the students. The student' language proficiency and maintenance and shift patterns are also explored in this chapter. Chapter 8 concludes the study. It presents the conceptual framework by which the dynamics of LPP at the micro-level are displayed. Language attitudes and practices are seen as the essential components that shape and are shaped by LPP at the micro-level. The complex interaction between the official language policy and the micro-level implementation is also presented as an essential element of the conceptual framework of this study. The chapter concludes by highlighting the implications and recommendations for LPP in Pakistan.

1.9 Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter has served as an introduction to the study as well as a guide and roadmap for the reader. I started with an account of how my personal experiences as a student, from school to university, and as a member of the Pashtun community, led to the inspiration for and conception of this investigation. I also gave a brief overview of the state of LPP in Pakistan and its implications for indigenous languages. The identification of
problems in LPP and my personal motivation, therefore, served as the purpose and rationale for this study. Next I presented the research questions which reflect the specific goals of this study. Then I described the theoretical framework and the research design that frame this investigation. Finally, I concluded the chapter with a brief overview of the chapters included in the thesis. In the following chapter I review literature on LPP, language attitudes and language maintenance and shift to establish the theoretical foundation of this study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Pakistan is a multilingual state where the majority of educated people can speak three languages: English, Urdu (the national language) and a regional vernacular (Pashto in this case). While the state’s official policy supports the regional vernaculars in education at school level, the de facto language policy privileges English and Urdu, and neglects the regional languages, especially in education. Subscribing to the view that actual language planning is manifested in the attitudes and practices of individuals, groups and organisations (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008), this study attempts to unravel the dynamics of micro-level language planning in the context of elite English-medium schools. More specifically, the study investigates the students’ language attitudes, language use patterns and their possible implications for patterns of proficiency, maintenance and shift vis-à-vis English, Pashto and Urdu. This chapter reviews literature that is relevant to these contextual problems and establishes the theoretical foundation informing this study. Language planning and policy (LPP) is the main theoretical construct on which this study is based; the others, i.e. language attitudes and language maintenance and shift, are seen as linked to and influenced by LPP. Thus the three main sections of this chapter explore literature with reference to LPP, language attitudes, and language maintenance and shift. In Chapter 3, which in part is a continuation of the literature review, I survey literature and analyse documents to explore the state of LPP in Pakistan as an outcome of political, social, historical, ideological, and global processes. Studies which take such a holistic approach to the investigation of LPP abound in the literature (Diallo, 2005; Guerini, 2008; May, 2000; McCarty & Wyman, 2009; Ricento, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; Taylor-Leech, 2007; Zepeda, 2009).

I begin this chapter by reviewing literature related to the broad theoretical construct of this study, i.e. language planning and policy. I begin by tracing the brief history of the field, defining the key terms such as policy and planning and discussing some of the more significant frameworks of LPP. This section also discusses various language planning activities. Once these fundamental themes of LPP are discussed, the focus of the literature review shifts to three key theoretical constructs within LPP. The first deals with language-in-education (L-i-E) planning, covering topics such as top-down and bottom-up planning, actors and their power in planning, and medium of instruction. In the second I review literature with regard to the role of language attitudes in LPP. Under the third theoretical
construct I analyze studies on LPP from language maintenance and shift perspectives. The role of schools in language maintenance and shift is also examined. The chapter ends by bringing these various threads together to establish the relevance of the theoretical framework to this study.

### 2.1 Language planning and policy (LPP)

#### 2.1.1 Developments and orientations

A survey of the history and development of the field is essential to understand the concept of LPP, which is shaped and influenced by global, political, historical, ideological, and social concerns. Ricento (2000) divides the history of language planning and policy (LPP) into three phases: 1) the macro sociopolitical (1960s to early 1970s), 2) the epistemological (early 1970s to late 1980s), and 3) the strategic (late 1980s to present).

The early stage of LPP, which was dominated by sociopolitical orientations, focused on the selection of a national language with the goal of nation building. Often referred to as the Franco-German notion of one nation one language, the underlying assumption was that “linguistic diversity presented obstacles for national development, while linguistic homogeneity was associated with modernism” (Ricento, 2000, p. 198). This entailed the kind of language planning that viewed the development of a single national and standard language that was capable of the nation’s “social and technological advancements” as the only panacea for language problems, particularly in former colonies in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. The indigenous languages, on the other hand, were assigned informal roles in local domains. During this era, although a number of nations in Africa, Asia and South America engaged Western-trained linguists to develop grammars, writing systems and dictionaries for indigenous languages, the intended result of stable diglossia, in fact, lowered the status of indigenous languages on the one hand, and on the other, extended the domains of the former colonial languages to national political and elite educational sectors (Ricento, 2006). Pakistan as a former British colony is a sound case of this approach of LPP, where the dominance of English in the key domains of administration, the army, the judiciary and in education leads to “perpetuate the stratified, class-based structures of the colonial era” (Ricento, 2006, p. 13). I deal with this topic with particular reference to Pakistan in Chapter 3.
The next phase saw language planners, influenced by critical and postmodern theories, questioning the linguistic, social and economic inequalities and “heirarchization and stratification of populations” (Ricento, 2000) which resulted from the LPP approaches of the previous era. Cobarrubias (1983, p. 41), for instance, argued that “certain tasks of language planners, language policy makers, educators, legislators and others involved in changing the status of language or language variety [in the previous era] are not philosophically neutral”. Harris (1981), on the other hand, saw a clear link between the educational system devoted to standardizing the linguistic behavior of pupils and the political psychology of nationalism in post-renaissance Europe. The policies of promoting European languages for nation building were seen as detrimental to minority languages in complex multilingual settings. This shift from a positivistic to a more “critical epistemological approach” was seen in the publication of a number of articles and books in the 1980s, mainly concerned with the ways “language use reflects and indeed influences social, economic or political inequality” (Ricento, 2006, p. 14). At the same time, with the establishment of the international journal, *Language Problems and Language Planning*, LPP also broadened its scope from the former colonies to developed countries; it was realized that language problems were not the concern of only developing nations.

The third period, which is still in the formative phase, is witnessing language planning being influenced by the forces associated with globalization and capitalism, such as the powerful media controlled by multinational corporations (Ricento, 2000, citing Said, 1993). People in every part of the world are now attracted towards learning the dominant language(s) of the world for pragmatic reasons. The preference for and adoption of dominant language(s), especially through education and immigration, has resulted in the decline in the status of indigenous languages. As a consequence of this trend, language loss and shift as an area of LPP gained particular attention of LPP experts and language activists (Crystal, 2000; Fishman, 2001; Nettle & Romaine, 2000; Pauwels, 2004; Romaine, 2006).

Critical theory and postmodernism (Tollefson, 2006) are the hallmarks of this third, ongoing phase of LPP. As such there is a shift towards the critical analysis of the role of ideologies, producing “more nuanced and contextualized, historical descriptions of events and practices” (Ricento, 2000, p. 18). Critical research examines the role of language
policies in social, political and economic inequality: “Such research is fundamentally opposed to positivist approaches that emphasize the researcher’s ‘objectivity’ and ‘distance’ from the ‘subjects’ of the research” (Tollefson, 2006, p. 43). A prominent figure among the critical scholars is Phillipson (1997), who unravels the link between the enforcement of imperial languages and the decline in the status of indigenous languages in former colonies, a situation which he terms “linguistic imperialism”. At the same time, language shift started to be understood not as a natural outcome of language contact but “a manifestation of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups—and their languages—hierarchically within a society” (Ricento, 2006). As concerns about the declining status of minority and indigenous languages intensified as a consequence of the past policies some scholars (Hornberger, 1998; May, 2001, 2005, 2012; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994) raised voice for “linguistic human rights”.

Critical language policy (CLP) research is categorized by Tollefson (2006) into the historical structure approach, and governmentality. The historical structure approach emphasizes the role of socio-economic class and political ideologies in shaping language policy alternatives. The goal in this approach is driven by consistent evidence in the literature that language planning and policy are social, historical processes that are inseparable from social, cultural, economic, political concerns arising from their historical context (Pennycook, 2000). As Pennycook (2000, p. 59) has argued, “one of the lessons that we need to draw from [the] account of colonial language policy … is that in order to make sense of the language policies we need to understand their location historically and contextually”.

The governmentality approach (Foucault, 1991; Moore, 2002; and Pennycook, 2002a, 2002b) is more concerned with the “indirect acts of governing that shape individual and group language behavior” (Tollefson, 2006, p. 49-50). These researchers, Tollefson notes, examine the techniques and practices of politicians, bureaucrats, educators and other state authorities at the micro-level. The view of micro-planning of language is also taken up by Baldauf (2008, p. 26) who relates micro-planning to:

… cases where businesses, institutions, groups or individuals hold agency and create what can be recognized as language policy and plan to utilize and develop
their language resources; one that is not directly the result of some larger macro policy, but is a response to their own needs, their own language problems, their own requirement for language management.

Both the historical and the governmentality approaches to investigating LPP are relevant to the context of my study. The micro-level ethnographic case study at the elite English-medium schools examines the schools’ language planning approach, beliefs and practices that in turn shape the language beliefs and use patterns of the students. Similarly, as an outcome of the events of the past—from British colonial rule to the establishment of the state of Pakistan and the framing of the constitution to policies of successive governments—the current language policy clearly depicts an alliance of the historical forces of the past and current socio-economic forces, particularly those in the context of globalization. The approach in this study, therefore, is dualistic, i.e. to view LPP as the product of its history and social context, which combines the past with current language policy and practices, both at the macro and micro levels.

2.1.2 Language planning and policy: Definitions

The definition of language planning and policy, which has evolved over the years, reflects the ethos of the scholars of the age in which LPP was defined. It was Haugen (1959, p. 8) who first defined language planning and policy:

By language planning I understand the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community. In this practical application of linguistic knowledge we are proceeding beyond descriptive linguistics into an area where judgment must be exercised in the form of choices among available linguistic forms.

A positivistic approach to language planning that paid attention to standardization in the 1950s and 60s is evident in Haugen’s definition. Other terms such as “language engineering” were also used to refer to more or less the same activity. One of the tendencies of the positivistic approach to LPP focused on finding technical solutions to language problems. In this respect Rubin and Jernudd (1971, xvi) contend that LPP is aimed at “problem solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision”. They also view LPP as a state initiated political and administrative activity
which involves orderly decision-making about language on a national level. In the same work, Rubin (1971, p. 218) describes LPP as an activity whereby “goals are established, means are selected, and the outcomes predicted in a systematic and explicit manner”. The view of LPP as an organized and orderly activity of the nation state is also reflected in Fishman’s (1973, p. 23) early work: language planning is “the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems” at the national level.

On the other hand, critical LPP researchers (Pennycook, 2001, 2006; Tollefson, 1991, 2006; Wright, 2004) place the practice of LPP within social and political contexts. Tollefson (1991), therefore, contends that:

Language planning-policy means the institutionalization of language as a basis for distinction among social groups (classes). That is, language policy is one mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources. Language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use. (p. 16)

Wright (2004) recognizes the crucial role that language planning plays in the distribution of power and resources in societies. Over the same period, scholars questioned the classical LPP characterization of language as an objective and natural entity, something as naturally fixed, and put forward a dynamic notion, such as “discourse”. Postmodernists like Pennycook (2006) and Tollefson (2006) preferred to call LPP a “colonial/modernist construction”; for Joseph (2004) it is a dynamic process.

The terms language “policy” and “planning” almost always occur in a pair so that despite their essential difference in meaning, some people tend to use them interchangeably. Language policy, according to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), refers to laws and policies and also customs and traditions related to language(s), while language planning is an activity undertaken government, intended to promote systematic linguistic change in some community of speakers. Language planning was the term used in the 1950s and 1960s to refer to “sweeping interventions and control of behavior”, while language policy attempts to be “less interventionist and to refer mostly to principles with regard to language use” (Shohamy, 2006, p. 49). The relation between language policy and language planning is complex and the boundaries between them are often blurred. The terms are not interchangeable but the relationship between them is difficult to distinguish. Baldauf (2006) distinguished between language policy as “the plan” and planning as the “plan
implementation”. Baldauf (2006, pp. 148-149) produced the following comprehensive definitions of the two terms:

Language planning is the deliberate, future-oriented systematic change of language code, use and/or speaking most visibly undertaken by government in some community of speakers. Language planning is directed by, or leads to, the promulgation of a language policy(ies) by government or another authoritative body or person.

A language policy is a body of ideas, laws, regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve the intended language change. Language policy may be realized in very formal (overt) language planning documents and pronouncements (e.g. constitutions, legislations, policy statements), in informal statements of intent (i.e. in the discourse of language, politics, society), or it may be unstated (covert). Formal statements may be symbolic or substantive in their intent. Taking a holistic view of the term, Lo Bianco (2010) informs us that language policy spreads over a continuum involving public texts (laws), public discourses (debates) and performative actions (communication).

Spolsky (2004), who captures the ideological, attitudinal and practical dimensions of LPP, defines it as follows:

A usual first step is to distinguish between the three components of the language policy of a speech community: its language practices – the habitual patterns 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.

2.1.3 Language planning and policy frameworks

An account of the historical development of LPP and its definition in the previous sections sets the scene for analyzing the various LPP frameworks that were developed over the past few decades. Haugen’s (1966) framework of language planning was the hallmark of the first era, also known as the classical age of LPP. The four aspects of language development in his matrix are: 1) selection of norm, 2) codification of norm, 3) implementation, and 4) elaboration. While selection and implementation are societal processes, codification and elaboration are linguistic in nature.
Around the same period Rubin (1971) made further progress and included evaluation in his cyclical framework so that the early stages of planning are examined and feedback on whether the plan is working or not is provided. Rubin’s iterative four stage model comprises fact-finding, planning, implementation and feedback. Later, Fishman (1981) built on the models of Haugen and Rubin producing a five-stage model. Also iterative in nature, this model consists of: 1) decision making, 2) codification, 3) elaboration, 4) implementation, and 5) evaluation. The first four stages of this model are similar to Haugen’s model and the fifth stage resembles J. Rubin’s feedback stage; the only difference is that while in Haugen’ model ‘elaboration’ is the last stage, in Fishman’s model it precedes ‘implementation’.

Haugen (1983) revised this model with additions as shown in the Table 2.2. In this model the activities that have a societal focus are referred to as “status planning”, i.e. the decisions “a society must make about language selection and the implementation to choose and disseminate the language or languages selected” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 29). The activities which have a language focus are called “corpus planning”, i.e., the decisions which need to be made “to codify and elaborate a language or languages” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 29). Selection, according to Haugen (1983), involves the identification of a language problem, such as the replacement of English with Irish in Eire. Codification involves the development of dictionaries and grammar. Implementation involves the activity of a writer, institution or government in adopting and attempting to spread the language form that has been selected and codified. Finally, elaboration is the continued development of language norms to meet the requirements of the modern world. Elaboration, therefore, is what Neustupny (1974) refers to as language cultivation (Haugen, 1983). This model was criticized for a lopsided emphasis on code and ignoring the socio-political issues that influence the language planning process. The model can also be examined in terms of form (policy planning), with its focus on basic language and policy decisions and their implementation, or in terms of function (language cultivation), with its

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Codification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Haugen’s (1966) framework of language planning
focus on language-in-education and extended language development and use (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997).

In contrast to these models, Cooper (1989) adopts a framework which is essentially non-linguistic (Lo Bianco, 2001) and accounting oriented. The scheme of eight components in Cooper’s model in fact points towards eight variables that need to be considered in the LPP process. The condensed form of Cooper’s (1989) scheme is as follows: 1) What actors, 2) attempt to influence what behaviors, 3) of which people, 4) for what ends, 5) by what means, 6) under what conditions, 7) through what decision-making process, 8) with what effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Society</strong> (status planning)</th>
<th><strong>Function (language cultivation)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selection (decision procedures)</td>
<td>3. Implementation (educational spread)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. problem identification</td>
<td>a. correction procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. allocation of norms</td>
<td>b. evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong> (corpus planning)</td>
<td>4. Elaboration (functional development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Codification (standardization procedures)</td>
<td>a. terminological modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. graphisation</td>
<td>b. stylistic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. grammatication</td>
<td>c. internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. lexication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Haugen’s (1983) LPP framework

Numerous other frameworks were devised in the following years; significant among those are Skutnabb-Kangas (2000), taking a linguistic human rights perspective, and Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), emphasizing an ecological approach to language planning activities. Hornberger’s (1994) model, which was modified in 2006, is also significant as it integrates the previous models; Neustupny’s (1974) “policy” and “cultivation” approach to language planning; Kloss’ (1969) status and corpus planning; Cooper’s (1989) acquisition planning; Ferguson’s (1968) typology of language planning activities such as standardization, graphisation and modernization; and Fishman’s (1991) indication of a language’s revival and maintenance through cultivation of its status.

Scholars in recent times have started to shift their view of language planning as an activity undertaken by governments to a belief that a great deal of language planning is actually
done in other societal contexts (Corson, 1999; Fishman 1991; Jernudd, 1992; Shohamy, 2006). Following this tendency, Spolsky (2004, p. 5) identifies three components of language policy of a speech community: “its practices, its beliefs and any attempts to influence practices by any type of language intervention, planning or management” (see Figure 2.1).

![Figure 2.1: A model of LPP, based on Spolsky (2004)](image)

Spolsky's framework addresses criticisms of early LPP work, particularly “the lack of attention paid to language practices and attitudes of communities affected by LPP” (Tollefson, 2002, p. 419-420), and lack of attention paid to the role of ideology in LPP (Ricento, 2000, 2006). This framework extends language policy research to include not just explicit aspects of language policy (language policy statements), but also implicit aspects (the practices and beliefs of a community). Here the terms ‘ideology’ and ‘beliefs’ are used interchangeably. According to Spolsky (2004, p. 14), beliefs “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”. The model presented by Spolsky gives a fairly comprehensive view of language policy as it lays down the covert as well as the overt dimensions of language policy. As Spolsky (2004, p. 222) puts it:

\[ \text{The real language policy of a community is more likely to be found in its practices than in management. Unless the management is consistent with the language practices and beliefs, and with other contextual forces that are in play, explicit policy written in the constitution and laws is likely to have no more effect on how people speak than the activities of generations of school teachers vainly urging the choices of correct language.} \]

Further extending Spolsky's framework, Shohamy (2006) calls for a critical look at the “powerful mechanisms” that are used in most societies nowadays to perpetuate the de facto language policies and practices rather than studying only the formal, declared and official policies. Shedding further light on the hidden strategies to manipulate language policies in
favor of the dominant group, Spolsky and Shohamy (1999) argue that with the rise of modern nation states, language policy has become a common method of determining membership of and access to the state’s institutions like the police, banks or hospitals. English enjoys a high status in Pakistan; it is particularly well-entrenched in state institutions like the armed forces, the judiciary and bureaucracy, and in the corporate sector—both public and private. A sound level of proficiency in English is one of the key requirements to get white collar jobs in these sectors. The title of Mahboob’s (2002) article “No English, No Future” aptly depicts the high status and pragmatic value of English in Pakistan. Assuming the schools as cites for the implementation as well as contestation of language policies (Cooper 1989; Corson, 1999), I attempt to explore the extent to which the elite schools’ L-i-E policy reflects and embodies a micro-level implementation of the government’s LPP, and the extent to which their operations embody an independent local language planning activity.

2.1.4 Types of language planning

In addition to language planning frameworks, it is also useful to understand the activities which are geared to achieve the goals of language planning; i.e. to bring about some change in the status, code, prestige and usage of language(s). Some of these have already been identified as processes in various frameworks in the above section. These language planning activities are generally categorized into four types: Status planning, corpus planning, acquisition planning and prestige planning.

According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) corpus planning can be defined as those aspects of language planning which are primarily linguistic and hence internal to language. Citing Bamgbose (1989), they list some of these aspects as: 1) orthographic innovation, including harmonization, change of script, and spelling reforms, 2) pronunciation, 3) changes in language structure, 4) vocabulary expansion, 5) simplification of registers, 6) style, and 7) the preparation of language material.

In Haugen’s (1966, 1983) framework, which I have discussed in the previous section, codification and elaboration are regarded as corpus planning activities. Codification involves three processes: graphisation, grammatication and lexication. Graphisation involves standardization of a language through the development of its writing system,
which may involve modification in alphabets or a system of ideograms (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Grammatication is about the extraction and formulation of rules that describe how a language is structured. Lexication involves the selection and development of an appropriate lexicon for the language. While codification involves formalization of linguistic norms, elaboration focusses on the functional development of that language. Haugen (1983) gives two aspects of elaboration, i.e. terminological modernization, which involves development of new terminologies to keep the language at par with culturally, technologically and economically changing conditions, and stylistic development, which implies diversity in the discourse style of a language with regard to different domains such as science and culture. A third aspect of elaboration, internationalization, was added by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997). By this they mean that when a language becomes a medium of international communication, it needs standardization to cope with problems that may arise due to difference in pragmatic differences across cultures and nationalities.

Corpus planning is generally seen as a purely linguistic activity, lacking ideological, social and political aspects. However, there is a growing realization among those involved in corpus planning that standardization has its social, cultural and political consequences—for the language planners themselves, for individual language users, and for minority language communities (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Luke, McHoul, & Mey, 1990). While Jernudd and Neustupny (1987) link corpus planning to conflicting interests prevalent in social context, Fishman (1988) warns that the standardization of a language to meet the economic and political goals of a nation should not be done at the cost of minority languages. Further reinforcing his argument, Fishman (2000, p. 50) contended that corpus planning always has conscious or unconscious social engineering in mind:

“Modernization” of the language is never just a socially neutral last effort, never a purely aesthetic or rational goal. Acceptance or rejection of corpus planning hinges not only on its linguistic felicity but also on the acceptance or rejection of the overt or covert social engineering with which it is inevitably associated in the minds of the authorities and of the public.

Status planning, according to Cooper (1989, p. 99), is the “deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community’s languages”. Status planning might include decisions regarding the designation of languages for official, national or local roles as well as the role of medium of instruction in education (Bamgbose, 1991). As already
discussed, in Haugen’s (1966, 1983) framework the societal focus as manifested in selection and implementation are regarded as the activities of status planning which, according to Cooper, include officialisation, nationalization and/or proscription of language use.

Since status planning is usually undertaken by non-language experts like the education ministry or a parliamentary committee on education and culture, or in some cases by politically active linguists (Fishman, 1980), the decisions have a political orientation (Bamgbose, 1991). Status planning, along with acquisition or language-in-education planning, is central to my study because in Pakistan we see that the status of Urdu and English have been enhanced significantly in the spheres of education, administration, the judiciary, the army, politics and legislation. Indigenous languages on the other hand are relegated in status. Owing to the declining status of Pashto in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, there is a growing realization that some kind of status planning for Pashto is required.

Acquisition planning, according to Cooper (1989, p. 157), is the “organized efforts to promote the learning of a language”. Cooper, who first formalized this concept, also put forward a rationale for devising this category and differentiating it from status planning. He, therefore, contends that when the aim of a language planning activity is to increase the uses or functions of language, it is status planning; however, when the aim is to increase the number of users of a particular language, a separate category is needed. Although acquisition planning also includes families passing on their native language to children, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) and Baldauf and Kaplan (2005) prefer to call it a language-in-education planning activity. In this respect acquisition planning can be called a government led activity which “typically describes the language teaching policies of states” (Lo Bianco, 2004, p. 742). Acquisition planning as an official and governmental activity implemented at the micro-level educational institutions brings out the complexity between macro and micro levels inherent in LPP activities. In her integrative framework of language planning, Hornberger (1994) depicts two orientations of acquisition planning: 1) policy planning which involves targeting education/school, literature, religion or mass media, and 2) cultivation planning which involves reacquisition, maintenance, shift, foreign/second language learning. Both policy-oriented and cultivation-oriented acquisition planning are the concerns of my study which, taking a holistic view of LPP, investigates
the dynamics of LPP in the micro context of the elite schools as well as the students’
language attitudes and patterns of language use, proficiency, maintenance and shift. I
discuss language-in-education planning in more depth in the following section.

The fourth type of language planning activity, prestige planning, was first identified by
Haarmann (1990), when he revealed that the lack of prestige planning was instrumental in
the failure of the Soviet Union’s efforts to raise the status of its small languages. Reflecting
on the role of actors and agents in prestige planning, Haarmann (1990) notes that prestige
of a language is accomplished through official promotion by governments, institutional
promotion by agencies and pressure groups, and individual promotion through the
activities of individuals. Differentiating prestige planning from status planning, Ager
(2005, p. 1041) contends that while status planning pertains to influencing “the real or
concrete aspects of language use”, prestige planning is about “the unreal or social-
psychological aspects”. However, when it comes to the implementation of certain
strategies as part of prestige planning, it becomes difficult to differentiate it from status
planning. For instance, certain strategies or activities of prestige planning which may
include the use of a language in higher domains such as the sciences, professions,
diplomacy, high culture, refined social interaction and literature (Lo Bianco, 2004) may
also be called status planning. Ager (2005, cited in Zhao & Baldauf, 2012) terms this
process ‘image creation’, and highlights the attitudinal aspect of prestige planning. He
argues that in order for language planning to be successful, attitudes such as prestige and
image of that language need to be changed. As such, for image and prestige planning to be
effective, a “bottom-up, democratic, and persuasive planning approach” is required; a
planning that is “less provocative and more benign, with the aim of changing the
recipients’ perceptions using bottom-up persuasive activities” (Zhao & Baldauf, 2012, p.4).

2.2 Language-in-education planning

The language-in-education (L-i-E) aspect of LPP has already been introduced in the
previous section. Here, I explore it further as language-in-education planning is one of the
main theoretical constructs of this study. Education has been regarded as the central site
where LPP is implemented even since the early phase of LPP. Haugen (1983) considered
education to be central to the implementation and elaboration of language and literacy
functions. Likewise, Kennedy (1983, p. i) contended that “nowhere is this [language]
planning more crucial than in education, universally recognized as a powerful instrument of change”.

Despite the realization of the significance of L-i-E planning in the early phase, it was not until Cooper (1989) gave prominence to acquisition planning that the theoretical foundation of the field was laid down. For Cooper, acquisition planning (L-i-E planning) has three foci: reacquisition of a language, maintenance of a language, and foreign language acquisition. Around the same period, Ingram (1989) viewed L-i-E planning as a complex task as it involves setting goals for the target language(s), such as the shaping of attitudes, the development of skills and the attainment of desirable proficiency level; it also involves practical considerations such as materials development and teacher supply.

Building on Cooper’s (1989) acquisition planning, a more comprehensive treatment of the theory of language-in-education came from Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) who regard it the most powerful resource for bringing about language change and the key implementation procedure for language planning and policy. They also see L-i-E planning as having three dimensions: medium of education, languages taught, and varieties used in education. They describe L-i-E planning as a six stages process: 1) Education policy (the articulation of education policy as separate from general policy), 2) Curriculum policy (the description of what languages are to be used, when, for how long, how and for which students, 3) Personnel (the determination of sources for educators, how they would be educated, retrained and rewarded), 4) Materials (instructional material, space, equipment and methodologies), 5) Community (the understanding of community and parental attitudes and identification of funding sources, and 6) Evaluation (the appraisal of curricula, student access, teacher success/interest, and cost effectiveness. At the same time Kaplan and Baldauf also take a critical approach to L-i-E (Tollefson, 2002) and highlight the various forces—linguistic and non-linguistic, operating at macro- and micro-levels—which render language-in-education as a process working under social, political and economic conditions. The critical perspectives on L-i-E are explored further in the following section.

2.2.1 Critical perspectives on language-in-education planning

Most of the early studies on language-in-education planning looked at LPP as a macro-level governmental activity, geared to solve language problems (Fishman, 1979; Haugen
1972) without situating it in the sociopolitical contexts in which the planning occurred. However, as Tollefson and Tsui (2004, pp. 1-2) argue, the emergence of “critical linguistics as a field of language study focusing on linguistic human rights, and the role of language in power, control, dominance, has provided new insights and new foci for investigations of language-in-education policies” (see, for instance, Fairclough, 1989; Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Tollefson, 2002). Critical linguistics, according to Tollefson (2002, p. 4), is social activism whereby linguists “are seen as responsible not only for understanding how dominant social groups use language for establishing and maintaining social hierarchies, but also for investigating ways to alter those hierarchies”. Shohamy (2006, p. 76) echoes Tollefson and Tsui’s view in a more forthright manner, and considers L-i-E planning as “imposed by political entities in a top-down manner, usually with very limited resistance as most generally schools and teachers comply”. As a result of this realization, Tollefson (2002) calls upon scholars and students of LPP to understand the social and political implications of policies adopted in specific historical contexts and to investigate how language policies affect the lives of individuals and groups who have little influence over the policymaking process. In addition to this, there is a growing call to investigate the role of human agency in policymaking (Canagarajah, 2005; Hornberger & Johonson, 2007; Ramanathan, 2005b). I review literature on these emerging perspectives on language-in-education planning in the following sections.

2.2.2 Macro/micro, top-down/bottom-up and explicit/implicit perspectives on L-i-E

As already discussed, with the dawn of critical approaches and post-modernism in LPP, the view of LPP shifted from a macro-level governmental activity to a more focused institutional, societal, group and individual level activity. Tollefson (1981) was among the first scholars who argued that language policy involves both macro- and micro-level policy goals and implementation decisions. Hornberger (1994) and Ricento and Hornberger (1996) tried to make better sense of the complexity of LPP at different levels with a particular focus on the critical role of educators. In their “multilayered onion” metaphor of LPP they liken legislation and political process to the outer layer, state agencies and institutions (like schools) to the mid layer, and the classroom practitioners to the heart of the onion. Ricento and Hornberger (1996, p. 419) conclude that LPP is a multi-layered construct, wherein essential LPP components, agents, levels, and processes of LPP
permeate and interact with each other in multiple and complex ways as they enact various
types, approaches, and goals of LPP. The micro level of language planning, which is often
“unnoticed and unrecorded”, is also referred to as “unplanned micro language planning
(Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 299). Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008, p. 4) underscore the need
for raising awareness at this level of language planning “because such planning is on-going
and therefore commonplace”.

Despite this emphasis there is no clear-cut distinction between micro language planning
and macro language planning as the boundaries between the two are blurry. As Liddicoat
and Baldauf (2008, p. 11) put it: “interactions between the micro and the macro, between
the local and the national, can operate in either direction. Language planning activities
which begin at the local level can come to influence macro-level decision making”. Similarly,
schools as “interface between the macro-level of language planning and the
micro-level” are not only the sites of government’s language planning initiatives, but
individual schools also “influence the ways in which those broader language goals are
played out in their own contexts” (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008 p. 13). Baldauf (2008) also
makes a distinction between the local context as the site of macro-level LPP
implementation, which he terms as localised LPP, and the local context as a site of micro-
level LPP implementation, which he terms local LPP. As such, one may essentially
consider localised LPP as top-down where micro-support is given for the implementation
of macro-LP; power thus resides at the macro-level (Baldauf, 2008, cited in du Plessis,
2010). On the other hand, in the local or micro-level LPP authority resides with a micro-
level LPP agent, rather than with an implementer. A good example of top-down LPP at the
local level (localised LPP) can be found in Miller’s (2006) study, which is about the efforts
to involve local government in the macro planning for Scots. Similarly, the study by du
Plessis (2010) on Xhariep community’s own language initiatives in South Africa, and the
study by Barkhuizen and Knoch (2006) reporting on the South African immigrant
community’s language practices in New Zealand, are good examples of LPP at the local
level.

The LPP activities at the micro-level, where power lies or is given to the local actors, may
also have some influence on the official policy. Such policy initiatives are referred to as
bottom-up (Bamgbose, 1987) or grassroots-initiated (Kamwendo, 2005), and non-
governmental (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997) type of language planning. In this respect Starks
and Barkhuizen (2003) observe that while top-down decisions taken by those with power at the top are imposed on those with less power, bottom-up planning also takes place on the ground. The top-down (macro and official) and bottom-up (micro and grassroots) concepts of LPP are often associated with explicit and implicit LPP respectively. Sometimes, however, an implicit policy may operate from the top down due to the tacit approval of state authorities. For this reason, Baldauf, Li and Zhao (2008, p. 234) define implicit language acquisition management (or L-i-E) as “ideology driven, non-consultative, and top-down ideology—like the ‘English only’ movement in the United States—or it may be more bottom-up driven and benign in intent, like the commercially driven individual demand for English in Tunisia”. Top-down implicit LPP also operates in Pakistan, where the official LPP establishes Urdu as the main language of the state and its institutions and asserts the promotion and preservation of regional vernaculars. However, in practice it is English which dominates the spheres of education, and institutions like the army, the judiciary and bureaucracy.

2.2.3 Language-in-education in schools

Schools are primary sites for the implementation as well as contestation of language policies (Cooper 1989; Corson, 1999). Spolsky (2009) maintains that schools are the key to language maintenance. In Baldauf, Li and Zhao’s (2008, pp. 234-235) extended eight-stage framework of language-in-education, the access policy and curriculum policy decisions pertain to the medium of instruction and the teaching of an additional subject policies. Further they contend that the choice of medium of instruction is not only an educational issue, but is also closely related to the underlying social, political and economic context.

2.2.3.1 The medium of instruction policy

Tollefson and Tsui (2004, p. 2) take a critical view of medium of instruction (MoI) policy and argue that as an integral part of education policy, MoI determines “which social and linguistics groups have access to political and economic opportunities and which groups are disenfranchised”. They explore MoI policies vis-à-vis these political and economic forces in three different settings: monolingual, bilingual and multilingual. Following Tollefson and Tsui (2004), Baldauf, Li and Zhao (2008) focus on the United States which,
despite its linguistic diversity, is characterized by English-dominant monolingualism as far as medium of instruction is concerned. English was made the MoI apparently to make the nation civilized and modernized, but in reality it has been a tool of political subjugation of minority groups. In the sphere of bilingual education, Singapore stands out as a state which has instituted English-knowing bilingual policies (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008, citing Chua, 2006). With English being the main medium of instruction and Malay, Mandarin and Tamil being taught as second school languages, Singapore has achieved political stability by “balancing the interests of different ethnic groups and rests on the rise of the English-knowing bilingual community” (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008, p. 237, citing Pakir, 2004). Finally, as an example of multilingual planning, they take the example of Macao where different schools with Chinese and Portuguese as the mediums of instruction coexist, ensuring stable bilingualism and biculturalism. These cases reveal that the choice of MoI, which are related to the curriculum and materials policy, is not only an educational issue but closely related to the underlying political, social and economic context (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Medium of instruction is also the focus of attention with reference to its impact on other languages, whether native or foreign. MoI in this respect is investigated in terms of its orientations: assimilationist or pluralistic, monolingual or bilingual. According to Fortune and Tedick (2008), using a language other than the mother tongue for instruction is usually called immersion. Immersion programs are additive when their goal is to produce bilinguals with academic proficiency in the home and in the official language, or are replacive and assimilationist when the aim is to move students from one language to another (Spolsky, 2009, p. 99). The French immersion program, in which English-speaking students were immersed in French (Genesee, 1988), and the immersion of English-speaking Maori children in Maori (Nicholson, 1990) serve as good examples of immersion programs. Some monolingual programs may be termed as submersion or “swim and sink” (Garcia, 1997), which means all students are placed in the majority or official MoI with no arrangements for students who speak another vernacular. Explaining the swim and sink concept, Baker (2006, p. 216) observes that “submersion contains the idea of language minority students thrown into the deep end and expected to learn to swim as quickly as possible without the help of floats or special swimming lessons”.
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2.2.3.2 Language(s) as additional subject

The teaching of additional language(s) is the second aspect of language-in-education policy. Spolsky (2009) believes that teaching language as an additional subject implies an additive approach in contrast to the replacive approach of the monolingual immersion program in an official language, or even a transitional program (Baker, 2006; Cummins, 1992) that pays no attention to home language once the official language is considered as established. One aspect of this type of bilingual program, as Garcia (1997) maintains, is that minority parents send their children to schools where the majority language is the MoI, but also send their children to supplementary schools for heritage language classes, which are often after school or on weekends. The focus of the programs is to promote ethnic language, culture and history. Another approach is the teaching of a language as a regular part of the curriculum; for instance the teaching of Urdu in English-medium schools in Pakistan. Spolsky (2009) observes that there is a common disapproval of home languages in the school system, while dominant languages are granted a higher status. This opposition to heritage language is mainly due to instrumental orientations. Errihani (2006, p. 412) notes that parents’ sense of pragmatism makes them far from being enthusiastic about their children’s learning Berber in Morocco. Similarly, Spolsky (2009, citing Rajah-Carrim, 2007) notes that efforts to introduce Creole in school found little support among Mauritian parents. In the following section I shed further light on English-only policies in schools.

2.2.3.3 The English-only monolingual policy: Linguistic and academic implications

Oyetade (2001) notes that parents from the Nigerian elite class send their children to fee-paying primary schools where the medium of instruction is English. The reason, he suggests, is the belief that the earlier a child begins learning in English the higher the chances of better mastery of the language; this will, it is believed, guarantee a good performance at the subsequent levels of education and will eventually lead to a good job. This is what Kachru (1986) calls the “alchemy of English”, which is the belief that English proficiency in and of itself will lead to children's economic and social betterment. Similarly, Omoniyi (2003) observes that there is an African-wide attitude that regards English as an instrument of true social progress, equality and justice accompanied by a negative attitude towards indigenous languages as medium of instruction in the school.
system. This sort of “post-colonial hangover” and the “hegemonic relationship between English and the indigenous languages in relation to upward mobility” (Fasold, 1997, cited in Omoniye, 2003, p. 141) also characterize the linguistic and educational scene of Pakistan. Many affluent parents in developing countries like Pakistan send their children to monolingual English medium schools with the aim of securing a successful career for their children.

The situation poses a significant dilemma, linguistic and academic, for all stakeholders including students, parents, educators and the state itself. On the one hand, there is no doubt that in the linguistic, social and professional environment that these societies have developed, only those with high English proficiency will succeed. On the other hand, there is ample evidence from research that mother-tongue instruction enhances cultural, cognitive, affective and academic benefits as compared to L2 instruction (Shohamy, 2006; Skutnab-Kangas, 2000). Forms of education which strive for biliteracy development and extended use of the L1 for instruction across the curriculum can foster academic achievement in both L1 and L2 due to cross-linguistic transfer (Cummins, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2004). As Thomas and Collier (2002, p. 7) observe, “the strongest predictor of L2 students’ achievement is the amount of formal L1 schooling; the more the L1 grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement”. Contrary to this, schooling that is based on L2 instruction on average produces the lowest achievement levels in the second language. The results, according to Skutnabb-Kangas (2004), are often bad or even disastrous in terms of cognitive, emotional and scholarly development. Mindful of the significance of L1 instruction for both academic success and for L1 vitality, international organizations too have recognized the linguistic and educational rights of indigenous populations (For instance, The Hague Recommendations Regarding Educational Rights of National Minorities and Explanatory Note, 1996).

2.3 Language attitudes and LPP

The study of language attitudes is seen as one of the central theoretical constructs of LPP because stakeholders’ attitudes are seen as essential to the formulation and implementation procedures of LPP (Baker, 2006; Choi, 2003; Giles, Hewstone & Ball, 1983; O’ Riagain, 2008; Youssef, 2002). Language attitudes are closely linked to language maintenance and shift (Fishman, 1991; UNESCO, 2003). Moreover, language attitudes have been found to
be correlated to language proficiency (Fishman, 1991; Young & Gardener, 1990) and the 
motivation to learn a language (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Lukmani, 1972) and use a 
language (Vassberg, 1993). Furthermore, Spolsky (2004) includes language beliefs as a 
constituent, together with language practices and language management, in his LPP 
framework.

2.3.1 Language attitudes: Definitions

Sarnoff’s (1970, p. 279) definition is usually taken as a starting point to define attitudes: 
“A disposition to react favorably or unfavorably to a class of objects”. Later, Zimbardo and 
Leippe (1991, p. 31) maintain that attitude, as a disposition, is a “learned tendency” to 
think about an issue in a particular way. Likewise, echoing closely what Sarnoff (1970) 
meant by attitudes, Eagly and Chaiken (1993, p. 1) define attitudes as “a psychological 
tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or 
disfavor”. Giles, Hewstone and Ball (1983) are credited with adding “language policies” to 
the list of objects concerning attitudes. Afterwards, Baker (1992) formally classified 
language attitudes as follows: Language variation, learning a new language, specific 
minority languages, language groups, language lessons, language preferences and language 
use and so on.

Schiffman (1997) draws on Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) and refines the scope and focus 
of language attitudes further. He contends that language attitude studies focus on a 
population or a segment of a population to understand people’s attitudes to: 1) language in 
general, 2) motivation towards the learning of a first or second language, 3) the status of a 
language or its speakers, 4) language shift, and 5) loyalty towards one’s own language. 
While most of the definitions portray attitudes as a psychological and subconscious 
process, Bohner and Wanke (2002, p. 17) highlight the external aspect of attitudes, i.e. 
behavior: “Because they influence behavior (own and others), they influence information 
processing, they influence social encounters and they form part of a person’s self-concept”. 
Attitudes, therefore, are not merely thoughts and beliefs lying dormant in a person’s head. 
They get externalized through a person’s behavior, and hence influence, shape or even 
replace others’ beliefs and attitudes.
Attitudes as a “learned activity” influencing behavior are essential to this investigation, which seeks to understand the dynamics of the language-in-education policy at the micro-level. The elite English-medium schools’ English-only policy will be investigated with regard to the students’ attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu.

2.3.2 Language attitudes: Types and orientations

Some definitions of attitudes also explicate the types or categories of attitudes. For instance, Baker (1992, pp. 12-13) proposes a three component model consisting of cognition, affect and readiness for action. The cognitive component, according to Baker, concerns thoughts and beliefs. To illustrate this, Baker (1992, p. 12) explains that “a favorable attitude to the Irish language might entail a stated belief in the importance of continuity of indigenous language”. Later, Eagly and Chaiken (1998, p. 271) concur with Baker and observe that the cognitions or thoughts that are associated with attitudes are typically termed beliefs by the attitude theorists. They further define beliefs as “the building blocks of attitude in the sense that attitudes are assumed to reflect the beliefs that people hold about attitude objects” (p.274). The affective component, according to Baker, concerns feelings, such as love or hate towards the attitude object, i.e. the Irish language or a passion for Irish poetry. Similarly, the action component of attitudes pertains to behavioral intention or plan of action under defined contexts and circumstances. To elucidate this, Baker maintains that a person with a favorable attitude to Irish might send their children to a bilingual school. These definitions help resolve the confusion that surrounds attitudes and beliefs and clarify why the two terms are sometimes used interchangeably.

Recently, Baker (2006) improved his categorization of attitudes further and came up with two clearly defined categories, i.e. the instrumental and integrative aspects of attitudes: “Instrumental attitudes to learning a second language or preserving a minority language might be, for example, for vocational reasons, status, achievement, personal success, self-enhancement, self-actualization, or basic security and survival” (p. 214). An integrative attitude to a language, according to Baker, may concern attachment to or identification with a language group and its cultural activities. Bokhorst-Heng and Caleon (2008, p. 236) report strong instrumental attitudes of speakers towards English in Singapore: “Because English is positioned as the language of economics, law, government, education and higher
education, it is also seen as a language of upward social mobility”. Observations about the instrumental value of English in Pakistan have also been reported (Fasold, 1997; Mahboob, 2002; Mumtaz & Mitha, 1996; Rahman, 2006). In Ghana, English is preferred as medium of education because it is regarded essential in developing professional skills (Guerini, 2008). Errihani (2008) reports that instrumental orientation is often quoted as a reason for the prevalent negative attitudes towards Berber and for the lack of interest in learning it in Morocco. Likewise, in the context of Pakistan, Rahman (2006, p. 84) laments the mere “lip service” paid to the indigenous languages, which are suffering due to the prevailing market conditions in which access to “power, wealth or prestige is only possible through English and, to a lesser extent, Urdu”. Describing a similar scenario about the native languages in India, Mohanty (2004) explains how the marginalized linguistic groups in India seem to accept the low status and exclusion of their languages as fait accompli. They perceive their languages important for identity and integrative functions only; instrumental functions are dissociated from the native languages in favour of the dominant ones.

Like instrumental attitudes, integrative attitudes towards languages are also depicted strongly in the literature. Shohamy (2006, p. 41) reveals that in the USA “English is associated with patriotism; speaking good English is equated with being a ‘good American’ (Auerbach, 2000, p. 181), and language is very much associated with loyalty”. A similar perception also prevails in Pakistan regarding Urdu, the national language, as a symbol of national unity (Rahman, 2006). Taking a divergent view from these ideologies of linguistic homogeneity as key to national unity and development, May (2001) argues that nationalism is the greatest threat to language diversity, based as it is on the notion of linguistic homogeneity in the public realm and, often, an allied public monolingualism. Likewise in the context of Pakistan, Coleman (2010) believes that promoting regional languages through education would serve to integrate the ethnically and linguistically diverse society rather than the contrary.

Ruiz (1984, as cited in Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009) provides a different orientation to the study of language attitudes. He proposes a typology for understanding language attitudes in any given society: language-as-a-problem, language-as-a-right, and language-as-a-resource. The language-as-a-problem attitude considers the children’s minority language as a problem that they should overcome to shift to a dominant language, English for instance, in order to assimilate and succeed in the mainstream society (Zhang &
Slaughter-Defoe, 2009). In the language-as-a-right orientation, on the contrary, minority students consider learning and maintaining their native language as their right. The language-as-a-resource orientation emphasizes the overall importance of all languages as a resource not only for immigrant or minority students, but also for society as a whole (Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009).

2.3.3 Language attitudes and ideologies

Both language attitudes and ideologies are found to be “critical for the long-term stability of a language” (UNESCO, 2003, p.15), for the success of heritage language programs, and ultimately for language revitalization efforts (King, 1999, p. 3). Since the terms language attitudes and language ideologies occur together quite frequently, and are used interchangeably at times, a distinction between the two is necessary.

According to King (2000, p. 168), “while a language attitude is ... a specific response to certain aspects of a particular language, language ideology ... is a set of beliefs concerning a particular language, or ... language in general”. Distinguishing between ideologies and attitudes, Myers-Scotton (2006, p. 110) argues that whilst language attitudes are “more unconscious assessments”, ideologies are “more constructed assessments”. The distinction implies that attitudes are deep rooted in individuals’ subconscious thoughts and emotions, and ideologies are constructed over time as particular societies respond to socio-historical forces (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010).

Irvine and Gal (2009, p. 402) define language ideology as “the ideas with which participants and observers frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them”. Spolsky (2004, p. 14) believes that language ideology is basically the language policy “with the managers left out”, which means “what people think should be done”. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2006) describe ideology as “ingrained, unquestioned beliefs about the way the world is, the way it has to be with respect to language”. Languages ideologies are, therefore, reflected in actual language practice, i.e. how people talk, what they say about language and their language choices and their sociopolitical positioning vis-à-vis particular languages (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010).
Although some traits of the two concepts might overlap, and at times it might be difficult to distinguish between a person’s ideology and attitude, ideologies are generally the beliefs held at group, community or societal level, developed over time as a result of historical, political and social processes. Ideologies, as such, are reflected in actual language practices, discourses and choices and their sociopolitical positioning with regard to languages; they are not hidden as they are clearly reflected in particular behaviors and in policies such as the advancement of multilingualism, the national language or the medium of instruction, etc. (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010, p. 120). Attitudes, on the other hand, are unconscious, personal and subjective by nature (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010).

2.3.4 Procedures for language attitudes research

Due to the latent nature of attitudes, there is a lack of consensus and consistency in their measurement (Garret, Coupland & Williams, 2003). The two approaches that researchers mainly apply to measure language attitudes are direct and indirect approaches or the combination of both. A direct approach is characterized by survey and interview techniques in which the informants themselves report their attitudes (O’ Riagain, 2008). The problem with this approach is that it is often unclear whether the responses elicited really express the attitudes as it is quite likely that responses might have been “influenced or inhibited by other processes” (O’ Riagain, 2008, p. 337).

The second approach to measure attitudes, an indirect approach, is the matched guise procedure, pioneered by Lambert, Hodson, Gardner, & Fillenbaum (1960). In this method the respondents listen to the voice recordings of different speakers reading some neutral passage of text; they are then asked to make an impression of the speakers using a series of personality traits rating scales, for instance intelligence, sincerity, etc. (O’ Riagain, 2008). The listeners are not aware that the speech extracts are, in fact, produced by one person using realistic guises of different languages or speech characteristics.

I follow the direct approach to understanding attitudes as I use a questionnaire and interviews. I try to reduce threat to the reliability of data by using a triangulation design and by corroborating findings through observations.
2.3.5 The role of attitudes in language learning and language maintenance and shift

Attitudes have been studied extensively in the literature on language acquisition, maintenance and shift. Language attitudes are strongly formed during language acquisition and learning and differ depending on the context in which the specific language is taught or spoken, since languages associated with pleasant events are more likely to arouse positive feelings (Baker, 2006; Korth, 2005). If positive feelings towards one language can foster acquisition of that language, negative attitudes towards another may naturally result in gradual rejection and shift from that language. Korth (2005) observes that language attitudes are both an input and outcome of language learning. As an input language attitudes are one variable among others in the prediction of bilingual proficiency (Baker, 1992). In his four-stage model of language acquisition Baker suggests attitudes as one among the four factors that influence formal language learning as well as informal language experience. At the same time, at the 4th stage, which depicts the outcomes of the process, attitudes along with cultural values are included in the non-linguistic outcomes of language acquisition. Many studies have been reported in the literature that focus on language learning and the students’ affective reactions to various languages in the classroom context (e.g. Lukmani 1972; Norris-Holt 2001; Saville-Troike 1989). Such studies attempt to show a causal link between positive or negative language attitudes and show how successfully people learn a language (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010).

Since Fishman’s (1991) reversing language shift (RLS) model, language attitudes and ideologies have become central to an investigation of language maintenance, shift, and revitalization. Emphasizing the connection between language ideologies and language maintenance and shift, Fishman (1991) argues that reversing resistant attitudes towards weak or threatened languages is the key to reversing language shift. Fishman (1991, p. 394) also stresses the importance to attitudes of those involved in language planning efforts, in particular for “minoritized” languages: “Even before concrete efforts are undertaken, RLS involves consciousness heightening and reformation … ideological clarification and awareness”. As such, numerous studies of language planning and policy have drawn upon theory in language attitudes and ideologies (Barkhuizen, 2002; Diallo, 2005; Guerini, 2008; McCarty and Wyman, 2009; Spolsky, 2004; Taylor-Leech, 2007; Zepeda, 2009). Highlighting a close link between language attitudes and language maintenance, Baker (2006) argues that in the life of a language, attitude towards that
language may be important in revitalization and revival as well as in language decay and death. Vassberg (1993, p. 146) sums up the importance language attitudes have for speakers:

[Language] attitudes … play a crucial role in the psychology of individual speakers and their use of language. For attitudes have been shown to have a profound effect on motivation to speak or learn a language; they are linked to views of identity and the desire – or lack of desire – for group membership and solidarity. Attitudes are affected by – and comprise – values and stereotypes held by both speakers and non-speakers of any given language.

2.3.6 The relevance of attitudes to the present study

The study of language attitudes is important in a multilingual context where some languages are dominant and others marginalized. In a community where second or foreign languages are dominant in schools, as is the case for minority communities, “the associated attitudes arising from this juxtaposition greatly changes the dynamics involved in learning the second language” (Gardner, 2002, cited in O’ Riagain, 2008, p. 329).

Pashtuns (the community where this study is situated) are generally regarded as having strong positive attitudes towards their language, Pashto. However, owing to the minimal role of Pashto in the spheres of education, government departments, business and the media, one may assume that these positive attitudes would be predominantly integrative rather than instrumental. The current inquiry is expected to reveal the nature of these attitudes and the extent to which they influence the use of English, Pashto and Urdu. Previous studies have noticed existence of a correlation between proficiency in and positive attitudes towards a language (Baker, 1992; Guerini, 2008). Through a case study of a mother and daughter from a minority group in the US, for example, Li (1999) finds that the parents’ positive attitudes influence the children’s heritage language skills and identity formation. This study aims to show whether a relationship exists between the participants’ language attitudes and their language use of and their proficiency in English, Pashto and Urdu.
Moreover, an investigation of attitudes in this study is also relevant to the particular
domain that this study aims to understand, i.e. English medium schools. Schools play a
crucial role in shaping language attitudes (Baker, 1992). They serve as the central agency
for language planning and policy, shift or maintenance (Fishman, 1991; O’ Laoire &
Harris, 2006), and for fostering language attitudes and ideologies, which are crucial in the
complex interaction of sociolinguistic and socio-economic variables in language
maintenance and shift. As English-medium schools are mushrooming in the private sector
in Pakistan, with the national language policy completely supporting such institutions,
tacitly or directly, my study of the students’ language attitudes and ideologies will reveal
whether and how far such attitudes influence the language maintenance or shift vis-à-vis
the three languages.

2.4 Language maintenance and shift and LPP

Theories of language maintenance and shift are relevant to the present inquiry because
attitudes towards a language can influence maintenance and shift processes for that
language (Baker, 2006). Similarly, in the multilingual context of Pakistan where regional
languages are neglected in the presence of two dominant languages, one may assume that
the language policy in Pakistan, especially at the micro-level of the elite English-medium
schools and higher education, is creating conditions which may facilitate shift from the
neglected vernaculars.

2.4.1 Language maintenance and shift: Definitions

Language shift is defined as a gradual reduction of the use of one’s mother tongue and the
shift to the use of the dominant language (Clyne, 2003). According to Karan (2000, p. 68)
language shift occurs “because individuals, consciously or subconsciously, make decisions
to use certain languages in certain situations” and “these individual decisions are motivated
by what people consider to be their personal good”. Language maintenance is closely
related to language shift and they can be regarded as being at either end of a continuum.
According to Pauwels (2004), language maintenance describes a situation where speech
communities sustain the use of their languages despite competition. Language shift, on the
other hand, involves a change by a speaker or speech community from the dominant use of
one language to the dominant use of another in most domains (Pauwels, 2004). It may also
refer to a process of gradual shift away from the first, endogenous or minority language in certain domains to the use of the dominant language (Clyne, 2003). Here it may be worth mentioning that maintenance of home language does not mean that students do not learn English or any other language. It does, however, imply that the use of home language is not discontinued as a result of exposure to and education in English (Baker, 2006; Hasson, 2005, 2006).

Related to language shift is language loss or decline, which, according to May (2006, pp. 257-258), occurs “in bilingual or multilingual contexts in which a majority language —that is a language with greater political power, privilege, and social prestige—comes to replace the range and functions of a minority language”. The inevitable result, according to May is that speakers of the minority language “shift” over time to speaking the majority language. The process of language shift may be described as consisting of three broad stages (May, 2006). The first stage involves increasing pressure on minority language speakers to speak the majority language, particularly in the formal domain. This stage is often facilitated by education in the majority/dominant language. The second stage sees a period of bilingualism, in which both languages continue to be spoken concurrently. However, there is a decreasing number of minority-language speakers, especially among the younger generation, along with a decrease in the fluency of speakers, as the minority language is spoken less and employed in fewer and fewer domains. The third stage—which may occur over the course of two or three generations, and sometimes less—sees the replacement of the minority language with the majority one. The minority language may be ‘remembered’ by a residual group of language speakers, but it is no longer spoken as a wider language of communication (Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998, cited in May, 2000).

One may find oneself in a terminological dilemma when referring to the languages in Pakistan. For instance, languages like Pashto, Punjabi and Balochi, although spoken by the majority of the population in their respective provinces, are the weakened, marginalized languages in the face of dominant languages like Urdu and English. These marginalized languages are perhaps better depicted through the term “minoritised languages”. King and Hornberger (2004, p. 6) note that “minoritised”, a term also used by McCarty (2002a), refers to “groups of individuals who, although perhaps numerically dominant, are marginalized within the larger society”. Pashto, like the other indigenous languages, except Sindi, is marginalized in the spheres of education, governance and the media despite being
a major language in the KP province. The following section further explores the marginalization or loss of “minoritized” languages, more specifically in the domain of education.

2.4.2 Language maintenance and shift and language policy

Many researchers are now looking at language planning and policy from a language maintenance and shift perspective under the influence of critical notions like linguistic imperialism and linguistic genocide (Phillipson, 1992, 1997; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000) and language rights (Canagarajah, 1999; Phillipson, 1997). As such, language shift started to be understood not as a natural outcome of language contact but “a manifestation of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups – and their languages – hierarchically within a society” (Ricento, 2006). These studies advocate multilingualism, cultural diversity and linguistic human rights. Endorsing a maintenance perspective, Hornberger (2006) argues that when language planners and policy makers in multilingual contexts devise language policies, they must be clear about the purpose of promoting a particular language. At the same time, they must be mindful of the need to develop local languages which are threatened by global languages.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) take a broader and critical view of LPP and argue that language planning should not be perceived merely as a monolithic activity, specifically designed to modify only one language, as was the tendency in the classical era of LPP, i.e. one nation, one language. Rather, LPP must be viewed as involving a “wide range of languages and of modifications occurring simultaneously over the mix of languages in the environment, some of which may constitute the motivation for an attempt at planned change while some may be dragged along willy-nilly as an outcome of an attempt at planned change in a given sector” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 269). Hence, although an LPP may be directed to only one language, the ripple effect may encompass everything in the environment, including minority communities and languages. Extrapolating this view, they outline eight constructs some or all of which may be invoked by language planning simultaneously, “each potentially impacting on a different language or variety present in the planning environment”. They are: Language death, language survival, language change, language revival, language shift and spread, language amalgamation, language contact, and literacy development.
Here I only discuss language shift as it is directly related to the topic under discussion. Language shift, according to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), may occur for a variety of reasons. One of these, which is the direct consequence of a country’s LPP, is the condition or situation in which a major national language or a foreign language is perceived as having resources which are not available in the indigenous language. English, for instance, has spread globally because it is perceived as a language of science and technology, and is given a dominant role in the LPP of many developing countries. Related to this is the second reason, i.e. “changing popular or (or at least public) attitudes” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 284) towards an external language, which results in enhancing the influence of that language. This influence is manifested in the dominant role given to language at institutional level, education for instance (status planning), and prestige enhancement. The notion of shift is more closely linked to language spread, which according to Cooper (1982, cited in Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 285) is “an increase over time, in the proportion of a communicative network that adopts a given language or language variety for a given communication function”. The global spread of English, its value as a language of science and technology and its high prestige value have caused English to be entrenched in the LPP and official domains of many countries, particularly the former colonies, including Pakistan. This is leading to a significant shrinkage of domain and function with regard to local languages among the educated elite (May, 2006; Mohanty, 2004).

Taking a critical view of the role of LPP in language shift, Fishman (2006) asserts that educational authorities are more implicated in planned language shift than any other authorities. The impact of education, which focusses on formal, written language(s) (or a foreign language, English, as is the case in the context of my study), is widespread, strong and long lasting in language shift because “education is generally obligatory, it focusses on the young, and its sway continues uninterrupted… for untold years” (Fishman, 2006, p. 320). Even if schools adopt a transitional conciliatory attitude towards the child’s L1, that is not enough to prevent a shift towards the institutional variety (whether it is the national language or foreign language, like Urdu and English in the case of Pakistan). Those who are exposed to these official varieties the longest and most intensively cannot hope but shift to it (Fishman, 2006). Fishman’s concern is also echoed in the work of Mohanty, Panda and Pal (2010), who contend that due to the dominant presence of English, South Asian societies (which include Pakistan) are characterized by a “typically hierarchical
relationship between languages that can be seen as a double divide between English at the top of the three-tier hierarchy, the mass language(s) of the majority at the middle rung and the marginalized indigenous… at the bottom” (p. 211). Likewise, studies have documented shift from regional vernaculars as a consequence of LPP in several communities: shift from heritage languages to the dominant English and Malay in Malaysia (David, 1996; Sankar, 2004); shift from Toechew to Mandarin and English (Saravanan & Hoon, 1997; Zhao & Liu, 2007) and from Tamil to English (Saravanan, 1999) in Singapore; and shift from vernacular languages to the dominant Pilipino and English in Philippines (Young, 2002). Ohiri-Aniche (1997, p. 75) further notes that small Nigerian languages are dying because of the trend to bring up children as monolingual speakers of English. Taking a critical look at the L-i-E policy in South Africa, Banda (2000) contends that language maintenance efforts would be futile “as long as the actions of policy makers suggest that a particular language (English in this case) offers opportunity for education, jobs and accessibility to communication, political, economic and industrial success, then language policies enacted to promote other languages will be futile”. A similar point is raised by Rahman (2006, p. 84), who argues that although there is a lot of “lip service” paid to the indigenous languages in Pakistan, “we create such market conditions that it becomes impossible to gain power, wealth or prestige in any language except English and, to a lesser extent, Urdu”. The language policies which conform to such economic and political positions of the powerful elite by promoting certain languages might also be facilitating the loss of or shift from the neglected languages. The aim of this study is to investigate language planning at the micro level and to understand patterns of language use and shift among the students of the elite schools.

2.4.3 Role of schools in language maintenance and shift

Schools are the primary sites where L-i-E policy is implemented and contested (Cooper, 1989; Corson, 1999). Emphasising a balanced bilingual approach, Corson (1999, cited in Menken & Garcia, 2010) observes that the purpose of language planning in school should be to consider how best to teach a national standard variety, teach English and maintain and revitalize community and heritage languages. Discussing the recent trends in language maintenance in Canada, Kouritzin (1999) opines that the respective roles of the home, school and community should be taken into consideration in order to help minority children maintain and enhance their L1 development. In his eight-stage reversing language
shift (RLS) model Fishman (1991) focuses, in stage 5 and 4, on mother tongue literacy and the use of heritage languages in school.

Similarly, Baker (2006) and Crawford (1989) consider mother tongue education an essential ingredient for language maintenance. McCarty (2002b, p. 304) also recognizes the role of schools in language maintenance: “Schools can be constructed as a place where children are free to be indigenous in the indigenous language in all of its multiple and ever-changing meanings and forms”. Fishman (1992), although recognizing the role of schools in language maintenance, sees little role for schools in reversing language shift because schools can only supplement, not replace the intimate intergenerational transmission. Hence it can be assumed that school is one of the key domains where attitudes towards languages are changed and shaped; where the occurrence or reversal of shift may be possible. While looking at the role of school in language shift or maintenance, we should not confine ourselves to the domain of school alone in terms of time and space. Since attitudes and ideologies are enduring, they may influence the students’ use of a particular language not just inside the school domain, but also in other domains, and may continue to influence students even after their school life.

### 2.4.4 Language maintenance and shift in Pakistan

In the multilingual society of Pakistan the majority of people speak two languages (Urdu and a regional language), and a significant portion of the population also speak a third language, English. For various reasons, Urdu, which is the national lingua franca, and English, which is the colonial legacy, have dominated the regional languages. There has been a growing tendency of negative attitude towards these regional languages, and in certain cases obvious shift from Punjabi towards Urdu have also been noted (Mansoor, 2005). The negative attitudes towards and possible shift from the regional languages could be attributed mainly to the instrumental value as well as prestige and status associated with the dominant languages, Urdu and English.

After a cursory look at the situation of regional languages in Pakistan in light of May’s (2006) language shift stages (see Section 2.4.1), one may assume that the regional languages could be somewhere in the middle or advanced level of the second stage of language shift, at least in urban centers. The regional languages have been excluded from
official domains right from the founding of Pakistan. Similarly, their role in education, especially in higher education is minimal. The spread of English-medium private and certain government-sponsored schools have totally excluded these languages from education. As a result of the widespread contact between two dominant and one minority language, more and more Pakistanis, especially the youth of urban centers, are speaking Urdu and English. If a significant number of Pakistanis, especially in rural areas, have not been affected by these tendencies, it may be because conditions or facilities which can trigger language shift, such as English-medium schools, have not yet reached these areas.

2.5 Conclusion

This review has mapped out the theoretical framework that informs this study. I have examined language planning and policy (LPP) with particular focus on language-in-education, language attitudes, and language maintenance and shift. Exploring the evolution of the field, this review has demonstrated that LPP has come of age from the classical approach, i.e. a policy of monolingual hegemony based on a single national language and a rejection of any serious role for minority languages, to an approach that calls for examining LPP as an outcome of the social, political, ideological and historical processes, and upholds linguistic diversity and language rights. More recently, LPP experts and language activists have been calling for serious attention to the decline of indigenous languages due to the spread of globalisation and global languages. Under the new approach, it has also been established that LPP is not only a top-down, macro-level activity of the government, but that a rather significant amount of language planning occurs at the micro-level as embodied in the practices, attitudes and beliefs of the individuals, communities and institutions.

This broad theoretical framework is appropriate to this study because Pakistan as a multilingual state has been following a language policy in which Urdu and English are at the centre of status, prestige and acquisition planning. The dominant role of the two languages in the spheres of education, the media and institutions, both governmental and private, are rendering the indigenous languages neglected, worthless and in a state of decline. Owing to the strong link between this policy and social, political, ideological and historical forces, any efforts to promote the indigenous languages have been fruitless.
This study is mainly concerned with language planning at the micro-level; as such the language-in-education (L-i-E) policy in this review was examined thoroughly because it is considered to be the most powerful resource for bringing about language change (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). In this regard schools are the primary sites where L-i-E policy is implemented and contested (Cooper, 1989; Corson, 1999), and are the key to language maintenance (Spolsky, 2009). The survey of literature reveals two aspects of L-i-E policy: the medium of instruction (MoI) and language(s) as additional subject. From a critical approach to LPP in general, there is a growing interest to critically examine MoI in terms of its orientations: assimilationist or pluralistic, monolingual or bilingual. MoI is also examined in terms of its role in promoting social stratification as it determines which social and linguistic groups have access to political and economic opportunities and which groups are marginalised (Ramanathan, 2005a; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). Similarly, the teaching of additional language(s) has its own significance, especially in the monolingual programs where it can result in additive bilingualism (Spolsky, 2009).

The literature also revealed the relevance of language attitudes to LPP because they are essential to the formulation and implementation of LPP practices (Baker, 2006; Choi, 2003). Moreover, since L-i-E policy “influences the behavior of others with respect to acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their codes” (Cooper, 1989, p. 45), and since schools have a central role in the whole process, the impact of such a policy on the students’ language attitudes, practices and maintenance becomes worthy of investigation.

In short LPP theory has shown that LPP, which is concerned with the status, prestige and acquisition of dominant, national or official language(s), can have serious implications for marginalized languages. The policy can negatively influence peoples’ language attitudes, patterns of language use, and their language maintenance and shift. It has also been established in this review that an investigation of LPP should not be confined only to the official policy as enunciated through various documents; it also entails an in-depth understanding of micro-level planning where the stakeholders’ language attitudes, preferences and practices hold the key to getting a true picture. This theoretical background is relevant to my study, which is aimed at understanding the dynamics of L-i-E at English-medium schools, especially of the elite category. These schools enjoy immense autonomy in their L-i-E policy, which can be termed assimilationist (Corson, 1999) and replacive immersion (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Whilst Urdu is taught as a compulsory subject,
Pashto, the mother tongue of a majority of the students, is not only excluded as medium of instruction, it is also not taught as a subject. In the following chapter I map the sociolinguistic milieu of Pakistan with particular focus on the evolution of LPP as an outcome of historical, social, ideological and political processes.
CHAPTER 3: THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC MILIEU OF PAKISTAN: AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF LANGUAGES AND LPP

3.1 The linguistic landscape of Pakistan

This study attempts to understand the language planning and policy (LPP), both at the macro- and micro-levels, in Pakistan. A study of LPP at macro level entails an examination of policy as expressed in the constitution, statutes of parliament, reports of the ministry of education, and documents of educational boards. A study of LPP at macro level in this study involves an analysis of the historical development of language policy as explicitly stated in various policy documents from the colonial rule to present. LPP at micro level is concerned with the actual language practices and management. LPP according Spolsky (2004) not only includes the explicit aspects such as the declared policy of a government but also the implicit aspects such as the practices and beliefs of a community. Relating language beliefs and practices to language management, Spolsky (2004, p. 14) further notes that “they can be a basis for language management or a management policy can be intended to confirm or modify them”. The main focus of this study is to understand LPP at the micro level, and as such to understand the language attitudes and practices of the English-medium schools students. Data was collected over three month ethnographic case study at two elite English-medium private schools (see chapter 4 for details). Findings are discussed in Chapter 5 and onwards. The current chapter, after describing the linguistic landscape of Pakistan generally, gives a detailed historical account of the language policy (at macro level) and critically analyses the social, political and economic (Ricento, 2000; Tollefson, 2006) forces that have shaped and influenced language policy in Pakistan.

Pakistan is a federal state comprising four provinces: Baluchistan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Punjab and Sind. Other areas include the capital territory and the group of seven federally administered areas (FATA). The government of Pakistan also exercises de facto jurisdiction over two other political entities; i.e. the western part of Jammu and Kashmir, known as Azad (independent) Kashmir, and Gilgit Baltistan. Pakistan has Iran to its east, Afghanistan to its north-west, China in the north, India to its east and the Arabian Sea to its south. The present state of Bangladesh was also part of Pakistan as its eastern wing before 1971. The following paragraphs deal with the demography of Pakistan in general and KP province in particular as understanding the contemporary map of languages on the ground.
requires prior reference to cultural history as well as to linguistic geography (Shackle, 2007).

The areas comprising Pakistan were the sites of several ancient cultures including the bronze era Indus Valley Civilization (2600-1900 BC) and the Neolithic Mehrgarh (7000-2500 BC). In the subsequent eras this region attracted many invaders and settlers, and thus at various times became part of empires and dynasties such as the Indian Empire, Arab Caliphates, Mongol, Mughal, Durrani Empire, Sikh and the British Empire. When the British rule came to an end in 1947, British India was divided into two states: India and Pakistan. Thus, as Shackle (2007, p. 100) observes, “the linguistic situation in Pakistan is a complex product of a variety of historical and cultural factors which have helped to shape both patterns of language use and the conceptions of ethnicity which are associated with these”. Similarly, the geography and landscape, which is so varied and diverse, add further to the diversity of ethnicity and languages in the region.

The languages spoken in this region belong to the Iranian and Indo-Aryan branches of the Indo-European languages. The ethnologue published by the summer institute of linguistics lists 66 languages spoken in Pakistan (Grimes, 1992). However, Rahman (2002) estimates 57 languages including English which is a second language for most of the educated Pakistanis. Table 3.1 below gives details of the percentage of speakers of the six major languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of speakers in 1998</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Estimated speakers in 2008</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Areas of prominence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>58,433,431</td>
<td>44.15%</td>
<td>76,367,360</td>
<td>44.17%</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>20,408,621</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
<td>26,692,890</td>
<td>15.44%</td>
<td>KP, FATA, Baluchistan and Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindi</td>
<td>18,661,571</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>24,410,910</td>
<td>14.12%</td>
<td>Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saraiki</td>
<td>13,936,594</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>18,019,610</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>Southern Punjab (and adjacent parts of KP, Sind and Baluchistan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>10,019,576</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
<td>13,120,540</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchi</td>
<td>4,724,871</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>6,204,540</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>Baluchistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Percentage of speakers of the six major languages in Pakistan, adapted from Rahman 2002.
Source: Census 1998 (The population was 132, 352, 000 in 1998; with a 2.69% growth rate it is assumed to be over 170 million in 2008.)
Note: Before 1971 when Bengal was part of Pakistan, Bengali was the language of the largest majority of Pakistan.
Although most of the languages could easily be identified with the area they are spoken in, for instance Sindi in Sind, some still need a little explanation. Urdu, which is the national language and is understood by many Pakistanis, is the native language of Indians (Mohajirs) who migrated from India after partition and settled mostly in the urban centers of Karachi and Hyderabad of Sind province. Saraiki is the language of people in Punjab and in some adjacent southern parts of KP, Sind and Baluchistan. Hindko is the language of people in Hazara division, Kohat and D.I. Khan districts in KP province. I dedicate the following section to the demographic description of Pashtuns because the study is primarily concerned with the language attitudes and preferences of Pashto speaking students.

3.1.2 The Pashtuns

The people who speak Pashto language and are living in the north-western parts of Pakistan and the adjacent south-eastern parts of Afghanistan are called Pashtuns. Historians and anthropologists have put forward various hypotheses about who Pashtuns are originally. Among them Khwaja Niamatullah, Hafiz Rehmat Khan, Qazi Attaullah and Afzal Khan Khattak relate them to the decedents of Jews, one of the lost tribes. This view is also supported by orientalists like H. W Bellew, Sir William Jones and Major Raverty who find a striking resemblance in the physiognomy of Pashtuns and Jews (Khan, 1992). They believe, according to Khan (1992), that the prevalence of biblical names, certain customs and superstitions, especially smearing of the door post and walls of the house with blood of sacrificial animals, further substantiates this theory. The theory, however, is doubted by the famous writers of Pashtun history like Syed Bahadur Shah Zafar, Sir Olaf Caroe and Ghani Khan. Khan (1992, p. 2), who tends to relate them more to the Greek rather than Jews, comments on the origin of Pashtuns in his book The Pathan in these words:

Most people look at his nose and say he is a Jew. Because they cannot link him with anyone else, they say he is one of the lost tribes. His Islamic faith, and its inevitable influence on his life and manners, give a certain plausibility to this impression. Yet the basic principles that rule him no matter who the King is are more Spartan than Jewish.

Whatever he might be, he is not a Jew, for where will you find a Jew who will tell his child about war and courage, death and glory! He is perhaps a mixture of every
race that came to India from the heart of Asia: the Persian, the Greek, the Mongol and the Turk.

The best course would be to forget how it all started and look upon what he really is today. Neither a Jew nor a Greek, but a temperamental neighbour who might become a loving friend, or a deadly enemy. He knows no happy medium; that is his greatest virtue and his greatest drawback.

As we will see in the section on Pashto dialects, the words *Pashto* and *Pashtuns* are pronounced with a /sh/ sound in the Southern and Eastern Dialect, while in the Western and Northern Dialect they are pronounced as *Pakhto* and *Pakhtun* with a /kh/ sound. Similarly, in most of the Indo-Aryan languages they are called *Pathans*, the name which the British also preferred to use. Although it is difficult to draw the precise boundaries of the areas where Pashtuns live, the estimate of Penzl (1955, pp. 1-2) is fairly realistic:

In Pakistan Pashto is spoken in the Northwest Frontier Province in the districts of Peshawar, Hazara [Pakistan], Kohat, Bannu, Dera Ismail Khan, also in the territories of Swat, Buner, and Bajaur. It is also spoken in northeastern Baluchistan in the Quetta-Pishin, the Loralai, Zhob, and Sibi areas; in the Punjab it is still spoken in the border areas of Mianwali and Attock. The whole tribal area between Pakistan and Afghanistan is Pashto-speaking.

In Afghanistan the Pashto-speaking area is in the East, the South, and the Southwest. Pashto is spoken in the entire Eastern [mashreqi] Province, which has Jelalabad [Dzhelalabad] as its capital; in the southern [szhinubi] administrative province with Gardez [Gardeez] as the principal city; in the southern and central parts of the province of Kabul outside of the Hazara [Afghanistan] territory; in the entire province of Kandahar [Qandahar]; and in most of the administrative province of Farah.

Pashto is the second most widely spoken native language after Punjabi in Pakistan. According to the 1998 census, the population of Pakistan was over 132 million and, as estimated in Table 3.1 above, could have well reached the figure of 170 million by 2008. This is an estimated figure because no census has been carried out since 1998. These figures show the total population of Pashto speakers in all areas including FATA and Baluchistan. The percentage of Pashto speakers in various areas is: 73.9% in KP, 99.1% in FATA, 29.6% in Baluchistan and 4.19% in Sind.

According to Mackenzie (1969, p. 450) Pashto has branched out of the Aryan family of languages which “divided into its distinct Indian and Iranian branches more than three millennia ago”. Figure 3.1 below, which is based on Grierson’s (1921) description of how
the division might have occurred, shows the origin of Pashto and some other languages in Pakistan.

![Tree diagram of the origin of Pashto based on Grierson (1921)](image)

### 3.1.3 Dialects of Pashto language

Pashto is generally believed to have two dialects: the hard Pashto in which the speakers pronounce the letter ښ as \(/x/\) or \(/kh/\) and the letter ږ as \(/g/\), and the soft Pashto in which the same letters are pronounced as \(/\Š/\) or \(/\sh/\) and \(/\ž/\) respectively (Hallberg, 1992). Thus “woman” is pronounced as \(/xә`ja/\) and “beard” as \(/gira/\) in hard Pashto, and \(/\Šәja/\) and \(/\žira/\) in soft Pashto respectively. A similar two dialect view is also expressed by Grierson (1921, p. 7):

> Two main dialects are, however, recognised, that of the north-east, and that of the south-west. They mainly differ in pronunciation. The Afghans of the North-east pronounce the letter ښ as \(/kh/\) and letter ږ as \(/gh/\) (Hard form), while those of the South-west pronounce them \(/\Šh/\) and \(/\Žh/\) (soft form), respectively.

Later writings, however, point to four dialects on the basis of finer phonological distinctions. For instance, MacKenzie (1959, as cited in Hallberg, 1992) distinguishes four dialect areas based on five different phonemes: South-west (Kandahar), South-east (Quetta), North-west (Central Ghazali), and North-west (Yousafzai). In his Sociolinguistic Survey of Northern Pakistan, Hallberg (1992) takes these previously followed criteria of phonological differences a step further and supplements them with lexical criteria. He compared Pashto word lists collected in 34 different locations in Pashto-speaking areas of Pakistan and Afghanistan (see Figure 3.2) and came up with four dialects as shown in Table 3.2 below.
Orthographically, Pashto uses the Arabic alphabet with the addition of the letters needed to make the sounds peculiar to Pashto, usually in $Naskh$ form (Penzl, 1955), which were created in the area where the Kandahar (southern) dialect is spoken. Scholars agree that despite differences in the various dialects, which are phonological in nature, there is a standard written form, which overshadows the phonological differences among the various dialects (MacKenzie, 1959 as cited in Hallberg, 1992, p. 8):

The criteria of dialect differentiation in Pashto are primarily phonological. With the use of an alphabet which disguises these phonological differences the language has, therefore, been a literary vehicle, widely understood, for at least four centuries. This literary language has long been referred to in the west as ‘common’ or ‘standard’ Pashto without, seemingly any real attempt to define it.

Figure 3.2:  shows areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan where Pashto is spoken.
3.1.4 Pashto Literature

A brief overview of the history of Pashto literature is deemed relevant here because the history of Pashto language is closely linked to that of its literature. For a very long time, the literary figures, most of whom were either associated with or inspired by the *Khudai Khidmatgar* (God’s servants of the people) movement of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, remained the only custodians and promoters of Pashto language. The relation between *Khudai Khidmatgars* and Pashto language is further discussed in section 3.2.2.1.

Pashto has a long literary tradition. Although the oral literary tradition is believed to be over 5000 years old, *Khair-ul-Bayan*, of Bayazid Ansari (1526-74) is considered to be the first extant work in Pashto. The book, however, has been criticised for its objectionable and heretical view of Islam by many, particularly by Akhund Darweeza (1533-1615) in his book *Makhzan ul Islam*, which is considered as the second book in Pashto. The literary period after this is dominated by Khushal Khan Khattak (1613-89), the chief of his Khattak tribe. A brave warrior and a prolific writer, Khushal Khattak authored 350 books of poetry and prose on subjects of religion, jurisprudence, sports, ethics, medicine, philosophy and falconry. The other great poet of the same era was Rahman Baba (1653-1709). He was born in a village south of Peshawar. He was influenced by the great Persian poets such as Saadi, Hafiz and Rumi. He is venerated as a Sufi (mystic) because his verse is infused with the spiritual longing for the divine.

With the dawn of the 20th century, a new breed of literary figures emerged who were inspired by Pashtun nationalism under the influence of the *Khudai Khidmatgars* movement. *Khudai Khidmatgars* had two closely linked and rather indispensable goals: to liberate the nation from British rule, and to reform Pashtun society through promoting a sense of Pashtun identity, modern education, political awareness and shunning the culture of guns and violence. As such, writings of this period portray ideals of modernism, pluralism, democracy, economic and social justice and freedom. Although the list is long, some of the prominent literary figures are: Amir Hamza Shinwari, Dost Mohmmend, Abdul Akbar Khan, Ghani Khan (the son of Abdul Ghaffar Khan), Samandar Khan, Ajmal Khattak and Qalandar Moomand (he wrote the first Pashto to Pashto dictionary). Along with these individual figures, literary forums like *Adabi Jirga*, *Bazm-e-Adab*, *Ulasi Adabi*
Jirga, and Adaby Tolana also played a significant role in promoting Pashto language and literature.

### 3.1.5 Pashtunwali

For Pashtuns, Pashto is not just a language but a sublime value that epitomizes and encompasses the basic principles of their society. Thus it is very common in Pashtun society that when a person does not stand for some principles, like he or she breaks a promise or violates any of the codes described below, he or she is told: “You have not fulfilled Pashto to me”.

The principles which define the way of the Pashtuns, the code of honor which governs their society is called specifically Pashtunwali. The main tenants of this code are: Ghairat and Nang (chivalry, honor), Melmastya (hospitality), Purdah and Namus (gender boundaries) and Jirga (council). The first trait, Ghairat, has two aspects: honourable actions in battles, and the defence of honor against shame by another person (Kakar, 2005). The defence which “requires a show of superior force by the insulted person” (Barth, 1965, p. 82) is called Badal or revenge. The second trait, Melmastya, or hospitality refers to the feeding of strangers and friends as well as defending the guest against his enemies. The guests are entertained in Hujra or the men’s guest house. Melmastya in which a guest is protected against his enemies is also called Nanawati, which means to enter into the security of a house (Kakar, 2005). Namus is the kind of honour which pertains to the practice of segregation or separation of the sexes. Pardah or veil is considered as a way of controlling women, and in a way men also. Hence men are bound by the rules of Namus and are restricted from stepping into the space reserved for women as women are restricted from entry into men’s space (Kakar, 2005). The fourth trait of Pashtunwali is Jirga, which is the council organized by Pashtuns on a village or regional level. The council decides disputes by consensus and their decisions are binding on the parties involved. Pashtuns who sit on the council must be known for their honor and their practice of Pashtunwali (Kakar, 2005). This detailed view of the demographics of the society now sets the scene for an account of the language policy.
3.2 The language policy of Pakistan: An historical account

3.2.1 Language policy in the British era

The British policy regarding the diffusion of English among Indians, according to Rahman (2005), went from “orientalist” to “Anglicist” from 1835 onwards. Under the orientalist approach the religious languages of both Hindus and Muslims, like Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit, were used in the domains of education and the courts. The British officers adopted Indian customs and wrote in Urdu and Persian so much so that they were being referred to as “white Mughals” by William Darlymple (2002, cited in Rahman, 2005). The Anglicist lobby, however, replaced Persian with English and other vernacular languages when in 1835 the Governor General William Bentinck, a man of Anglicists views, accepted T. B. Macaulay’s recommendations that Indians should be taught English at the higher level of education and that the Indian elite should be Anglicised (Rahman, 2005). Referring to this decision as an “educational apartheid”, Rahman (2005, p. 8) comments:

The old feudal elite (in chiefs colleges) learnt good English which they used even for informal conversation with each other. The masses, on the other hand, struggled with English at school and had to contend with it during college and university days when they gained working proficiency in it, though it never became the language of preferred, private conversation. English thus became a marker of urban, middle and upper class identity which it remains even today.

The new language-in-education policy in the British India was seen as an ideological move “where English education was adopted as a colonial strategy to enhance national unity and successful governance” (Durrani, 2012, p. 32).

The British officials in Northern India and later in Punjab (parts of which now comprise Pakistan), however, retained Urdu as a suitable medium for lower levels of administration and education (Shackle, 2007). As a result of considerable expansion of education and diffusion of print media by the colonial state “both English, and on a far wider scale, Urdu gained currency as standard languages throughout the region” (Shackles, 2007, p. 104). Sind, however, was an exception because its separate occupation and administration resulted in promotion of Sindi instead of Urdu.
Even though the Angliscist language policy was termed as discriminatory by most of the locals, there were strong voices among Muslims, as with Hindus, who favored education in English because Muslims were at a disadvantage by shunning English while Hindus had earned employments as well as the rulers’ favor by embracing English education. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-98) and Nawab Abdul Latif (1828-93) were prominent among those who encouraged Muslims to receive education in English. This pro-English movement was even given religious sanction when Shah Abdul Aziz (1748-1823), a religious reformer and authority, pronounced that it was permissible for Muslims to learn English, but for purely instrumental reasons (Rahman, 2005). Despite these efforts, Muslims remained skeptical about education in English.

As stated earlier, Macaulay’s recommendations, famously known as Minutes on India in 1835, stirred a significant shift in the colonial language policy. He argued that education in English would produce a much needed reservoir of officials for the empire (Macaulay, cited in Bergs & Brinton, 2012, p. 2080):

> We must at present do more to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, in intellect.

The policy led to the setting up of schools by the government of the East India Company, and later by the government of the British Queen. Moreover, with the setting up of the first three universities in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1957, English started to be the language in the domain of higher education. This division of English-medium and vernacular-medium schooling has remained a defining characteristic of education in Pakistan, and arguably even within the larger subcontinent (Durrani, 2012).

Macaulay’s 1935 Minute is still at the heart of the debate on colonial education policy, regarded in its nature and purpose as cultural imperialism (Carnoy, 1974) and linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). Carnoy (1974, cited in Evans, 2006) claims that strong emphasis on European learning in a colonial curriculum was intended to promote a sense of cultural inferiority and inadequacy among indigenous students. Similarly, Phillipson’s (1992) central thesis in linguistic imperialism is that the British imposed the English language on their colonial subjects for political and economic purposes. However, an opposing perspective on colonial education policy, known as enlightened paternalism,
came from Whitehead (1988). He contends that the policy was significantly influenced by the needs of Britain’s Asian and African subjects who increasingly came to regard modern education in English as the means not only to socio-economic advancement, but also intellectual and political liberation (Whitehead, 1988, cited in Evans, 2006).

3.2.2 The British attitude towards Pashto


Pashto is all important as the lingua franca on the Indian North-West Frontier. If there is any trouble there, the knowledge of Pashto is indispensable. Its political importance can be gauged from the fact that it is studied in both German and Russian Universities. It is also the language of our Pathan troops.

Thus one can easily infer two reasons why Pashto was important for the British: to use it in order to deal with the people effectively, and to counter the influence of the Russians, their adversary empire in the region which was taking a lead in learning and teaching Pashto, and thus gaining strategic advantage. This realization, therefore, became instrumental in the learning of Pashto by English officers which then led to the writing of Pashto learning books and dictionaries. However, it was the German writers, Dorn and Grieger, who produced pioneering works on Pashto. Dorn’s Chrestomathy of the Pashto and Grieger’s articles inspired and guided British interest in Pashto (Rahman, 2002).

As a result of this interest, George Morgentierne (1932, cited in Rahman 2002) did some scholarly work on Pashto and some other languages of Pakistan. Mohabbat Khan (1806-7) produced the first linguistic study of Pashto, Riaz-ul-Mohabbat, a grammar book and dictionary for Sir George Barlow, the acting governor of NWFP (Rahman, 2002). Subsequent works worth mentioning are: Ajaib-ul-Lughat (1819) by Allah Yar Khan, a dictionary of Hindustani-Persian-Pashto; Farhang Irtizai (1810) by Mohammad Irtiza, a Pashto-Persian-Urdu dictionary; Tutor to Pashto (1896) by Maulvi Ismail Khan (Rahman, 2002).

However, despite the realization of the importance of Pashto for their own utility, and some individual efforts mentioned above, the British did not take any major measures to
teach Pashto to Pashtuns. The main reason for this, according to Rahman (2002), was the British belief that it was politically more expedient for Pashtuns to become Indianized, and to this end, while Pashto was tolerated as an unofficial medium in primary schools mainly for translation, the real prominence was given to Urdu (as already discussed in Section 3.2.1). The following excerpt from a report cited in Rahman (2002, p. 364) clearly depicts this belief:

At present in many of the border schools, all that the best scholar can do is to translate the Goolastan into Pushtoo after his own fashion; but the teachers are gradually brought under training in the Derajat and Peshawar Normal Schools, where they soon pick up a knowledge of Urdu, which they will, on their return communicate to their pupils. (Edn. P 1864a: 3)

There were some experiments and some individual efforts by British officers to teach Pashto, but due to the general apathy among the British these efforts did not make any significant impact. In contrast to the situation in Pashtun areas of British India, Pashto gained great prominence in the state of Swat (now a district of KP province), established in 1915 and recognized by the British in 1926. The ruler or Wali of Swat, Miangul Abdul Wadood replaced Persian with Pashto as the official language. He ordered the teaching of Pashto, for which books were written, translated and printed in Pashto (Hussain 1962, cited in Rahman 2002). Due to this language policy, Pashto remained very strong in Swat, particularly in the domain of education. As Pashto remained largely neglected in the official and educational domains in Pashtun areas of British India, the following section gives a nutshell account of the tension between forces which supported it and those which opposed it during the colonial era.

3.2.2.1 Pashto and the politics of Pashtun nationalism

Pashto was proposed as an identity marker by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the founder of the anti-British and pro-Congress Khudai Khidmatgar Movement which began in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) in 1929 (Rahman, 1995). Members of this movement, also known as the “Red Shirts”, were inspired by the communist ideology of the Soviet Union on one hand, and Pashtun nationalism on the other. In their struggle for the welfare and unity of the Pashtun nation they were seen as the supporters of the Pakhtunistan movement, which coincided with the Afghan irredentist claims on the
Pashtun populated areas of British India (now Pakistan). With regard to the language policy of the British, particularly in the north-western parts, Abdul Ghaffar Khan and his movement resisted the British policy of teaching Urdu by opening schools in tribal areas. Since these schools accepted neither state aid nor the prescribed curricula, they were called “Azad” (free) schools (Khan, 1969, cited in Rahman 2002). The medium of instruction in these schools was Pashto. The schools were only confined to the nationalist circles and, therefore, did not make significant impact on the wider population, which was developing a more positive attitude to Urdu as the language of education because it guaranteed jobs to them. As Rahman (2002,) notes, when Sahibzada Abdul Qayyum Khan (1864-1937), the first chief minister of NWFP, carried out a survey of Pashtun opinion about medium of instruction in 1929-30, he found that the Pashto-speaking population was practically unanimous in favor of instruction throughout in Urdu. Accounts and everyday conversations are usually in Urdu and never in Pashto (Rahman 2002, p. 367).

This is a classic example of how a language is favored or shunned due to its utility value in society. The real opposition, however, came from the speakers of Hindko with significant proportions of Hindus and Sikhs (Rahman, 2002). This turned the opposition to Pashto into a religious issue as well. Abdul Qayyum Khan tried to adopt a balanced language policy according to which, as reported in the Khyber Mail (1935, cited in Rahman, 2002, p. 367):

> Pashto is henceforth to be the medium of instruction in the NWFP but only in the 1st and 2nd class—and in the Pashto speaking areas only. In Hindko speaking areas Urdu will continue to be the medium of instruction. Even in areas where Pashto will be enforced as the new medium, Urdu alone will be the sole medium of instruction in the 3rd and 4th primary classes.

Even this effort did not conciliate the parties favoring Pashto and the parties opposing it, and thus the Hindu and Sikhs observed a ‘Black Day’ on 7 August 1936 against the teaching of Pashto. The situation made Dr Khan Sahib, the elder brother of Ghaffar Khan and a leader of Congress in NWFP, promise that the circular (regarding the teaching of Pashto) would be repealed (Rahman, 2002). For a year or so neither Dr Khan’s Congress nor Qayyum Khan’s Muslim League insisted on the teaching of Pashto. However, in 1938 Dr Khan’s government succeeded in making it the medium of instruction in schools in Pashto-speaking areas only.
3.2.3 The post-independence language policy

When Pakistan came into being as a result of the freedom and partition of British India in 1947, the newborn state inherited British values and systems in various sectors such as bureaucracy, the army, the judiciary, administration and education. Although continuation of the British system in most of these areas was unavoidable and proved quite helpful for the new dispensation to survive, the education policy, especially with respect to language, has been a matter of controversy, division and class-based discrimination. According to Rahman (2002), the British left behind a legacy of three streams of education roughly divided along socio-economic lines: the Madrassas (religious schools) catered for rural and very poor children; vernacular medium schooling for working and lower-middle class children; and English-medium schools for the middle and upper classes. This system, Rahman notes, continues to date.

Many of the nation’s leaders who came from the Urdu-speaking provinces of India conceived a language policy which would promote “Pakistani ethnicity through the cultural heritage of the Urdu language” (Ayres, 2009, p. 6). As such, Urdu, a variant of Hindustani with significant influence of Arabic and Persian, was declared the national language of Pakistan soon after its creation. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan, in his address at the convocation of Dhaka University in 1948, declared that the people of different provinces would determine the official language of the province (Jinnah, 1948, cited in Burke, 2000). Mohammad Ali Jinnah, however, further added that it could only be Urdu that would serve as a bridge between the peoples of different provinces and be the official language of Pakistan (Khalique, 2008). Highlighting the indispensable role of language in the ideology of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah added that anyone who tried to mislead the nation on national language would be “the enemy of Pakistan” because without one state language “no nation can remain tied up solidly together and function” (Jinnah, 1948, cited in Burke, 2000, p. 150). This emphasis on one common language reflects similar epistemological assumptions as that of the British, i.e. speakers of the same speech community would consider themselves compatriots of a united nation and therefore easier to govern through one state language (Durrani, 2012, citing Ayres, 2009). The intention behind making Urdu the national language, despite the presence of languages of larger majorities such as Bengali, Punjabi, Sindi and Pashto (see Table 3.1), therefore, was to pre-empt and neutralize the language-based ethnic movements, which could break
up the new state. The policy of Urdu as the national language, however, was not without problems, both ethno-linguistic and social. According to the census of 2001, Urdu is the mother tongue of about 7.5% of the state’s population (Government of Pakistan, 2001, as cited in Rahman, 2004b) comprising Muslims who migrated to Pakistan after the partition and settled mostly in the urban centres of Karachi and Hyderabad in Sind province. The presence of this large migrant community, known as Mohajirs, and the state’s Urdu-centric language policy have always fuelled ethnic and linguistic tensions in Sind.

The most significant consequence of this policy, however, was the opposition of the Bengali intelligentsia to Urdu. The Bengali language was a symbol of a consolidated Bengali identity in opposition to the West Pakistani identity. Moreover, Bengali was considered a potent tool to gain a just share of power in federal government and in Bengal (East Pakistan) where the most powerful and lucrative jobs were controlled by the west Pakistani bureaucracy and military. These apprehensions of the Bengali intelligentsia are also echoed in Putz (2004), who observes that the elite in African states employ official language policies to limit access of non-elite communities to political influence and socio-economic success. Consequently, Bengalis resorted to violent demonstrations in favor of making Bengali a national language. Finally the government installed Bengali as the national language alongside Urdu, “but this was not enough to remove other grievances which eventually led to the Bengalis’ secession in 1971” (Powell, 2002, p. 241).

In 1948 an advisory board of education was set up to review the education system. The board in its first meeting resolved that mother tongue should be the medium of instruction at the primary school stage. Also a number of institutions were established or supported by the state to do basic work in Urdu: from coining new terms, to translations, to developing new tools and techniques to expedite its adoption as an official language (Rahman, 1996).

The Sharif commission, formed in 1959, had recommended that Urdu and Bangla be used as mediums of instruction from Class 6 onwards, and in about fifteen years Urdu would reach a point of development where it would become the medium of instruction at university level. The commission, however, did not make clear how and when and by whom it would be determined that Urdu was ready to replace English. Following the commission’s report, when Urdu was made the language of education up to class VI, there was strong protest in Sind as “this meant that Sindi, which was a medium of instruction up
to matriculation (Class 10), would now be replaced by Urdu” (Rahman, 1997, p. 150). Finally when the decision was reversed as a result of Sindis’ opposition to Urdu, it contributed to a permanent wedge between the native Urdu speakers (Mohajirs) of Sind and the Sindis.

3.2.4 Language policy in Ayub Khan era

Even though the previous commissions had recommended the promotion of Urdu and Bengali, there was a revived emphasis on the promotion of English during the reign of General Ayub Khan (1858-69). He established cadet colleges and other institutions besides sponsoring the semi-autonomous schools like Aitcheson College, Burn Hall, Lawrence College, Karachi Grammar School and many convent schools across Pakistan where negative attitudes towards Urdu and regional languages prevailed so much so that Urdu was considered “a language of servants and taxi drivers” (Khalique, 2008, p. 101). On the other hand Urdu medium schools and institutions were established to provide the elite and affluent middle class with an “underclass of clerks, Munshis and literate servants” (Khalique, 2008, p. 101).

Consequently, the policy of promoting the elite English-medium schools was criticized for their role in promoting injustice in the society. Ayub Khan’s insensitivity to the public criticism of his education policy led to nationwide strikes by students in East Pakistan in 1962 and Peshawar in 1964 (Rahman, 2004a). According to the Commission on Students Problems and Welfare (CSPW), the students demanded that Pakistani languages should be made medium of instruction; that missionary (English-medium) schools be banned, and that all schools be on a par with each other. However, the CSPW, appointed to investigate these demands, finally refused to make any changes to the education system (Rahman, 2004a).

In 1971 the eastern wing of Pakistan got separated and the state of Bangladesh was established. In addition to many political, ideological, administrative and socio-economic factors, the Bengali-Urdu controversy was also an instrumental factor that led to the dismemberment of Pakistan. The state of Pakistan was given a new constitution in 1973 under the rule of the Pakistan Peoples’ Party led by Zulfiquar Ali Bhutto. As evident from
the language-specific article (251) below, the language policy was again left shrouded in confusion and open to manipulation. The article states:

- The national language of Pakistan is Urdu, and arrangements shall be made for its being used for official and other purposes within 15 years from the commencing day.
- Subject to clause (1), the English language may be used for official purposes until arrangements are made for its replacement by Urdu.
- Without prejudice to the status of the national language, a provincial assembly may by law prescribe measure(s) for the teaching, promotion and use of a provincial language in addition to the national language.

Khalique (2008) notes that the timing of the constitution coincided with the lapse of the 15-year lease given to English by the Sharif Commission and hence renewed that lease for another 15 years. When Sindi was made the official language in Sind, following clause (3) of the article of the 1973 constitution, the Urdu speaking Mohajirs in urban centers again resorted to protests.

The ethnolinguistic tension, which had started as a result of Sindis’ opposition to Urdu as recommended by the Sharif Commission (Report of the commission on national education, 1959) (as discussed in 3.2.3), resurfaced in January-February 1971. This time the Mohajirs protested against the decision of Sind University and the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education to promote Sindi. More violent protests by Mohajirs took place in 1972 as a result of the passing of a bill in the assembly which made both Sindi and Urdu compulsory subjects in Classes 4 to 12 and knowledge of Sindi necessary for jobs (Rahman, 1997). While the linguistic controversies persisted in Sind and Bengal all these years, the provinces of Punjab, Baluchistan, and North West Frontier Province (NWFP) continued with their Urdu policy in schools.

3.2.5 LPP in the General Zia era (1979-1988)

The next phase in the language policy making started with the martial law rule of General Zia-ul-Haq (1979-1988). He made efforts to Urdu-ise the government functioning. With the aim of strengthening the ideological foundations of the state, Zia-ul-Haq’s language
policy recommended that Urdu be used as medium of instruction and that English schools be abolished (Mansoor, 2004). In 1985 when I was a government school student in my native village, all of a sudden the morning assembly commands changed from “stand at ease…attention” to the Urdu version “Asan Bash…Hoshyar”. Accustomed to the English expressions for years, the change sounded quite strange to most of us. However, as Powell (2002) notes, the move to Urdu medium was accompanied by more conservative and religious content, with Arabic becoming a compulsory subject. Thus we witnessed the introduction of Arabic as a subject from Classes 6 to 8. This was part of the General’s plan to legitimize his rule through the so-called Islamization of the society through promoting Arabic and Urdu. During that time the students in mainstream government schools in Pashto-speaking areas had to cope with four languages: English, Urdu, Pashto and Arabic. The language policy of General Zia, which favored Urdu and Arabic, strengthened the role of these languages in schools. For instance Urdu, which was made compulsory in class XI and XII in professional colleges, continues to be so (Mansoor, 2004). However, overall the language policy mostly remained unchanged especially with regard to English-medium schools which continued to serve the elite. In this regard, Mahboob (2002) notes that in 1983 the General gave legal protection to the elite English-medium schools to continue with their English-only L-i-E policies.

This tendency of using language(s) for political control in Pakistan reflects what Cooper (1989) calls the use of language by those who want to promote themselves and achieve power through mass mobilization. Rahman (1999) clearly exposes the ideological and political considerations behind the apparently confused and chaotic language policy in Pakistan. He notes that the state's language policy in Pakistan is using Islam to prevent national disintegration, Urdu to contain regionalism, and English to check Islamization.

### 3.2.6 LPP in the PPP, Muslim League and General Musharraf eras

The language policy in the successive governments of Pakistan People's Party (PPP) and Muslim League (1989-1999) remained almost the same. The elite private schools continued to flourish; the position of Urdu, as strengthened by General Zia, remained the same; and the indigenous languages remained largely neglected in the domain of education. Emphasis on Islamisation and glorification of war on the one hand, and the adoption of policies promoting private sector education on the other (Rahman, 2004a) thus
continued to widen the gulf between the haves and have-nots socially and ideologically. The government of General Parvez Musharraf, which took over in 1999, announced in the National Report on Education (Government of Pakistan, 2004) the introduction of English as a second language as a compulsory subject from Class 1 in a phased manner in all provinces. The report says nothing clear about the native languages except a vague reference to one of the responsibilities of the ministry of education: “National language and other languages should be used for official purposes including medium of instruction” (p. 2).

3.2.7 Language policy under the PPP and allies (2008-2013)

The government (2008 to 2013) which is led by the People’s Party and its allies took some practical measures as far as language in education is concerned. The historic 18th Amendment Act of 2010 gave greater autonomy to provinces as a result of which education policy largely became a provincial subject. In fact the education policy had already been announced in 2009 in accordance with the spirit of the 18th Amendment Act. The ten policy statements as expounded in the National Education Policy of 2009 (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 20) are:

1. The state shall provide greater opportunities to the citizens and areas that have been largely excluded from mainstream development and participation in the national processes, by ensuring even and equitable human development across Pakistan.
2. Governments shall identify schools in less developed areas for prioritisation in resource allocation and management for improving quality.
3. Ministry of Education, in consultation with Provincial and Area education departments, relevant professional bodies and the wider public, shall develop a comprehensive plan of action for implementing the English language policy in the shortest possible time, paying particular attention to disadvantaged groups and less developed regions.
4. The curriculum from Class I onward shall comprise of English (as a subject), Urdu, one regional language and mathematics, along with an integrated subject.
5. The Provincial and Area Education Departments shall have the choice to select the medium of instruction up to Class V.
6. English shall be used as the medium of instruction for sciences and mathematics from class IV onwards.
7. For the first five years, Provinces shall have the option to teach mathematics and science in English or Urdu/ official regional language; but after five years the teaching of these subjects shall be in English only.
8. Opportunities shall be provided to children from low socio-economic strata to learn English language.
9. A comprehensive school language policy shall be developed in consultation with provincial and area governments and other stakeholders.
10. Federal, provincial and area governments shall develop joint strategies with main Madrassah systems, through consultations, to formally integrate market-oriented and skills-based subjects in the Madrassahs’ curricula - subjects that would enable the children graduating from Deeni Madaris to have wider employment options.

As clearly shown in point 3, 8, 9 10, an attempt has been made to strike a balance between promoting English in the disadvantaged areas on the one hand and strengthening regional languages in the curriculum on the other as mentioned in points 4-7. The empowerment of provinces to decide the medium of instruction as well as the introduction of mother tongue (MT) subject for up to Class 5 itself is a significant step for the promotion of regional languages. Section (3.2.8.1) takes a detailed view of the measures taken in the KP province in the light of these recommendations.

3.2.8 Language policy in the post-independence KP province

In Section 3.2.2.1 we saw that the political and ideological positions of the “Red Shirts”, who were perhaps the only supporters and custodians of Pashto language and Pashtun culture, put Pashto in a dilemma. The British (before partition) preferred the teaching of Urdu over Pashto because they wanted an Indianized identity for Pashtuns as Pashto was seen as a symbol of Pashtun nationalism. The opposition to Pashto in education continued even after the partition and no government in the post-partition Pakistan took any serious measure to promote Pashto, like the way Sindi was promoted in Sind, because Pashto still continued to carry the symbol or stigma of Pashtun nationalism of the “Red Shirts” who were regarded as anti-Pakistan and separatists (or pro-India and pro-Afghanistan).

Ironically, the National Awami Party (the post-partition body of the “Red Shirts”), which came to power from April 1972 to February 1973, also moved away from Pashto and made Urdu the official language of NWFP (Rahman, 1995). The move, however, is regarded by many as the nationalists’ attempt to remove the anti-Pakistan stigma associated with them for their opposition to the partition of India. As the nationalists still remain perhaps the only supporters and custodians of Pashto, Pashtun culture and identity, the dilemma of Pashto continues as its supporters are not only politically weak in Pakistan, but are also
seen with skepticism by many in the civil and military bureaucracy and in the mainstream media of Pakistan. With time when the ruling elite found Pashtun nationalism, with Pashto as its symbol, less threatening, and when identity-conscious Pashtuns like Qalander Mohmand and Khwaja Sail, Director of Pashto Translation Project, made a strong recommendation, Pashto was made medium of instruction in 1984 in the Pashto-speaking districts (Khattak, 1998, cited in Rahman, 2002).

In 1979 the Soviet Union occupied Afghanistan. While the Pashtun nationalists urged Pakistan’s neutrality and non-interference in Afghanistan's internal matters, the military dictator General Zia-ul-Haq made Pakistan the frontline state against communism, and the Pakistan military and intelligence agencies actively supported the American CIA and Afghan Mujahideen (the Islamic freedom fighters). Although the Soviets were finally forced to leave Afghanistan, the decade-long war sowed the seeds of religious extremism which later grew into Talibanisation among the Pashtuns of Afghanistan and Pakistan. When America attacked the Taliban government after the events of 9/11, anti-West and pro-Taliban sentiments grew stronger among the Pashtuns. Thus the Mutahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA), the alliance of various religious parties, gained an overwhelming majority in the 2002 elections in NWFP under the reign of another military dictator, General Pervez Musharraf. Following in the footsteps of the previous governments, the MMA also took measures to promote Urdu. They neglected Pashto because it was still regarded as a symbol of Pashtun nationalism, anti-Pakistan and separationist. Thus both Pashto and the Pashtun nationalists were at the receiving end during the five-year rule of MMA.

The events, however, took a different turn in the 2008 elections. Disillusioned with their suffering in the name of Jehad and Islam for almost two decades, and with the stigma of terrorism attached to them internationally, Pashtuns in the NWFP this time voted the Awami National Party, led by the grandson of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, into power. Despite their staunch adherence to the principle of non-violence advocated by their great leader, when the Pashtun nationalists formed the government in NWFP, they found themselves in the midst of another US-led war, this time the war on terror. ANP has been the only political force which has opposed religious extremism, both of the Afghan Jehad type and the Taliban type, practically and ideologically. Consequently, they lost hundreds of their party workers, several district heads, members of provincial assembly, and the top leadership faced several suicide bomb attacks. As the blood of the Pashtuns continued to
spill on both sides of the border, the nationalists achieved their long-standing goal of 
restoring the historical name “Paktunkhwa” for NWFP (the full name is Khyber-
Pakhtunkhwa) through a landmark constitutional amendment on 19 April 2010. The 
following section gives a detailed account of the implications of the 18th amendment for 
the language-in-education policy in KP.

3.2.8.1 Language policy in KP: Recent developments

When I was writing my research proposal prior to my field trip, I mentioned I had not been 
aware of any steps taken by the provincial government to promote Pashto because I had 
been in Auckland since they came to power. I anticipated that I would be able to gain 
further knowledge of the developing situation during my field trip. Interestingly, while I 
was busy with collecting data at one of the schools, in late 2010 I saw a news report about 
the provincial government’s4 decision to make mother tongue a compulsory subject at 
schools. This attempt by a provincial government to embed mother tongue instruction in 
schooling across one of the most linguistically diverse parts of the country appears to be in 
line with the National Education Policy of 2009 given that Maths and Science subjects will 
be taught in English (Coleman & Capstick, 2012). Later, in August 2011, the KP 
government took further steps with its multilingual education initiative by approving the 
formation of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority, geared for the 
promotion of all languages of the province (Appendix I). The provincial assembly passed 
the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Language Authority Act (Government of KP, 2011). 
The seven goals of the authority as outlined in the draft Act are to:

1) Consider ways and means for promotion of regional languages and to make all 
necessary arrangements in this regard for teaching, promotion and use of regional 
languages.
2) Coordinate and ensure correct use of regional languages.
3) Promote the use of regional languages through publications and to undertake 
preparation and publication of dictionaries, encyclopedias, reference books, 
scientific literature and periodicals.
4) Arrange translation and publication of technical terms in science, home economics, 
humanities and commerce subjects.

4 The KP government at that time was run by ANP, the Pakhtun nationalists and followers of the Khudai 
Khidmatgar movement led by the visionary Abdul Ghaффar Khan (see Section 3.2.2.1). As a result of the May 
2013 elections, the ANP government was replaced by Pakistan Tehreek-i-Insaf (PTI) and its coalition 
partners. By the time of the writing of this thesis, they have not come up with a clear L-i-E policy.
5) Announce and arrange prizes, awards, seminars, lectures and adopt any other measure for promoting any of the objectives.
6) Recommend to government a curriculum and syllabus for the gradual teaching of the regional languages, spoken in the province, and
7) Take any other steps which are incidental or consequential to any of the aforementioned functions.

To implement the recommendations of the Act, a phased plan was announced according to which both the government and the private schools of the province will teach mother tongue (MT) as a compulsory subject from Class 1 to 12. Initially all 25 districts, of which 17 are Pashto speaking, will start teaching MT as a compulsory subject from Class 1 to 6. Nine of the 17 Pashto speaking districts, where Pashto is already taught from Classes 1-6 (introduced in 1984), will start teaching Pashto to Class 7 in 2012, Class 8 in 2013 and so on till Class 12. All other districts where MT (Pashto, Seraiki, Kohistani, Hindko and Khowar) is not already taught will start teaching MT subject from classes 1-6 in a phased manner. Hence they will start teaching MT to Class 1 in 2012, Class 2 in 2013 and so on up to Class 6. Due to the fact that Pashto is the dominant language of the province, a language which some of the students from other language backgrounds might want to learn, non-Pashto students will be able to opt for their own MT or Pashto as a second language. Similarly, private schools, where MT has been totally ignored, will start teaching MT as a compulsory subject from Class 1 in 2012 and then up to Class 6 in the same phased manner as described above. Therefore, by 2017-18 all the educational institutions in the province up to Class 12 or intermediate level will have the students’ MT as a compulsory subject (Government of KP, 2011).

In the long history of language controversy which started during the colonial period and continues even today, the measures taken by the ANP-led provincial government provide a ray of hope as far as Pashto and other native languages in the province are concerned. However, as the common feature of Pakistan’s political history, there is no guarantee that policies of one political party will be retained if another party comes to power. Already some of the mainstream parties, historically opposed to the politics and ideology of the Khudai Khidmatgars, are trying to politicize the issue at various forums like the Senate, National and Provincial Assemblies, public gatherings and in the media. The Gandhara Hindko Board, an association of the Hindko Speakers, organized a “Two Day Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Languages and Cultural Conference” in Peshawar. The focus of the conference was to raise awareness of some of the endangered languages in the north of KP
province. The conference speakers also criticized the current language policy of the government and expressed doubts about its intentions, in spite of the fact that the policy is not discriminatory to other languages in the province like Hindko, Saraiki, Kohistani, Seraiki and Khowar as they too will be taught in their respective areas. In Chapter 5, I discuss findings related to the stakeholders’ attitudes towards the policy; I also reflect on some problems that marred the implementation of the policy.

3.3 The education system of Pakistan

The education system has been a highly centralized affair in Pakistan with the Ministry of Education in charge of coordinating schools and colleges up to Class 12 (intermediate) in the entire country. The educational system in Pakistan can be divided into seven levels as shown in Table 3.3 below. The boards of intermediate and secondary education (BISE), under the ministry of education, are responsible for registration, syllabi, textbooks and examinations of the government and private schools. The private schools, however, have freedom to choose their curriculum, mainly the textbooks, especially for classes which are not being examined by the board. These include the O Level (equivalent of Classes 9, 10/ Matriculation) and A Level (Higher Secondary/Intermediate/Class 11, 12), which come under the University of Cambridge, and all courses/textbooks from pre-school to Class 8. Most of the private elite schools offer the O/A Levels parallel with the BISE stream. So students who opt for the BISE are taught the prescribed textbooks of the boards as their exam is board based. All students, whether in government or private schools, are taught Urdu, Islamic Studies and Pakistan Studies as compulsory subjects up to Class 12. Finally, a distinction must be made between different categories of English-medium schools which, according to Rahman (2004a) are: state influenced elitist schools, elite private schools and non-elite private schools. Due to their large number and complex variation in terms of quality, courses and fee structure, the non-elite are difficult to describe as a clear category.
Table 3.3: A brief summary of the education system in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Usual duration</th>
<th>Medium of instruction</th>
<th>Other details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>Govt. schools: Urdu  MT</td>
<td>Medium of instruction in government schools, though not usually mentioned in government reports, is either Urdu or native language of the respective region. Mainly four subjects (English, Urdu, Mathematics, Islamic Studies) are taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elite private schools: English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Class 1-5</td>
<td>Govt. schools: Urdu  MT</td>
<td>English, Urdu, Mathematics, Science, Islamic studies and Pakistan studies (social studies in the case of private schools) are compulsory subjects at both government and private schools. Pashto is a compulsory subject in government schools only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elite private schools: English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Elementary</td>
<td>Class 6-8</td>
<td>Govt. schools: Urdu</td>
<td>English, Urdu, Mathematics, Science, Islamic studies and Pakistan studies are compulsory for both government and private schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elite private schools: English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Class 9, 10</td>
<td>Govt. schools: Urdu</td>
<td>Syllabi and exams for matriculation are controlled by BISE. Syllabi and exams for O level are controlled by University of Cambridge. Students of O level study English, Urdu, Islamic Studies and Pakistan Studies as compulsory subjects and three optional subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matriculation) O level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elite private schools: English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Secondary</td>
<td>Class 11-12</td>
<td>Govt. schools/colleges: English (Teachers and students, however, mostly use Urdu and MT in class.)</td>
<td>Syllabi and exams for intermediate are controlled by BISE. Syllabi and exams for A level are controlled by University of Cambridge. Students have to study at least 3 subjects to pass the exam. Students of A-level who wish to continue bachelor's degree in Pakistan must also study Urdu, Islamic studies and Pakistan studies in order to be eligible for enrollment at university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intermediate or FA/FSc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elite private schools: English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Govt. universities/colleges: English (Teachers and students, however, mostly use Urdu and MT in class.)</td>
<td>Most of the professional courses at this level are either taught in university campuses or professional institutions. However, a great number of courses of general sciences and arts are taught through postgraduate colleges affiliated with the nearest regional universities. Islamic studies, Pakistan studies and one course of English (in some universities) are compulsory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Year 13-14)</td>
<td>Private colleges/universities: Mostly English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Govt. universities/colleges: English (Teachers and students, however, mostly use Urdu and MT in class.)</td>
<td>Most of the professional courses at this level are either taught in university campuses or professional institutions. However, a great number of courses of general sciences and arts are also taught through postgraduate colleges affiliated with the nearest regional universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Year 15-16)</td>
<td>Private colleges/universities: Mostly English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: in some cases Bachelor’s is 3 years, so MA is completed in 17 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of them may be truly English-medium with Oxford and Cambridge syllabi and teachers fluent in English, but a majority of them are English-medium only in name.

Higher education, which entails the university education of bachelors and masters, too is controlled by a central body, the Higher Education Commission (HEC), previously known as University Grants Commission. The medium of instruction for the majority of courses in most of the universities in the government sector is English although there are a few exceptions in Sind and Punjab, while in the private sector the medium is English overall. Since the focus of this study is the language attitudes and preferences of school students, and the language in (school) education policy, I will not discuss higher education any further and focus instead on schools in the following pages.
3.3.1 The elite English-medium schools

The elite schools are modelled on the British public school system; fees are extremely expensive; the medium of instruction is English (Coleman & Capstick, 2012). Established by private entrepreneurs in major cities, these schools have branches across the country. Munir (2004) reports that there has been an almost ten-fold increase in the number of private schools (from about 3300 in 1983 to approximately 32000 by the year 2000). Due to the poor standard of government schools, parents in poor communities have also started sending their children to private schools (Harlech-Jones, Sajid, & ur-Rahman, 2005; UNESCO, 2002). The average monthly tuition fee of a student in some of the prestigious schools is between 8000 to 12000 rupees, which is far more than the monthly income of an ordinary laborer. Most of the students undertake Ordinary Level and Advanced Level exams (O level and A level) of Cambridge University as this later on affords them advantage in getting admission to British and American universities, where the majority are destined to go for higher studies. Their schools have books written by native speakers of English with attractive pictures and creative exercises. The schools expose them to real-life situations and extracurricular activities and thus equip them to speak English fluently (Rahman, 2007).

The students in these schools are exposed to western ideas and they develop a liberal world-view. But at the same time Rahman (2004a) believes they are “social snobs”. The Nur Khan report (Government of Pakistan, 1969, cited in Rahman, 2004a, p. 34) which investigated the students’ uprising against General Ayub’s education policy notes that “there was almost a caste-like distinction between those who feel at ease in expressing themselves in English and those who do not”. As he further notes, they look down on their fellow citizens who attend vernacular-medium schools and Madrassas. They are also alienated from Pakistan’s culture, languages, literature, dress, and even cuisine. This situation is quite similar to that in many African states. For instance, Omoniyi (2003) observes that there is an African-wide attitude that regards English as an instrument of true social progress, equality and justice accompanied by a negative attitude towards indigenous languages as a medium of instruction in the school system.
Mindful of the fact that the current parallel streams of education in Pakistan (i.e. the government and elite private schools) create unequal opportunities for the students, the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, pp. 19-20) acknowledges that:

These elite schools cater to a very small minority of school going children. The bulk of lower middle class and poor children study in the non-elite low quality private and government schools, which fail to produce students who can compete for high end jobs…. Most of these elite schools follow the Cambridge or London University O/A level systems that have a different curriculum, assessment system and textbooks. A major bias of the job market for white collar jobs appears in the form of a candidate’s proficiency in the English language…. English language also works as one of the sources for social stratification between the elite and the non-elite.

It is indeed encouraging to note that the body which has to be blamed for the disparity and flaw in the education system seems to realize it in all earnestness. In this regard, the policy action plan no. 4 appears to be a significant stride forward:

A common curricular framework in general as well as professional education shall be applied to educational institutions in both the public and private sector. Government shall take steps to bring the public and private sectors in harmony through common standards and regulatory regimes. (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 19)

The policy action statements, as already given in Section 3.2.7, further indicate the good intention of the policy makers to reduce the unjust and discriminatory system by devolving the education policy authority to provinces, enhancing the status of regional languages, and providing opportunities to promote the teaching of English in areas of low socio-economic status.

3.3.2 The non-elite English-medium schools

While the elite schools cater a small minority of the elite and affluent class of society, the bulk of students from lower middle class go to non-elite low quality private schools (Government of Pakistan, 2009). For the past two to three decades, the education landscape of Pakistan has experienced a mushrooming of English-medium schools of the non-elite category in the streets of cities, towns and even small villages. Non-availability of the government schools or lack of facilities and quality education thereof is the main reason why these schools have grown so rapidly. In addition to this, the schools’ claim to be
‘English-medium’ also attracts the aspiring middle and working class parents to send children to these schools, even if the government schools are available. But these claims, as Coleman and Capstick (2012) warn, must be treated with care. Most of these schools fail to produce students who can compete for high end jobs to allow vertical social transition National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009).

The schools charge a modest fee between Rs 50 and Rs 1500 per month, which is far higher than the fees in an average state vernacular school but lower than that of the elitist private English school (Rahman, 2002). The quality of teaching, the academic level of the teachers and their competence, and other facilities as such are commensurate with the fee the schools charge. Due to the weak system of controlling and overseeing private schools\(^5\), the non-elite English-medium schools, like the elite schools, enjoy significant power in choosing their text-books and medium of instruction. According to the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009), most of the schools in this category have Science and Mathematics textbooks in English; however the medium of instruction is mostly Urdu or a mixture of Urdu, English and local vernacular.

For all their shortcomings as compared to the elite schools, the English-medium non-elite schools are still making a good contribution to the overall progress of literacy in Pakistan. They also provide means of living to thousands of educated Pakistanis, especially the women, who otherwise would have remained jobless. In terms of quality of education, it would be unfair to label all of them as below standard. In fact, the variation within these schools is so great that it at times it would be difficult to distinguish a quality non-elite school from an average elite school, at least in terms of quality of education if not the facilities.

### 3.3.2 The elite public schools

The elite schools which are established and sponsored by the state or its institutions are the great public schools, the federal government model colleges and the schools run by various state institutions such as the army. In schools which are established and run by state institutions such as the Army, the Air Force, the Police, the Pakistan International Airlines

\(^{5}\) See Section 5.4 (Chapter 5) for details.
etc., priority is given to the admission of the children of the employees or beneficiaries and the fees charged to them is far less than the fee of other peoples’ children. The Model Colleges of Islamabad are also equipped with far better facilities than the mainstream government schools. Mainly the children of the residents of the posh capital, the majority of whom are serving and retired civil servants, businessmen, feudals and politicians, get admission in these schools and colleges. Some of the elite schools set up in the colonial era still enjoy the status of educating the elite. The famous Aitchison College, Rahman (2002, p. 29) notes, was based upon the aristocratic model of English Public Schools to produce “loyal, Anglicised, elitist Indians who would understand, sympathize with and support the British Raj in India”.

The government elite schools sector is mainly dominated by the armed forces. The schools which are established, financed and administered by the armed forces are the Cadet Colleges, Pakistan Air Force schools, the Military College in Jehlum, the Army Burn Hall Colleges, and many others. The children of army personnel, irrespective of rank, have certain concessions in terms of admission and fees. As such the students of cadet colleges and public schools come from a lower socio-economic background than that of the private English-medium schools (Rahman, 2004a, 2004b). In a survey in 2003, Rahman found that these students were less liberal in their attitudes than their counterparts in the private schools. Thus it can be argued that even though the cadet colleges and public schools teach English as a high priority language, they do not inculcate negative attitudes towards national languages and culture in their students.

The above paragraphs make it clear that the disparity or social stratification is not only influenced by the private elite schools, but also by the state or state institution sponsored elite schools and colleges. One wonders whether and to what extent the recommendations of the National Education Policy of 2009 will be accepted and implemented in these schools, especially in the armed forces schools, given the fact that the military is the strongest organization, at times stronger than the government itself.

3.3.4 Madrassas

The religious schools in South Asia, most of which operate in mosques or units within mosques, are known as Madrassas. The Madrassas teach a curriculum known as Dars-i-
Nizami, first introduced by Mullah Nizamuddin Sihalvi (d.1747) who was a scholar of some repute in Islamic jurisprudence and philosophy in Lucknow (Ahmad, 2004). The Madrassas are supported by the community through trusts, endowments, charitable donations, and Zakat contributions. Although the Madrassas were already there, their number increased manifold after 1979 when Pakistan, under the rule of General Zia, supported the Afghan war (or Jehad in a religious sense). There is no accurate and authentic data about Madrassas in Pakistan as most of them are not registered with the Ministry of Education. Ahmad (2004) notes the number of Madrassas of all types in Pakistan is around 14680. According to some estimates their number could be over 28000. However, the claim is not supported with empirical evidence. According to an estimate of the Ministry of Education about 1.6 million students were enrolled in Madrassas in 2007-2008.

Rahman (2002) conducted a survey of students from Madrassa, government and private schools and found that 43.51% of the Madrassa students favored Urdu and 25.16% Arabic as the medium of instruction. Both English and mother tongue were favored by only 0.76% each. Similarly a far larger number of Madrassa students favored a military solution of the Kashmir dispute and very few of them believed in the equality of men and women (Rahman, 2002). The data clearly depicts the Madrassa students’ inclination towards extreme views.

The National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009) recognizes Madrassas as private sector institutions which, like the elite private schools, also lead to a type of social divide. Young children, the report states, educated in Madrassas normally do not have skills that enable them to seek employment outside the realm of duties associated with clerics. This leads to social tension due to a sense of exclusion among children educated in these institutions. As a result of this sense of seclusion and deprivation, many such students become prone to getting brainwashed and recruited by the extremist elements within the Madrassa system. The state and society of Pakistan suffered heavily at the hands of these elements for more than a decade. Finally, the government decided to register and regulate the syllabi of Madrassas and provide them resources in the form of funding, skills-based textbooks, guidance, etc. in order to bring them on a par with other educational institutions. The policy action statement 10 of the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 20) clearly outlines the government’s goal:
Federal, provincial and area governments shall develop joint strategies with main Madrassa systems, through consultations, to formally integrate market-oriented and skills-based subjects in the Madrassas’ curricula - subjects that would enable the children graduating from Deeni Madaris to have wider employment options.

Many Madrassas, however, are resisting the government’s plan of registration, regulation and the introduction of modern knowledge and English as a subject in the syllabi. Their skepticism regarding the government’s Madrassa reforms stems from an orthodox Islamic view (as held and interpreted by some) that the knowledge of religion is superior to worldly knowledge. Moreover, they are also skeptical about accepting a change proposed by a system which is more akin to western ideals than Islam in the spheres of governance, education, law and economics.

3.3.5 Government schools

According to Pakistan Education Statistics (Government of Pakistan, 2008), about 67% of the whole school-going population in Pakistan attends the various categories of government schools such as primary, middle and secondary/high schools. The medium of instruction in government schools, although not generally mentioned in government reports, is either Urdu or the native language of the region such as Pashto or Punjabi. The textbooks are prepared by the respective regional boards of education. Their quality in terms of content (tasks, activities, etc.) and material is regarded as far lower than the textbooks which are used in the English-medium schools. Rahman (2004a) refers to the use of textbooks in government schools as an instrument for inculcating a particular worldview and ideology. As he notes, “there is so much glorification of war and the military, and the anti-Hindu and anti-India remarks and religious bias interspersed throughout the textbooks” (p. 27). The worldview here is in sharp contrast to the one that I discussed in the case of the elite private schools. Moreover, the textbooks tend to promote the Pakistani national identity so rigidly that the ethnicity or values, history and heroes of other ethnic groups are totally ignored. These centrist policies have been resented by various ethnic communities and have even resulted in separatist tendencies as was seen in the case of the loss of the East Wing (Bangladesh).
While comparing the three streams of schools in Pakistan in socio-economic terms, Rahman (2004a) reveals that the children of ‘haves’ get education in the elitist English-medium schools, the middle class join the Urdu-medium schools, while the ‘have nots’ frequent the Madrassas. Due to the poor condition of government schools, as I have mentioned, an increasing number of parents in Pakistan are sending their children to private schools (Alderman, Orazem, & Paterno, 2001). Depicting a gloomy picture of these government schools, Abbas (2003) reveals that the teachers are frequently absent or late for class; that the curriculum reflects a compromise to satisfy various political pressure groups; that teaching is dull and uninspiring; that textbooks are poor, both in quality and content; and that examinations are characterized by rampant cheating and corruption. In addition, the average number of students in a class may range from 60 to 80, which often renders teaching and learning highly inefficient. Harlech-jones et al. (2005, p. 564) found through a survey of school students’ parents in Northern Areas of Pakistan that 80% of the respondents believed the government schools:

- do not facilitate good employment opportunities for students in later life;
- do not ensure that their students learn to read English well;
- do not provide good quality education;
- do not have good discipline amongst teachers;
- do not have relations with parents;
- do not have good discipline amongst their students.

The above perceptions together with a multitude of problems related to resources, poor administration and ideology-ridden syllabi make government schools the least preferred choice for the parents to send their children to. In a survey of about 230 students Rahman (2002) found that most of the students in government schools are from low income families. The government now seems to have awakened to the alarming situation in which the parallel streams of government and private schools are causing social stratification. The National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009), therefore, lays great emphasis on reducing this gap. In this regard the following statements of the policy action under Sections 3.4 and 3.5 are worth-mentioning:

- Provincial Governments shall encourage private education at the school level as an option available to those who can afford such education. At the same time,
Governments shall take steps to encourage public sector institutions to draw benefit from the resources available in the private sector.

- A common curricular framework in general as well as professional education shall be applied to educational institutions in both the public and the private sector. Government shall take steps to bring the public and private sectors in harmony through common standards, quality and regulatory regimes.

- The state shall provide greater opportunities to the citizens and areas that have been largely excluded from mainstream development and participation in the national processes, by ensuring even and equitable human development across Pakistan.

- Governments shall identify schools in less developed areas for prioritisation in resource allocation and management for improving quality.

- Ministry of Education, in consultation with Provincial and Area education departments, relevant professional bodies and the wider public, shall develop a comprehensive plan of action for implementing the English language policy in the shortest possible time, paying particular attention to disadvantaged groups and less developed regions.

3.4 Conclusion

While all these years, before and after the inception of Pakistan in 1947, were fraught with language controversies and riots, which mostly involved the underprivileged masses, the privileged continued to rule in English and English reigned supreme (Khalique, 2008). As mentioned earlier, both the Sharif Commission (Government of Pakistan, 1959) and the 1973 constitution had declared that English was supposed to continue as the official language until such time that the national language(s) replaced it. However, as Rahman, (2004b, p. 5) notes: “This date came and went by and English is as firmly entrenched in the domains of power in Pakistan as it was in 1947”. The National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009) provides some reason for optimism since the basic precursor of its recommendations, i.e. the devolution of authority in the education sphere to provinces, is now enshrined in the constitution through the 18th Amendment.

One is not sure whether the implementation has been complicated by economic considerations, political influence, time factors, lack of will or all of these. As Cooper (1989, p. 185) suggests, “implementation of a decision may require repeated efforts by planners to cope with the resistance of those they seek to influence”. Unfortunately, there is an inherent lack of will and commitment among the planners in particular and the
population in general to promote the marginalized indigenous languages in Pakistan. Those who are concerned are not powerful enough to force implementation of the language policy against a multitude of odds. This leads us to believe that there is a lack of conviction in acquisition planning for the regional languages in Pakistan. Mere rhetorical support will not achieve the stated goals of promoting a language unless there are incentives for the language and opportunity for it to be a school language (Hornberger, 2006). This lack of conviction in promoting the vernacular languages could be attributed to the state's covert language policy that has always been English-centered regardless of what the constitution might have declared. Rahman (2007) notes that the civil bureaucracy and the armed forces, both of which are institutions of the state, invested heavily in creating an English-medium system of education. The elitist English-medium schools continued educating the children of the elites, especially the civil bureaucracy and the military. As Cooper (1989) observes, language is often used by those who want to promote themselves and achieve power through mass mobilization. The English language has been retained as an instrument in the hands of the elites to maintain their superiority over those who do not have adequate access to it in education (Stiller, 1993). It does not only create socio-cultural and socio-linguistic chaos, it also causes emotional and cultural displacements, which together may be termed “cultural anarchism” (Giri, 2010). English in Pakistan is the preferred language of the civil and military elites as it gives them the “competitive edge” and “cultural capital which has a snob value and constitutes a class-identity marker” (Rahman, 2006, p. 77). Echoing a situation almost similar to Pakistan, Putz (2004) observes that in (post)colonial African states languages such as English, French and Portuguese are spoken almost exclusively by members of the social elite, who also employ official language policies to limit access of non-elite communities to political influence and socio-economic success. In the context of South Asia, Ramanathan (2005a, p. 112) highlights the “generally divisive role that English seems to play in the larger scene”.

In this chapter I have given a detailed account of the forces of colonization, bureaucracy, military and the elite which did their utmost to promote English and Urdu as the dominant languages and which neglected the regional languages for various reasons, some personal and some national. However, an important variable in the whole debate is the masses, the people who matter, who have to choose, maintain, learn and use these vernaculars. The pro-Pashto forces like the nationalist followers of Khudai Khidmatgars may not represent the whole of the Pashtun population. How and to what extent have the existing language
policies together with the current forces of globalization influenced language-related perceptions of the people? In this study I am trying to discover the language attitudes and preferences of English-medium school students and their parents and teachers, which no doubt is a specific section of the society.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to investigate language-in-education (L-i-E) planning at the micro-level in the context of two elite English-medium schools (School A and B). It also examines the students’ language attitudes and language practices which, according to Spolsky (2004, p. 14), “can be a basis for language management or a management policy can be intended to confirm or modify them”. Research into these language-based issues involves a systematic and principled inquiry (Brown, 2004) and falls somewhere along the qualitative-quantitative continuum (Brown, 2004; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). This study employs a mixed-methods research design to achieve its research goals.

The purpose of this chapter is to explicate the design of this study, provide a background of the study context and participants, and discuss the procedures and instruments that were used to collect and analyze data. In designing my study, I follow Creswell (2009, p. 5) who maintains that a research design or plan involves the “intersection of philosophy, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods”. I begin this chapter with the discussion of the philosophical worldview or research paradigm with which the study is aligned. Following that I discuss case study and mixed methods as strategies of inquiry; features of qualitative and quantitative studies also come under discussion in this section. Before I move to the specific instruments that were used to collect data, I find it appropriate to introduce the context and participants of my study. This also explains the criteria for site selection and my own positionality as a researcher. After that I discuss the specific tools I used for data collection, such as semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, observations, review of documents and the questionnaire. I then describe the rationale and approach to the analysis of data. Finally, I discuss the criteria for judging the worthiness of the research.

4.1 The research paradigm

Guba and Lincoln (1994) argue that no researcher should go about the business of inquiry without being clear about the paradigm that informs and guides his or her approach. Echoing the same view, Creswell (2009, p. 5) suggests that “individuals preparing a research plan make explicit the large philosophical ideas or worldview they espouse”. A paradigm, according to Bogdan and Biklin (1998, p. 22), is “a loose collection of logically
related assumptions, concepts, or propositions that orient thinking and research”. Philosophically, a researcher’s worldview or paradigm entails his/her claims about what is knowledge, i.e. ontology; how we know it, i.e. epistemology; and the process of studying it, i.e. methodology (Creswell, 1994). There are four paradigmatic positions that researchers take with regard to knowledge: Post-positivism, constructivism/interpretivism, advocacy participatory and pragmatism. In the following section I discuss interpretivism, the paradigms with which this study is aligned.

4.1.1 Interpretivism

The interpretivist approach to knowledge creation (Bernstein, 1995) is based on the view that there can be no understanding of the social world without interpretation (Johnson, 1987). In other words interpretivism is needed because human action and discourse cannot be analysed with methods of the natural and physical sciences alone (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this respect interpretivism challenges the deterministic explanation of human behaviour that establishes a causal relationships between variables and espouses a worldview that attempts to embrace the complex and dynamic quality of the social world, and allows the researcher to view a social research problem holistically, get close to participants, enter their realities, and interpret their perceptions as appropriate (Hoepfl, 1997; Leitch, Hill & Harrison, 2010, citing Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Shaw, 1999).

Interpretivism is often combined with constructivism (Creswell, 2009; Mertens, 1998) as there are multiple constructions and interpretations of reality (Merriam, 2002). Reality, as Myers (2009) contends, can only be accessed through social construction such as language, consciousness and shared meanings. To that end, a constructivist paradigm is underpinned by observations and interviews to get information. Interpretation makes meaning of that information by drawing inferences (Williams, 2000) and/or understanding the phenomena through the meanings that those involved ascribe to them (Gephart, 2004). The meaning making process, therefore, is complex, involving thick and creative descriptions. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) explain the crux of this process as follows:

The researcher does not just leave the field with mountains of empirical materials and easily write up his or her findings. Qualitative interpretations are constructed. The researcher first creates a field text consisting of field notes and documents from the field…. The writer-as-interpreter moves from this text to a research text, notes and interpretations based on the field text. This text is then re-created as a
Both the goals and methodology of this study align with the paradigm of interpretivism. The study sought to understand the phenomena, i.e. the way language-in-education policy is envisioned, contested and implemented at the micro-level of English-medium schools. The study was conducted in its natural setting, with the researcher participating in the social and cultural worlds of the target community using observations and interviews to get their view of the reality, i.e. the phenomenon in focus. I, the researcher, interpreted these understandings in the light of my observations, my familiarity with the research context and with the context of the larger society. This involved drawing inferences from the participants’ responses and looking for patterns and connections in the data transcripts across all the participants.

4.2 Strategies of inquiry

In the above two sections I discussed the philosophical paradigms with which this study is aligned. Now I turn to the strategies of inquiry that were adopted to achieve the goals of this study.

4.2.1 Case Study

A case study research is primarily a form of qualitative and interpretive research although quantitative analyses are sometimes used if they are deemed relevant (van Lier, 2005). Duff (2008) maintains that since case studies can easily integrate qualitative and quantitative data, they can be linked to a mixed-methods design. This study focuses on the L-i-E policy, attitudes and practices in the context of two schools (School A and B); as such it is a multiple case study. The purpose, however, is not to compare or contrast the two cases. Both schools belong to the elite category and are similar in terms of curriculum, language teaching philosophy and resources. As such they represent two cases based on literal replication (Bengtsson, 1999), which implies that the cases selected are similar, as are the predicted results.

Case study, according to Yin (1989), is an empirical enquiry that investigates a phenomenon within its real-life context using multiple sources of evidence when boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clear. In terms of its nature, Yin
(2003) gives three broad categories of case studies, i.e. case studies are exploratory, descriptive and explanatory. The first type of case study is used to search for interesting phenomena for further investigation. The aim of a descriptive case study is to give a complete description of the phenomenon in its natural context. The explanatory seeks to explain how events happen, often linking cause and effect (Richards, 2011).

Almost every definition of case study highlights its bounded nature. According to Gerring (2007, p. 33), a case study is “focused on a single, relatively bounded unit”. Taking a strong position on the bounded nature of case study, Merriam (1988, 1998) asserts that if the phenomenon being studied is intrinsically bounded, it is not a case. Miles and Huberman (1994), however, take a more flexible approach and suggest that intrinsic boundaries may not be so easy to establish. They therefore posit that the case study must be a unit of analysis, in which there is a “heart” or focus of the study, but then there is a “somewhat indeterminate boundary defining the edge of the case: what will not be studied” (1994, p. 25).

Primarily this study investigates L-i-E planning at the micro-context of two elite schools. At the same time, the study takes a dualistic approach to understanding LPP (Ricento, 2006 & Hornberger, 2004) in that it views LPP as the product of its history, politics and social context, which combines the past with current language policy and practices, both at the macro and micro-levels. This leads to a methodological dilemma as far as case study as a research approach is concerned. Gerring (2007) observes that the torment of case study begins with its definitional penumbra. To resolve this dilemma, I concur with Stake (1995) who prefers to call case study an “integrated system”; drawing rigid boundaries around the two cases, School A and B, would have led to the oversimplification and isolation of the cases (Van Lier, 2005). This position is further substantiated by Dyson and Genishi (2005) who contend that at a case, be it a community, a classroom, or a program, “is not a separate entity but a located one, existent in some particular geographic, political, and cultural space and time” (pp. 119-120).

As the boundaries of case study research are porous (Richards, 2011) and as it relates in various ways to other forms of research such as action research and ethnography (van Lier, 2005), I deem it pertinent to discuss some aspects of the methodological approach in this study that are ethnographic in nature. Highlighting difference between case study and
ethnography, Duff (2008) maintains that whereas the former focusses on the behaviors or attributes of individuals or entities, the latter aims to understand and interpret the behaviors, values, and structures of collectivities or social groups with particular reference to cultural basis for those behaviors and values. But yes, confusion may arise, and both approaches could be applicable where the case is a defined cultural group or community (Duff, 2008). The two cases in my study are placed in a defined cultural group; moreover, I as the researcher as well as a member of the community significantly supplement thick description of the context and actors’ behaviors and attitudes with my own interpretations where necessary. Likewise, the three characteristics of ethnography, i.e. discovery, naturalism and understand (Genzuk, 2003) clearly pervade in this study. That said, following Walters (2007) I choose to consider my research strategy as case study because the phenomenon that the research investigated are the two schools, and as ethnographic because I did not consider the schools to be bracketed off from the social, cultural, ethnic, political and historical context.

Like any research strategy, case study is not without its weaknesses. One criticism is that as a research method case study lacks rigor; some case study researchers are dubbed as sloppy and/or biased in the interpretation of data (Yin, 2009). A major criticism of case study research pertains to generalizability—a process of establishing the nature of inferences that can be made about the findings and their applicability to the larger population (Duff, 2008). Some scholars consider this an unfair criticism because “a single case or nonrandom sample is selected precisely because the research wishes to understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many” (Merriam, 1998, p. 208). Duff (2008) prefers to highlight “transferability” as a substitute for “generalizability” in case study. Transferability requires that the research describes the research design, context and conditions so well that the readers can decide for themselves if the interpretations apply to another context with which they are familiar (Brown, 2004; Dörnyei, 2007; Duff, 2008). In Section 4.6 I discuss how I address the weaknesses that pertain to the qualitative aspect of this case study.

4.2.2 Qualitative and quantitative research

These two modes of inquiry, as philosophical rivals, have been introduced briefly in the previous sections. Put simply qualitative research can be taken to refer to research that is
based on descriptive data that does not make use of statistical procedures (Mackay & Gass, 2005). One of the main characteristics of qualitative research is that it involves a range of methods, perspectives and approaches. As Mason (1996) points out, “qualitative research—whatever it might be—certainly does not represent a unified set of techniques or philosophies, and indeed has grown out of a wide range of intellectual and disciplinary traditions” (p. 2). To Nunan (1992) qualitative research is grounded, meaning that theory is generated from data rather than being imposed on it, and that it is exploratory in nature, expansionist, descriptive and inductive. A qualitative approach to inquiry aims to provide a holistic overview of the people, situations or events under study (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), and allows researchers to capture the individual’s point of view, examine constraints of everyday life, and secure rich descriptions of the social world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

Philosophically and methodologically qualitative research is quite different from quantitative research. In qualitative research, researchers try to understand the participants’ experiences in a natural setting using approaches such as ethnography or case study. Instead of numbers researchers collect words (such as texts from interviews and observations) and audio-video footage about the phenomenon under study (Ivankova & Creswell, 2009). Without preconceived hypotheses or ideas they analyze data for common patterns (relationships among themes) in order to allow multiple interpretations of participants’ individual experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In quantitative research, on the other hand, researchers typically gather numeric data; for instance, multiple choice question responses on questionnaires. Researchers then try to analyze the data objectively through certain statistical techniques, and let the numerical results prove or disapprove a hypothesis so that those results can be generalized from a sample to a large population (Ivankova & Creswell, 2009).

Even though qualitative and quantitative modes of inquiry represent two opposing worldviews, in recent times there is a growing tendency among researchers to combine the two. In the following section I discuss why this combination is justified, and how it is applied in this study.
4.2.3 Mixed methods approaches

Mixed methods approaches are now well-established along with the purely qualitative and quantitative traditions in the social sciences. Mixed methods is an approach for collecting, analyzing and mixing quantitative and qualitative data at some stage of the research process within a single study in order to understand a research problem more completely (Creswell, 2008). Dörnyei (2007) notes that the tradition of mixed methods research gained momentum in the 1990s, and the two high profile publications by Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998, 2003) established mixed methods as a legitimate form of inquiry in the social sciences.

Highlighting the usefulness of a mixed methods design, Patton (2002) notes that studies that use only one method are more vulnerable to error linked to that particular method compared with studies that use multiple methods in which different types of data can validate each other. Dörnyei (2007) gives a more comprehensive account of the benefits of mixed methods in terms of three essential qualities. The first quality that impresses Dörnyei (2007) is that the strengths of one method can be utilized to overcome shortcomings in the other. To illustrate this point, Dörnyei (2007, p. 45) refers to criticisms that are typically targeted at one paradigm by proponents of the other:

QUAN researchers have seen QUAL research as being too context-specific and employing unrepresentative samples… On the other hand, QUAL researchers view QUAN research as overly simplistic, decontextualized and reductionist in terms of its generalizations, failing to capture the meanings that actors attach to their lives and circumstances (Brannen, 2005).

Dörnyei (2007) argues that these concerns can be easily addressed and neutralized in a mixed methods approach as the weakness of one approach is the strength of the other. The second quality of mixed methods that Dörnyei refers to is the ability of multi-level analysis to better understand a complex phenomenon by converging numeric trends from quantitative data and specific details from qualitative data. Dörnyei (2007, p. 45) thus concludes that “words can be used to add meaning to numbers and numbers can be used to add precision to words”. He further relates this quality to triangulation, an approach that utilizes multiple methods to corroborate findings and ensure research validity. I discuss triangulation and its relevance to the present study in detail in Section 4.6.1. The third
benefit of a mixed methods approach pertains to its acceptance for larger and multiple audiences. As Dörnyei (2007) puts it: “A well-executed mixed method study has multiple selling points and can offer something for everybody, regardless of the paradigmatic orientation of the person” (p. 46).

Ivankova and Creswell (2009, p. 139) outline four categories of mixed methods design: exploratory, explanatory, triangulation and embedded. Exploratory design is used when a researcher needs first to explore a topic using qualitative data before measuring or testing it quantitatively. In explanatory design, qualitative findings are used to help explain, refine, clarify or extend quantitative results. Triangulation design is employed when a researcher wants to collect both types of data at the same time about a single phenomenon in order to compare and contrast the different findings to produce well-validated conclusions (Creswell, Plano, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003). Finally, embedded design is used when a researcher needs to answer a secondary research question that requires the use of different types of data within a traditional quantitative or qualitative design.

Similarly, drawing on Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) and Johnson and Christensen (2004), Dörnyei (2007, p.169) outlines nine possible combinations of mixed methods design (listed below) with sequence and dominance as the most widely acceptable typological principles. Hence, in the list below capital letters denote priority or increased weight, lowercase letters denote lower priority or weight, a plus sign (+) represents concurrent data collection, and an arrow (→) stands for sequential collection of data.

1. QUAL + QUAN 6. QUAL → quan
2. QUAL + quan 7. qual → QUAN
3. QUAN + qual 8. QUAN → qual
4. QUAL → QUAN 9. quan → QUAL
5. QUAN → QUAL

In this study I employed an ethnographic case study approach using qualitative data collection instruments such as interviews, focus groups and observations. A questionnaire was administered about the same time to get a general picture and to validate the qualitative findings. As such the study is geared towards a triangulation design (Creswell et al., 2003) based on the QUAL + quan mode (Dörnyei, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).
This entails a design in which the qualitative mode of inquiry outweighs the quantitative data, and the two approaches operate simultaneously. The separate methods in the concurrent designs “do not influence the operationalization of each other” and the results are “integrated in the interpretation phase” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 172). The concurrent mixed-methods design, however, is not without its limitations. In case there are discrepancies in results from the two modes of inquiry, a researcher may be unclear how to resolve them (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Although in some cases the researcher might gain new insight from the disparity, in others the research might conduct additional data collection or develop a new project to address the discrepancy (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

All in all triangulation in this study is justified because there is already a well-established scholarly tradition of measuring attitudes quantitatively through tests and questionnaires as well as qualitatively through interviews, focus groups and observations. Moreover, triangulation enhances the trustworthiness of a study by corroborating the research findings through a combination of various methods. Following Lopez and Tashakkori (2006), Figure 4.1 below depicts how data was triangulated in the mixed methods design of this study.

![Figure 4.1: Triangulation design procedures adapted from Lopez and Tashakkori (2006)](image)

Having discussed the broad research strategies that this study adopts, I now introduce the research context and participants to set the scene for the discussion of the methods that were used to collect data.
4.3  Context of the study

4.3.1  The linguistic community

The study was conducted in Peshawar, the capital city of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province of Pakistan. Pashto is the first language of the majority of the people in KP, and is thus the first language of most of the students in the elite English-medium schools where this study was conducted. For a detailed account of the Pashtun community see Chapter 3.

4.3.2  Site selection and access

In selecting the schools, I subscribed to the approach of judgmental or purposive sampling in which researchers choose the sample based on who they think would be appropriate for the study. Purposive sampling in qualitative research entails the inquirer selecting individuals and sites for the study because “they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomena in the study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 125). Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) note that qualitative researchers use nonrandom and purposive sampling techniques because “they seek out groups, settings and individuals where… the processes being studied are most likely to occur” (p. 378). Owing to the goals of this study and its strategy of inquiry, random sampling in the selection of schools would not have served any purpose. The study, which was exploratory in nature and aimed to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon, i.e. language-in-education (L-i-E) at the micro-level and language attitudes and practices, does not aim to generalize its findings; the questionnaire was used only for internal generalization (Duff, 2006).

Although there are many private English-medium schools, School A and School B are among those that truly represent the English-only philosophy of second language teaching. They have a long history of educating children of the elite class and producing students who are distinguished for their competence in English, particularly spoken English (Rahman, 2007). Branches of the schools only in Peshawar were selected because I was interested in the language attitudes and language use patterns of students of English-medium schools whose home language is Pashto. Both schools belong to the elite category and are similar in terms of curriculum, language teaching philosophy and resources. As such they represent two cases based on literal replication (Bengtsson, 1999), which implies that the cases selected are similar, as are the predicted results. In short while selecting the
two schools for this study, my aim was not to compare or contrast the schools in terms of their LPP beliefs and practices.

In addition to purpose, convenience was another factor in selecting the sites and participants. I was a student of School A from 1986 to 1990. My past association with and understanding of the school culture served two purposes: First, it motivated me to choose it as my research site, and second it helped me get a very positive response from the school principal when I made initial contact with the school. In School B, I have a close friend serving in a senior teaching position. He also offered to extend full cooperation and showed a keen interest in my study when I approached him with regard to my intended study. The principal and my former teachers in School A, and my friend in School B served only as “gatekeepers” during this study. I neither used them to influence my participants (students, teachers and parents), nor asked them to make any special arrangements to facilitate my study to the extent that it might have risked the credibility and naturalness of my inquiry.

4.3.3 Researcher’s positionality

I was born and have lived most of my life in the Pashtun community of KP in Pakistan. After about ten years of schooling in my village, I enrolled in an English-medium school in the provincial capital city of Peshawar, where I studied for four years till the completion of my matriculation (Class 10). Hence I still have some memories of the school academic environment, the attitudes to various languages, and the students’ and parents’ socio-cultural and socio-economic status. This familiarity with the research environment and the participants, however, did not trap me into “bias B” (Miles & Huberman, 1994), which occurs when the researcher goes native (Adler & Adler, 1987), i.e. the researcher becomes a participant. The visit for the collection of data for this study was my first contact with the school after twenty years. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, I belong to the rural Pashtun community. The rural and urban communities are quite different in their values, norms, preferences and attitudes. Such social, physical and temporal distance allowed me to enter the research context as an outsider and maintain a balance between emic and etic perspectives.

The research procedures in this study provided for both emic and etic perspectives, both of which are fundamental to ethnographic case study research. The aim in obtaining an emic
perspective was to infer the insider’s point of view, i.e. to describe language attitudes, and language practices as described, demonstrated and practiced by the target population. The etic approach allows the researcher to shift to an analytical view of observing L-i-E planning and language attitudes and practices as an outsider. When taking an emic perspective, Creswell (1998) warns of the risk to the credibility of the data when the researcher is an insider in the studied group. The etic perspective has the advantage of imparting credibility to qualitative data though avoiding insider bias. By adopting an etic perspective, I as a researcher, remained open and non-judgmental (Riemer, 2009) while reporting and interpreting the participants’ beliefs and practices.

4.3.4 The schools

General information about the elite English-medium schools in Pakistan is given in Section 3.3.1 (Chapter 3). Here I describe specifically the two schools where I carried out my research. I only discuss the information that the two schools have made publicly available through their websites and prospectuses. The information that I obtain about them through my research is discussed in Chapter 5.

Although the two schools are not similar in terms of size and overall student population, they follow the same curriculum, cater to the needs of students and parents from the same socio-economic background, offer similar co-curricular environment and have more or less the same vision and philosophy of education. Children of the affluent families who go to the schools are charged a monthly fee of between 7000 to 14000 rupees. Both School A and B run two parallel streams of education, i.e. one under the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (BISE), an organ of the ministry of education, and the second under the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. Table 3.3 (Chapter 3) summarizes basic information about the two streams.

4.3.4.1 School A

School could be called the most representative of the elite category of private English-medium schools in Pakistan. It has hundreds of branches across the major cities and big towns in Pakistan. The school has a student population of over 224,000 students in nine countries (UK, Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Oman, UAE, Pakistan and Bangladesh). The sprawling campus of the school in Peshawar has two divisions within a
single boundary wall: The section for Class 1 to 10, which they call the school, and the section for Class 11-12, which they call the college. At school the boys and girls have separate classes while at college they sit together. The school has a huge open space for the students to play, run and have fun during break time. Since half of my target student population was in the school section (Classes 9 and 10) and half in college (Classes 11 and 12), I had to shuttle between the two sections quite frequently.

The school mission statement states that School A “aims to provide quality education of an international standard. We aim for excellence through quality management, quality training and quality teaching, bringing benefit to our students, the community and the wider world” (School A website). In addition to quality education, the school takes pride in having a comprehensive teacher training program in collaboration with several universities in the UK. As explained on the website, the training department works with University College Plymouth and St. Mark and St. John, to offer teachers two certificates: The Certificate in Professional Education and the Post Graduate Certificate in Professional Development. Teachers can earn a master’s at Leeds Metropolitan University (School A website).

Access to the school was easy because I as an alumnus\(^6\) of the school was able to establish contact with one of my former teachers who is still there. Contact was also established with the principal through a close friend who is secretary to the chairperson of the whole School A system. As indicated in my ethics application, this is how getting access to an organization works in Pakistan. The principal, a young and energetic business graduate, welcomed me warmly and showed keen interest in my research. I explained to him the background of the research and the ethical issues involved; I talked him through the participant information sheets and the consent forms of the teachers and students as well. He appointed a teacher of English to coordinate my activities during the entire duration of data collection.

With the kind and generous cooperation of School A, I was able to observe 15 classes, conduct three focus group discussions, interview nine students and six teachers. In addition to this, my presence in the school at various locations such as the principal’s office, the library and computer room, and my frequent strolls through the corridors and my hanging

\(^6\) I was a student at School A from Class 7 to 10 (1986-1990) in the BISE matriculation stream.
around the playgrounds, during the entire period of research, offered an enriching and insightful experience that was essential to supplementing and corroborating data from other sources.

4.3.4.2 School B

School B, another school of the elite category, is also located in Peshawar; hence, Pashto is the first language of the majority of students. Unlike School A, School B has a small building with a small playground, library and computer room facilities. The number of students and teachers too is significantly smaller than the other school. The school does not have separate sections for the juniors and seniors and the boys and girls. As such, while School A has a moderate kind of co-education, School B has a full co-education system. It has branches in two other cities in the KP province.

Explaining its vision of education, School B claims to provide students with a challenging curriculum, taught by skilled professionals in a learning environment that encourages and rewards academic excellence. The school has a strong belief in the value of parents’ involvement in the education of their children; parents, as such, are urged to join wholeheartedly with the school in supporting and encouraging their children’s commitment to education. The school also boasts its up-to-date pedagogical approach and the professional strength of its faculty:

Our teaching and training methodology is focused on students’ participative learning techniques. The ever growing faculty and professional staff at [School B] is dedicated, experienced and highly motivated to provide quality education with all modern techniques, so that the students can earn a good reputation for themselves as well as for the institution. (School B prospectus)

At the same time it is claimed that the School B curriculum as well as the co-curricular and extra-curricular offerings are second to none: “We strive to create an environment where each and every student is given the attention necessary to achieve his/her individual success” (School B prospectus). In terms of curriculum, which includes textbooks and controlling of exams, school B is affiliated with the University of Cambridge and University of London for GCE O Level and A Level examinations; for matriculation and intermediate examinations, it is affiliated with BISE, Peshawar. The school’s admission
criteria include an entry test in which the applicants must obtain at least 50% in English, Urdu and the Maths components.

I accessed School B through contact with a close friend who is teaching there. As with School A, I explained to all my participants the background of my study, the ethical considerations and their rights. They showed a keen interest in my work and assured me of the best possible support. I was particularly impressed by the students’ interest in the nature and aims of my work. However, as my data collection progressed, for some reason School B was not as open in giving me as much access as School A. Hence, although I was able to conduct the students’ interviews, teachers’ interviews and the focus group discussions, I could not do the class observations. Nevertheless, as I discuss in Section 4.4.4, this situation did not affect my overall results.

4.3.5 The participants

The main participants in this study are the students. Teachers and parents were also interviewed to get a view of their beliefs about the language-in-education policy of the schools, and their own attitudes towards the three languages. The inclusion of parents and teachers served as participant triangulation to corroborate findings from the students.

4.3.5.1 The students

Recently an enormous body of LPP scholarship has focussed on the linguistic ecologies of youth in the complex settings of language shift. Students are seen as the real policy makers (McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, & Zepeda, 2009) because they make decisions, conscious or not as to the language(s) they want to use (Shohamy, 2006). The students also perform identities within local peer cultures and to position themselves in emerging interactional moments in classrooms, family homes, and out-of-school spaces (McKay & Wong, 1996; Zentella, 1997). This study is an attempt to contribute to the growing body of scholarship on youth vis-à-vis LPP in the context of the two elite schools.

I selected the student participants on the basis of the following criteria: 1) students should be enrolled in one of the elite English-medium schools, 2) they must have at least five years of their schooling in these or in any other school of the elite category, 3) they should either be enrolled in Class 9-12 of the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education
(BISE) stream or in the equivalent O Level and A Level of the University of Cambridge, and 4) their first language must be Pashto.

I hoped to get a group of participants with a balanced male and female ratio. Initially I was a little pessimistic about getting the desired number of female participants as adolescent girls in Pashtun society normally avoid face-to-face interaction with male strangers. Normally the schools in this region do not have co-education due to the cultural norms of Pashtun society (see Chapter 3). However, the private schools do usually have a girls’ section adjacent to the boys on the premises of the main campus. In spite of my apprehension, I got a very positive response from female participants, not only among students but also parents and teachers. In fact the teacher participants were all females. Many of the focus groups students agreed to be interviewed. The demographic details of the students are given in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reference in interview</th>
<th>Reference in focus groups</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Class/school</th>
<th>No. of years in English-medium school(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamoor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>FG#1, S1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>FG#2, S3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begaayya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>FG#2, S4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Class11) A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laiba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>FG#2, S5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(O Level) A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>FG#1, S3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>FG#3, S4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faiza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>FG#2, S6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class10) A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farhad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>FG#3, S2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>FG#1, S5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(O Level) A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#1, S2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Class10) A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zargona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#1, S4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(O Level) A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laiba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#2, S7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#3, S1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashif</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#3, S3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#2, S1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zameer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#2, S2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulsoom</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>FG#4, S3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palwasha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>FG#4, S5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>FG#4, S1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Class10) B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>FG#4, S2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(A Level) B</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>FG#4, S5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class10) B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>FG#6, S3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class 9) B</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahir</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariq</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class10) B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghayoor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(A Level) B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaimoos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(Class12) B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class10) B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#5, S3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(O Level) B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>FG#6, S4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Class10) B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Information about student participants
4.3.5.2 Teachers

The only criterion for selecting the teachers was that they should have at least five years’ experience of teaching English at either of the two schools or at any other school of the elite category. Six teachers from School A and three from School B\(^7\) agreed to participate in the interviews. Interestingly, all of them were female. Following the approved ethical procedures, I approached them through the courtesy of the school principal. I explained to them the background of my study, gave them the participant information and consent forms, and assured them of their rights so that they did not feel any pressure whatsoever in their decision to participate in the study. Since classroom observations were also planned, I assured them repeatedly that their teaching or language abilities would not be judged and that it would be in the interest of my research if they remained normal in the class. Interviews with teachers were conducted mostly in English, with occasional switching to Urdu. One teacher did not allow voice recording; hence I had to make handwritten notes. Table 4.2 summarizes information about the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reference in interview</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Language of interview</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saeeda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA (journalism and English), Diploma in TEFL</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>BA (General) and MA (English) in progress</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukhsana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA (Sociology)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nosheen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA (English)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farkhanda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA (Political studies) and Diploma TEFL</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA (English and Urdu)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urooj</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MA (ELT)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bachelor of Law (LLB)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shazia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>BA (General)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Information about teacher participants

---

\(^7\) Even though the school principals were not formally recruited as participants in this study, I also include some of the responses from my informal interaction and email correspondence with them. They had verbally consented to the inclusion of their views in this study.
4.3.5.3 Parents

Keeping in view the advantage of participant triangulation, the parents’ perceptions were sought to corroborate the information provided by the students and teachers. Only those parents whose children were enrolled in either School A or B, were selected for interviews. Contact with the parents was mainly made through the principals; three of the students who participated in the interviews and focus groups helped in arranging meetings with their parents. Hence three of the parent participants were parents of the students, the rest were parents of other (non-participant) students in the two elite schools. A total of eight parents were interviewed. My aim was to understand what lies behind their decision to send their children to the elite schools, their perceptions of the language-in-education planning in the schools, and the language attitudes and practices of their children. The parents were from diverse professional backgrounds. Demographic details of the parents are given in Table 4.3. Interviews with most of the parents were in Pashto; an interview with one parent was in English, another in English/Pashto, and another in Pashto/Urdu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Reference in interview</th>
<th>Language of interview</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arzoo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parent 1</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amjad Ali</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parent 2</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahoor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parent 3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifthikar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parent 4</td>
<td>English/Pashto</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheheryar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parent 5</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahir Zaman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parent 6</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>Bank Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigat</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parent 7</td>
<td>Pashto/Urdu</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbul</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parent 8</td>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Information about parent participants

4.3.6 Ethical considerations

Researchers need to anticipate the ethical issues that may arise during their studies (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006a). A good qualitative study is one that has been conducted in an ethical manner (Merriam, 2002). Creswell (2009, p. 87, citing Israel & Hay, 2006) explains that researchers need to “protect their research participants; develop a trust with them;
promote the integrity of research; guard against misconduct and impropriety that might reflect on their organizations and institutions; and cope with new challenging problems”.

In my study these ethical concerns had already been taken care of as I had to obtain ethics approval from the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (UAHPEC) before proceeding with data collection. Approval for the study was granted after the committee was satisfied that the research was in accordance with the guidelines of the UAHPEC, and that the participants would be treated with respect, their safety and privacy would be ensured, and their cultural and social sensitivities would be safeguarded. The participant information sheets (PIS) and consent forms (see Appendix B) had been carefully written to address all possible ethical concerns.

As is the usual norm in Pakistani society, I accessed my research sites through the courtesy of acquaintances that were related with either the principal or teachers in the two schools. Upon my arrival at the schools, the first thing I did was to introduce myself. Then I explained the purpose of my visit and the background of my study. After this I talked them through the PIS and consent forms. The same was repeated for all participants. Since I knew that the students and teachers of the elite English-medium schools were fluent in English, their PIS and consent documents too were in English; I also talked to them in English. As for parents, I translated their PIS and consent forms in Urdu which is the most widely read and understood language in Pakistan (see Appendix C). However, when I explained the background of my study and the ethical concerns I used Pashto with most of them as they preferred to use Pashto. Two of participants were comfortable with English; hence their PIS and consent documents and my explanation were in English.

A common ethical concern in studies that are undertaken in organisations like schools relates to the power differential in relationships with the students. According to the UAHPEC guidelines, in such a situation the students may feel obliged to participate in the research when asked because they may see it as a school project. Hence an unequal relationship of power between the researcher and the participants could ensue. I addressed this issue by clearly explaining the purpose of my project, emphasizing the voluntary nature of their participation and highlighting their rights. Likewise, both from the point of view of ethics and the reliability of my data, I took great care to stress the non-evaluative nature of my work. I also assured them about the confidentiality of the information they
provided to me. The aim was to boost their confidence so that they were not anxious during the data collection process. Moreover, as a student researcher, who was perhaps more qualified and experienced than most of the teachers and even the principals, I took extra care not to reveal or highlight much about my educational and professional background and reminded them again and again to treat me as a student. The aim was to reduce the “halo effect” and the “observer’s paradox” as much as possible, as both were critical to my ethical commitment and the reliability of the data.

Another key ethical consideration, which I as a member of the Pashtun community was conscious of, pertained to the social and cultural norms of the society and the law and order situation in Pakistan. Adult females and adolescent girls are not usually allowed to meet male strangers in Pashtun society. Even though I knew that in the relatively liberal, moderate and co-educational environment of the elite schools this would not be a problem, I took extra care in explaining to my female participants their roles and rights. Students who were below 16 years of age had already been given two PIS and consent documents, one for their parents and one for the students themselves. One incident is noteworthy here. A student in focus group 3 at School B expressed her reservation about the video recording of a focus group discussion which had been conducted the previous day. Adhering to my ethical commitment, I handed over the video tape to the principal and asked the student if she would allow the audio recording to be included in my data. She happily agreed to that.

4.4 Research methods

A total of five data-collection tools were used in this investigation: Survey questionnaires, focus group discussions, semi-structured interviews, observations, and a review of documents. Table 4.4, later in this section, gives a summary of the research tools, their approximate duration, participant type, number, and a tentative schedule of research procedures.

4.4.1 Survey questionnaire

The main purpose of the questionnaire (see Appendix D) was to get a general profile of the students’ attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu; it also sought data about the students’ domain-wise language practices, and their proficiency patterns in the three languages. Pauwels (2004) notes that questionnaires are used to investigate language use
patterns, language proficiency and language attitudes of bilingual or multilingual people in specific contexts or domains. Although domain analysis can also be done through other means such as observation, a questionnaire is a common instrument because of its “ability to obtain detailed data on a sizeable number of language users within a reasonable time frame” (Pauwels, 2004, p. 723).

With regard to developing questionnaire items, Dörnyei (2009) and Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010) suggest that inspiration can be drawn from 1) exploratory data gathered in interviews or student essays, 2) discussion with colleagues, and 3) established/published questionnaires in the field. Some scholars also advise consulting academic literature for getting ideas for questionnaires (Malhotra, 2006). In selecting items for my questionnaire I was mainly guided by my research goals, which led to a review of relevant literature; ultimately, it was in the literature that I came across the established questionnaires in my focus area. In addition to this my discussions with peers and friends over the years on the issues of language education in Pakistan, which culminated in my joining the PhD program, also proved helpful in generating ideas for appropriate questionnaire items.

Some of the questions in the questionnaire were adopted from Altamimi and Shuib (2009), Guerini (2008), Ejieh (2004), the self-assessment checklists from the Swiss version of the European Language Portfolio (2000), and Padilla and Sung (1997). Appropriate adjustments were made to suit the socio-cultural context of the participants and their assumed level of linguistic competence. The questions (total 82) were divided into three sections; each representing a broad category or variable based on my research goals and questions (Creswell, 2009):

A. Patterns of use of English, Pashto and Urdu in various domains (18 Questions)
B. Attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu (32 Questions)
C. Students’ self-evaluation of their proficiency in English, Pashto and Urdu (32 Questions)

A small section on the students’ demographic information was also included at the end of the questionnaire. The data in this section was not used in the analysis as it was only given to make sure that the respondents fulfilled the criteria I had set for their participation.
Section A is about the language use patterns of the students in various domains such as home, school, markets etc. I used a four-item Likert scale and excluded the “neutral/undecided” option because I believe students would seldom, if ever, opt for it owing to the fact the statements/questions in this section target the concrete acts of language use for which the students would definitely choose one of the three languages. For instance, it would be illogical to add “undecided” in a scale for a statement: “This is the language I use at home”.

However, in section B, which seeks information about language attitudes, I followed the well-established convention of measuring attitudes, i.e. a five-item Likert scale, which consists of a one-dimensional bipolar continuum running from strongly agree to strongly disagree evaluations of an attitude object with the neutral “undecided” in the middle. The Likert scale is designed to measure attitudes or opinions (Bowling, 1997; Burns & Grove 1997). A Likert-type scale assumes that the intensity of experience is linear, i.e. on a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and makes the assumption that attitudes can be measured (McLeod, 2008).

Section C of the questionnaire sought the students’ self-evaluation of their perceived proficiency in English, Urdu and Pashto in terms of listening, reading, speaking and writing. Following Dörnyei (2009), I used scale items that are ranked in order. The students were instructed to order their perceived proficiency by circling a number on the scale of 1-5 (with 1 indicating the lowest and 5 indicating the highest proficiency in a particular language). Hasson (2008), in a study of self-perceptions of native language abilities in bilingual Hispanic young adults, used similar self-reporting ability ratings to elicit respondents’ proficiency in language.

Before administering the questionnaire, I concluded a pilot study to determine whether it was appropriately designed and whether the students had any issues while filling it in. The piloting stage is discussed in the following section. Once piloting was done and the revised version was ready, I administered the questionnaire. By that time I had already started collection of qualitative data. First I discussed the questionnaire with the teachers who were coordinating my data collection. I explained to them the questionnaire items, its aim, the participant selection criteria and the ethical issues. Keeping in view the number of students, the School A teacher took 75 and the School B teacher took 50 copies. They
distributed the questionnaires on the basis of random sampling, covering almost every class from Class 9 to 12 in both Cambridge and BISE streams. A total of 110 students accepted questionnaires in the two schools. Some questionnaires were not considered since they were either completed by non-Pashtun students or not completed properly. The total number of valid questionnaires was 90.

Questionnaires are perhaps the most widely used instruments for collecting sociolinguistic information. However, the instrument also has its limitations. The respondents may overstate or misrepresent their language competence or they may over-report the choice of a language variety in certain domains or underrate the use of their native language in an attempt to assert their distance from traditional culture and demonstrate their adherence to the modern, educated elite (Guerini, 2008). Besides, respondents may describe their language behavior in a way that they think the researcher would like them to, a phenomenon which Baker (1992) describes as the “halo effect”. Section 4.4.3 contains more details on the halo effect.

In spite of these limitations I believe the use of a questionnaire was a useful source of data in this study. First it allowed me to corroborate the qualitative data findings. Comparing the qualitative and quantitative data findings enhanced my insights into the themes and categories. Secondly, the data from a large cohort helped me to obtain what Maxwell (1992) and Duff (2006) term internal generalizability, which means generalizing within the community. Owing to these advantages, I have to agree with Guerini’s (2008, p. 8) contention that:

> Albeit some of the answers may turn out to be imprecise or even partially unreliable (especially in individual language proficiency report), a careful analysis of the data can offer useful insights into the respondents’ attitudes as well as into the relationship among various languages spoken within a given speech community.

### 4.4.1.1  Piloting the questionnaire

Piloting the questionnaire is an integral part of questionnaire construction (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) because problems in questionnaire items can pose difficulties for respondents (Barkhuizen, 2002; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). My aim in piloting the survey
questionnaire was to test it for variation, meaning, wording, ambiguity, clarity of scales, explicitness of instructions, task difficulty, respondents’ interest and attention, flow and naturalness of the sections, order of questions, and timing. In other words, the questionnaire was examined for validity. Validity, according to Joppe (2000), determines whether the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are.

Brown and Rodgers (2002) suggest two procedures to improve a survey once it is written: “Get feedback from colleagues on the quality of the items and/or to pilot the survey instrument with participants similar to the ones you will eventually be surveying” (p. 143). The idea of feedback from colleagues is also supported by Brace (2008), which he terms as informal piloting. As part of informal piloting, I showed the questionnaire to two of my colleagues in the department. Their feedback was useful as they not only suggested improvement in the phrasing of some questions, they also gave ideas for adding a few more questions. Similarly, the thorough feedback that I got from my supervisor helped to improve the questionnaire.

As part of the second procedure, that is formal piloting, I had planned to do it on site before administering the questionnaire. I needed to have a group of student participants who fulfilled the same criteria as I had devised for my actual participants. In this respect, I discussed the questionnaire with the teacher nominated as coordinator for my data collection by the School A principal, and requested her to distribute 15 questionnaires, along with PIS and consent forms, among the students who she thought would not be part of the actual data collection. The pilot questionnaire was appended with an additional sheet which contained the following questions, and which the students were requested to answer after they completed the questionnaire:

1. Which, if any, items on the survey were unclear to you? Explain.
2. Which, if any, items did you find difficult to answer? Explain.
3. Did you feel that the answer scale adequately allowed you to express your opinion? If not, please explain.
4. In your opinion, which, if any, items on the survey display a bias on the part of the research? Please explain.
5. How long did it take to complete the questionnaire?
6. Provide any additional comments that you would like to make.

After three days she returned 10 questionnaires. Most of the feedback showed that the students did not have any issues; only a few pointed out minor concerns. For instance, one student noted that he did not really understand what is meant by “feelings and emotions” in Q 26 (Section B). To address this concern I added “love, anger and sympathy” as examples in brackets. Another student indicated that questions 11 and 12 could be combined as the language used for discussing sports and movies is the same that is used for politics and economy. Even though the argument made sense, I did not merge the two questions, as one (Q 11) pertained to the topic of entertainment and the other (Q 12) was about serious discussion. So there was a chance that some of the students might use different languages for the two different topics. While looking at the language proficiency section of the pilot questionnaires, I was also curious about the middle value responses on the Likert scale, as Asian respondents are believed to be culturally inclined to adopt a neutral standpoint about their language proficiency (Chen, Lee & Stevenson, 1995). Fortunately, their responses showed variation on the Likert scale; this led to my decision to retain the undecided items.

With regard to time, the average time they took to fill in the questionnaire was 46 minutes, slightly more than the average time (42 minutes) taken by my colleagues at the informal piloting stage.

While revising the questionnaire after the pilot study, as I read the questionnaire again and again, I felt that it would be more appropriate, and less complicated from the students’ point of view, to have one section instead of two for the attitude related questions. Hence the final questionnaire ended up with a total of three sections: A) language use patterns, B) language attitudes, and C) language proficiency. In Section 4.5.5, I discuss how I analyzed the questionnaire data.

4.4.2 Focus Groups

Morgan (2001, p. 141) defines focus group interviews as a research method that gathers data through group interaction on a theme determined by the researcher. As noted by Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006b), focus group interviews are useful to explore people’s behavior and attitudes on issues largely taken for granted. Similarly, to Ho (2006, p. 52), “the hallmark of focus group interviews is the explicit use of group interaction as data to
explore insights that might otherwise have remained hidden”. I included focus groups in my study because, as Dörnyei (2009) posits, the focus group format is based on the collective experience of group brainstorming, which entails participants thinking together, inspiring and challenging each other and reacting to the emerging issues and ideas.

Dörnyei recommends 4-5 groups as a minimum to achieve adequate breadth and depth of information for a project. I was able to conduct six focus group discussion, three at each school. The teachers who were coordinating my data collection helped to form groups according to the students’ availability on a particular day. Hence I did not have control over the composition of the groups except for the basic criterion of the students’ academic level which I had already explained to the teachers. Details of the composition of the groups are given in Tables 4.1 and 4.4.

In my introductory comments before the start of group discussions I reminded the students of their rights as participants as outlined in the information sheet (PIS) and consent form. To assure them of their rights and safety I told them that they would not be judged on any aspect of what they said or how they said it; the ideas they shared, and their identity would be kept confidential. They were informed that the discussions would be video recorded as well as recorded on a separate voice recorder, and once the recording started, it could not be stopped. However, the participants had the right to leave the discussion permanently or momentarily as and when they wanted.

The focus groups were held inside classrooms which were free, and at times that fitted in with the students’ schedule. The idea was to hold the discussions in a relaxed atmosphere. To ensure ease and naturalness in the discussion, I followed Ho’s (2006) idea of interacting with the participants before the group discussions; I asked about their studies and in a light vein talked to them about my study and the purpose of the focus group discussion. I would start the focus group by thanking the participants, introducing myself and the background to my study. In order to ensure the free flow of ideas I told them they were free to choose any language they felt comfortable with. However, owing to the students’ English proficiency and preference, all of the group discussions took place in English.

I had prepared the focus group protocols containing 5-6 broad themes based on my research questions. However, once the discussion started my participation or interference
was minimal. I would only speak when I realized there was a need to orient the discussion to the target themes or goals. For instance, on one occasion in focus group 1 at School A when students were discussing the ridicule that is targeted towards Pashtuns by non-Pashtuns (Punjabi), the discussion was slipping towards politics. At that moment I had to interfere: “OK I agree with what you guys say. Let us come back to the languages” (Moderator, FG#1). Moreover, as the moderator of the discussion I had to make sure that every student had an opportunity to speak, even the shy ones, and to prevent a dominating group opinion, i.e. the groupthink, by actively encouraging the members to think critically (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 145).

The focus groups turned out to be a rich and relatively more natural source of data on my research themes because the participants spoke freely. The trail of discussion generated as a result of their arguments and counter arguments produced exhaustive reflections and insights, some of which I had not anticipated. Later during the analysis, I found that these insights provided a rich nursery for the emergent themes. I would conclude each focus group by thanking the students for their participation and asking them if there were any issues that were not raised and required further discussion. I would also ask the group members if they were willing to volunteer for the semi-structured interviews. Finally, once I was back home at the end of the day, I made sure that I recorded my annotated memo about the focus group if required.

**4.4.3 Semi-structured interviews**

Semi-structured interview are useful when the aim of the research is to throw light on a puzzling or unexamined question (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Rich discussion can be generated as opposed to more structured interviews or short answers typical of questionnaire responses. Semi-structured interviews constrain the answers as little as possible, and allow the respondents to speak at length if they wish to. According to Dörnyei (2007) semi-structured interviews offer a compromise between two extremes, that is, structured and unstructured interviews: “Although there is a set of pre-prepared guiding questions and prompts, the format is open-ended and the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on the issues raised in an exploratory manner” (p. 136). In this respect semi-structured interviews serve as a suitable tool for the collection of rich qualitative data in
studies based on the exploratory and interpretivist paradigm (Babbie, 2011; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), such as this study.

In preparing the interview protocol, also referred to as schedule or guide, I mainly followed the criteria I used in the questionnaire. I was also guided by my research questions. In addition to this, the academic literature that I studied and my discussions with my supervisor with peers also enlightened me with ideas for the interview protocol. The protocol included a collection of broad questions about the topic and, as Dörnyei (2009) suggests, was not meant to serve as readymade response categories that would limit the depth and breadth of the respondents’ stories. Rather it served to ensure that the key topics were covered, nothing important was left out and questions were appropriately phrased.

The interview participants included students—those among the focus group who agreed to be interviewed—teachers of English, and parents. Criteria for selecting the interview participants have already been discussed in Section 4.3.5. Before starting the interviews, I briefly explained the background of my study to the participants and reminded them of their rights as participants. I also asked them again if they would allow voice recording. All interview participants allowed voice recording except one teacher at School A; I made hand-written notes of that interview. Interviews with students and teachers were conducted in the schools while interviews with most of the parents were conducted in the drawing rooms of their homes; only two of the parents made themselves available at their work places for the interviews. While conducting interviews at their homes, I needed to take extra care about the “halo effect”, which I discuss below, because in Pashtun culture guests are held in high esteem (see Chapter 3, section on Pashtunwali); as such, there was a chance that my hosts would tell me what they thought I wanted to hear. To ensure ease of communication I told the participants that they were free to switch to any language, English, Urdu and Pashto, which they felt comfortable in.

For all its usefulness as a source of qualitative data, the semi-structured interview is not without its challenges. One limitation is that exactly the same question may not necessarily be asked in each interview, and that some questions may be left out because more focus is placed on others. This may harm the consistency or dependability (Edge & Richards, 1998) of comparison with the views of other participants. However, I made a conscious effort to
somehow cover the main themes in all interviews. Initially, I had planned follow up interviews for information that was either found missing or was not clear.

I was able to interview only one teacher for the second time. This practice could not be continued with others for two reasons: First, I felt the participants found it difficult to make themselves available for the follow up interview; second, when I listened to the interview soon after they were conducted I did not find any significant themes that were not covered. Even if I noticed that something was missing, I decided to contact those participants by phone and email. Hence my contact with some of the participants continued even after I had completed my fieldwork.

Here it is worth mentioning that interviews with parents were not as exhaustive as with teachers and students. Their number too was lower than the other participants. Their inclusion was meant to obtain general perceptions about the major themes of this study, such as L-i-E policy and their attitudes towards the three languages (English, Pashto and Urdu). Hence, when I analyzed the data, their insights played a complementary role in corroborating findings from other sources as and when appropriate.

The second possible limitation of semi-structured interviews is the “halo effect” (Baker, 1992). This means that the respondents may say something that is not true, but something they think the researcher wishes them to say, or say what is the usual and accepted opinion on a particular topic. I anticipated that the interviewees, particularly the teachers, might come under the “halo effect” as they might see me in a position of authority, or they might fear that I would share my findings with the school authorities. Hence they might say something that would not reflect their true practice or belief. To cope with this issue, or rather preempt it, I would explain the nature and purpose of my research to every participant clearly. In addition to the written PIS, I verbally explained how the information would be kept confidential and secure, and how their participation or non-participation would not affect their employment. I made my best effort to convince them that their true language attitudes, beliefs and practices hold the key to the trustworthiness and success of my study, and that I would never judge them on what they do and believe as teachers of English and as employees of the school.
Thirdly, the relationship between the interviewee and interviewer may be asymmetrical (Nunan, 1992). This means that the researcher may be in a more senior position than the respondent. To address this issue of imbalance of power, the researcher has to promote discussion from the interviewee by valuing opinions and reinforcing equal collaboration between the two (Tanggaard, 2008) and allowing the interviewee the freedom to change or redirect a topic. Moreover, the researcher has to ensure that he or she has the “member’s competence” (Woods, 1996), which comes from being accepted as part of the interviewee’s community, or at least having earned the right to participate in it. I believe I was able to establish my position as a member of the community as I share the participants’ ethnic and linguistic background. There are further commonalities between the participants and myself. For instance, my past schooling in one of the schools and my current status as a student of the University of Auckland gives me a student identity. Similarly my profession as a teacher of English makes me part of the English teaching community in Pakistan. Lastly, my own children go to schools where English is the medium of communication, and sometimes I also face the dilemma of which language my children should speak. This identifies me with parents, another group of participants in this study.

I concluded my individual interviews by thanking the participants for their cooperation. I listened to the audio recording of the interviews in the evening of the same day on which the interviews were recorded in order to confirm the recording, its voice quality and to make sure all the key items in the interview protocol had been covered. On one occasion when a response of the interviewee was not clear, the next day I got the chance to meet her, played the recorder and asked if she could repeat what she actually said. Moreover, listening to the interview when it was fresh was also the right time to record analytic memos about the interview, if required, in a notebook. Initially I had planned to transcribe the interview soon after it was recorded. However, due to time constraints, mainly due to unexpected chores I had to do, I decided to do the transcription after completing the data collection.

4.4.4 Observations

Observation is the conscious noticing and detailed examination of participants’ behavior in a naturalistic setting such as a classroom, a teacher’s room or any environment where
language use is being studied (Cowie, 2009). As an essential data collection method in ethnographic case study, observation allows the researcher to immerse him/herself in a research setting and systematically observe “dimensions of that setting, interactions, relationships, actions, events and so on, within it” (Mason, 1996, p. 60). The researcher also makes detailed field notes about the place, the people, and the interactions that occur (Croker, 2009). Observation in my study was particularly useful as it helped me to demystify my previous assumptions and to validate the information reported in interviews. As such, the use of observation, together with other methods of data collection, enhanced the trustworthiness of the investigation. The firsthand experience of the research setting through observation, depicted through thick descriptions, also enhances the validity in general and transferability (Edge & Richards, 1998) of results in particular. Guba and Lincoln (1981, p. 213) describe the research setting where observations are particularly useful:

In a situation where motives, attitudes, beliefs, and values direct much, if not most of human activities, the most sophisticated instrumentation we possess is still the careful observer, the human being who can watch, listen ... question, probe, and fully analyze or organize his/her direct experience.

Observation in my study was an ongoing and continuous process. My role was that of a non-participant observer. While observing classrooms, I not only audio-recorded the lesson for capturing instances of interactions relevant to my study goals, I also followed Creswell (2007) and made field notes using an observational protocol (see Appendix G). The first part of the protocol had space for information about the participants, the subject being taught, specific topics and activities, the time and date, and the classroom setting. The remaining portion was divided into two columns: One for observational notes and one for my reflections. The notes were documented in chronological sequence. I paid specific attention to the use of language by the teacher for teaching lessons, giving instructions and discussing extra-curricular issues. In addition to this the students’ use of language with their teacher and among themselves in group activities was also observed.

Observations offered me the firsthand experience of language as it is perceived and practised as part of the L-i-E policy, that is manifested in the curriculum, and its use in general. They added value and trustworthiness to my prior assumptions, and to the
information I obtained through interviews. The areas I observed could be summarized as follows:

- Classrooms in general were observed for the teachers’ and students’ use of language.
- English classrooms were observed for language use as well as pedagogy; attitudes towards languages were also in focus.
- Students were observed for their use of language(s) in domains such as corridors, playgrounds, the cafeteria, computer rooms and the library.
- Observations were also made in the teachers’ room and principals’ office, often frequented by the teachers and visitors.
- The schools noticeboards, wall charts, flyers and instructions were observed.

My original plan included observation of classes at both School A and B. The School B principal and/or teachers, however, for some reason changed their minds and declined to allow me to observe classes. This was done despite an earlier assurance they had given to me by signing the consent forms. Observations in other domains, such as the playgrounds, and interviews and focus groups were allowed to proceed as planned. To make up for any shortcoming that this could have caused to my overall findings, I focused more thoroughly in my interviews on language use in classrooms. At the end of the day, I do not think this situation did any harm to my overall understanding of the school’s L-i-E policy and the stakeholders’ language attitudes and practices. In addition to having other sources of data available because of the triangulation design of the study, I also had the generous and unhindered cooperation of School A as my first research site.

4.4.5 Review of documents

Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and internet-transmitted) material (Bowen, 2009). As is the case with other types of qualitative data, “document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, cited in Bowen, 2009, p. 27). Documents provide useful data as they can help the researcher “uncover meaning, develop
Lo Bianco (2010) maintains that language policy spreads over a continuum involving public texts (laws), public discourses (debates) and performative actions (communication). Moreover, in addition to the micro-level, context-specific investigation, this study adopts a historical structure approach (Tollefson, 2006) to investigating language policy. In this regard written and published documents provided useful insights into the historical, social, political and ideological forces that shaped LPP in Pakistan. The documents that were consulted in this study include: The constitution, statutes of parliament, reports of the ministry of education, reports of various commissions on language policy, documents of the education boards, school curriculum given on the websites, school prospectuses, and language policy discourses.

Document review in my study served three purposes. First, it provided context-specific information, such as that given in the schools’ prospectuses and websites. Second, documents bearing witness to past events, provided me historical insights (Bowen, 2009) into the development of LPP in Pakistan. Finally, document review served to validate some of the findings in this study; for instance, when proficiency in English was seen as indispensable to getting white collar jobs, I referred to the National Education Policy of 2009, which makes a similar observation about English.

In this section I have discussed the rationale and procedures of various research methods that were used to collect data in this study. Table 4.4 below summarizes the research instruments, their schedule and the number and type of participants relevant to each procedure.
Table 4.4: Data-collection schedule: The project started on 20th September 2010 with my first visit to School A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>The questionnaire was administered on 29 September when the qualitative data collection had already started. Prior to this, a group of 15 students filled in and gave feedback on a pilot questionnaire.</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus groups</strong></td>
<td>Focus Group 1 (5 Oct, 2010) Focus Group 2 (8 Oct, 2010) Focus Group 3 (13 Oct, 2010) Focus Group 4 (22 Oct, 2010) Focus Group 5 (28 Oct, 2010) Focus Group 6 (1 Nov, 2010)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Total: 31. FG1 (5); FG2 (7); FG3 (4); FG4 (5); FG5 (5); FG6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-structured interviews</strong></td>
<td>Started after the first Focus Group Any convenient time during the study Any convenient time during the study</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>From start till end of the study over three months</td>
<td>Lessons of English, chemistry and business studies classes (teachers and students)</td>
<td>15 lessons and unspecified ongoing observations in other domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of documents</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing during and after the data collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis in my study was a cyclical and ongoing process occurring simultaneously with data collection. As Richards (2003, cited in Croker, 2009) puts it, “analysis is neither a distinct stage nor a discrete process; it is something that is happening, in one form or another, throughout the whole research process. The relationship between data and analysis is therefore an intimate one” (p. 268). I followed the procedures of holistic content analysis which involves coding for themes, looking for patterns, making interpretations and building theory (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Later, Dörnyei (2007) added another initial phase, transcribing the data, to the stages suggested by Ellis and Barkhuizen. The qualitative data analysis, therefore, has three stages: a) pre-coding (transcribing the data), b) initial or open coding, c) second-level coding (growing ideas, looking for patterns), and d) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions.

Before I discuss the data analysis process, it would be worthwhile to throw some light on the emergent and non-emergent debate around qualitative inquiry. A very dominant and traditional view of qualitative inquiry pertains to the purely “emergent” nature of themes,
not contaminated by the background knowledge or biased interference of the researcher (Dörnyei, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). However, following Miles and Huberman (1994) and Tashakkori and Teddlies (2003), my search for patterns and themes was not altogether “unplanned and unstructured” and my background knowledge, which is based on the study of literature in this area, made the analysis more productive, effective, relevant, focussed and “time-efficient” (Dörnyei, 2007). In fact when I was doing my initial literature review and then designing the questionnaire for this study, some of the key topics related to L-i-E policy and language attitudes were already in my mind. However, having said so, I did not let my data analysis approach deviate from the spirit of a true qualitative inquiry. The diversity, width and depth of my qualitative data during the three months intense engagement at the research sites offered great potential for the emergence of themes. The analysis was thus based on a fine blend of looking for preconceived themes deductively (i.e. bringing codes to data) and getting gradually to themes inductively (i.e. finding them in data) (Dörnyei, 2007).

I now turn to the actual process I followed in my data analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994) broadly divide data analysis into two activities, i.e. data management and data reduction. Data management involves the handling of data, both in hard and in electronic form, in such a manner that it is easy to access and secure. This is an important activity in a study like this which involves a large volume of data. Data reduction is like extracting the essence from the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data reduction helps facilitate access to conceptual themes and patterns (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) by organising the data into “meaningful chunks (categories), usually by a system of coding, and interpreted by reference to relationships that emerge from data reduction” (Suter, 2012, p. 355).

I used the Computer Aided Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) NVivo 9 to manage and reduce my data. NVivo helps manage, sort, classify and analyse unstructured, non-numerical or qualitative data. While I was transcribing data through NVivo, I was also able to code data that was frequently recurring. Once a code/theme emerged in one data source, a focus group for instance, with time as the analysis progressed from one data source to another, such as an interview, it would become an across-the-sources theme. NVivo also came in very handy to make new notes as well as add the previous notes and memos recorded during the data collection. NVivo was particularly helpful in observing a large number of codes, from various sources (interviews, focus groups, students, parents, etc.), identifying those which were related, and grouping them into categories. At the same
time I found it very convenient to rename or reassign the codes and move certain codes from one category to another or do away with codes that were insignificant. Here it would be useful to mention that NVivo does not generate themes or categories automatically, as its purpose is only to assist researchers, who must manage and reduce data before analysis (Bazeley, 2007; Richards, 2009). On the whole, the use of NVivo not only helped in handling the large volume of data gathered from various tools and participants, it also helped in coding, pattern making and ultimately in interpreting the data. Following Dörnyei (2007) and Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), I discuss these processes further below.

4.5.1 Pre-coding

The pre-coding stage involves the first impressions that one makes about the data during the collection as well as transcription stages. Stake (1995, p.71) defines analysis as a matter of “giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations”. Making sense of our first impressions is a crucial pre-coding move. I made some useful impressions about the data during data collection and data transcription. I recorded some of the key ones in memos. Often regarded as a tedious process, the good thing about transcription of recorded interviews, focus groups and observations is that “it allows to get to know our data thoroughly” (Dörnyei, 2007). I transcribed data as soon as I completed my fieldwork. Involvement of a transcriber and waiting too long for the transcription would have resulted in loss of information, which may include impressions one gets at the time of the actual data collection events. Since I was interested in content rather than the linguistic form of the verbal data I left out certain linguistic phenomena, such as pauses and intonations.

Pre-coding also occurred at the time of transcription or reading the transcription once it was ready. I read and re-read the transcripts, reflected on them and noted down my thoughts in annotations in NVivo, an example of which is given in Figure 4.2. This was a useful technique because “pre-coding reflections shape our thinking about the data and influence the way we will go about coding it” (Dörnyei, 2007). Certainly, many of my initial impressions later led to the formation of themes and categories as I proceeded with the data analysis.
4.5.2 Initial/open coding

At this stage I read a few texts (e.g. interviews or focus group transcriptions) several times to get a general sense of the data. The coding process involved highlighting a text, i.e. a phrase, sentence or paragraph, if it was found relevant to my research goals. A code or theme found for the first time was given an appropriate name or label, and if it had already been labeled, the new text in the data was dragged to merge with the existing code. This facility offered by NVivo 9 made the coding highly time-efficient. Following Corbin and Strauss (2008), at this stage I carried out line-by-line coding. Many codes emerged at the initial stage of coding; however, as I read through more transcripts, a stage arrived when the possibilities for new codes were almost exhausted and the frequencies of the existing codes started to increase. Every possible care was taken to make the labels clear and explicit. In labeling the codes, my aim was to pick key words for the codes from the actual data/transcripts in order to make the codes authentic—an approach which is referred to as ‘in vivo’ coding (Dörnyei, 2009).

Following Dörnyei (2007, citing Lynch, 2003), I arranged an external code check, which involved asking a colleague to look at a portion of the data and recode it using the list of codes already developed, as well as possibly introducing new ones. In one of the weekly department doctoral seminars, I gave the participants a copy of an interview and asked them to code it. Then I gave them a copy of the interview that I had coded (at the very initial stage of my data coding) and asked them to compare my coding with the coding they did, and to comment. As expected, there were similarities as well as significant differences in the data coding among the participants. The exercise helped me as both the similarities and discrepancies were enlightening, leading to a revision of the original codes (Dörnyei, 2007). This point is discussed further in Section 4.6.
Owing to the exploratory nature of this study, which takes a microscopic view of LPP and investigates language attitudes and practices, I mainly used an inductive approach to coding or arriving at themes. However, as discussed above, I also subscribe to the view that non-emergent or theory-driven codes (Gibbs, 2007), based on my background knowledge, can make my analysis more productive, efficient and focused (Dörnyei, 2007). As such, the final code list included inductive or emergent as well as theory-driven or priori codes.

4.5.3 Second-level coding: Looking for patterns

Second-level coding is like going beyond a mere descriptive labeling of the relevant data segments to noticing patterns that emerge across the individual respondent’s account or responses. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) note that pattern coding facilitates the interpretation and explanation of data. One way of doing second-level coding is to go through several respondents’ accounts and list all the codes that have been identified in them and cluster together the closely related codes under a broader category (Dörnyei, 2007). Another way of second-level coding, as Dörnyei notes, is to produce a hierarchy of codes in the form of a tree diagram. Figure 4.3 is an instance of the tree diagram that I made using NVivo 9. (This process is discussed further below.) At this stage of the analysis I also refined the list of the codes I had arrived at during the first level of coding; some codes were discarded as they were either too weak or not relevant to the scope of the study. I also merged similar codes and made the wording of certain codes more appropriate so that they reflected the views and responses they embodied. For instance, at the initial stage “language dominance” appeared to emerge as a category. However, a second careful look at the related themes revealed that the dominance was mostly based on the students’ use of a particular language or on the prestige and status of a language. Hence I decided to shift some themes to the more established categories of Domain-wise language use patterns and some to Instrumental attitudes to languages.
Before I discuss the actual pattern making process it would be helpful to say a few words about the analytic memos which I wrote during the coding process as well as at the early stages of data collection and transcription. Memos are records of thoughts and reflections which come to the researchers’ mind when they are actively engaged with the data (Dörnyei, 2007). Memos turned out to be powerful sense-making tools for me when I reached the stage of conceptualizing my themes and making sense of the codes and their relationships (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Figure 4.4 shows a memo that I recorded when,
while coding data, I noted that the students’ use of language appears to have two aspects: One that relates to the schools’ policy, and the other that relates to the students’ own preferences for a language.

*English as key to success in education* emerged dominantly in my study because of their high frequency. Together with other themes, they were clustered under instrumental attitudes as they essentially reflected the pragmatic value of English. Secondly, patterns can also be discovered when the informants themselves alert the researcher to the existence of a pattern. For instance, when I was coding responses related to the theme *National value of Urdu*, I noticed on several occasions that respondents juxtaposed the national status of Urdu with the divisive role of Pashto (or any indigenous language). They contended that if Pashto was given a role in education, it would divide the country along regional, ethnic and linguistic lines. As a result I discovered one of the emergent themes of this study, *MT as divisive*, and I grouped it under the integrative attitudes category. Its juxtaposition with *National value of Urdu* helped in gaining insightful interpretations of the data. Thirdly, themes can also be linked because of their similarity. I followed this criterion the most in finding patterns. For instance, ‘pride’ in this study was used in two ways. Where pride associated with a language was related to rank and achievement, I coded the ideas as the *Status value of English* under the instrumental attitudes category. Likewise, when pride was referred to in terms of ethnic identity, I grouped the theme under the integrative attitudes category. Finally, as Ellis and Barkhuizen note, the theories which inform their work also provide researchers with relevant ideas and expectations when they search for patterns in the data. Although there are several instances of this approach in my study, notable among them is the linking of themes like *The medium of instruction* and *Languages as subjects* under the broad category of Language-in-education policy. The main stages of the data analysis process are graphically presented in Figure 4.5.
4.5.4 **Interpreting the findings and developing a conceptual framework**

Interpretation is the process of reaching conclusions, finding answers to research questions, and getting the overall picture of the study (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Owing to the cyclical nature of qualitative data analysis, some tentative conclusions were already drawn and recorded in memos (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, citing Glaser, 1978). As Creswell (2009, p. 189) suggests, interpretations are sometimes “couched in the understanding that the inquirer brings to the study from her own culture, history, and experiences”. For instance, when during the data analysis I came across the students’ references to their uneasiness in speaking Pashto in certain contexts due to the stigma of terrorism associated with the region, I as a member of that society was able to understand their sensibilities towards the on-going social and political upheavals. Interpretations, as Creswell further notes, could also be meanings derived from a comparison of “information gleaned from the literature or theories” (p. 189). There are many instances of such an approach to interpretation in my study. One example is given in Chapter 5 (Section 5.4.2), where I show that the limited authority of the teachers in the elite schools is in line with what Spolsky (2009) contends. Similarly, evidence of divergence in my findings from the relevant theory can be found in Chapter 6 (Section 6.2.2) in which the participants’
perceptions of MT is in contrast to what Coleman (2010) argues in the context of Pakistan, and the view that May (2008) upholds about multilingualism. Overall, interpretation in this study remained flexible, took different forms and continued throughout from the initial stage of pre-coding and initial coding to the final stage of arriving at a conceptual framework—all geared to meet the research goals of this study.

4.5.5 Quantitative data analysis

I have already discussed the development and administration of the survey questionnaire in Section 4.4.1. The questionnaire included 82 questions split into three broad categories:

A) Patterns of use of English, Pashto and Urdu in various domains (18 questions)

B) Attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu (32 questions)

C) Students’ self-evaluation of their proficiency in English, Pashto and Urdu (32 questions; 8 each for speaking, listening, reading and writing skills)

The questionnaire data was analyzed through descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel software. Descriptive statistics are used to characterize or describe the answers of a group of respondents to numerically coded questions (Brown, 2001). To that end, Brown (2001) notes four possible procedures: Frequencies and percentages, graphical display of data, measures of central tendency (mean, mode, median) and dispersion (range and standard deviation). In my study I applied the first two procedures; i.e. measurement of frequencies and percentages and graphical display of data. To perform the statistical analysis of the first three sections of the questionnaire, I assigned a numeric value to each response on the Likert scale: 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (undecided), 4 (disagree), and 5 (strongly disagree). Similarly, responses to language proficiency in the fourth section included a scale values from 1-5: 1 (I cannot do it at all), 2 (I can do it but with great difficulty), 3 (I can do it but with some difficulty), 4 (I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty), and 5 (I can do it comfortably).

The results of the analysis were presented in the form of graphics and tables. Table 4.5 and Figure 4.6 below are examples. The outcomes of the statistical analysis as presented graphically is accompanied by descriptive paragraphs with my interpretations and inferences. Discussion of quantitative data results also included a comparison with the
relevant qualitative data findings. Terming this approach as multiple-level analysis, Dörnyei (2007) maintains that it is useful for studies which have quantitative data (from a questionnaire) about a larger group as well as intensive qualitative investigation, e.g. interviews, involving a sub-sample of this group.

In this section I have discussed the procedures of analyzing the qualitative and quantitative data involved in my study. In the mixed-methods and concurrent-triangulation design of this study, the various methods did not influence “the operationalization of each other” and the results have been “integrated in the interpretation phase” (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 172). As suggested in the literature, the synthesis of the qualitative and quantitative data sought to corroborate the findings and enhance the credibility of the study.
4.6 Criteria for judging research

The essence of a competent inquiry is that it follows clearly defined criteria for ensuring its worth and credibility. These criteria in quantitative research are commonly known as reliability and validity. Criteria for improving validity of quantitative data in this study have been discussed in Sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.1.1 with regard to the survey questionnaire. Even though the concepts of reliability and validity are not altogether excluded from qualitative inquiry, most qualitative researchers prefer alternate concepts such as trustworthiness (Edge & Richards, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Trustworthiness, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), is the writer’s ability to convince his or her audiences (including self) that “the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of” (p. 290). To achieve the broader goal of trustworthiness, they suggest concepts such as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as counterparts for internal validation, external validation, reliability and objectivity in quantitative inquiry. In the following paragraphs I discuss these concepts with reference to my study.

Credibility refers to the truth value of a study. For Brown (2004) the standard of credibility in qualitative research requires researchers to show that “they maximized accuracy of their definitions and their characterizations of the people or things under investigation, especially as the various participants in the study judged those interpretations” (p. 495). Researchers suggest several strategies to enhance the credibility of a study. One is to design the study so that the researcher has prolonged engagement in the research setting, or if short, a very intense one; superficial one-shot data collection will not serve the purpose (Brown, 2004; Edge & Richards, 1998; Heigham & Croker, 2009). Persistent observation over a long period of time fosters a better understanding of the culture and community in focus. It also helps in building trust with participants and helps in checking for misinformation that may stem from distortions introduced by the researcher or informants (Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, & McCormack, 1991). My study involved a three months intensive and continuous engagement with the two English-medium schools. I had a rigorous engagement in the research sites, applying multiple/mixed methods of data collection, involving a variety of participants, collecting data at all relevant places, and through maintaining prolonged contact with participants. Moreover, this physical engagement was followed by an ongoing engagement through emails and telephone for
further information as well as member checking. Triangulation also enhanced the credibility of my study.

Transferability, which is analogous to external validity or generalizability in quantitative research, pertains to the richness of description and interpretation offered (Edge & Richards, 1998). According to Lazaraton (1995), the most frequent criticism leveled against qualitative inquiry is that the results are not generalizable to other contexts. However, Davis (1992) argues that qualitative researchers strive for transferability rather than generalizability. This requires that the research describes the research design, context and conditions so well that the readers can decide for themselves if the interpretations apply to another context with which they are familiar (Brown, 2004; Dörnyei, 2007). A predominant feature of this study is the use of thick description. I have tried to describe the setting and the participants in such detail that I am sure I have enabled readers to transfer information to other settings (i.e., other elite English-medium schools) and to determine whether the findings can be transferred “because of shared characteristics” (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993, p. 32).

Dependability, according to Edge and Richards (1998), is a matter of taking care that the inevitable changes in the situation being investigated, in the participants, and in the emergent design of the study itself, are properly documented, so that the decisions made and the conclusions reached are justifiable in their own context. I have already explained the inevitable changes in the design of the study in the relevant sections in this thesis. For instance, in Section 4.3.6 I explained how one of the focus group students expressed reservations about the video recording and how I addressed her concern by handing over the video tape to the principal the next day. Similarly, in Section 4.4.4 I explained how the School B Principal and/or teachers changed their minds and declined to let me observe classrooms and how I coped with the situation.

Dependability, which is considered analogous to reliability or consistency in quantitative research (Brown, 2004), can be enhanced through the use of overlapping methods, stepwise replication, and inquiry audits (Brown, 2001; Denzin, 1994). Similarly, Dörnyei (2007) recommends peer checking, respondent feedback or member checking as strategies for validity/reliability checks. With regard to overlapping methods, I have already explained that this study employs multiple or mixed-methods for data collection to
improve its credibility. Credible results as such are also dependable. With regard to member checking, I sent transcripts of interviews and focus groups to the participants to check the information for accuracy. Only few of them responded through emails; all of them were satisfied with the way their speech had been transcribed. Finally, I also did peer checking or debriefing. In Section 4.5.2, for instance, I explained how I shared my codes and categories with colleagues in a departmental seminar.

Confirmability involves full revelation or at least making available the data upon which all interpretations are based (Brown, 2001). Often seen as the equivalent of replicability and objectivity in quantitative research, confirmability “is not an issue of matching descriptions to objective facts” (Edge & Richards, 1998, p. 345) but a requirement from researchers to make their data available so that “other researchers could examine them and confirm, reject or modify the original interpretations” (Brown, 2004, p. 494). To achieve the value of confirmability, researchers also provide audit trails, a detailed and reflective account of the steps taken to achieve the results, including the iterative moves in data collection and analysis, and the development of coding frames and the emergence of main themes (Dörnyei, 2007). I took two measures to ensure confirmability in my study. First, as I discuss and present my findings I give ample evidence from my data. Second, following Brown (2004), I would certainly make my data available to other researchers, following ethical guidelines, if such a request were to be received. Thirdly, I have provided a comprehensive audit trail for all the stages of the research—from site selection, to data collection, to data analysis.

4.7 Conclusion

Following Creswell (2009), I divided the research plan of this study, as presented in this chapter, into three main categories: research paradigm, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods of data collection. As such, I started by discussing interpretivism, the research paradigm with which this study is aligned. I discussed mixed methods research as a strategy of inquiry in the next section. In this section, I briefly covered the basic characteristics, strengths and weakness of qualitative and quantitative approaches to inquiry. Then I discussed case study as another main strategy of inquiry. Before moving to the specific methods, I presented information about the research setting and the participants. I provided an in-depth account of the research sites (schools) and the
participants (students, teachers and parents), as well as the criteria for their selection. This also included a detailed account of how I addressed possible ethical concerns. After this I discussed the specific tools of data collection, their rationale, strengths and limitations. I then gave an in-depth account of my approach to data analysis, both qualitative and quantitative. Finally, I discussed the criteria used for judging the research. This entailed how I took care of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability in this study. In the next chapter, I present findings related to the dynamics of L-i-E policy at the two elite English-medium schools.
CHAPTER 5: LANGUAGE PLANNING AT THE MICRO-LEVEL: THE CASE OF TWO ELITE SCHOOLS

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3 I discussed the sociolinguistic milieu of Pakistan with particular focus on the evolution and development of formal language policy since the creation of the state of Pakistan. This overt language planning at the macro-level was discussed with reference to the constitution, acts of parliament, reports of various commissions on languages, language policy discourses and the education policies announced by the Ministry of Education. Moreover, while discussing the development of language planning and policy (LPP) in Pakistan I critically analysed how LPP in Pakistan has evolved as a consequence of the actions of various social, cultural, political, ethnic and economic forces (Pennycook, 2000; Ricento, 2000; Tollefson, 2006). Following the theoretical framework of this study, as discussed in Chapter 2, I concur with the view that LPP operates at both the macro and micro-levels (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008) and that language planning in the micro-context such as schools is a “fundamental and integrated part of the overall language planning process, which merits attention both within the context of the operation of macro-level planning—as necessary extension of it—and in its own right—as a local activity with no macro roots” (p. 4).

In this chapter I discuss the language-in-education (L-i-E) policy and practices of the two elite schools, School A and B in Peshawar, the capital city of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province of Pakistan. In order to provide a holistic picture of this micro-level language policy, I draw on my observations, my interactions with school teachers, principals, students and parents, my reading of the schools’ websites and prospectuses and my familiarity with the context. Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions, however, are the main sources of findings and discussion. As per the mixed-methods design of this study, I also discuss the quantitative data from the questionnaire that is relevant to the themes in order to get a more general picture of the two elite schools. Both School A and School B belong to the elite category and are similar in terms of curriculum, language teaching philosophy and resources. As such they represent two cases based on literal replication (Bengtsson, 1999), which implies that the cases selected are similar as are the predicted results. In short the goal of this study is not to compare or contrast the two schools in terms of their language policy. However, if an idea or theme that is peculiar
to either school A or B emerges, I specify and explain it accordingly. Moreover, I must concede that the information that I could obtain about the two schools is not proportionate. School A was more open in giving me access than School B. Likewise, as I discuss the curriculum and pedagogical practices, I could draw on a lot of information on the website of School A. School B’s website and prospectus are not as detailed as that of School A; hence whatever I report is based on the information given on their websites or what I was told by the teachers and students during interviews.

I have organised this and the subsequent chapters thematically. This implies that data from various instruments and respondents (students, teachers and parents) are used to explore and discuss an emergent theme. The elite schools and the participants in this micro-level LPP context are seen as closely linked, thereby understanding each other’s language attitudes, preferences and practices. For instance, when I discuss students as actors and their power in LPP, in addition to the students’ comments, I also draw on the views of their teachers.

This chapter shows that the language-in-education policy of the elite schools has three dimensions: (1) medium of instruction, (2) language use in general, and (3) the teaching of languages as subjects. These dimensions are explored in the following sections with reference to three languages, i.e. English, Pashto and Urdu. Once the schools’ LPP is delineated, the section that follows focuses on how the policy is implemented. Three themes emerge with regard to the schools’ implementation strategies: (1) curriculum, (2) method and philosophy of language teaching, and (3) punishment as a tool of language management. Then I identify the actors and explore the extent of their power at the micro-level LPP of the elite schools. The next section examines the stakeholders’ response to the government’s new LPP. This section offers interesting insights into the complex nature of power and interaction between micro-level (elite schools) and macro-level (official) LPP. Finally I discuss some of the quantitative data related to the themes of medium of education and languages as subjects. The data helps draw a general picture of the students’ perceptions about the role and status of the three languages in education. I begin with an overview section that sets the scene for a detailed discussion of language planning in the subsequent sections.
5.2 Language-in-education policy

5.2.1 Language-in-education policy: An overview

Language or medium of instruction is a key component of language policy. Its importance can be gauged from the fact that Fishman (1991), in his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale of an endangered language, places the school medium of instruction at stage four. Although in the relevant L-i-E policy documents there is no evidence of any classification or categorisation of schools as bilingual or monolingual in Pakistan, the elite schools can be easily grouped as predominantly monolingual and English-only. Urdu is taught as a compulsory subject due to the state’s declared LPP. The students’ second preferred language for informal communication, after English, is also mostly Urdu. However, as I report in the findings of this and the subsequent chapters, Urdu appears quite insignificant and worthless in the context of the elite schools due to the dominant status of English. The mother tongue of the majority of the students and the language of the community, Pashto, is altogether excluded from the schools’ L-i-E policy. The two elite schools are, therefore, found to have strict English-only monolingual language policies. This is illustrated by the statements of students, teachers and parents, as well as my observations in classrooms, libraries, the principals’ offices, playgrounds and corridors. In the corridors and playgrounds, however, I could hear more multilingual voices, a mixture of Urdu, English and Pashto, than in other domains where English was more dominant. I will discuss these findings with reference to data in the subsequent sections. Before I embark on discussing the key findings with regard to medium of instruction and language use, it would be worthwhile to report some of my early impressions and observations about the schools’ L-i-E policy.

During my first visit to school A while I was waiting in the principal’s office for a teacher who was supposed to coordinate my data collection, a parent came to meet the principal. She started talking in Urdu even though her accent showed that she was a Pashto speaker. The principal, after his initial greeting in Urdu, soon switched to English. Maybe he already knew that the woman would be comfortable in English. The discussion proceeded in English. As I reflect on the scene against the background of everything I learned about the school, it is evident that the principal’s switching to English was part of the overall language policy of the school. The principal had to showcase the commodity (English) for which the parents had admitted their children in the school. Interestingly, his conversation...
with me was mostly in Urdu and occasionally in English. I knew he was Pashto-speaking and I am sure that he too would have no doubt about my native language (on the basis of my first introduction with him). When the office boy entered the room with tea, the principal addressed him in Pashto: “yo cup milma la warka” [give one cup to the guest]. After some time the teacher I was waiting for arrived. When she started speaking to me in English, she showed signs of a native-like English accent. She was teaching English to A level, the senior most class in the school. She too could speak Urdu and Pashto. Similarly, the group of students who were introduced to me as my potential participants in the study also preferred to converse in English with momentary switch to Urdu and Pashto. The principal and teachers of School B also talked to me in English with occasional switches to Urdu.

5.2.2 The medium of instruction

Normally the schools explicate their curriculum, of which language-in-education policy is an important component, through their prospectus or official websites. It was interesting to note that for all their reputation as English-medium schools, and in spite of what the participants reveal about their language preference in the following paragraphs, the medium of instruction (MoI) aspect of their policy and curriculum is not highlighted on the website and prospectuses, which are the first sources of information for the general public. Nevertheless, there is enormous focus on modern teaching techniques, up-to-date curriculum, the teachers’ training and the grooming of students for the challenges of the modern world, etc. With thorough screening I was able to dig out some evidence in the curriculum webpage of School A’s website: “School A curriculum has contextualised and built on these [foreign] curricula to adapt to local needs. It is taught in English with the exception of language classes” (School A website). This tendency to understate their L-i-E policy could only be attributed to the fact that since the schools for decades have been so well known for their English-only policy, they feel no need to emphasise this aspect in their public documents.

The classes that I observed were mostly English classes as well as some other subjects like chemistry, computer studies and accounting. The MoI was English in all of the classes that I observed. In all classes the students asked questions in English as well as spoke to each other in English in pair and group activities. Regarding English as the MoI, there was no second opinion among the students. For instance, an O Level student reported that “in class
I speak in English because Pashto is not allowed in the class” (Student 5). This view was supported by another student: “In class we are not allowed to speak any other language than English” (Student 11). A number of students referred to the school rules when they talked about MoI, as this comment from a focus group demonstrates: “At school we have to speak English because it is an English medium school and we have to maintain our discipline” (FG#5, S4).

The views of teachers and parents concurred with the students. A teacher from School B reported that the MoI is English “because all the subjects are in English; so they have to be very strong in English” (Teacher 7). Likewise, a School A teacher explained that the school has an explicit policy for English as the medium of instruction:

The school policy generally, not just for A Level, requires both teachers and students to communicate in English because this is the medium which is being used for different course contents also, excluding Islamic studies and Urdu. Islamic studies at lower level is in Urdu, but at O Level and A Level it is in English. The rest are all in English. (Teacher 3)

Similarly a parent reported that the school puts great “emphasis on the total use of English inside the class as well as outside” (Parent 6). Another parent explained that since instruction in English is part of the school curriculum, “they [teachers] mainly emphasises on competence in English” (Parent 2). The MoI aspect of LPP is further explored in Section 5.3.1 with regard to the elite schools’ curriculum.

The students’ positive attitudes towards English as the medium of education were quite pragmatically oriented. For instance most of the students reported that they prefer English as medium of education because they find learning in English easy as compared to learning in local languages such as Urdu and Pashto (I discuss this theme in detail in Sections 5.2.4.2 and 6.1.1). Similarly, another view that led many of the students to favour English as the medium of instruction related to higher education, which is mostly in English. I found many students agreeing with this comment of one of their teachers:

But the problem would be in the higher classes because the higher education is all in English. If you look at the government schools, up to matric every subject is taught in Urdu but as soon as they enter grade 11 or first year all these subjects are in English, and at BA level everything is compulsory to do in English except Urdu and Islamic Studies. (Teacher 4)
Another view which coincided with the preference for English pertained to scepticism about the capacity and suitability of local vernaculars as mediums of instruction. A student remarked:

But I am not sure if our local languages could be used to teach physics or mathematics and other subjects. Maybe I haven’t studied that much in Urdu or Pashto. I think English is fine… I wouldn’t want books to be in Pashto and Urdu; it would be disastrous as we wouldn’t get anything. Even my cousins who have been in schools where English is not emphasised so much [government schools], even they want Pakistan Studies in English. (Student 6)

Scepticism about the cultivation of native languages and their ability to be used for teaching science has also been reported by Spolsky (2009, p. 103): “It is hard enough to develop appropriate terminology and materials for elementary education, but by the secondary level with more advanced courses, especially in sciences, the pressure becomes even stronger”. To explain this situation, Spolsky refers to the Arab nations’ use of French at the secondary level despite their active Arabization. Spolsky also cites instances from Africa and Malaysia where there is a strong tendency to use English for teaching science subjects. Having discussed the medium of instruction, I now turn to the elite schools’ policy with regard to the use of language(s) in general.

5.2.3 Language use in general

When asked about the MoI and the use of language in out-of-class domains in the school, there was uniformity in the views of all stakeholders that the schools had a clear and well-defined policy for the use of English in routine communication outside the classroom. The response of this student is representative of many such comments by the students: “In class we are not allowed to speak any other language than English. Even in school, outside the class, we are not allowed to speak any other language” (Student 11). A student explained how her grooming in the school has influenced her language use even outside the school domain: “We have been taught to speak English with friends and everywhere, so that (speaking English) has become a habit” (Student 3). In the co-curricular sphere, the schools were also found to give explicit instructions to students that they must speak English. A student in the focus group reported that “the farewell parties are organized by school, so they ask us to speak in English” (FG#2, S3). The school language policy is not only confined to the students’ use of English in daily conversations but also attempts to
influence their leisure activities: “They urge us to speak English, read English novels, watch movies, and listen to [English] music” (FG#4, S2).

There was a slight difference in the approach towards language policy between the two schools. School A students and teachers said that the English-only policy is being strictly enforced at school only (i.e. Class 1 to Class 10). At the college level, however, there are no clearly expressed rules and the students have greater freedom in language choice. For instance in the comment of this student there is an implicit reference that language policy was strictly enforced in school, but not in college: “When we were young like in school they used to tell us to speak in English” (FG#2, S4), suggesting that now in A Level or college there is no formal restriction on the use of language outside the class. This view was supported by another student: “We were used to doing that [speaking English] in school, where they clearly asked us to speak in English, so we did” (Students 2). School A students clearly differentiated between school and college levels in terms of the policy with regard to English, although for me as an outsider there was no difference as the building and teachers were the same for both the school and college sections. When I repeatedly heard that English outside classrooms was strictly enforced at school but not at college (A Level), I wondered for a while why those senior students were using English all the time if college was not strict about languages? I soon got the answer, as embodied in this response:

But in school they used to convince us and persuade us to speak English and only English; and they were quite strict about that so that we get fluent. Now that we are fluent our use of English is habitual actually. (Student 3)

The students, therefore, start speaking English habitually and spontaneously when they reach college. In School B, on the other hand, there was no clear distinction between the school and college levels; the strict English-only policy was for all the levels. This comment of a college-level student at School B suggests that the English-only policy is enforced at all levels: “We don’t usually speak Urdu at school; we are not allowed to speak Urdu except in Urdu class. We are supposed to speak in English all the time” (FG#4, S3).

The teachers’ and parents’ responses to the school language policy reflected similar views to those of the students. For instance, this teacher’s remark confirms the ubiquitous nature of English in elite school contexts: “Yes, this is the school policy that teachers and children should be speaking English in the corridors, in the playgrounds, in the classes and canteen,
everywhere” (Teacher 9). Another teacher reported that the strict English-only policy is for both the students and teachers: “We try our level best that the students, whether right or wrong, are encouraged to speak English and so do the teachers” (Teacher 7). Not only the teachers and students held this view, parents also shared it. The following comment by a parent represents several similar parent responses: “Their main priority is to talk to children in English, and make the children speak English. I mean not just the lecture or teaching, but also the language of daily use; for instance, instructions about homework, greeting, asking, etc.” (Parent 2).

This and the previous section have revealed that the elite schools put great emphasis on English as the medium of instruction as well as the language of general communication. The strict English-only policy means the exclusion of the other two languages, Urdu and Pashto. Thus the school L-i-E policy is geared towards English-only monolingualism. Moreover, on the basis of my early impressions in the principal’s office (discussed above in the overview), it can be argued that the schools have an explicit policy to showcase their English-centric LPP even to the parents. The following section is about another aspect of language policy, i.e. languages as subjects.

### 5.2.4 Languages as subjects

Language-in-education planning at the micro-level refers to MoI as well as the teaching of languages as a subject (Menken & Garcia, 2010; Spolsky, 2009). Spolsky (2009) believes that teaching language as an additional subject implies an additive approach in contrast to the replacive approach of the monolingual immersion program. As such in this section I will discuss two languages, Urdu and Pashto, in terms of their status as language subjects in the context of the two schools. The discussion of Pashto as a subject is more detailed because there were more in-depth and diverse reflections about Pashto, which is the MT of the majority of the students.

#### 5.2.4.1 The teaching of Urdu

Urdu is the national language of Pakistan. Even though a majority of Pakistanis can understand and speak this language, it is the first language of only 7% of the population (Government of Pakistan, 1998). It is taught as a compulsory subject from pre-school to

---

8 Even though Pashto is not taught in the elite schools, and has never been taught in any of the English-medium schools, the participants appeared more interested to reflect on its possible inclusion in the curriculum.
intermediate (Year 12) in all government as well as private schools. It is also a major
ing language in the information and entertainment media. It is the medium of communication
in most of the government and private (non-elite) schools. As a result of its status, it enjoys
high prestige value among the masses in general. Among the educated Pakistanis Urdu is
valued higher than the native/regional languages and lower than English in terms of status,
prestige and instrumental value.

The websites and prospectuses of both School A and School B outline Urdu as the only
language, other than English, that is taught as a subject. Responses of teachers and students
also confirmed this. For instance this student gave a nutshell account of the status of Urdu
not only in the language policy but in society at large: “Because Urdu is used as a subject
so it has a brighter future than Pashto and people are learning it, speaking it. It is also used
in the offices. So due to all this Urdu can survive longer” (Student 12). An A Level
student linked the indispensability of learning Urdu to its national status: “Our national
language is Urdu, you have to learn and use it one way or another” (Student 89). These
comments reveal that the status of Urdu as a compulsory subject, its emergence as a lingua
franca and its influence in other domains like offices, is inherently linked to the
government’s status and prestige planning initiatives for Urdu.

Despite the compulsory teaching of Urdu from Class 1 to 12 and despite the realisation of
its importance, the stakeholders’ attitudes towards Urdu as a subject were negative. As this
teacher reported, although Urdu is taught as an additional subject along with English it is “
not taken that seriously [as English] because the students say that there is no future in Urdu
so they just try to get passing marks and get rid of Urdu” (Teacher 4). In Chapter 6 I point
out that it is only English which the students regard as instrumental to success in their
educational career. Urdu, despite its status as a compulsory subject, was seen as having
little or no role. In this respect one student frankly remarked that he does not care much
about Urdu because mere “speaking in Urdu and Pashto is enough for me. I really don’t
need to improve it. I mean that’s not one of my priorities” (Student 6). This and the
previous few comments reveal that despite their positive attitude towards Urdu as the
national language and despite its status as a compulsory subject, the elite schools’ students
are not positively disposed to the Urdu subject.

9 The theme of Urdu as a symbol of national unity is discussed with regard to integrative attitudes in Chapter
6.
Another strong theme that contributed to the negative attitude towards Urdu as a subject stemmed from the fact that many of the students found Urdu difficult to learn. To explain this point, a student in a focus group observed that “nowadays people are mostly writing books in English; Urdu books were written long ago and Urdu in those days was extremely difficult. So it is very difficult for us to understand Urdu”\(^{10}\) (FG#4, S3). Another student made the same point very simply: “Urdu is so difficult” (Student 11). English teachers’ opinions about Urdu were similar to those of students. A teacher, for instance, reflected on her own experience of learning Urdu: “Urdu is also taught to us from day one, but you see Urdu is difficult” (Teacher 8). Similarly, a teacher lamented the predicament of English-medium school students, particularly with reference to reading and writing: “Reading and writing in Urdu is already very difficult for the English-medium school children” (Teacher 8).

The difficulty that the elite school students face in Urdu could be attributed to the prominence that is given to English. In addition, two major factors contributing to the lack of commitment towards Urdu as a subject could be its low instrumental value (see Chapter 6), and its minimal role at the higher education level of education. To sum up, although Urdu is a language of prestige second to English, it has a low status as a subject and a majority of the students find it difficult and of limited worth.

### 5.2.4.2 Perceptions about the possible teaching of Pashto

Pashto or any other native language (except Urdu) is not part of the elite schools’ curriculum as evidenced in the prospectuses and the reported data of the participants. Something that the schools exclude from the curriculum and do not teach is called the “null curriculum” (Eisner, 1994). Certain aspects of the null curriculum in some contexts are as worthy of investigation as the aspects which are included. Since the participants had reflected in depth about the role of MT in general and in education, in this section I discuss their perceptions about the supposed inclusion of Pashto subject in the curriculum. I discuss the stakeholders’ perceptions of Pashto’s exclusion from the school, its significance, if any, for them, and their thoughts on its inclusion in future curricula.

---

\(^{10}\) Up-to-date books are still being written in Urdu on a regular basis. She is actually referring to the significant use of classical poetry and prose in the Urdu textbooks, which is difficult for students to comprehend.
While the strength of Urdu lies in its status as national lingua franca, the language of media and a compulsory subject in schools, Pashto’s strength lies in its status as the language of home and community. However, the very fact that Pashto is the MT of the students in this context makes its case as a subject in schools weaker. I heard many students and parents saying that they do not need to be taught Pashto because they already know it: “I am not that interested in Pashto. If I speak it for half a year I can communicate with anyone appropriately” (FG#1, S1). A student in another focus group also observed that “you do learn your MT anyway” (FG#4, S3), suggesting that there is no need to learn it in school. Opinion among the teachers and parents was similar. For instance, this School B teacher is content with her students’ ability to speak their MT: “We don’t need [to teach] it. Spoken is enough, isn’t it?” (Teacher 8). A similar argument was put forward by another teacher: “You don’t have to teach them. A child coming from that Shinwari\(^{11}\) background knows Pashto, but these two languages [English and Urdu] have to be taught” (Teacher 7). Preference for Urdu and English over MT as subjects was also reported by several parents as evidenced in this comment: “I will opt for Urdu for my children because Pashto is already used at home” (Parent 1). One can see a sense of complacency among the participants as far as MT is concerned. However, for me their complacency is ironic as there is sound evidence in the data of this study that many of the elite school students are undergoing a language shift from MT both in terms of functions and domains of use. Moreover, even though they report frequent switching to Urdu and English due to lack of expressions in MT, thus showing clear signs of MT loss (to be discussed in chapter 7), they take their MT for granted, find no issue with it, and feel no need to learn it at school. There seems to be this strange contradiction between being already able to speak Pashto and learning it. A similar perception about native languages is also reported by Guerini (2008, p. 7, citing Andoh-Kumi, 1997): “why should we pay high school fees only for you to learn languages we already speak”?

As in the case of Urdu, a strong perception or rather apprehension prevails among the majority of the students that if Pashto was introduced as a subject, they would find it difficult to learn. In the comment of this student there is an interesting, inherent dilemma as it is not clear whether he finds Pashto difficult because he never learnt it or he never learnt it because he found it difficult: “Pashto is way too difficult, like never in my life I have read a single sentence of Pashto because it is difficult” (Student 6). This view was

---

\(^{11}\) Shinwari is a Pashtun tribe.
supported by a parent who believes that “Pashto is a very difficult language, especially in writing” (Parent 1). The students generally feel comfortable with speaking it, but at the same time learning its grammar formally appears quite daunting. The view is encapsulated in the comment of a Class 10 student: “But Pashto grammar is really difficult, so I try to improve it by speaking it in my family, so I hope it will improve as I grow up. I will keep on speaking it. I can’t forget it” (Student 14). The fact that most of the students found formal learning of Pashto difficult appears to contribute to their negative attitude towards Pashto as a subject:

So it will be obviously difficult for us because we know how to speak it but we don’t know how to read and write it. Hardly anyone is going to be happy because we have all been trained for Urdu and English. (FG#4, S3)

This remark depicts two reasons for the students’ opposition to Pashto: one is their apprehension about the difficulty of reading and writing Pashto; the second is their complacency stemming from the belief that since they can speak it, they do not need to learn it.

In addition to the perception of difficulty, students were also wary of having MT as a subject as they thought it would add to the burden of their studies. A student in a focus group remarked that “they cannot take too much pressure. I think you have to deduct one subject [if MT subject is introduced] (FG#4, S3). Another student tried to find a middle ground between his commitment to MT and his studies: “I think it should be introduced as a subject but orally, not in written form because it will put a lot of burden on us” (FG#5, S3). On quite a few occasions when students expressed positive attitudes about the value of Pashto, especially as a symbol of identity, their perception suddenly changed when I sought their opinion about its inclusion as a subject in the school curriculum: “I mean out of my own preference I would like to do it [learn Pashto], but if it was something from the school like a subject, I will not be ready to handle it” (Student 4). The following response is a typical representation of the students’ apprehensions concerning MT as a subject:

Pashto? To be honest I really don’t want to complicate my life anymore. Because you know it is a big pressure on us students, learning three languages; it’s too much pressure. If we stress upon one language it’s so hard, we have to make real struggle to try and improve it. Including Pashto in the course will be like terrible [laughing], so that’s why I will never suggest it. (Student 6)
Despite these strong reservations, there were several voices among the students who felt that there was nothing wrong with the introduction of MT as a subject. For instance, in this comment of a focus group discussion, the student recommends the teaching of Pashto in the elite schools because “99% students here are Pashtun and no one knows how to write or read Pashto, so I think we should be taught here” (FG#2, S4). Further substantiating her point, she referred to the example of Sind province and suggested their model should be emulated in KP: “She [her friend] said that till 8th class they were taught Sindi, so why not Pashto here in this province” (FG#2, S4).

Support for MT as a subject among parents and teachers, however, was minimal. For instance, this parent was sceptical if his son would bear the burden of another subject: “To learn a third one [i.e. MT along with English and Urdu], and at the same time learn subjects like medicine, engineering and arts also etc.; this is very difficult and not possible” (Parent 3). Another parent was concerned about the burden of effort as well as finances involved in the teaching of another subject: “I will discourage totally [with a loud laugh]. We have been spending money, time, and energy to make teaching of quality English available to them. Now who on earth will be ready to learn Pashto” (Parent 1). Likewise, the comment of the following teacher clearly referred to the autonomy that private schools enjoy in terms of the curriculum: “Private sector has its own set up. Pashto is not necessary for them because we are following the Peshawar board till Class 8. Afterwards most of the students go for Cambridge” (Teacher 6). Yet another teacher, who had her own children enrolled in that school, asserted that “I will react very badly; I am going to take my children out of this school [if MT subject was introduced]” (Teacher 8). An explanation in this regard came from this teacher from School A who felt that any attempt to impose MT as a subject would not yield positive results, at least in the context of the elite schools:

When you actually try to put too much pressure on people to speak that language [MT] and appreciate it more often, that’s where the people start to realise that this is something which is losing its value and now is just being imposed on us. So when you do too much for something that is going to end up like you are making a mistake. (Teacher 3)

In addition to the aforementioned arguments against MT as a subject, a number of stakeholders were of the view that the teaching of MT would promote regionalism and weaken national unity: “There will be conflict because if you put the system in Pashto here, then most certainly they will put it in Punjabi, so there will be conflict among the
various provinces” (FG# 3, S1). In the same manner, the majority of stakeholders were not convinced about the teaching of MT owing to its minimal pragmatic value. I discuss these themes in Chapter 6 in detail under integrative and instrumental attitudes towards languages. In sum, the findings discussed above suggest five reasons why the teaching of MT is opposed:

1) Since students can speak it well, they do not need to learn it in school.
2) Formal learning of Pashto is difficult.
3) Learning Pashto would be an extra burden and might negatively affect their performance in other subjects.
4) Teaching a local language would go against the spirit of national unity and might promote regionalism.
5) There is no instrumental value attached to Pashto either in education or in the job and business spheres.

This section has revealed that the language policy of the elite schools does not support any language other than English. Although Urdu is taught as a subject, as it is obligated by the official policy, there is an overall negative attitude towards it. The students’ mother tongue, Pashto, is altogether excluded from the school curriculum. Hence instead of additive bilingualism the elite schools L-i-E policy is oriented towards replacive immersion. Having discussed the three aspects of micro-level LPP, I now turn to how the schools implement this policy.

5.3 Implementation of language policy

Three themes emerged with regard to strategizing and implementing the schools language policy: (1) curriculum, (2) pedagogy and philosophy of teaching, and (3) punishment as a tool of language management. The totality of curriculum contents and pedagogical choices ultimately constitute an enacted language and literacy policy (Lo Bianco, 2010, p. 165). Before discussing these themes, I would like to shed some light on how the language policy is communicated to the teachers.

The policy regarding the use of English, both inside and outside the class, is implemented quite vigorously. It is clearly communicated to the teachers in various ways and on various occasions. A teacher explained that the policy with regard to English is strictly enforced, saying “whenever there is staff meeting we are told that even if you are unnoticed you have
to speak English” (Teacher 1). Another teacher reflected more deeply on the policy from the perspective of teachers as implementers of the policy:

Yes. It [policy] is communicated to the teachers and the teachers are observed randomly by the higher ups. For instance the language, if the science teacher is using Urdu or Pashto in the class, she is like given reprimand for that. You are not supposed to use that language in the class. (Teacher 5)

As the data in the following sections will reveal, the principal, irrespective of his or her\(^\text{12}\) educational background, and the teachers of English, are the main proponents, monitors and implementers of the English-centric policy of the schools. In the following section I discuss curriculum, the first of the three aspects of policy implementation. It is mostly based on documentary evidence, i.e. the schools’ websites and prospectuses, and my observations.

5.3.1 Curriculum

Curriculum, which generally refers to a defined and prescribed course of studies, is one of the determinants in the implementation of language acquisition management (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). Tariq Rahman, a prominent sociolinguist from Pakistan, has written much about the elite schools. He describes their curriculum in these words:

Some books have been especially reprinted for Pakistan but the changes made in them are minor—clothes of women are Pakistani and some characters have Pakistani Muslim names—while the books are still meant for a Western readership. … Children read such classics as Lorna Doone, Little Women, Wuthering Heights, and Tom Brown’s School Days and famous figures like Florence Nightingale and so on. The world portrayed here is Western, middle-class, and successful. The overwhelming message of the texts is liberal and secular. Concepts like the segregation or veiling of women, ubiquitous religiosity, sectarianism or ethnicity get no support. (Rahman, 2004a, pp. 38-39)

In terms of the curriculum, School A’s website refers to Montessori and Reggio Emilia methods for early childhood education, and for Classes 1-8 the curriculum is “modelled after Scottish curriculum and the UK national curriculum” which have been contextualised “to adapt to local needs” (School A website). It was interesting to note School A’s claim of the adaptation of the foreign curricula to local needs because they also claim that the curriculum is taught in English with the exception of language classes (Urdu in this case). Students from Classes 1-8 are taught the curriculum based on these aforementioned foreign curricula. From Class 9 onwards, when students enter the secondary and then the higher

---

\(^\text{12}\) The principal of School A was male and that of School B was female.
secondary (intermediate) levels, the majority of them continue with the curriculum of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and thus take O Level and A Level exams. Some of them, however, opt to continue with the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (BISE) stream and study the textbooks prescribed by the board and appear in the BISE exams like matriculation and intermediate (the equivalent of O Level and A Level respectively). Some elite schools do not even permit students to take matriculation exam (Rahman, 2004a, p. 38). Formerly, only those students who planned to go to the USA or the UK for their university education opted for O Level and A Level, and the majority of students used to opt for the BISE system. As I have personally observed and heard from fresh undergraduate students at the GIK Institute—the Engineering University where I taught for four years—this trend has now for several reasons significantly changed in favour of O Level and A Level. First, more people come to know about its high prestige value due to its association with the University of Cambridge and the UK. Second, a greater number of students in the elite schools are now planning to go to developed western countries for higher education. This theme will be discussed further in Chapter 6 when dealing with the instrumental value of languages. Thirdly, and most importantly, the professional universities in Pakistan have started entry or admission tests based on the pattern of SAT and the University of Cambridge exams. As such, students who have successfully gone through the Cambridge exams are better equipped to pass the test as compared to the BISE students. When I was a lecturer at the GIK Institute, one of the leading technology universities in Pakistan, I knew that about 70-80% of students who succeeded to enrol had done A Level. Similarly, School B’s prospectus mentions that the school is registered with the University of Cambridge and the University of London as well as with the BISE.

It is evident from the information above that the students in these schools are taught according to foreign (mostly UK) curriculum, except a small percentage of students who switch to BISE stream after Class 8. However, with regard to the medium of education policy and language use in general, the practice is the same for both streams of education (BISE & Cambridge). Although I did not get a chance to observe a BISE based class, from my interaction with teachers and students it was evident that the language policy is uniform for all students. Of course there would be some pedagogical differences in the teaching of courses (especially English) as the locally produced BISE textbooks mainly follow the traditional Grammar Translation approach with an emphasis on formal teaching of
grammar, vocabulary and memory based comprehension questions, while the University of Cambridge emphasises activity-based learning; communicative and task-based methods of language teaching in which students get greater opportunities to practice, interact and produce the language skills13.

In the mainly foreign curriculum of the elite schools the “local or contextualised” parts of the curriculum comprise compulsory subjects like Urdu, Islamic Studies and Pakistan Studies, which is in line with the requirements of the ministry and its boards of education14. A striking aspect of the curriculum of the elite schools is the exclusion of the native language or mother tongue. It was interesting to see that the schools have ignored the significance which the Scottish and British curriculums attach to the languages of local communities. For instance, the Scottish curriculum website notes:

Very importantly, teachers can make great use of opportunities to link language learning with progress in English and with other languages used by people in the school community, enabling children to explore and experiment with sound patterns and make links and comparisons between languages. (School A website)

The website further notes that:

The study of Gaelic supports learners to gain a deeper understanding of Gaelic language, culture and heritage. Children and young people will enjoy Gaelic as a living language with a rich culture and heritage. Teachers will use the framework of experiences and outcomes to heighten the awareness children and young people have of what is special, vibrant and valuable about Gaelic culture and heritage. (School A website)

Similarly, the UK national curriculum website highlights “the importance of foreign language in primary school in providing valuable educational, social and cultural experiences for pupils” (School A website). In the curriculum of the elite schools, the paradox is that the foreign language is given a very dominant status while the local language and culture are completely neglected. The teaching of Urdu as a subject is no substitute for the language of the community as Urdu is a second language for about 93% of Pakistanis (Government of Pakistan, 1998). The discrepancy in the language part of the curriculum continues even further. School A, which also has branches in other countries, offers education in local languages to students in Malaysia: “The students study in the local

---

13 I have personal experience of studying these books as a student; I also got a chance to sift through some of the books during my fieldwork in the schools.

14 For a majority of the students who opt for O Level and A Level these subjects are not compulsory. However, if these students want to get admission to professional universities inside Pakistan, then it is compulsory for them to take these subjects.
languages and in English” (School A website). Again no such role or significance is accorded to local languages by the same school in Pakistan. This surely is the case because the government’s official LPP tacitly approves the English-only policy of the elite schools.

In this section I have explored the curriculum of the elite schools with particular emphasis on language-in-education policy. The elite schools follow the curriculums of foreign countries as they are deemed more effective in teaching English. Even though it is claimed that the foreign curriculum is contextualised to serve local needs, the use of the local language(s) is strongly discouraged.

5.3.2 Foreign language teaching: Philosophy and pedagogy in the context of elite schools

In the previous sections it has been shown that the stakeholders in general and the teachers in particular have a general apathy towards native languages. By teachers I mean teachers of English as they were the ones I interviewed at the schools. The data from interviews revealed that their attitude towards native languages coincided with their philosophy of foreign language (English) teaching. The comment of this School B teacher reflects a general perception that I noted among the teachers, with only a few exceptions, that the use of the native language could hinder or retard the foreign language acquisition process: “I think they [native languages] do influence the English learning process. When the students feel that the teacher can speak to them in those languages, they try to approach you in that language. … They stop learning English” (Teacher 9). The idea of immersion in a second or foreign language that strictly excludes the use of any other language is also encapsulated in this response of a teacher in School A:

I am of the opinion that we should provide an environment, if the environment is English she/he has to talk in English. It should be the direct and communicative method. If you don’t give response in Urdu or Pashto, I would be forced to respond in English. (Teacher 4)

The teacher in the above comment refers to the communicative way of language teaching. During an English class observation (Class#3, School A) I noted that the teacher followed some of the tenants of communicative language teaching such as meaning negotiation and construction, language use of the target language, and the use of authentic material. Similarly, another teacher noted that “I will give them six different examples and eventually they will understand, although it’s easier to give them a Pashto word or an Urdu
one” (Teacher 2). The monolingual language teaching philosophy is explained more elaborately by this teacher:

We always discourage these [native] languages in the classroom. We always encourage them and help them. We like them to speak English, and if it is broken and not fluent, then we help them and give them easy vocabulary so that they should be able to convey their ideas, but we strongly discourage the other languages. Because if their ears do not get acclimatised to English how will they learn it; how they will be able to speak. (Teacher 5)

Views of some of the students also reflected the language teaching philosophy of their teachers as evidenced in this comment of a School A student: “As far as English teachers are concerned they would definitely not allow Urdu, let alone Pashto, because they have this belief that they have to teach English only. So they wouldn’t let you move away from the language” (Student 7). Yet another student held a similar view to that of his teachers as far proficiency in English was concerned: “Like if I don’t speak English all the time even at home, and watch English movies, listen to English music, so ya my English will lag behind” (Student 14).

The schools were also found to have a centralized and controlled mechanism to ensure teaching that conforms to the schools’ teaching philosophy. In this respect, School A provides curriculum resource packs (CRPs) and daily lesson plans (DLPs) to its teachers so that they may deliver effective teaching (School A website). The CRPs comprise a scheme of studies related to a centralized book list of private and government publications. DLPs, which are structured around the CRPs, incorporate interactive teaching and learning approaches. The principal of School A explained that “Teachers usually write their lesson plans as per the guidelines of DLPs on the weekend for the next week. These are duly checked by the head of the branch” (Principal School A). The structured and centralized nature of these resources and pedagogical approaches could have both positive and negative implications. On the positive side they would ensure uniformity in teaching goals and practices, as well as facilitating the new teachers to adjust to the school system quickly. On the negative side, the system could restrict the teachers’ freedom to respond to the complex and dynamic nature of second or foreign language teaching. This pedagogical approach, together with the practice of observation of teachers “randomly by the higher ups” (Teacher 5) raises some questions about the teacher’s authority in the case of elite schools. I discuss the teachers’ authority vis-à-vis their role as implementers of LPP further in Section 5.4.2.
5.3.3 Punishment as a tool of language management

Punishment as an instrument to discourage the use of native languages has been a common feature of language management in societies where linguistic homogeneity of the dominant language is seen as essential to nationalism or national unity and prosperity (May, 2008). McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas and Magga (2008) and Spolsky (2009) report instances of schools in the USA, Canada and New Zealand imposing harsh punishments on students who spoke their native languages in their English dominant schools. Similarly, McCarty et al. (2008, p. 300, citing Spack, 2002) report that after cleanliness, “No Indian Talk” was the first rule in the federal Indian schools, and infractions were brutally punished. The elite schools in Pakistan appear to follow the same pattern and punish the students in various ways for violating the rule, i.e. speaking Pashto or Urdu in or outside the class. My observations and the evidence in interview data show that the principal and the English teachers are at the forefront of strictly implementing the schools’ English-only policy. The evidence regarding this theme is adequately found in the data from all stakeholders, as well as my own observations.

The comment of this student in a focus group discussion in School B gives a clear reference to the penalty for speaking Pashto: “Like in school they tell us ‘don’t ever speak Pashto’; and if we speak they fine us. No matter which school you go, they fine the students who are found speaking Pashto” (FG#4, S3). School A on the other hand has a fairly relaxed policy for students of college (A Level, intermediate) outside the class: “But it is not necessary or compulsory that we talk in English outside the class, but we do speak [English]” (Student 2). The school section (Class 10 and below), however, is quite strict, as evidenced in this comment of an A Level student: “When I was in school I remember our teachers would fine a student if he or she was found speaking in a language other than English” (Student 9). Several students spoke about the active role of the principal in this respect: “Our principal [of School B] gets angry when she finds us speaking Pashto, and she say ‘speak in English’” (Student 14). Similarly, another student referred to his former school (also an elite school of the same category) principal who had categorised the school areas linguistically:

In my previous school, which too was an English-medium, our principal used to warn us that when you are in red line you should speak English, and once you cross the red line then you are allowed to speak Urdu only. The red line was drawn in the field where we used to assemble. (FG#2, S7)
Although I have argued that the strict language policy was meant to promote English only, between the two neglected languages (Urdu and Pashto) Urdu still enjoys some respect:

And sometimes if you wanted to ask a question from the teacher and he could not get your accent or you could not get your point through English you had the permission to ask him in Urdu. But Pashto, I don’t know why were they so against using Pashto in class. Like if the teacher stands in the corner and if they would hear you speaking Pashto, they would say English, speak English. (Student 3)

This tendency was noted in both schools. Even some of the parents reported that the schools show some tolerance for Urdu, but not Pashto. In this regard a teacher of School B made a very interesting revelation: “You know we have boxes in the class and even if the teachers are not around, we tell the monitors to write the name; we are going to fine those five rupees for Urdu and ten rupees for Pashto” (Teacher 8). Similarly a parent reported that if the students do not speak English, they are punished “by imposing a fine and even sending a letter to parents” (Parent 1).

This section has revealed that the elite schools have a vigorous implementation plan for their language-in-education (L-i-E) policy. Teachers are clearly instructed to make sure that English is the only language of communication in and outside the classrooms. They are observed for their own commitment to the policy. The schools follow the curricula of English speaking countries for up-to-date resources and pedagogical techniques which offer appropriate resources for an immersion oriented language planning. Related to curriculum is the schools’ foreign language teaching philosophy and pedagogy which are mainly English-only and immersion oriented. There is a strong perception that the use of local languages could impede the students’ fluency in English. Finally, there is an established system of punishments to implement these policies and philosophies. Having discussed the implementation of language planning, I now turn to the actors and their power in the process of L-i-E planning.

5.4 **Actors in language management: Who holds the power?**

Since LPP operates at national, institutional and interpersonal levels (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), the purpose of this section is to identify the actors and explore the extent of their authority at the micro-level of elite schools. Before I discuss the individual actors, I give an overview of the power of the elite schools vis-à-vis the national and official language policy.
In terms of L-i-E policy, the elite schools act quite autonomously from the official language policy. The official LPP oversees the management of policy at the macro level and controls the school to some extent. For instance, it is on the recommendation of the official LPP that English, Urdu, Pakistan and Islamic Studies are made compulsory together with subjects like science and maths. This macro policy applies to the whole system of education, both government and private (Government of Pakistan, 2009). The government bodies, however, surrender their authority when it comes to medium of instruction, the choosing of curricula and language use in general. While the mainstream schools teach all subjects, except English (that too through translation into Urdu or local language), the elite English-medium schools teach everything in English except Urdu. Not only this, as I have already discussed there is a strict policy of prohibiting and discouraging Urdu or regional languages even outside classrooms. The private schools also have the power to decide whether to teach MT as language subject. Not a single elite school so far has introduced this subject. The official language policy, as expounded through various reports of the Ministry of Education and the curriculum documents of the educational boards, acknowledges the fact that the curriculum structure of private schools does not give a clear idea of their equivalence with public sector qualifications and that “private sector establishments within the mainstream are not properly regulated” (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 17-18). I browsed the websites of Private Institutes of Educational Regulatory Authority (PIERA) to seek any information. There I could only find guidelines related to the physical and academic resources such as school buildings, the library, number of teachers, physical training instructors etc. I also searched websites of various educational boards (which conduct the matriculation and intermediate exams), but all in vain. Similarly, my emails to educational boards, PIERA officials and the secretary of education for the KP government did not get replies. Finally, I contacted the school principals whom I had met and interviewed during my field trip. I asked them if they are receiving any instructions or guidelines with regard to medium of education, the local language as a subject, and the language of communication in general. One of them replied and said, “No such communication has ever been received” (Principal, School A). Hence it became clear that the government has delegated this power to the private schools, perhaps tacitly.

My in-depth understanding of the schools and the reported data of the participants revealed that there are various actors who influence the language policy at the micro-level of elite
schools with varying degree of authority. They are: (1) the principal, (2) teachers, (3) students, and (4) parents. In the subsequent paragraphs I discuss the roles and authority of these actors.

5.4.1 The school principal

The principal has the highest administrative and academic authority in private schools. He or she guides the school’s education and language policies and sets procedure for their implementation. Of course there are powerful bodies such as the board of governors and the school owners, but since they are not normally located in schools, they delegate their authority in most matters to the school principal. The principal as the first contact point with the external actors is better positioned to express and project the school vision to the outside world. Much of what I have already discussed in the previous section with regard to power in L-i-E policy in fact relates to the principal as he or she is the one who represents the school in dealing with the official bodies as well as the general public.

In addition to their role as policy makers, the principal is also at the forefront of implementing the school L-i-E policy. He/she is quite strict in making sure that the teachers not only make the students use English and avoid Urdu or Pashto, they also use English among themselves all the time and become role models for the students. The power that the principal holds is evident from the responses of the students and teachers as well. The role of the principal in this regard was mentioned several times in the data. As a Class 10 student in School B reported, “the principal gets angry” when she finds “us speaking Pashto” and would tell us to “speak in English” (Student 14). Similarly, I found the teachers highly conscious and careful about conforming to “the system”, the language policy of the school: “No never ever; in English class we never switch to Urdu. This is strictly forbidden in our system” (Teacher 5). The system actually refers to the rules set by the principal. The policy is not just for the students, but also for the staff when they interact with each other in the staffroom, as this teacher reported: “It is strict. We have to speak English all the time. This is the policy. … Every time when there is staff meeting we are told that even if you are unnoticed you have to speak English” (Teacher 1). I found that the majority of the teachers’ beliefs reflected the language-in-education vision of the schools. Two of them reported significant change in their attitude towards language teaching due to their experiences in school and numerous workshops that they attended as part of the staff
development programme of the schools. This is discussed in more depth in the following section.

5.4.2 Teachers

I have discussed the evidence in which teachers are given strict instructions to speak English not only with students but also amongst themselves in the staffroom. In this section I will discuss the extent of authority that lies with the teachers. As such I will examine whether teachers as actors in implementing the school language policy are merely being dictated to by the principal or are exercising their own authority.

There is adequate evidence in the reported data to show that the school administration has a strict system of checks and balances for the teachers in order to make sure that they conform to the English-only policy both for the students and staff. In this regard a teacher from School A reported that:

The teachers are observed randomly by the higher ups. For instance the language, if the science teacher is using Urdu or Pashto in the class, she is asked for that and she is like given reprimand for that, you are not supposed to use that language in the class. (Teacher 5)

Together with the pressure of the principal, there is also pressure from parents and students on teachers to demonstrate fluency in and consistently adhere to the use of English in the classrooms. As will be discussed in the following section, students of senior classes complain if they find a teacher using Urdu or Pashto in class. The teachers in the private schools have to follow instructions about language policy from the employer without questioning their validity or rationality. Joblessness is a huge problem and the jobs in the private sector are not permanent and secure. Hence scarcity of jobs on one hand and a lack of security on the other restrict the teachers’ autonomy in the private schools. Contrary to this, teachers in the government sector have permanent and secure jobs. Ironically, the standard of education that the permanent teachers impart to students in government schools is far lower than that imparted by the teachers in elite private schools (see Alderman, Orazem, & Paterno, 2001; Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 19).

Notwithstanding the pressure of the principal vis-à-vis the strict English-only policy, the majority of the teachers that I interviewed actually believe in and subscribe to the same language ideology as that of the school. This teacher for instance is a staunch advocate of
the total immersion approach to language teaching: “I will give them six different examples and eventually they will understand, although it’s easier to give them a Pashto word or an Urdu one” (Teacher 2). When I asked “so you will not encourage the use of Pashto or Urdu”? She replied: “No not; I take it seriously”. This approach is also confirmed from the views reported by the students: “As far as English teachers are concerned they would definitely not allow Urdu, let alone Pashto because they have this belief that they have to teach English only. So they wouldn’t let you move away from the [English] language” (Student 7). Another teacher expressed a more logical view in support of English as the only medium of instruction: “Because English is the one language that cannot be avoided because it is the language of other subjects” (Teacher 3). One may question the authority manifested in these comments as it actually conforms to and reflects the schools’ LPP. A thorough analysis of the teachers’ reports did, in fact, reveal that their language teaching beliefs and practices were influenced by the language policy and environment in the schools. A teacher thus reported that the language policy “does influence the teachers’ perception because largely the focus is on the use of English language” (Teacher 3). Another teacher explained how the school groomed her professionally: “I was new to the system (elite schools) and did not know about group-work [communicative language teaching] in the class, and they really taught me very well. It is useful for both students and teachers” (Teacher 1). A similar experience of growth was narrated by another teacher: “Actually it [speaking English] has become a habit. Being a teacher working for the last 16 years I speak English most of the time [in English] (Teacher 8).

In spite of the English-only policy under the strict administration and in spite of the fact that the majority of the teachers really believed in a total immersion LPP in English coupled with exclusion of other languages in the school domains, I came across a few teachers who held a view quite different from the general ideology with regard to language. They said they switch to Urdu and Pashto, especially in the lower and primary classes, when they need to explain something to those students who recently joined their system. The following remark of a School A teacher, for instance, reveals a view which is quite contrary to what the majority of teachers have reported:

15 Some quotes are relevant for two themes. For instance, this quote was part of the quote I use in discussing language pedagogy and philosophy (Section 5.3.2).
Still they [the school authorities] have given us this choice that if a child doesn’t understand you in English then you should switch to Urdu and if still no understanding then to Pashto. Here are some students who start from zero and we want them to come to that level, so first we have to bring our level to their level so to be with them. So if we are using too much English then he will be pressurized and will run away. (Teacher 4)

In this comment there is a reference to the delegation of authority to teachers in language teaching. However, the view is contradicted by another teacher from the same School A:

The teachers are observed randomly by the higher ups. For instance the language, if the science teacher is using Urdu or Pashto in the class, she is asked for that and she is like given reprimand for that, you are not supposed to use that language in the class. (Teacher 5)

She further reports that she does not actually agree with this kind of policy and the way native languages are treated in the school:

Because we are still under the influence of colonialism; we consider English a hell of a thing. And for all the usefulness of English, which is another thing and we cannot neglect it, we look at other languages as a derogatory. This is how our mind is setting. (Teacher 5)

The view of this teacher stands out as rare because, as I have already discussed, the beliefs of most of the teachers in this context reflect the language-in-education ideology of the school.

To sum up, the practices of the teachers in the elite schools, especially their conformity to the strict English-only policy mandated by the school administrators, are essential to the realisation and success of the language-in-education vision of the schools. Even those who do not agree with the system philosophically conform to it with full commitment and have become role models for their students. Although a majority of them actually believe in what they practice as implementers of the school English-only policy, there is evidence that suggests that their professional grooming has been coupled with ideological transformation. Moreover, the curtailment of the teachers’ authority is also evident from the schools’ practice of giving ready-made lesson plans to teachers (Section 5.3.2) and the strict supervision of their language practices to make sure they speak only English (Section 5.4.1). This seems to be in line with Spolsky’s (2009, p. 253) observation: “While schooling is conducted in a closed classroom where the teacher appears to be the language manager, teachers’ language beliefs and their consequent practices and management activities are largely controlled from outside, from some higher authority”.
5.4.3 Students

Before I discuss the students’ role as actors in L-i-E policy, I find it worthwhile to mention that insights into the students’ influence on LPP were obtained mostly from the reported data of teachers. As I have already explained, the three actors (students, teachers and parents) in this micro-level LPP are closely linked; they understand and, in certain respects, influence each other’s language attitudes and practices.

The students are important actors in the elite school system for various reasons. They belong to the elite and the affluent class and as such they and their parents are the valued customers of these educational-cum-commercial chains of enterprise. Secondly, they as the product of the school present a positive image of the school as centre of quality of education to the outside world; fluency in English is the main feature of this quality. Thirdly they are important because they are the voice of their parents, another category of actors which I will discuss in the following section. At the same time they are an important reflection of their teachers whose performance, as expected by the school administration (i.e. making the students fluent in English), is manifested in the way the students perform, act and behave vis-à-vis their English. Yet for all their significance both for their parents and the school, the teenage students themselves were generally not very concerned about the language situation they were passing through. This situation is depicted in this comment of a teacher:

With teenagers it works in a very kind of a bubbled situation for them because their world revolves around themselves, their passion and their friends and languages at this stage of their lives are not such a huge deal that they will have to sit and decide which language is better for me. They are speaking whatever they are speaking because of their friends and their influence. (Teacher 3)

The friends’ influence, to which the teacher refers, is certainly strong on the students. However, as regards the choice of language, there is adequate evidence in this study to suggest that the elite school youth are prudently informed about the role and significance of the three languages. The themes of instrumental and prestige value of the dominant languages (English and Urdu) which I discuss in Chapter 6 bear ample evidence for this view.

With regard to power in LPP, the students are in the middle of influences both from their teachers and parents. On one hand they were found to have been influenced by the school L-i-E policy as implemented through the teachers; on the other they were mindful of what
is best for them (especially with regard to languages) and for which their parents have made a huge investment. In the following section and in Chapter 7, I report findings related to parents encouraging their children to speak English. The two-pronged influences from the school and home definitely have a bearing on the students’ language attitudes and preferences. There was a general awareness and unanimity of beliefs that their bright futures are indispensably tied to their proficiency with regard to English. As such they were not prepared to make any compromise on English, and anything short of that expectation would result in a complaint: “They do object on these things; if for instance Physics or Biology teacher is using Urdu so they will never like it and they complain against it even if the teacher is conceptually clear” (Teacher 5). The reference is being made to the high school and college students who, having gone through the stringent English-only system in their early years of school, are now conscious of the prestige as well as pragmatic value of English.

The students’ influence in the context of schools is best manifested when they make their own language choices. Even though speaking English in the classroom is a rule, the students personally prefer to use English in classrooms (Teacher 3). Likewise, outside the classroom, where students enjoy greater freedom, the students still prefer to speak in English: “But it is not necessary or compulsory that we talk in English outside the class, but we do speak [English]” (Student 2). The fact that the students choose their language(s) is further substantiated by this comment an A Level student in School A: “But in school they used to convince us to speak English and only English; and they were quite strict about that so that we get fluent. Now that we are fluent our use of English is habitual actually” (Students 3).

The voice of the students in the context of the elite school is a valid component of language-planning in school context (Baldauf, 2010). Their power is not just confined to their influence on the school teachers’ medium of instruction in the classroom. Their own language choices, preferences and attitudes about the use of languages in general and in the school domain in particular constitute a significant aspect of the micro-level language planning or what is referred to as “simple management” (Neustupny & Nekvapil, 2003; Spolsky, 2009). In the following section, I discuss the role and influence of the fourth actor, i.e. the parents.
5.4.4 Parents

Parents’ role in language planning is also significant in that they not only influence the school language policy by conveying their expectations to the principal and teachers, by virtue of their authority at home they can also influence language planning at home. Parents’ involvement with the education of their children and the school system has come a long way in Western society. I have to attend about four detailed meetings each year with the teachers of my children who are going to a mainstream (government) school in Auckland. This is something unimaginable in the government schools in Pakistan where parents are neither aware and concerned nor encouraged to have a voice in the schooling of their children. The elite private schools, however, have followed the system in the Western schools and have put great emphasis on “parental involvement” which is deemed as having a “profound impact on the child and serves to enrich the learning experience” (School A website). In addition to this, the parents enjoy greater power in the education of their children because they have invested heavily to bestow the kind of education on their children that can groom them for a successful career nationally and internationally. They are the valued customers of these commercial enterprises. They have enrolled their children in elite schools because they believe that the schools provide a high quality of education. At the same time, almost all of them believe that the standard of education in government schools is poor (see Chapter 6). Likewise, they consider proficiency in English as synonymous with high quality in education and a passport to a successful career. Although one may question this view, realities on the ground, both in the education system and in the job market, prove them right because English in Pakistan is the key to a successful and dignified future, material comfort and security (Rahman, 2005). The National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 19) also confirms the advantage that the elite school students enjoy on the basis of high proficiency in English: “A major bias of the job market for white collar jobs appears in the form of a candidate's proficiency in the English language. It is not easy to obtain a white collar job in either the public or private sectors without a minimum level proficiency in the English language”. Almost all of the parents who I interviewed were satisfied with the way the schools were educating their children; great resemblance between the beliefs about language-in-education of the two actors, school and parents, was also found.
The parents’ influence in the language policy of the elite schools can be gauged from the fact that many of the teachers tried to justify the schools’ emphasis on the use of English as a demand from the parents. As this teacher reports:

Because the parents do expect us, when they come for parents-teachers meetings, they want us to work on their English language skills, and that say that that’s why we have admitted them in this school because we don’t have these opportunities for them at home. (Teacher 5)

Similarly, an A Level student reported that:

Parents basically want their children to speak English fluently, and they know they can speak Urdu and Pashto, but English is a problem in our society. So they put their children in English-medium school. So the teachers give more importance to English … so that parents have no complaints. (Student 3)

As well as showing a concurrence between the school L-i-E policy and the parents’ perceptions, these comments also show that parents believe in the total immersion in English approach of the school towards language teaching. Together with their power in ensuring English as the only medium of communication in education, the parents’ power was also reported in resisting the inclusion of native languages, particularly Pashto. The comment of this teacher is an explicit confirmation of the parent-power in School A: “Not at all. The parents will not accept it, and the parents are very powerful in School A because they pay a lot of money and will get nothing” (Teacher 4). The second part of this comment bears sound evidence of concurrence of attitude towards Pashto as subject among teachers, and parents. Students could not be expected to have a different view. The parents’ influence in this respect was reported more diplomatically by another teacher: “But that [Pashto as subject] will be provided if majority of parents wish [their children] to study that language” (Teacher 3).

In addition to their influence in the schools L-i-E policy, there is sound evidence of parents influencing the language practices of their children. A parent reported that “I encourage them to speak English” (Parent 4). A teacher explained how she as a mother wants her children “to have English as their preferred language” (Teacher 8). Another parent reported that “parents don’t encourage speaking Pashto at home” (Parent 1). This teacher reveals how she planned language for her son successfully: “So before started going to school I planned and started talking with him in English and he understands me. Me and my husband we talk in English all the time so he keeps on picking up the words” (Teacher 1).
Parents, who are dubbed as “invisible planners” (Pakir, 1994), are quite visible and influential as far as the elite schools are concerned. Their decision to enrol their children in these schools is by and large a tacit subscription to the language policy of the schools. At the same time, their preference for the English-only policy of the schools is synonymous with their resistance to include MT as a subject. Instances of such negative attitudes towards native languages in schools elsewhere have been reported in the literature. Igboanusi (2008) reports stories of some parents coming to the classroom to protest the teaching of an indigenous language to their children in Nigeria. Spolsky (2009, citing Rajah-Carrim, 2007) also reports Mauritian parents’ disapproval of efforts to introduce local languages.

To summarise, Figure 5.1 below is a graphical presentation of the actors’ position and their power in the context of the elite schools.

![Figure 5.1: Actors and power in language-in-education planning](image)

The arrows suggest the influence of one actor over the other. I found that the principal is the most powerful actor who formulates and implements the policy. While the principal’s authority mainly influences parents by encouraging them and their children to speak English and handing down punishment (money and letters) for violating the school rules, it is also influenced by parents who, due to their own background, awareness and attitudes, are more conscious about the English proficiency of their children. Parents also encourage their children to speak English as they want to get their investment returned in the form of a successful career, which in most cases is guaranteed by improved proficiency in English. The major influence on students, however, comes from their teachers, especially in the early years of their schooling. When they reach the college level, by virtue of their proficiency in English and their realisation of the prestige value of English they themselves
choose their language(s). The school teachers in this system are under pressure from both the parents, with whom they regularly meet at the end of terms and who expect results in the form of their children’s fluency in spoken English, and the principal, who observes the teachers to make sure they adhere to the English-only policy in and outside the class. In the following section I discuss the elite schools and their associated stakeholders’ response to the government’s recently announced policy of making a regional language (Pashto in this case) a compulsory subject. It offers further insights into the complex interaction between macro-level official LPP and the powerful micro-level actors and their power.

5.5 Recent developments in LPP in Pakistan: Implications for the micro-level implementation at elite schools

In Chapter 3 I discussed the recent decision of the provincial government regarding the compulsory teaching of Pashto and other regional languages of the province in schools from Class 1 to 12\textsuperscript{16}. I also noted that the mother tongue as a compulsory subject policy is going to be implemented in a phased manner. I was in the middle of my data collection when the policy was announced by the then provincial government. Although ideas about MT as a subject had already transpired during interviews and focus groups discussion, I started to ask specifically about the new policy in the subsequent interviews after the official announcement of the decision. In this section I will discuss the reactions and perceptions of the stakeholders to the new policy.

Opinions with regard to the new language policy of the provincial government were divided and at times ambivalent. Although I found a reasonable support for the policy, the counter point of view easily outweighs the views in favour. Among those who were sceptical about the new policy, many believed that the decision was politically motivated\textsuperscript{17}. First I discuss the views that support the proposed LPP.

The response of the following parent reflects his support for Pashto as he believes it is declining: “If [the new LPP is] implemented, it will be good for Pashto. At least it will slow down the decline process” (Parent 2). A teacher reported a positive attitude towards the new LPP: “They [students] can speak it but they can’t write it as it is not taught in

\textsuperscript{16} See Appendix I: The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority Bill, 2011.

\textsuperscript{17} In section 3.2.8 of Chapter 3 I discussed how Pashto has been suffering from a dilemma because the Pashtun nationalists who support its promotion are politically isolated (the current coalition with Pakistan People’s Party is an exception), especially with regard to their nationalistic ideology, and are stigmatised for their leaders’ association with the Indian National Congress which was opposed to the division of India (and as such opposed to the creation of Pakistan).
school. Their spoken is good but they have problems in writing that. So I think they will not show any resentment” (Teacher 1). Similarly, another teacher observed that “there is nothing wrong with bringing Pashto as part of the national curriculum, I mean if we have Urdu then why not Pashto in, if not national, at least in regional curriculum. Somehow it will make people come a lot closer to the language” (Teacher 3). Students, however, were cautious in expressing their support for the new policy. In MT as a subject (Section 5.2.4.2) I discussed the students’ reservations about Pashto, and the main arguments that emerged from the students’ data revolved around two themes: MT is difficult to read and write, and it would be an additional burden on them. As regards their attitude towards the new LPP, some of the students were fairly positive about it, but not willing and ready to accept the subject right away, and preferred the initiation of the new policy from early classes first. As on student argued: “But if they start it for students in the early stage of their education then it will be good” (Student 12). Another student, although expressing a positive attitude, hints at the burden aspect if the subject was introduced in senior classes right away: “If they want to introduce it as a subject they should do it from junior classes; if they make it a subject for us in 9th and 10th, it will be very hard” (FG#4, S1).

At the time of the announcement of the new LPP it was not clear when and how the policy was going to be implemented. This might have been the cause of the students’ apprehension as they seemed not to be mentally prepared for the subject, even though they liked the idea. Later when details of the act passed by the provincial assembly were released to the media, it was revealed that the policy would be implemented in a phased manner. In short the policy had already addressed the apprehensions of the students in the higher classes and a provision was made to start the teaching of Pashto subject from Class 1 in areas and schools where it was not already taught.

The stakeholders’ reserved optimism as discussed above was, however, outweighed by their rather blunt scepticism about the proposed changes in LPP. A majority of them related their opposition to the policy with the extra burden that the policy would likely entail for both parents and students. This view is embodied in the remark of one of the parents: “I will discourage totally [with a loud laugh]. We have been spending money, time, and energy to make the teaching of quality English available to them. Now who on earth will be ready to learn Pashto [18]” (Parent 1). A student, who personally had a very

---

[18] This and the following comment have also been discussed in Section 5.2.4.2 as it relates to both of the themes. Discussion of MT as subject and the new LPP overlapped quite frequently in the data.
positive attitude towards Pashto, was reluctant to accept its teaching in school: “I mean out of my own preference I would like to do it [learn Pashto], but if it was something from the school like a subject, I will not be ready to handle it” (Student 4).

As I mentioned earlier, the policy was not clear and elaborate when it was first announced through the media; the initial impression was that, as usual, it was meant only for the government schools and the private schools were exempted. Hence a teacher was quite content with the policy as long as it was for the government schools: “At government schools level, I don’t think they will say anything against it. Maybe they are happy to see that their child will learn how to write their native language” (Teacher 1). This perception which takes it for granted that the government and the private/elite schools are distinct and separate worlds reminds me of the title of Tariq Rahman’s book Denizens of the alien worlds, which is written on the same theme and is aptly depicted in the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 17): “Existence of insulated parallel systems of public and private education in Pakistan remains a cause for concern as it creates inequitable social divides”. The view was further reinforced by another teacher: “Private sector has its own set up. It is not necessary for them because we are following the Peshawar board till Class 8. Afterwards most of the students go for Cambridge” (Teacher 6). The two comments above clearly indicate the divided nature of Pakistani society on educational (private and public) as well as linguistic basis. The government schools (and the community of students, teachers and parents associated with them) and the private elite schools are accepted and taken for granted as different and distinct worlds, different in ethos, priorities, status and goals. So strong are the forces of this social and educational polarisation of Pakistani society that neither the constitution and statutes of parliament, nor the successive education policies of the ministry of education could counter them. Such a powerful and parallel implicit LPP is an undeniable reality. This has placed all the native languages, including Urdu to some extent, in a state of dilemma in the education system of Pakistan.

The dilemma of Pashto, however, is greater than other languages. As discussed earlier, its only supporters, the Pashtun nationalists are generally considered as separatists, anti-Pakistan, pro-Indian and pro-Afghanistan due to the political ideology and affiliations of their elders in the past. Those Pashtuns who are opposed to the nationalists ideologically
and politically are also sceptical about any measures that they take\(^\text{19}\); this is a common feature of Pashtun society. Several remarks by parents and teachers confirmed this attitude: “I think there is no use or benefit of this initiative. They are doing it for politics. It can lead to ethnic division and provincialism” (Parent, 5). The association of the promotion of Pashto in schools with provincialism and with something inimical to the national unity of Pakistan has emerged as a strong theme in this study.

About a year later since the announcement of the new LPP in 2010, when I was busy analysing my data, the government of KP province formally announced the new policy and its framework. It was clearly stated that the policy would be applied to schools in the government as well as private sectors. Hearing this, I needed to get back to the school principals to follow up on some questions I had already asked or failed to ask during my data collection. I emailed them an open-ended questionnaire in which I also included a question about the recent statement of the government on the new language policy, and sought the elite schools’ position. I got the following reply: “I think this is a total waste of time, efforts and resources. This totally is a political decision and has nothing to do with education in the province whatsoever” (Principal, School A). In response to the question about the possible reaction of the parents he said: “I do not think that this will be taken positively by the parents of any private school” (Principal, School A).

Another year passed; it is now 2012 (by the time I write this chapter), the year when the implementation of the new policy should have started. I am still in Auckland, now writing my thesis. The news about the new language policy that I read in the newspaper is not very encouraging. The private schools’ lack of interest in introducing Pashto (or other local languages) as subject in school is allegedly coupled with the slackness of the concerned government departments in implementing the policy. A serious lack of coordination among the concerned government departments and the private schools was exposed when the daily Dawn published an investigative story about the lack of progress in implementing the new LPP (Dawn, 19 May 2012). The newspaper reporter, who surveyed 13 private schools in Peshawar, found that the schools were unaware of the decision (new LPP) which had to be implemented in 2012 onwards. One official of a major chain of private school, similar to the one I focussed on, believed the policy was only for government schools. He was surprised when the reporter showed him the notification clearly mentioning the private

\(^{19}\) For instance, the teaching of Pashto subject; renaming of the province from NWFP to Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP); and their goal of uniting Pashtuns, etc.
schools. When the chairman of Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (BISE), who is also the head of Regulatory Authority for Private Schools, was contacted by the reporter, he rejected the claims of the private schools in the KP province and said that the notification had been issued from his office to all private schools in the region (Dawn, 19 May 2012). A year or so after decision about the new policy was taken, Coleman and Capstick (2012) are still unsure about the progress: “What is yet to be seen is the extent to which these policies have been implemented and materials prepared in each language” (p. 49)

This instance of administrative inefficiency, confusion, denials and blaming, etc. is a common feature of how offices operate in Pakistan. One thing that I am sure and optimistic about is the provincial government’s resolve and honesty, especially at the top political level, in getting this project materialised. What is discouraging about it is the private schools’ lack of interest. For that, it would not be fair to blame them totally. For decades they have been catering to the demands and expectations of their valued customers and have been selling them the much sought after commodity in the shape of English. At the same time another selling point of these schools has been their pride in excluding Pashto (and Urdu to some extent) from the school domain as well as encouraging the use of English even in outside-the-schools domains. Themes such as punishment for speaking Pashto, Pashto obstructing English fluency, minimal instrumental and educational value of Pashto etc. have been discussed with sound evidence in this chapter and elsewhere in this thesis. Owing to these realities, beliefs and attitudes it would be very hard for the private English-medium schools to come to terms with the new LPP. For the first time perhaps we see a top-down language related intervention from the macro-official level at micro level language management, which has so far enjoyed immense freedom. But as Errihani (2008, p. 412) notes: “When attitudes towards a certain language are negative, it is extremely difficult for any agency to affect change in the status of that language, let alone revive it and maintain it”. Similarly, Errihani (2008) echoes Schiffman (1996) who reminds us that unless people’s attitudes and beliefs and stereotypes towards a language are changed first, no authority and no language policy will succeed in bringing about any change in the fate of that language. While I explore the stakeholders’ attitudes towards the three languages in Chapter 6, the following section is aimed at getting a bigger picture of the students’ language attitudes in the context of language-in-education planning at the elite schools.
5.6 Quantitative data findings

The purpose of this section is to corroborate the qualitative data findings through triangulation because words can add meaning to numbers and numbers can add precision to words (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). As the methodological design of this study was based on concurrent triangulation (Dörnyei, 2007) in which the quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments are administered at the same time, it is quite likely that some of the emergent themes in the qualitative data may not have a related question or statement in the questionnaire and vice versa. With regard to the presentation of values, although the actual values are given in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, for the sake of clarity I combine the values of Strongly Agree and Agree; hence the percentage values that are given in this and the following paragraphs (77.4% agree, for instance) are the sum total of Strongly Agree and Agree for their respective question questions. Seven questions in the questionnaire were found relevant to the themes that emerged in the qualitative data that have been discussed in the above pages. Table 5.1 shows the relevant questions and the responses of 90 students.

In Figure 5.2 and Table 5.1 question 1 (A) relates to L-i-E policy in terms of language of communication in school. Language of communication is a generic term which includes both the medium of instruction and the language of general communication in and outside the classrooms. The results (77.7% E, 23.3% MT, and 27.7% U) confirmed what was found and discussed with regard to language of communication in the qualitative data. Question 2 (B) solicited information about another aspect of L-i-E policy, i.e. the teaching of a language as a subject. The results (96.6% E, 1.1% MT and 55.5% U) confirmed the teaching of English and Urdu at schools. As expected, MT is not taught. The low percentage of responses for Urdu could be due to the optional status of Urdu for the students of A Level (for details see Table 3.3 in Chapter 3). Overall, the two questions corroborated the qualitative data themes related to the roles and practices of the three languages as part of the schools L-i-E policy.

Figure 5.3 and Table 5.2 present the results of statements related to the students’ perceptions about language in education in general. Q6 (B) and Q7 (B) pertain to the theme of medium of instruction (Section 5.2.2). While reflecting on the MoI, a number of

---

20 E = English, MT = Mother tongue, U = Urdu
students opposed the role of native languages in education. The students reported that they find learning various subjects of science and arts easy in English and quite difficult in native languages. A similar trend was found in the quantitative data as depicted in Q6 (B) in which a significant majority of students find it easy to study science subjects in English (95.6% E, 13.3% MT and 20% U) and difficult in MT. Likewise, in response to Q7 (B), a strong majority of the students (92.2% E, 13.3% MT and 38.9% U) find it easy to study arts subject in English. The relatively higher percentage for Urdu for both science and arts could be attributed to the fact that Urdu is taught as a compulsory subject from early school to Class 12, while Pashto is altogether excluded from the English-medium schools’ curriculum.

The results of Q13 (B) are interesting. Even though a strong majority of students still believe that English (94.4% E) should be the language of communication in schools across the province, a modest percentage of students favour Urdu (57.7% U) as well. The low preference for MT (25.5% MT), reflects the same perception as was found and discussed in Section 5.2.4.2, i.e. since the students can speak MT, they do not need to learn it. Question 14 (B), part of which reports what is already asked in Q6 (B) and Q7 (B), reflects more or less the same pattern as depicted in Q6 B and Q7 B, and as emerged in the qualitative data. The position of MT has slightly improved in the results (90% E, 37.8% MT and 45.6% U). This could be explained in terms of the way Q14 B has been phrased as compared to Q6 and Q7. In Q6 (B) and Q7 (B), I have used the present tense, which refers to their current experience of learning the arts and science subjects. So the situation in these questions is a real and on-going experience for the students. Q14 (B) on the other hand asks about future possibility, which is not likely to affect these students. Hence they might have felt free to comment without worrying about the practical implications of using the native language as the language of communication in schools. This makes sense when we refer back to Section 5.5 (about the new policy of introducing MT as subject), where it was shown that some of the students favour MT inclusion in the curriculum but only from early classes. Moreover, the use of word “interesting” in Q14 (B) could also be a reason why a majority of the students supposed Pashto for this particular question. The students who have not been taught to read or write a single word of Pashto could be curious to try it out. Similar kinds of impressions about Pashto in education were also made by a couple of students during the interviews as reported in Section 5.5. As I have pointed out, it might be convenient for students to find education in Pashto “easy and interesting” from a safe
distance, but the question arises: do they really mean it? Probably not. In Q17 (B), they have already linked success in education with English.

Finally, question 17 (B) solicits the students’ views on the overall success of education in terms of vocabulary in the three languages. The results are interesting (63.3% E, 30% MT and 68.8% U) as the majority of students prefer Urdu, followed closely by English; as per the usual pattern only a small percentage of students believe that MT has the capacity to be used as a language of education. The results show a slight contrast from the qualitative data findings in which the students not only report a high level of proficiency in English, but also prefer it as the medium of education.

Figure 5.2: L-i-E policy practices: Frequency distribution showing the sum of actual number of responses for all the time and most of the time; N= 90

Figure 5.3: L-i-E policy attitudes: Frequency distribution showing the sum of actual number of responses for strongly agree and agree; N= 90
Table 5.1: Results related to the school L-i-E policy (language use); only the questions that are relevant to the qualitative data themes have been selected. Q1 (A) refers to the first question in Section A of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to L-i-E policy practices</th>
<th>Lang.</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (A). This language is the medium of communication in my school.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 (A). I study this language as a subject at school.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Results related to the school L-i-E policy (language attitudes); only the questions that are relevant to the qualitative data themes have been selected. Q6 (B) refers to the seventh question in Section B of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to L-i-E policy attitudes</th>
<th>Lang.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>%agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%agree</th>
<th>S. agree &amp; agree combined</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>%agree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>%agree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree &amp;</th>
<th>%agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 (B) It is easy to study science subjects like physics, maths, computer science and geography in this language.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 (B). It is easy to study arts subjects like literature, Islamic studies and history in this language.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 (B). I would like to have this language as medium of communication in every school in my province.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 (B). I think learning will be easy and interesting if this becomes the language of communication at schools.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 (B). Education will not be successful due to shortage of vocabulary in this language.</td>
<td>E:</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M:</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U:</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Results related to the school L-i-E policy (language attitudes); only the questions that are relevant to the qualitative data themes have been selected. Q6 (B) refers to the seventh question in Section B of the questionnaire.
5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter I have tried to explore the various dimensions of micro-level language planning. Findings from my three-month case study fieldwork (followed by on-going interaction with participants through phone and email) have been discussed in depth. Attempt has also been made to unravel the complex interaction between official LPP at the macro-level and the elite schools’ so far unchallenged autonomy in language-in-education at the micro-level. LPP at the two elite schools was, therefore, investigated both as an extension of the macro-level planning and as a local activity with no macro roots (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). To get a bigger picture within the micro-context of schools, data from a questionnaire that related to the qualitative data themes have also been discussed.

With the help of adequate evidence I reported that the elite schools enjoy substantial autonomy in the spheres of curriculum, particularly in medium of instruction and the teaching of language(s) as subject. The unchallenged power of private schools is also confirmed by the National Education Policy report (Government of Pakistan, 2009). English is given huge importance as the schools have to cater to the needs and expectations of their elite and affluent clients. To that end, they generally adhere to the total immersion approach (Fortune & Tedick, 2008) of language teaching in which the role of local languages is minimised through strict measures. Although Urdu is taught as a subject under the obligation of official LPP, its use other than in the Urdu subject class is discouraged. The situation of small regional languages like Pashto is even worse as they are not only excluded as a subject, their use in and outside the classroom domains is declared punishable.

In terms of authority in language planning, the school principal, who represents the school administration and governing body, is at the forefront. Parents and students also hold significant influence and their voice is taken seriously in language and academic matters. Teachers’ authority is very limited as they are supposed to implement religiously the language policy, be it the pedagogical or the medium of instruction aspect of the curriculum, as directed by the school authorities. Several teachers were found to have been influenced by the school language policy and expressed similar views about foreign language teaching as those held by the schools. Finally, an important theme that emerged in the qualitative data was the stakeholders’ perceptions of the new language policy of the
provincial government according to which for the first time the English-medium schools are obligated to start teaching a regional language (Pashto in the case of Pashto-speaking districts) as a subject. Although the picture with regard to implementation of the policy decision is not clear at the moment, the stakeholders, especially the private schools, appear quite sceptical and pessimistic about the new LPP.

According to Lo Bianco, (2010, p. 168) schooling often validates educated and middle class modes of linguistic expression, imposing these as the required register of the exchange in classrooms, and the modelled norm for what is sociolinguistically appropriate for educated circles in general. The way the elite schools are executing their language policy manifests their adherence to the same philosophy by equipping their students with the most accepted and prestigious forms of linguistic expressions. In the process, however, they are narrowing their choices by adhering to an assimilationist policy (Corson, 1999) in the form of omission of native languages (Lo Bianco, 2010). This divide between the school language and the students’ home language could have serious implications. Fishman (1991) has argued that schools can extinguish the endangered languages within a few generations. Although I have not investigated or determined whether or to what extent Pashto is an endangered language (as that is outside the scope of this study), there is no doubt that Pashto (like other minority/regional languages) has been seriously neglected in the domain of education, government offices and media. The impact of such a policy on the individuals’ attitudes, beliefs and practices of their native language cannot be ruled out. Deriving guidance and inspiration from Spolsky (2009) that language policy not only includes explicit aspects such as language policy statements but also implicit aspects like the practices and beliefs of the community, the goal of this study was to investigate LPP at the micro-level in the context of two English-medium elite schools. Thus in this chapter I have discussed findings related to the various dimensions of the schools’ language-in-education planning. In the following Chapter (6) I delve deeper into the stakeholders’ attitudes and beliefs. In the subsequent Chapter (7) I take up the students’ domain-wise language practices vis-à-vis English, Urdu and Pashto.
CHAPTER 6: ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH, PASHTO AND URDU

In Chapter 5 I discussed the various dimensions of language planning and policy (LPP) at the micro-level in the context of the two elite schools. The main focus of the chapter was the way the schools envision, contest and implement their language policy. Since language management or planning can be intended to confirm or modify attitudes and beliefs and alternatively since attitudes and beliefs can be a basis for language management (Spolsky, 2004), in this chapter I look at the stakeholders’ beliefs about and attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu. In this way I am taking the investigation of language planning and policy (LPP), as embodied in the attitudes and practices of individuals, groups and organisations (Liddicot & Baldauf, 2008), to a more specific and deeper level. I use the terms “attitudes” and “beliefs” interchangeably because, as I have discussed in Chapter 2, the cognitive aspect of attitudes comprise beliefs about the world (Garrett, Coupland, & Williams, 2003).

The key stakeholders in the study are the students. As such it is the students’ views that are foregrounded in this chapter. However, as in Chapter 5, the views of the other stakeholders (teachers and parents) are incorporated into the discussion to gain insight into how and to what extent the attitudes of these three groups of actors concur or diverge. Moreover, triangulating data from the various participants, who are closely related in the context, lends credibility and trustworthiness to the findings. To report the students’ attitudes I mainly draw on data from focus group discussions, interviews and observations. The teachers’ and parents’ data is derived from the semi-structured interviews. In the last part of the chapter I discuss quantitative data from the questionnaire in order to corroborate my findings and build a general picture of the students’ attitudes in the context of School A and B.

While I was making sense of the data, my understanding of the preconceived categories of language attitudes was informed by Edwards (1982) and Garret, Coupland and Williams (2003), who refer to cognitive, affective and behavioural attitudes, and Baker (2006), who categorises language attitudes as instrumental and integrative. Following Baker, in the following sections I group the attitudes related themes into two broad categories:
instrumental and integrative attitudes to English, Pashto\textsuperscript{21} and Urdu. Even though I follow Baker (2006) in this broad categorisation, the basic themes which form these categories are mostly emergent, grounded in the data and unique to the specific context of this study.

6.1 Instrumental value of English, Pashto and Urdu

Baker (2006, p. 214) relates instrumental attitudes to “vocational reasons, status, achievement, personal success, self-enhancement, self-actualisation or basic security and survival”. Although conceptually some of the attitudes that emerged in my data could be related to these, essentially they are peculiar to the context of my study. As such I have named them according to their relevance to context and the way they were phrased by the respondents. They are:

- English as key to success in education
- English as key to success in life
- The global value of English
- Status value of English
- Status value of Urdu
- Minimal utility value of mother tongue (MT)

It would be worthwhile to say a few words about the criteria used for grouping the stakeholders’ responses according to the above themes as some of the responses could be associated with multiple themes. This is the usual dilemma faced by qualitative researchers. In qualitative research such themes are generally referred to as overlapping or co-occurring themes. For instance, from its appearance the theme of English as key to success in education could be integrated into the theme of English as key to success in life. However, owing to the emergence of numerous codes which linked English to success in education, it became necessary to categorise those codes under English as key to success in education. Similarly, in the Status value of Urdu one aspect such as Urdu as a national lingua franca could well be seen as related to “integrative attitudes”. However, responses related to this theme actually refer to the advantage which Urdu gives to its speakers by virtue of it being spoken and understood by a majority of Pakistanis, irrespective of their

\textsuperscript{21} I refer to Pashto as mother tongue (MT) most of the time.
ethnicity. On the other hand, the phenomenon of Urdu as the national language is discussed under “integrative attitudes” because it symbolises national unity and identity. A significant number of responses can be placed in two and sometimes three themes, especially where a number of ideas are embedded in the same unit of analysis, e.g. a sentence) which is structured in such a manner that different ideas cannot be presented separately. In addition to this, I as the researcher and the one familiar with the study context, took great care to group codes under appropriate themes.

6.1.1 English as key to success in education

The attitudes embodied in this theme were anticipated because education at the higher level in Pakistan is mostly in English, be it the government universities or the private. Thus students who get more exposure to learning and practising English at school level generally do well at the university level also. The students were unanimous in their attitudes towards the importance of English as a key to success in their educational careers, as evidenced in the comment of a student in the focus group: “So yes obviously English is the best medium of education” (FG#1, S4). Another student in the focus group referred to the vast body of knowledge which is only accessible through English: “Especially the books, which are in English, so in order to get what is written in the books we have to know English; that’s why it is more important” (FG#4, S 2). Proficiency in English was regarded to be synonymous with success in education “because if you are good in English you are good in studies” (Student 7). Students also highlighted the predicament of students who are weak in comprehending English texts and in taking written exams in English. A number of students emphasised the use of English as medium of education from primary to higher levels: “If further education is going to be in English then they should start English from primary level. Because it is going to be very hard for lots of kids to study MBBS [with a weak foundation in English]” (Student 1). Yet another student concurred with this focus group member and observed that “English is required in education whether it is the junior level or university level” (FG#4, S1).

I posed similar questions to the parents in order to get a view of their language attitudes. They were also mostly unanimous in their belief that English is important for success in education: “You know in practical life everything requires English. Like getting admission at a quality university, getting good grades in any subject whether it is engineering,
medicine, MBA, and then getting jobs, everything requires high standard of English” (Parent 1). One of the parents who was a medical doctor said: “My medical books are in English. Engineering books are in English. English is a must for education” (Parent 4). He further added:

I have seen people who don’t know English and they suffer. In the medical college in which I teach, there are students, like Arabs, Iranians, and Africans; they fail mainly because they don’t know English. English is an international language; it is no more the language of the British alone. It now belongs to everyone. (Parent 4)

There was consensus among the parents that English was essential to ensure a bright future for their children and that there was no other option than the English-medium schools: “The main idea behind this decision [sending children to English-medium school] is to secure a bright future for our children and they are competent in English” (Parent 2).

With their language attitudes leaning strongly in favour of English and English-medium schools, a majority of the parents were also very pessimistic about the quality of education in government schools and believed that the facilities there were inadequate and that the schools were poorly managed. For instance, one parent said that “the government schools have poor standard, and English mediums schools are comparatively better. That’s the basic reason [why they send children to English-medium schools]” (Parent 4). Another parent agreed with the view: “I think they are not up to the required standard of education” (Parent 2). One parent was quite clear in arguing that the lack of resources in the government schools is the real problem: “Suppose there are 50 students in a class, how can you expect a teacher to pay attention to every student in a class of 40 minutes? But here [elite schools] the maximum number of students is 20. So every child gets attention. Teachers know their weaknesses, strengths and even their behaviour” (Parent 1). These instances of parents’ perceptions about the government schools show that it is not just for the love of English that parents choose English-medium schools for their children, but also the lack of resources and low quality teaching in the government schools. The schism between the private and government sponsored education system is similar to the situation in Lagos where, as Omoniyi (2009, p. 60) notes: “The private sector provides a desirable alternative to a defective system of public education”. 
The teachers too were mindful of the realities on the ground in the education system and stressed the importance of learning English in order to avoid difficulties at the higher levels of education. A teacher put it this way: “English is the medium of learning all the other subjects at this level. So for that if you don’t understand English it will be difficult [to succeed in education]” (Teacher 2). Another senior teacher who was also the head of the girls’ section, referred to the history and political ideology of Pakistan vis-à-vis language and education in support of her view that English was indispensable for students: “You see they [religious pundits] declared that Sir Syed Ahmad Khan has turned into a Christian; he said I am not a Christian, but English is today’s requirement. He urged Muslims to teach English because without this we cannot learn modern knowledge” (Teacher 6). Furthermore, she emphasised the universality of English as far as knowledge was concerned:

Because everything is in English, you can’t go for the higher studies without good English. Even a student cannot understand anything at college level without English. Physics, Chemistry, Biology, whichever field and whichever college they go, everything is in English. (Teacher 6)

This unanimity in the views of all stakeholders with regard to the value of English for education was expected. Pragmatism can be seen as the main force behind the attitudes of stakeholders in this context. Similar attitudes towards English and native languages are reported by Mahboob (2002) in the context of university students in Karachi, the capital city of Sind province in Pakistan. Although the context and nature of participants in Mahboob’s study are different from the context of my study, concurrence in the finding is significant in building a general picture of language attitudes in Pakistan. Similar preferences for English are reported by Guerini (2008) in the context of Ghana where instrumental value is attached to English as the medium of education and is regarded as essential for developing professional skills. Likewise, Kırkgöz (2009, p. 671) notes that the Policy Document (1984) in Turkey implicitly assigns English “instrumental value as a medium of teaching and learning and as a vehicle for one’s access to professional knowledge”.

---

22 He was a reformer who urged the Muslims of British India to learn English and get a Western education.
The emergence of this theme confirms the indispensable position that English holds in the education system of Pakistan. It also highlights the central role of English in the government’s status planning (Cooper, 1989) initiatives, particularly those in the domain of education. As such the policy favours the students of English-medium schools. On the contrary, about 60% of students who attend mainstream government schools\textsuperscript{23} are at a disadvantage. Pakistanis have been living with this educational paradox, which also has implications for the socio-economic sphere of society, for more than a century (if we include the educational policies of the colonial rulers; see Chapter 3). Rahman (2004a) has been consistently critical of this policy and considers it to be something that is steering society towards linguistic apartheid. The problem is even realised by the policy makers as evident in the National Education Policy Report (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 19):

\begin{quote}
A number of factors lead to the differences that allow students of the elite schools to do better. Management, resources and teaching quality are their main strengths. Most of these elite schools follow the Cambridge or London University O/A level systems that have a different curriculum, assessment system and textbooks. A major bias of the job market for white collar jobs appears in the form of a candidate’s proficiency in the English language.
\end{quote}

The observation made in the report is valid as the privileged position of English-medium students in higher education is an undeniable reality. Mahboob (2002) also finds that a significant majority of students who participated in his study had an English-medium school background. The finding, according to Mahboob, is symbolic of the higher ratio of English-medium school students in higher education in Pakistan. Likewise, when I was serving as a lecturer in one of the top-ranked engineering universities I noticed that the majority of students had an A Level background at an elite school. Students from Urdu-medium schools are often at a disadvantage in getting admission as English is a key component of the highly competitive tests for entry to a university program. The following section takes the pragmatic value of English beyond the level of education.

\subsection*{6.1.2 English as key to success in life}

The theme of \textit{English as key to success in life} is distinct from the theme of \textit{English as key to success in education} in that it suggests proficiency in English can ensure success for its

\textsuperscript{23} The medium of instruction in these schools is either Urdu or the native language of the area where the school is located.
speakers in spheres other than education in the context of Pakistan, such as employment, personal achievement, and status. As one student in the focus group discussion simply put it: “English is the only language which gives us advantage surely in professional and educational spheres” (FG#1, S3). When I asked the other members of the group whether they agreed with S3, one student responded affirmatively: “I think he is right because mostly in jobs here you need good English, like if you apply for a job, the first thing that they check is your conversational skills in English” (FG#4, S3). Yet another A Level student believed that “since my education and my profession everything is going to be in English so I need to be really good at it” (Student 1). For almost all of the students the importance of English lay in the ubiquitous utility of English: “I also think English is very important for us as it can be used everywhere” (FG#6, S4). A reference was also made to the use of English as the language of official documents: “Even our documents here are in English” (FG#4, S2).

A parent echoed the views expressed by the students: “There is a general perception that whoever is good in English, he will have many job opportunities after education” (Parent 6). A similar view was expressed by another parent: “The most important language for the bright future of our children I think is English” (Parent 2). Favour for the dominant languages and scepticism about the role of native languages in education have also been reported in other contexts. For instance, Errihani (2008) reports that for pragmatic reasons parents in Morocco favour the dominant French over Berber for their children.

English was not only considered key to the success of students, a general perception that English was essential for the survival and progress of the country also emerged among most of the participants. In this regard one teacher linked the importance of English to the survival of the whole society: “We have to live in this world and without English we cannot survive” (Teacher 8). A student in a focus group discussion made a similar observation: “We are not developed, so we need to rely on other countries and for that we need to know English” (FG#5, S5). English was also linked indispensably to progress and a prosperous future: “English is very important; it is a must because we can’t advance without it” (Parent 6). In the following sections I show that the value of English as key to success in life has enhanced the status and practice of English on one hand and has led to a decline in the status and roles of native languages on the other. Reflecting on the high pragmatic values of English (and Urdu), Rahman (2006, p. 84) argues that “we create such
market conditions that it becomes impossible to gain power, wealth or prestige in any language except English and, to a lesser extent, Urdu”. The Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 19) also acknowledges this fact:

A major bias of the job market for white collar jobs appears in the form of a candidate’s proficiency in the English language. It is not easy to obtain a white collar job in either the public or private sectors without a minimum level proficiency in the English language. English language also works as one of the sources for social stratification between the elite and the non-elite.

For most of the participants in this study the preference for English, however, is not just confined to their success in Pakistan; as discussed in the following section they also see English as the key to the realization of their global ambitions.

6.1.3 The global value of English

The global value of English was the theme mentioned by almost all stakeholders (students, teachers, parents). Everyone believed that the greatest worth of English is its status as a global lingua franca. A majority of the parents reported that they were going to send their children to Europe or America for higher education. Similar views were held by the teachers and students. It may sound astonishing to many that almost every student in this study is able to afford university education in the US or Europe since Pakistan is a poor country with socio-economic indicators among the lowest in the region, mainly due to bad governance, political instability and poor law and order. However, as I have already pointed out in Chapter 3, the students attending these schools belong to the most affluent class of society. Moreover, I noticed during my field research that between 25-30% of the students have already lived in a foreign country and they still see their overseas connection as the key to the realisation of their dreams and ambitions.

Students were unanimous in the belief that English was necessary for their studies abroad: “English is going to help when you go to a foreign country for education or whatever” (FG# 3, S1). Another student in the same group endorsed this opinion: “English, well I am trying to go abroad after A Level, so English will help me outside as you know they can’t understand Pashto or Urdu” (FG#3, S2). One of the students echoed a typical perception that currently prevails among most of the educated middle and upper class Pakistanis:
“because everybody is in the struggle of learning English as it is an international language; and who wants to live in Pakistan? No one wants to; everybody is trying to move out” (Student 6). In this example the desire to gain proficiency in English and to go abroad is coupled with the desire to leave Pakistan, mainly due to the deteriorating economic and security situation.

Parents and teachers are in agreement with students as far as attitude towards English for its global value is concerned. For instance, this response of a parent is representative of numerous such responses that I received from parents: “Moreover, if they go abroad for education or job, English will help them a lot, as it is used, spoken, and understood everywhere” (Parent 6). Similarly, this teacher confirmed that sending children to a foreign country nowadays is an obsession, something that cannot be dispensed with: “They have to learn English. I mean we just hammer it into their heads that you are going to go abroad for a better degree. I mean I have my own children who are in medical colleges. But they are not staying back [in Pakistan]” (Teacher, 9). She further explained that there is little chance of her children staying back because their brother is already in the USA. Feeling proud of their achievement, the teacher added that: “if I say my son is very good in English and my head is held high with pride, and he has done this and he has gone to America” (Teacher 9).

There are those who perceive the potential of globalisation for enhancing the progress and prosperity of humanity as it brings people together (Friedman, 2006) and those who see it as a threat to diversity (Chomsky, 2003). Concerns over the effects of globalization on diversity are especially evident in the area of language rights and language education, particularly given the close links between globalization and English as an international language (May, 2008; Pennycook, 2001; Phillipson, 1999; Tollefson, 2000). The evidence in the above paragraph could be viewed as linked to these concerns, which are always at the core of a debate on minority rights in any society. Even though there is no reference to the marginalisation or loss or shift of the vernaculars in this particular context (which I discuss in Chapter 7), the tendency or attitude towards English for its global value and allied instrumental benefits is strong to the extent of obsession. The prominence that English has gained as a result of globalisation is rendering the relationship between English and native languages hegemonic. As evidenced in literature on multilingual societies, especially the former colonies, the local languages are bearing the brunt of the
prominence which English is gaining in the states’ language policies under the influence of
globalisation, and Pakistan is no exception. The value of English as a global language has
also been reported by Mahboob (2002) in the context of his study on the language attitudes
of university students. The following section sheds further light on how English is
entrenched not only in society generally but also in the hearts and minds of people,
especially the educated elite, in Pakistan.

6.1.4 Status value of English

The theme of high status value of English (and the status of Urdu in the following section)
is based on those responses in which the participants associate, or refer to others who
associate, a high social status to the speakers of these two languages. In Chapter 2 (Section
2.1.4) I discussed status planning as the “deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of
functions among a community’s languages” (Cooper, 1989, p. 99), and prestige planning
as the official promotion of a language by governments and/or its agencies (Haarmann,
1990). The findings reported in this and in the following sections, therefore, reveal that the
high status and prestige of English and Urdu, as consequence of LPP in Pakistan, are seen
as reflected in the social status of those who are fluent in these languages. While the
themes in the previous three sections deal with specific pragmatic reasons, i.e. education,
jobs and global value, which can be the key factors in enhancing the status of English and
its speakers, in this section I group and discuss the responses in which the participants
explicitly attribute a high status value to English.

The status value of English which was particularly salient in the data was mainly based on
the themes of modernity, progress, and success as depicted in this comment made during a
focus group discussion:

When you speak in English you look more cultured and educated, and when you
speak Pashto, people may think you are illiterate or something. So English speaking
has been made a trend. And when you speak in English, they would say this person
is from higher status. (Student 10)

Likewise, another student in the same group hinted at his conscious efforts to gain fluency
in English because it is a status symbol: “I would like to speak English because people give
it a lot of importance because you appear to be modern and educated” (FG# 5, S3). Yet
another student related English to success and respect: “Everyone wants to be good in English, and that way you get respect and success” (Student 15). Success and respect are seen as the parallel rewards of proficiency in English.

The view was endorsed by parents and teachers. For instance, a parent was quite frank in accepting that if “a person is speaking English and Urdu in our society, people, including myself, will give more importance to him” (Parent 2). Another parent noted that if her children spoke English with native-like fluency, she would be “very proud [laughing]; English has such an importance in our community” (Parent 1). A teacher from School A hinted at the status of English in Pakistan in terms of history: “Yes, it is a matter of prestige and it is a matter of status symbol in Pakistan, not just now, it has been since 1947” (Teacher 4). Likewise, a teacher confirmed what most of the parents thought about English: “They are proud of the fact that their children are so fluent in English” (Teacher 3).

I found that even though most of the teachers accepted the status value of English as prevalent among the elite schools’ students and their parents, a limited number of them did not buy the idea. For instance, in this comment the teacher’s scathing sarcasm at the prevailing perception about English is quite obvious: “They want their children to be more vocal in English because in our society we have this [inferiority] complex that if someone is talking fluently in English, his personality is very impressive even if he or she is zero in other subject areas” (Teacher 4). Another teacher, while expressing her disdain at the status of English, referred to the slave-master metaphor: “The attitude [to MT] is very negative. And I used to discuss these things in our staffroom, and I think it is because we are still under the influence of colonialism, we consider English a hell of things” (Teacher 5). This finding, however, contradicts the English teachers’ overall positive attitude to English, especially with regard to education (see Chapter 5).

A slur or stigma was sometimes associated with low proficiency in English. For instance, a student in this focus group observes that “some people think that by speaking English they will look quite modern, for example some of our TV and film stars when they come to talk shows they speak wrong English, so people laugh at it” (FG# 2, S3). The latter part of this comment suggests the theme of ridicule directed against those who are not on a par with the fluency level of English that this elite social class may have reached. This is a
prevailing attitude among fluent speakers of English towards those who are not fluent. Rahman (2004a) calls them “social snobs”. The view was echoed in the comment of another student: “But otherwise in the society, I do find that if you can’t speak English then you are made more fun of. I do feel that quite commonly” (Student 4). Shedding further light on the issue, one A Level student observed:

   Ya I think so. Because you know back when I was in Class 7 and 8 I realized that people who use English, even in our culture, I realized that if somebody doesn’t know English they target them, they target that person, oh my God he doesn’t know English. (Student 6)

This is in line with Rahman’ (2004a) observation about the attitude of English-medium school students towards Urdu or vernacular-medium school students. He maintains that English-medium students hold Urdu-medium students in open contempt and describe them as *Paendoo* (rustic) as a term of derision. Similarly Mansoor (1993) finds that male and female students studying in both Urdu and English medium schools rate English speakers to be more cultured, mannered, intelligent, educated, and capable than Urdu speakers.

The findings discussed in this section illustrate the intrinsic link between language attitudes and language planning and policy (LPP). The high status value which the participants in this study attribute to English reflects the status planning for English which has been a dominant feature of LPP in Pakistan. At the same time language management policy can be intended to confirm or modify language attitudes (Spolsky, 2004). The findings in this section, therefore, confirm this relationship between status planning for English (as part of overall LPP) and the stakeholders’ positive attitudes towards the status value of English. In the following section I discuss their perceptions of Urdu, the language which is mainly promoted by the state, and only minimally by the elite schools.

### 6.1.5 Status value of Urdu

Explicit references to the social status of Urdu were found in the data, though not as saliently as those of English. The status of Urdu has two dimensions: its status as a national lingua franca, i.e. the language which the speakers of linguistically diverse communities use to communicate with each other, and its status as the language acceptable in various state institutions along with English. This comment of a student encapsulates the fact that
Urdu, along with English, is a language of high status: “Urdu should be made stronger; it is our national language and we should communicate in it and take pride in that” (FG#5, S4). The status of Urdu is also viewed in terms of social class as evidenced in this comment: “you have to learn languages like Urdu and English; due to this others would think I am from high class, and I am very educated; so it is because of society that they [English and Urdu] have high status” (FG#5, S2). Speaking Urdu and English can also serve as a source of pride for some youngsters in their peer groups: “But sometimes my father urges me to speak English at home, and also when we speak English some of our friends feel proud of it if they speak English or Urdu” (FG#5, S2).

Urdu was also seen as a high-status language as it is the preferred language of various civil and military institutions along with English. The comment from a focus group student hints at the institutional support given to Urdu on the one hand and negative attitude towards regional languages (Pashto in this case) on the other:

My Dad is in army and he says army people are mostly Punjabis and anyone who can speak Urdu can’t speak Pashto; and you see over there I speak Urdu and my sister, her Urdu is not that good, I mean it is fine but you can tell that her accent is from Peshawar. So they look at her with scorn, as if she is not from a decent civilized background. (FG#1, S1)

References were also made to the status of Urdu in other government institutions. In this regard the response of this student was typical: “Well Urdu is something that since we have been living in Pakistan and it is the national language and every other government department uses Urdu, so we have to communicate with them in Urdu” (FG# 3, S1). One student justified his preference for Urdu, along with English, in education because “Urdu is used in the government offices” (Student 12). I have explained in Chapter 3 and elsewhere in this thesis that English is the official language of the bureaucracy, the armed forces (comprising the army, air force and navy), the superior judiciary, corporations such as the Pakistan International Airlines, and the parliament. The official records of almost all of the institutions are maintained in English. However, for oral interaction Urdu is also used in these institutions. In parliament Urdu is the common language. The armed forces have largely remained anglicised in their functioning, management and language preference. It

24 Although she herself is not in the army, she must have had frequent interactions with army officers and their families in various social gatherings. Secondly, there is a greater likelihood of her going to an army school of the elite category, where most of the army officers tend to send their children. Both of these could be contexts where she might have faced her Urdu accent-related predicament.
was in the era of General Zia that the use of Urdu was emphasised in the army. He also strengthened the role of Urdu in the education system and the state media. This status planning for Urdu was used for the purpose of strengthening national unity.

The high status value of Urdu was also confirmed by the finding that those who cannot speak Urdu fluently with an appropriate accent face ridicule. An aspect of Baker’s (2006) instrumental attitudes to language pertains to basic security and survival. As I noted in the previous section (6.1.4), low proficiency speakers of English are mocked by fluent speakers; slurs are also targeted at poor speakers of Urdu. This comment of a student in a focus group reveals this attitude quite clearly: “Actually those children who belong to typically Pashtun families, their Urdu is pathetic at school age. And then the people and society make fun of them” (FG# 2, S4). Another student noted that racial and linguistic taunts are not always one sided:

Well, my mother tongue is Pashto, and I agree with her [S4] as she said that they make fun of our Urdu. They usually make fun of each other. It’s not only that they make fun of Pashtuns; Pashtuns also make fun of Punjabis’ accent. I think this is not good. (FG# 2, S7)

One student from the same group was highly conscious of his poor Urdu accent: “And it [embarrassment] is even worse with me because my Urdu accent is extremely terrible” (FG# 2, S3). During my research I found several families which adopted the home language policy of using Urdu or English or both as in the case of this parent: “Sometimes my own mother tells me to talk to children in Urdu so that they are confident in school and face no difficulty” (Parent 5). This parent actually refers to the embarrassment or shame that many Pashtun students have to face due to their improper or Pashto-like Urdu accent. Another parent was quite candid in expressing his positive attitude to the status of Urdu: “For instance, a person is speaking English and Urdu in our society. People, including myself, will give more importance to him” (Parent 2).

Urdu was also considered important due to its role as a national lingua franca. The participants were unanimous in their view that it was a privilege to know Urdu as it is understood and spoken by the majority of Pakistanis. A student in this regard observed that Urdu connects you with the whole country (FG#6, S3). When I asked a parent about the status of Urdu, he concurred with the views of the students: “When someone from Punjab
comes here we speak Urdu or Punjabi with them. Similarly, when we go to Karachi or Islamabad or Lahore, again we speak Urdu or Punjabi with them” (Parent 2). The privileged status of Urdu as a lingua franca was juxtaposed with the disadvantage of the native languages on several occasions in the data: “We understand Pashto but everyone in the whole country doesn’t understand Pashto; they understand Urdu” (FG#6, S1).

Historically Urdu has been a popular language in the subcontinent region for pragmatic, academic and political reasons. Urdu enjoyed high status in the British era as at that time it was the preferred medium of education for pragmatic reasons (see Chapter 3). After the creation of Pakistan, the status of Urdu was further enhanced when it was made the national language. However, the pragmatic role of Urdu started to decline due to the growing influence of English in the domains of education, the civil bureaucracy, and the army. Due to the recent trend of globalisation, the position of English has become even stronger vis-à-vis Urdu. Despite the dominant position of English in LPP in Pakistan, efforts have been made to promote Urdu as a symbol of national unity and as a lingua franca. Consequently, both English and Urdu enjoy high status. In the process only minimal attention has been paid to the indigenous languages which are getting marginalised due to the emphasis on English and Urdu. Mansoor (2005) reports a dominant view of the status of Urdu and a correlated negative attitude towards and shift from Punjabi among the educated Punjabi youth. Though not as widespread as in Punjab, similar perceptions can be found about Pashto in the KP province, particularly in the context of elite schools. Scepticism about the utility value of Pashto, which emerged as a dominant theme in the data, therefore, warrants a separate discussion.

6.1.6 Minimal utility value of mother tongue

The unanimity with which the stakeholders expressed positive attitudes towards the utility value of English was matched in their progression of scepticism about the instrumental value of MT. They do not see any role for Pashto in spheres such as employment, business, education, etc. This lack of usefulness of Pashto is also leading to a decline in its prestige and status. This is manifested in the participants’ rejection of Pashto in education, both as a medium of instruction and as an additional subject (see Chapter 5) despite strong feelings of pride and identity associated with Pashto. In Morocco, Errahini (2008) reports that
instrumental orientation is often quoted as a reason for the prevalent negative attitudes towards Berber and for the lack of interest in learning it.

Expressing negative attitude towards the pragmatic value of Pashto, the following student’s statement is representative of a major finding in this study—that the MT’s role is and has to be confined to its symbolic level, i.e. as a marker of Pashtun identity and nothing more: “If somebody has to speak these [indigenous] languages, it is for the love of these languages; it’s not that they gain any advantage through those languages” (FG#1, S3). Responses expressing a lack of trust in the instrumental functions of Pashto reverberate throughout the data. One student in a focus group hinted at the futility of MT in the sphere of education: “So if we just speak Pashto, and we study Pashto you know, that won’t help us” (FG#3, S2). A parent was also satisfied that the use of Pashto should be confined only to the home: “Pashto is confined to the sphere of home only; no matter how you speak it, good or bad” (Parent 1). Similarly, while comparing the significance of the three languages, another parent noted: “Pashto comes at number three [in order of importance]. Pashto has no role in our society except that it is mother tongue” (Parent 1). A teacher while talking about the role of MT in education was bluntly pessimistic: “I mean we are going to stop their progress [by teaching Pashto]” (Teacher 9). The view that the use of MT in education and in everyday and professional life could be shifting was noted on several occasions in this study.

Ambivalence also emerged as a salient feature of the stakeholders’ responses to the status of Pashto in terms of its instrumental worth. For example, in the first response discussed in the above paragraph, the student referred to the love of MT as well as its worthlessness. Similarly, a parent was quite positive about the instrumental value of Pashto, but in the same breath she expressed pessimism: “There are very few courses in native languages, for example some students do MA in Pashto. He/she will become a poet, playwright or a teacher or do a TV program in a Pashto channel. But even these opportunities are rare” (Parent 5). A similar contradiction can be seen in the opinion of a teacher who saw the utility value of Pashto for those who would like to do an MA in it: “As I told you, yes if you take your MT as a profession, then yes. But I don’t recommend it for the students in general” (Teacher 8). Further evidence of ambivalent feelings towards MT can be seen in the detailed response of this School B teacher:
I feel guilty; I feel very bad, because my own knowledge [of Pashto] is not sufficient. I have not read any book. It’s all on hearsay; you tell me something about any poet or any warrior, I’ll know it, but I don’t know the details. And I will never make that effort because that interest is not there to make research and go into the details. And you don’t see any utility or benefit in knowing them. No we don’t see anything [measures to promote Pashto] by the government or by the schools. (Teacher 7)

In this remark, which typifies the mind-set of many educated Pashtuns, the teacher on the one hand realises that we should know our language, history and values, and on the other sees no utility value in doing so. I observed this dilemma on many occasions; sometimes it would be expressed explicitly, as in the example above, and at other times I felt it from the non-verbal cues accompanying their responses. In the comment that follows, even though the student is acknowledging Pashto as an important language in the region, there is an aura of scepticism about it since the informant wants to emphasise Pashto’s role for in-group communication only:

I don’t think I will need to use Pashto outside [the KP province]. There are very little chances of my using it outside; if I find someone speaking Pashto, or maybe even with that person I will start speaking in English. So Pashto is mainly for this province. (Student 1)

Ambivalence with regard to Pashto is strikingly different from the informants’ clarity of thought on English and to some extent Urdu. When I look at this dilemma in the presence of strongly positive attitudes towards English and Urdu as discussed in the previous sections, I see a parallel with what Muthwii (2004), echoing McGregor (2000), notes: Kenyans are “volunteering to be compelled” into using English. Describing a similar scenario about the native languages in India, Mohanty (2004, p. 5) observes that:

Unfortunately, most of the marginalized linguistic groups seem to be accepting the low status and exclusion of their languages as fait accompli. Their language is perceived as important for identity and integrative functions, but instrumental functions are dissociated from the native languages in favour of the dominant ones.

In the same vein, Rahman (2006, p. 84) laments the mere “lip service” paid to the indigenous languages in Pakistan, which are suffering due to the prevailing market conditions in which access to “power, wealth or prestige is mainly possible through English and, to a lesser extent, Urdu”. A parallel to the findings in my study can also be
seen in Mahboob’s (2002) study in which the participants find their first languages pragmatically insignificant and consider them useful only for in-group communication.

Having discussed the participants’ attitudes towards the instrumental functions, I now turn to their attitudes towards the integrative roles of the three languages.

6.2 Integrative attitudes to languages

Following Baker (2006), the themes that are grouped under this category are those in which respondents express their association with or membership of a group, community, nation, province or country; the participants’ attitudes towards languages vis-à-vis national unity and patriotism are also included in this category. I also include identity related attitudes, as a person’s association with a group or region entails his/her identity. Moreover, there are numerous responses in the data in which the participants express their feelings of dignity and superiority on the basis of their association with Pashtun, culture, history and ethnicity. I have grouped and labelled such responses as Pride associated with MT. At the same time, the attitudes which reflect shame associated with a particular language, or beliefs that certain languages are detrimental to the unity of a group or community, are also discussed under this category.

An interesting finding in this study is that unlike instrumental attitudes, which were mostly associated with English, stakeholders seem to show minimal integrative attitudes to English. While the themes of The global value of English and The status value of English emerged saliently in the data, they mainly had a pragmatic orientation and, as such, have been reported under instrumental attitudes in the first part of this chapter. The stakeholders’ integrative attitudes have been grouped under the following themes:

- The national value of Urdu
- MT as divisive
- Identity value of Pashto
- Pride associated with Pashto
- Shame associated with MT
6.2.1 The national value of Urdu

The national value of Urdu emerged strongly both in the interviews and in the focus group discussions. Even though Urdu is second to English in terms of status and has a moderate level of pragmatic significance, the finding was expected because Urdu as the national language has been supported by the state since its inception. Urdu dominates the mainstream media, both print and electronic. Urdu is taught as a compulsory subject from Class 1 to 12. However, its overall status in education is second to English (see Mahboob, 2002, and Chapter 5).

Much evidence in the data confirmed that Urdu as the national (Pakistani) identity marker has a special place in the hearts and minds of Pakistanis. A student’s response in this regard was typical: “Urdu in our country will remain strong because it is our national language and is the national identity of the country” (FG# 5, S4). On quite a few occasions, the relative national importance of Urdu was juxtaposed with the limited role of Pashto as a national language: “Urdu is getting more importance because it is our national language. Pashto is not needed anywhere in the country except this province” (FG# 6, S3). The role of MT confined to mere in-group communication was also raised in the previous section, Minimal utility value of MT. On a number of occasions the respondents positioned the role of Urdu as a national lingua franca (instrumental value) together with Urdu as a symbol of national unity (integrative value), as evidenced in a focus group student comment: “Urdu is the language which is understood by many people in all four provinces in our country. In a way it is a unifying language” (FG#2, S3).

Teachers and parents were also found to be on the same page with students with regard to Urdu as a symbol of national unity. The belief was expressed quite clearly by a teacher from School A: “Urdu is our national language and we can’t deny that it is part of our values, and we need to work for that as well” (Teacher 4). Responses of several stakeholders reflect the philosophy of the political leaders and policy makers who made Urdu the national language despite the presence of native languages like Bengali and Punjabi spoken by huge populations in their respective provinces. The logic behind making Urdu the national language was to keep regionalism or provincialism at bay and strengthen national unity through a language that did not represent any specific ethnic group (see Chapter 3 for details). One teacher in School A believed that Urdu “is a common language
which has united all” (Teacher 6). Parents also emphasised the national role of Urdu, as one said: “Urdu [is important] as it is our national language” (Parent 4).

I came across several occasions where respondents implied that favouring Urdu is synonymous with patriotism: “It [Urdu] is important for the country because the first thing we should do is to support our country. And then after that it’s our family and everyone” (Student 11). Another student maintained that “Urdu is important because it is my national language and not because I am really patriotic and I should say I like Urdu because it is our national language in the country, but Urdu is important for me because I am a Pakistani” (Student 1). Even though the student seems to deemphasize his sense of patriotism, the comment still highlights the link between Urdu, nationalism and patriotism.

For all their clarity and unanimity in their views about Urdu as the symbol of national unity, the students seem ambivalent with regard to the government’s acquisition planning for Urdu. Interspersed among the positive attitudes to the national and status value of Urdu are comments which carry undertones of scepticism about Urdu in education. In response to my question about the importance of Urdu in education a School B student maintained that “it’s like at young age we are told [at school] that it’s our national language” (Student 9). The comment of another student in this regard was interesting: “we have been told [in schools that] Urdu is our national language. And everybody speaks in Urdu, everything is in Urdu. It is very dominant, you cannot contradict it” (Student 7). In these responses there is a clear indication that the state and the schools are making deliberate efforts for the status and acquisition planning for Urdu. Reflecting further on Urdu in the same interview, Student 7 doubted if “someone here [in school] would be reading Urdu newspapers”. When these comments are seen in the context of the students’ almost unanimous negative attitudes to the learning of Urdu (reading, writing and grammar, etc.), which I discuss in Chapter 5, it becomes clear that the students in the elite schools are experiencing some tension with regard to Urdu. On the one hand they are mindful of the status and prestige value of Urdu, and are thus willing to speak it, on the other they find it hard to accept its academic role in the English-dominant environment of their school. The student population in general in Pakistan, comprising the government schools, madrassas and non-elite private school, however, is more at home with Urdu than English.
The government’s status, prestige and acquisition planning efforts, as manifested in the attitudes of the stakeholders, are not without problems, especially when seen in their political and historical contexts. In Chapter 3 I discussed the Urdu-Bengali controversy which is considered to be one of the contributory factors to the dismemberment of Pakistan. Similarly, the Sindi-Urdu controversy has always remained a bone of contention between Sindis and Mohajirs in Sind. In the KP province, although the majority of Pashtuns preferred Urdu to Pashto in the educational and official domains, a potent opposition to Urdu at the expense of Pashto has always existed from the British era Khudai Khidmatgars to the present-day Pashtun nationalists. Without suspecting the intentions of the founding fathers of Pakistan, one wonders whether the policy of making Urdu the national language and elevating its status over the other languages has really been successful in strengthening national unity. Rahman (2004b) highlights how the state’s policy of using Urdu as a symbol of national unity is backfiring:

In short, the state’s use of Urdu as a symbol of national integration has had two consequences. First, it has made Urdu the obvious force to be resisted by ethnic groups. This resistance makes them strengthen their languages. Second, it has jeopardized additive multilingualism recommended by UNESCO (2003), and as Urdu spreads through schooling, media and urbanization, pragmatic pressures make the other Pakistani languages retreat. (p.4)

The view of national lingua franca to which Rahman refers is also reported by Shohamy (2006, p. 41) in the context of the USA where “English is associated with patriotism; speaking good English is equated with being a ‘good American’ (Auerbach, 2000, p. 181), and language is very much associated with loyalty”. More recently May (2008) argued that nationalism of the nation-states is posing the greatest threat to language diversity. May’s assertion is relevant in the LPP context of Pakistan where indigenous languages are dangerously marginalised and neglected in comparison English and Urdu. Section 6.2.5 concerning Shame associated with MT shows how the feelings of shame force the elite school students to avoid speaking Pashto in certain contexts. The finding bears evidence of the danger to which May refers. Although the political history of LPP in Pakistan, as briefly referred to above, and the views of scholars like Tariq Rahman highlight problems with the hegemonic role of Urdu, the students find the promotion of native languages, Pashto in this case, detrimental to the unity of Pakistan, as I will show in the following section.
6.2.2 MT as divisive

With regard to the theme of the national value of Urdu I noted that the attitudes of a number of participants reflected the ideology of the founding fathers; i.e. Urdu was believed to be essential to the national integrity and unity of Pakistan. Expressing an opposite belief about Pashto, several students feel that any effort to advance the roles of regional vernaculars is going to weaken the integrity of the country.

The view is candidly reflected in this focus group student’s words: “But for unity of our country we should promote Urdu further and remove other languages because Urdu is the only language understood in the four provinces” (FG# 5, S5). Similarly, while responding to the possibility of enhancing the status of Pashto, another student said: “There will be conflict because if you put the system in Pashto here, then most certainly they [people in Punjab] will put it in Punjabi, so there will be conflict among the various provinces” (FG# 3, S1). In the opinion of another student there is an implicit reference to the perception held by many that projecting a Pashtun identity, and speaking Pashto for that matter, would be tantamount to rejecting a Pakistani identity: “I would rather not want to be identified as a Pashtun. I don’t like being identified as a Pashtun. Not even a Punjabi. I just want to be a Pakistani” (Student 1). Interestingly, no evidence of this attitude was traced in data from parents and teachers except where (in Chapter 5) some of the parents and the principal of School A expressed scepticism about the new policy of introducing Pashto in education.

Coleman (2010), however, has a different view as he sees the promotion of native languages as a unifying factor rather than being divisive. In his report on Pakistan’s ELT policies and practices, commissioned by the British Council, he argues that the adoption of multiple languages in primary school education actually tends to strengthen the loyalty of ethnic minorities to the state, rather than the reverse, because all ethnic groups perceive that they are being respected equally. He further notes that “a well-established European example can be found in Switzerland and an Asian parallel, arguably, can be seen in Singapore. Very recent developments along these lines have taken place in Orissa and in Southern Thailand” (p. 31). On the basis of this argument, Coleman (2010) and Coleman and Capstick (2012) recommend the use of mother tongue for students in the early years of education in Pakistan. In this respect these scholars concur with May (2008) who advocates linguistic diversity as against public monolingualism. The findings I have
discussed so far have mainly revealed the students’ scepticism about their MT in terms of national unity and pragmatic significance. However, when it comes to the abstract concepts of identity and pride, their attitudes are strongly positive towards their MT. In the following two sections I discuss the students’ attitudes towards the identity and pride values of Pashto.

6.2.3 Identity value of Pashto

Owing to the intrinsic relationships between the individual, language, society and identity, it is inevitable that the theme of identity would emerge in the data that was gathered to explore the stakeholders’ language practices and attitudes. As Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982) posit, it is largely through the use of language that social identity and ethnicity are established and maintained. This point is made clear by Miller (2000, p. 74): “What seems inescapable is the understanding that our identities are shaped by and through our use of language”.

Conceptions of identity illuminated in this study are related to social or in-group identity (Tajfel, 1974, 1981). Tajfel (1974) defines social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 69). Building on the social group theory of Tajfel, Giles and Johnson (1987) developed their ethnolinguistic identity theory, which focusses on language as a salient marker of group membership and social identity. According to the theory members of ethnic in-groups seek to achieve “psychological distinctiveness” from out-groups by using language as a tool for social comparison (Giles & Johnson, 1987). Taking a similar view of social identity, Mok (2010, p. 266) maintains that “individuals sort themselves into groups by identifying a source—an attribute—and allocating themselves on the basis of that attribute. People who share an attribute are members of the ‘in-group’; those who are different belong to other groups or the ‘out-group’”.

In the previous section it was noted that there was a feeling of scepticism about the promotion of Pashto. Several participants believe that a policy that promotes regional languages will harm national unity. This means that low or negative value is attached to Pashto when it comes to national identity. However, when it comes to ethnolinguistic
identity, positive association with Pashto emerged quite saliently. The view of Pashto as indispensably linked to identity emerged in the data on many occasions, as evidenced in the response of a focus group student: “With Pashto we can develop our Pashtun identity” (FG# 5, S2). Reference was also made to the link between identity and Pashtunwali, of which Pashto is a basic component. One School A student explicitly sough to achieve “psychological distinctiveness” from out-groups (Giles & Johnson, 1987) by asserting that “I would even like to speak it [Pashto] when I go to Islamabad and speak it among those people so that I represent where I am from” (Student 2). At the same time there were those who went to the extent of divesting those who cannot speak Pashto of their Pashtun identity, as shown in the comment of this student about the famous Indian movie star: “Shah Rukh Khan cannot be counted as Pashtun because he doesn’t speak Pashto” (FG# 6, S3).

Parents were generally found to agree with the students’ beliefs. For instance, one parent observed that “Pashto is our mother tongue. If I can speak Pashto, people will recognize me as Pashtun” (Parent 1). Another parent echoed this view: “But at the same time, we shouldn’t forget Pashto. It is identity” (Parent 6). These comments, nevertheless, were not free from tinges of irony as the same parents in other contexts in their interviews expressed reservations about any role for Pashto in the education of their children. Poised favourably in favour of English, they seem little concerned about their children’s decreasing use of Pashto and its possible attrition.

When teachers were posed a similar question, even though most of them recognised the identity value of Pashto, some were cautious and reserved in their remarks. A teacher, for instance, reflects on the identity value of Pashto by referring to the parents’ beliefs, and thus avoids giving her own view: “Pashto is primarily the focus of a lot of parents who don’t want their children to lose their cultural identity just because they are studying in a language program” (Teacher 3). When I repeated the question and made it more specific, the teacher again replied with a sense of detachment: “I would say that the naturalised language of the state has to be always respected because that is what makes a country unique from others and one region from another region” (Teacher 3). Another teacher

25 Pashtunwali is the Pashtun tribal code of conduct, which I discuss in Chapter 3.
26 Shah Rukh Khan is a famous Indian movie star. His Pashtun father went to New Delhi from Qissa Khwani Bazaar in Peshawar, the capital of KP province.
referred to the value of Pashto as a necessity for living in society, as if imposed externally, rather than a reality inherently belonging to and upheld by society: “Pashto you will require because you are living in this culture” (Teacher 2).

As I reflect on the data above, and the perceptual differences that emerged between teachers and other stakeholders regarding this particular theme, I can see some influence of the school language-in-education policy on some of the teachers. For instance, in Chapter 5 I noted that the elite schools in general and the teachers as implementers of the schools L-i-E policy in particular have negative attitudes towards the role of the students’ MT in education, be it as medium of instruction, a taught subject or general language use. I also looked at the teachers’ opposition to MT; they were found to believe that the use of MT could interfere with the English proficiency of the students. The inference that I attempt to draw about the teachers’ attitudes towards MT becomes more obvious when it is viewed together with the teachers’ negative attitudes towards MT as discussed under the instrumental category. Nevertheless, a few of the teachers were quite candid in expressing their belief about the identity value of Pashto: “The place where we belong to, we should be able to speak the language of that place idiomatically”. A teacher from School B concurred with this view: “I think it is always the mother tongue [that we must know]; you know where you belong to and your identity. So it [MT] is a must” (Teacher 8).

The above findings, especially those related to the students, confirm the social identity view of Pashto, that is, Pashtun social identity and ethnicity are in large part established through language (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982). That being the case, an investigation such as this one which takes a microscopic view of LPP and the related language practices and attitudes, becomes even more significant. Pashto, like many other indigenous languages, is under pressure due to the dominant status of English and Urdu. The implications of such a policy could be more serious for the students of English-only elite schools, who in the context of this study report significant domain and function shifts from and consequent attrition of Pashto (see Chapter 7). In the following section I take up another aspect of the integrative attitudes, Pride associated with Pashto.
6.2.4 Pride associated with Pashto

Like identity, pride associated with mother tongue also emerged as a dominant theme in the data. Pride was used by the participants in this study in two ways. One related to the feeling of pride based on social status (Shariff & Tracy, 2009). I discussed this aspect of pride in the previous section with reference to the participants’ feelings of superiority associated with English, which is seen as instrumental for the attainment of rank and status. The second way in which pride was associated with a certain language pertained to ethnicity. Ethnic pride, according to McCreary, Slavin and Berry (1996), provides a subjective sense of attachment to a specific ethnic group and is associated with higher self-esteem. Generally, I observed that the association of pride with English and Urdu is based on social status, i.e. pragmatically oriented, while pride associated with MT, as linked to ethnic identity, is valued for its integrative orientation. It is the integrative aspect of pride which I discuss below.

A student’s comment in this regard was representative of several such responses: “You know in this region the people are mostly Pashtuns, and they are very proud of their language” (Student 2). The response of another focus group student encapsulates the pride value of Pashto together with a desire to promote it: “I think we should take pride in our language and we should learn it like we are talking and writing in English, so we should also improve our understanding of our culture and language” (FG# 2, S5). Commenting on the teaching of Pashto to future generations, a student in a focus group declared that “they shall be proud of it, because this is our own MT. Before learning any foreign language we should learn our own language (FG#2, S3). In Chapter 5 (Section 5.2.4.2), I made a comment that when students talk about Pashto as their identity, they seem to show a favourable attitude even towards the learning of Pashto. However, they change their stance when they are specifically asked about Pashto as a school subject or medium of instruction. The same paradox can be seen here. Whilst taking pride in the language, the student in the above comment is positively poised towards learning Pashto. However, the actual situation with regard to their attitudes to Pashto in education is quite different (see Chapter 5).

Comparison of languages by participants has been a recurring feature in this study. For instance, in relation to the theme of National value of Urdu I noted that whilst talking about the national value of Urdu, the participants would refer to regional languages as
threats to national unity. Similarly, while they talk about the pride value of Pashto, which is inherently linked to ethnolinguistic identity, they disown or disregard Urdu. A student in the focus group remarked: “Our family really takes pride in Pashtun heritage and stuff, so we don’t speak Urdu at all and I speak Pashto and English, and I think everyone has a right to choose his language” (FG# 2, S2). In this comment the student not only expressed the pride her family takes in speaking Pashto at home, she also expressed a negative attitude towards Urdu. As another instance of juxtaposition, a student maintained that “I really love music in Pashto, I like the lyrics and the rhythm and everything. I don’t like Urdu that much. But Pashto is my own language, I really feel proud of it” (Student 14).

A class or section of educated Pashtuns is emerging who openly express pride in Pashto and English, while at the same time giving no importance to Urdu. This could be attributed to two factors: One, the growing sense of nationalism among Pashtuns as a result of their economic and political deprivation in the federal set up in which the big provinces are dominating in every sphere; second, a possible reaction to the ridicule targeted against Pashtuns for their non-standard accent of Urdu. In the context of this study, however, this is not a salient theme because despite being proud of their MT, the students associate feelings of shame with Pashto in certain contexts.

Data from the parents and teachers did not reveal adequate information about the theme of pride associated with Pashto. The response of only one parent is worth quoting here: “Pashto is important as it is a sign of our national pride and prestige” (Parent 8). Similarly, among the teachers only one expressed a positive attitude to pride associated with MT: “They [students] feel proud of it. I think those who try to detach themselves from their language and land are very insincere” (Teacher 6). Nevertheless, there were some teachers who did not see any point in being proud of Pashto: “But maybe when I say of Pashto I won’t be that proud” (Teacher 9). The presence of only one instance of the theme among teachers, similar to the trend in the identity theme above, suggests a pattern of positive attitudes among the English-medium school teachers. The data does not provide any concrete evidence that could explain this trend. However, when looked at in the general context of this study, particularly the findings discussed in Chapter 5 which explore the dynamics of L-i-E policy of the two schools, an explanation for the teachers’ attitudes towards MT could be offered. There I noted that the teachers of English, who have been
influenced by the school’s foreign language teaching vision, tend towards an assimilationist
or replacive immersion practice (Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Spolsky, 2009); as such they not
only disregard the role of students’ MT in education, they also discourage its role in non-
academic domains of the students’ lives (see Chapter 7). At the same time their attitude
towards the pragmatic value of MT, as already discussed in this Chapter, are also negative.

The findings discussed in this section reveal the students’ firm association of pride with
Pashto; as such it confirms a general impression about Pashtuns that they are proud of their
language and identity. However, the students who imagine a future beyond the locale of
KP or Pashtunwali, who are inculcated with the belief, both at home and at school, that
English and Urdu are the languages of success and prestige, who do not see a role for
Pashto in education and other domains, and who see their language and kind being
constantly mocked on Urdu dominant TV channels, the nature of identity can become
complex as well as changeable (Fishman & Garcia, 2010). Thus in the following section I
report that the participants, who attach a strong pride value to Pashto, find themselves in
situations where they feel ashamed of Pashto.

6.2.5 Shame associated with MT

Section 6.2.3 revealed that the students saw Pashto as a symbol of their group or
ethnolinguistic identity. However, a pattern of responses also emerged in the data whereby
Pashto was associated with shame in certain contexts. As the evidence in the data suggests,
these feelings of shame could be attributed to psychological, social and political reasons.
The emergence of this theme in the presence of themes related to pride and identity
confirms that identity is contextualised, i.e. “it depends essentially on circumstances and
contrasts that play upon it, modify it, and create or recreate it” (Fishman & Garcia, 2010, p.
xxvii), and is dynamic across time and space (Norton, 1997).

A basic reason why many youngsters feel ashamed of Pashto is the taunts or ridicule they
face from Punjabi or Urdu speaking counterparts, mostly in cities like Islamabad, Lahore
and Karachi. The following comment of a focus group student bears evidence for the
perception: “But when you speak Pashto in other provinces, they look down upon you.
Pashto is seen as something insulting” (FG#1, S3). A student in another group also
observed that “slowly you see people are becoming ashamed of being a Pashtun” (FG# 4,
The response suggests that the feeling is increasing among Pashtun teenagers. This could be attributed to the spread of electronic media, especially private TV channels, the internet and social media in which Urdu is the dominant language. A few years back comedies and stage shows on national and private TV networks used to characterise Pashtuns as low in IQ, simple or uncultured. Likewise, there are many jokes about them circulated on email and mobile phones through text. This student in a focus group describes the whole issue elaborately:

Similarly, people of other regions are mocking them that they have low IQ and they don’t understand anything. So because of all these things if someone asks one whether you are a Pashtun, he or she will say no, no I am not a Pashtun. There are many people who are ashamed of being Pashtun. As such they know Pashto but they would avoid in situations where they have to feel embarrassment. (FG# 4, S2)

One student was of the view that Punjabis always taunt Pashtuns for having a low IQ: “You will not understand as you are a Pashtun. So this attitude puts Pashtuns under a lot of pressure and obviously they will feel ashamed of their Pashtun background” (FG# 4, S3).

Another aspect of this shame is the Pashtuns’ Urdu accent. When they speak Urdu, their accent is conspicuously influenced by their Pashto accent. The comment of this student clearly explains this trend: “Actually those children who belong to typically Pashtun families, their Urdu is pathetic at school age, and then the people and society make fun of them” (FG# 2, S4). Personally I also know many Pashtun families in Peshawar and Islamabad who speak Urdu with their children at home because they want them to have the right Urdu accent when they grow up, and hence avoid embarrassment.

Quite a few students referred to the stigma of terrorism associated with Pashtuns, both in Pakistan and Afghanistan. As discussed in Chapter 3, in the Jehad (holy war) against the Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan, the subsequent rise of Taliban and extremism, and the current war on terror, Pashtuns have unfortunately been a major player. This, together with some of the Pashtunwali traits (see Chapter 3), according to which Pashtuns are supposed to be warriors and protectors of their tribes and freedom and possess weapons, has led to the shaping of a negative image of Pashtuns. In this regard, a student in a focus

---

27 Although the internet is dominated by English, users in general in Pakistan mostly follow YouTube, Facebook and the web-based contents of TV programs etc., which are mostly in Urdu.
28 The trend has now decreased most probably due to the regulations of PEMRA (Pakistan electronic media regulatory authority).
group observed that “nowadays because of the terrorism thing, Pashtuns have kind of lost their reputation” (FG# 4, S3). Another student said: “I think one of the reasons why some Pashtuns are avoiding their language is because of the terrorism, as it is commonly believed that these terrorists are mostly Pashtuns. So people for their own self-esteem don’t want to speak Pashto” (Student 15). The stigma of militancy and terrorism is not merely a psychological or social issue for Pashtuns, it has some practical implications too; for instance, Pashtuns have to go through extra security checks when they move from the KP province to Islamabad or when they travel overseas.

A certain feeling of shame with regard to Pashto could be linked to the students’ image of themselves as formed by others. For instance, this comment of a student suggests the prestige value of English and Urdu on the one hand, and the declining status of Pashto on the other.

I think it [status of Pashto] will get worse day by day because many people are feeling guilty in speaking Pashto. They feel as if they will appear backward. So they don’t like speaking in Pashto. They are impressed with Urdu and English more. (Student 11)

Similarly the comment of this student embodies a typical perception among the students that one must be proficient in English if he/she wants to appear educated: “English is preferred so much, like if you don’t know English they think you are not fully educated” (Student 4). A noteworthy aspect of the students’ perceptions about shame associated with MT is their reference to others by using the third person expressions such as “they” and “people”. As such the students tend to avoid saying it explicitly that they hold Pashto in low-esteem. However, the fact that their own actions and behaviour are influenced by what “others” say and perceive suggests that they have internalised the judgment of others; hence they certainly believe in what others say about MT.

The finding is significant as Pashtuns are generally believed to be proud of their language and identity, a fact which even speakers of other languages (Urdu and Punjabi) recognise. Thus the same Pashtun identity, which is a source of pride for the students, becomes a source of shame in a different context. They view English and Urdu more positively for prestige and pragmatic reasons, and at the same time they view the group of speakers who are fluent in these languages as their role models. As a result they tend to switch from
Pashto to English or Urdu when they want to present a positive image of themselves in certain contexts. In their ethnolinguistic identity theory, Giles and Johnson (1987) note that individuals compare their own social group to out-groups. If the comparison is negative, one strategy that they adopt is to assimilate into a group that the individual or the individual’s group views more positively. Where language is a salient marker of group membership and social identity, the strategy, as Giles and Johnson note, can be the individuals’ linguistic adaptations. Bucholtz (2003) refers to this approach as ‘strategic choice’, while Kim (2003) call it ‘masking’—a process whereby individuals conceal and portray different versions of their identity as a response to who they come into contact with and what goes on around them.

In summary this chapter has so far shown that for the students of elite schools the three languages are significant for various reasons. Figure 6.1 is a graphic representation of the participants’ instrumental and integrative attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu. In the category of instrumental attitudes English emerged as a dominant language owing to its high status and pragmatic value. In integrative attitudes category, however, it is Pashto that is in the spotlight, for various reasons. Urdu appears to have a balanced role as it enjoys limited significance in terms of both the instrumental and integrative attitudes.

![Figure 6.1: Conceptual framework for attitudes towards English, Urdu and Pashto](image)
Having discussed the stakeholders’ attitudes as evident in the qualitative data, I now turn to the quantitative data in order to provide a broader picture of the students’ language attitudes.

### 6.3 Quantitative attitudes data

The quantitative data was based on the results of a survey questionnaire filled by the students. Students who participated in the interviews and focus group discussions also filled in the questionnaire. As in Chapter 5, I combine the values *Strongly Agree* and *Agree* for the sake of clarity in the discussion; actual values, however, are given in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 and Figures 6.2 and 6.3. This means that when I refer to a value, 70% agree for instance, it is actually the sum of the values of *Strongly Agree* and *Agree*. Moreover, I do not include the negative responses (*Disagree* and *Strongly Disagree*) as they are in inverse proportion to the positive responses. Since students were required to tick one option for all three languages, positive responses for a particular statement for a particular language give a clear indication of the negative responses. For instance, 70% *Agree* means 30% *Disagree*. Likewise, I have selected for discussion only those questions which are relevant to the qualitative data themes discussed earlier in this chapter.

The rationale behind using this multi-method, triangulation design (see Chapter 2, methodology) was two-pronged: to see whether the quantitative data confirm or contradict the qualitative data and to gain a broader view of language attitudes, language preferences and language maintenance and shift. The survey questionnaire as such was meant to place the qualitative findings in the broader context of the two English-medium schools. The following sections discuss the two main categories of attitudes as they are reflected in the quantitative data: the instrumental and integrative values of the three languages.

#### 6.3.1 Instrumental attitudes to languages

The first theme that emerged quite strongly in the qualitative data in relation to the category of instrumental value of languages was the value of languages for success in education. The finding is confirmed by an equally significant majority in the survey.

---

29 The inverse relationship is not absolute as it depends on the undecided figures, which are quite low in most cases.
responses. As the results for Q6 in Table 6.2 and Figure 6.2 show, a majority of students (95.6% E) find it easy to study science subjects, such as Maths and Computer Science, in English. Urdu (20%) and MT (13.3%) are not deemed to be ideal languages to study science subjects. Regarding arts subjects (Q7), even though the majority of students (92.2% E, 13.3% MT, and 38.9% U) agree in favour of English, a fair number of them also agree in favour of Urdu. As with the tendency in science subjects, only 13.3% of the students find studying arts subjects easy in Pashto. The results, therefore, show the students’ overall negative attitude to MT as medium of education.

My earlier discussion of the qualitative data showed that most of the students in the elite schools believe that education in Urdu and Pashto would be very difficult (see Chapter 5). They were more comfortable with English simply because they had been in English-medium schools for a number of years. However, findings in this survey show some degree of positivity in attitudes towards Urdu in learning arts subjects, which could be attributed to three reasons. First, Urdu is a dominant language in media, both print and electronic, and in the entertainment industry; the Pakistani dramas and Bollywood movies (in Hindi) are very popular among the youth in Pakistan. Secondly, Urdu is taught as a subject from Class 1 to 12 in all schools, both in the government and private sectors. Thirdly, as I noted in Section 6.1.5, Urdu is regarded as a symbol of status and prestige after English. A similar trend is found in Q14 which seeks responses about the language in which the students find overall learning easy and interesting. Strongly positive attitudes to English (90%), fairly positive attitudes to Urdu (45.6%) and MT (37.8%) can be seen for this statement.

Questions 1, 3, 8, 9 pertain to the second most dominant theme in the instrumental category in the qualitative data; i.e. *English as key to success in life*. A similar tendency can be seen in the quantitative data. In response to Q1 (90% E, 15.6% MT and 63.3% U), a strong majority of the students agree that English is necessary for getting jobs, while a fairly high number of students agree in favour of Urdu. MT is seen as the least significant in this respect. A similar trend can be seen in the results of Q3 (88.9% E, 32.2% MT and 66.7% U) which pertains to promoting business in Pakistan. While most of the students

---

30 I have referred to Q6 (B), Q7 (B) and Q 14 (B) in Chapter 5 as well.
favour English, a significant number of students prefer Urdu as well. MT is again ignored by the majority of students in terms of its capacity to promote business.

The government and private business offices are important domains in Pakistan where language as a marker of social class and status can make a significant difference. Question 8, as such, targets the pragmatic value of a language in this domain. While the majority of students consider Urdu and English (73.3% E, 41.1% MT and 80% U) as the most useful languages in this respect, only 41.1% of the students favour Pashto. The result is significant because even though English and Urdu are the languages for official communication and documentation, it is not compulsory for staff to speak either Urdu or English in government or business offices. However, in case a client or visitor does not understand Pashto the official would certainly switch to Urdu or English. Hence, with Pashto as the dominant language in KP, one would expect the mainly Pashto-speaking officials to speak Pashto among themselves and with clients and visitors, who too happen to be mostly Pashto speakers.

This finding shows that the students who visit these offices for various purposes may either speak these languages of prestige naturally due to language shift or intentionally for the benefits that the use of these languages could bring them. It also reflects the prestige value that the staff and officials associate with English and Urdu. There is a common perception among the Pakistani youth that when you are wearing pants and a shirt and/or speak English, you will get special, supportive treatment from government officials. Even police will not bother you at security check posts. The underlying reasons for these perceptions and practices (as evidenced in these data) could be attributed to the prestige value of Urdu and English on one hand, and to the perception that people who speak these languages are considered highly educated, and hence fair, meritorious and law-abiding, while speakers of regional vernaculars are generally considered uneducated (see Section 6.2.5 on Shame associated with MT).

The purpose of Q9 was to know the students’ views with regard to the usefulness of the three languages for the progress and prosperity of the whole country. In a related theme in the qualitative data (see Section 6.1.2 on English as key to success in life) the participants considered English as indispensable to progress in Pakistan. In the quantitative data too the majority of the students regard English (86.7% E) the key to the country’s progress, more
so than they do Urdu (66.7% U). MT with the lowest positive responses (26.6% MT) failed to gain the participants’ trust with regard to contribution to the development of Pakistan.

Another important theme that was discussed in the qualitative data is the association of status and pride with the languages. As already explained (Section 6.2.4), the participants in this context view pride in terms of social status and pragmatic benefits, such as rank, authority and achievement, they can achieve by virtue of their association with and fluency in the three languages. In line with the trend in the qualitative data, strongly positive attitudes were expressed towards English and Urdu in the quantitative data, while MT was ignored. Q23 is a representative statement on the status value of a language. The results (77.8% E, 46.7% MT and 57.8% U) show that the majority of students believe that when they hear someone speak English fluently, they wish they could speak like him/her. Urdu stands in second position, while MT is third. However, the figure for MT is still significant because no such attitudes were expressed for Pashto in the qualitative data. A more significant trend can be seen in Q27 which solicits responses pertaining to feelings of superiority associated with a particular language. English gets the highest number of responses (72.2% E) for the statement. Urdu stands second (58.9% U), while only a modest number of students find MT (40%) to be a source of pride. The value for MT is still significant because as mentioned earlier, no such attitudes were shown for Pashto with regard to its status and prestige in the qualitative data.

Question 28 which solicits information about the parents’ pride with regard to their children’s proficiency in the three languages was hard to analyse because the question combines both the pragmatic aspects of pride as well as the ethnic or integrative. As already explained, in this study the association of pride with MT generally connotes integrative attitudes (culture, identity, and ethnicity) and the association of pride with English connotes pragmatic attitudes (rank, social status, achievement). In this question, since the information about the parents’ pride is sought with regard to the three languages, it blends the instrumental and integrative dimensions of attitudes. The results (81.1% E,
Table 6.1: Instrumental attitudes to English (E), mother tongue (M) and Urdu (U), based on data from Section B of questionnaire; N=90. Note: Questions are sequenced according to the order in which I discuss them, reflecting the order of the qualitative data themes. Only the questions that are relevant to the qualitative data themes have been selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to instrumental value of languages</th>
<th>Lang.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly agree &amp; agree combined</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree &amp; Strongly disagree combined</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 It is easy to study science subjects like physics, maths, computer science and geography in English</td>
<td>E: 78.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 It is easy to study arts subjects like literature, Islamic studies and history in this language</td>
<td>E: 57.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 I think learning will be easy and interesting if this becomes the language of communication at school</td>
<td>E: 57.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I prefer to speak this language because it is necessary for getting jobs in Pakistan</td>
<td>E: 48.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 This language is essential if I want to promote my business in Pakistan</td>
<td>E: 47.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 21.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 The use of this language in government and business offices helps in getting things done easily</td>
<td>E: 35.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 The development of our country is possible if we are competent in this language</td>
<td>E: 57.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 23.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 When I hear someone speak this language well, I wish I could speak like him/her</td>
<td>E: 54.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 27.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 My ability to be fluent in this language makes me feel superior to those who cannot speak it</td>
<td>E: 49.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 My ability to speak this language fluently is a matter of pride for my parents</td>
<td>E: 55.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 28.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 21.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 I like this language because it is an international language</td>
<td>E: 69.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: 1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U: 3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Instrumental attitudes to English (E), mother tongue (M) and Urdu (U), based on data from Section B of questionnaire; N=90. Note: Questions are sequenced according to the order in which I discuss them, reflecting the order of the qualitative data themes. Only the questions that are relevant to the qualitative data themes have been selected.
60% MT and 57.8% U) show that even though English scores the highest by a large margin, Urdu and MT also get positive responses from a significant number of students. This is in line with the qualitative data findings where English was seen as a language of high social status (for pragmatic reasons), Urdu was preferred for pragmatic reasons (Section 6.1.5) and integrative reasons (Section 6.2.1 National value of Urdu), and Pashto was associated with pride on the basis of ethnic identity (Section 6.2.4).

The global value of English was also a dominant theme under the instrumental category in the discussion of the qualitative data, which in the questionnaire was targeted by Q5. The vast majority of students (91.1% E) agree that they like English because of its global value. Only a small percentage of students rate MT (8.9%) and Urdu (21.1%) positively in this regard. This was obvious for two reasons. First, Pashto and Urdu cannot be expected to enjoy the same global status as English. Second, there is a great tendency among the Pakistani youth to try or at least hope to go to a foreign country, preferably a developed western country, for study, work, residence or business.

On the whole, the questionnaire data have confirmed what was found in the qualitative data vis-à-vis the instrumental value of languages. Mainly English and to some extent Urdu received positive attitudinal responses under the instrumental category, while MT mostly received negative responses in this respect. A noteworthy finding in the quantitative data attributes to English and Urdu a pragmatic role in government offices. The majority of the
students believe that if one speaks English and Urdu in this domain, one will receive more supportive and accommodating treatment in the offices. This theme also surfaced in the qualitative data but not as saliently as its results in the quantitative data.

6.3.2 Integrative attitudes to languages

In the analysis of qualitative data under the integrative category I found that Urdu enjoys high significance as a symbol of national or Pakistani identity. Positive attitudes were also expressed with regard to Pashto as a marker of Pashtun identity and a source of pride. A theme (Section 6.2.2) also emerged in which the participants believe that if Pashto (or any regional language for that matter) is promoted through education, it would harm national unity. Yet a significant number of participants, especially younger students, said that Pashto was a source of shame for them in certain situations and they would try to avoid using it. In the following paragraphs I discuss results of the statements in the questionnaire that relate to the integrative attitudes themes explored in the qualitative data. Table 6.2 and Figure 6.3 give the overall picture of integrative attitudes.

Questions 20 and 30 aimed to explore attitudes relating to the national value of the languages. The trend that was seen in the qualitative data can also be noted in the quantitative data, with slight divergences. In response to Q20, the majority of students (72.2% U) agree to the value of Urdu as the symbol of national identity. A fairly high number of students (57.7% MT) attribute this value to MT. Interestingly, an equally high number of students (52.1% E) also favour English. Though not as great as Urdu, positive attitudes to MT and English are significant; something which was not found in the qualitative data.

In response to Q30, which also solicited responses about the national value of the three languages, Urdu led with a clear majority of 78.8% followed by MT (46.6%). English, as expected, received minimal positive responses (11.1% E), which is in sharp contrast to the result in Q20, which sought almost the same kind of information. Wording of the two statements could be the possible reason behind the unusual result for English. Whilst Q20 is phrased more positively and in a neutral manner, Q30 is straightforward and has a negative phrase that narrowly curtails the respondents’ choices, giving them an either this or that choice with no room for a middle way. In terms of ethnic identity, the results of
Q29 confirm MT as a marker of Pashtun identity, with a majority of students (66%) agreeing to Pashto, and 36.6% and 19.9% agreeing to Urdu and English respectively.

Question 16 was aimed at seeking information about the role of languages in national unity. The overall trend confirms what was found in the qualitative data with regard to Pashto. A fairly low number (42%) of students agree that MT (or native languages) could be detrimental to national unity as against 38.8% for Urdu and 32.1% for English. The results for English and Urdu are notable because no such opinion surfaced about these two languages in the qualitative data. I believe that some of the students might not have understood the meaning of “impede” (even though the pilot questionnaire did not reveal any problem with the word). The high number of undecided responses, 17% for Urdu and 31% for English, might suggest a certain lack of clarity about the statement among the participants.

The identity value of MT emerged as a dominant theme in response to Q25. 91% of the students agree that they love MT or Pashto as it is the language of their ancestors, as against 17.6% and 48% for English and Urdu respectively. Similarly, Q32, which solicited responses about the significance of language for its culture, folk music and indigenous literature, a majority of the students (72.1%) prefer MT, followed by Urdu (61%) and English (41%). Q24, which is very similar to Q32, produces almost identical results: MT (56.5%), Urdu (54.4%) and English (44.4%). When compared to the qualitative data findings, the results for Q32 and Q24 are significant vis-à-vis the three languages. For instance, it was only the MT which was associated with cultural identity in the qualitative data, while English and Urdu were preferred mainly for pragmatic reasons. Likewise, one may question the students’ preference for Pashto literature (literature is embedded along with native culture and folk music in Q32 and Q24) as it seems to contradict another major finding of this study (Chapter 7); that is, they show minimal interest and proficiency in reading Pashto literature, preferring instead English for reading novels, poetry, newspapers, magazines, and English and Urdu for music and movies. The mixed results for these two questions can probably be attributed to the inclusion of the word “literature”—which entails the students’ academic interest and proficiency in English and Urdu—alongside native culture and music, for which their preference is MT.
Pashto as a marker of Pashtun pride was seen as a salient theme in the qualitative data. Pride in this context refers to the participants’ association with a group on the basis of ethnic, racial and cultural bonds and is as such distinguished from the pride, prestige or status based on the pragmatic value of a language. Q31 can be seen as relevant as it attempts to solicit the students’ beliefs with regard to pride among natives of the KP province. The question also has an additional dimension in that it relates pride with language in education in the context of KP. Quite contrary to the findings in the qualitative data, which showed Pashto as a symbol of Pashtun pride and identity, the majority of students agree in favour of English (72.2%) and Urdu (61%), and only 57.7% students feel proud of Pashto. The result could be attributed to the language in education factor incorporated in the wording of the statement. These students of English-medium elite schools have already shown strongly positive attitudes towards English as the key to success in education. Most of them also see Urdu as a symbol of national identity and status. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 5, they are against the inclusion of Pashto in the domain of education. As such, if there had not been a language in education dimension in Q31, which lent it a pragmatic dimension, the result might have shown a higher rating for MT.

A straightforward question (Q29) sought the students’ attitudes towards the identity value of languages (One cannot be considered a Balochi/Pashtun/Punjabi/Sindi if he/she doesn’t speak this language.). The results (66% MT, 19.9% E and 36.6% U) are noteworthy, particularly with regard to Pashto and Urdu. While in the qualitative data the students expressed strong attitudes towards the ethnolinguistic identity value of Pashto, the figure of 66% here shows a difference in attitude in the quantitative data. The figure of 36.6% for Urdu too is a little surprising as only few would see Urdu as a marker of Pashtun identity or Sindi and Punjabi identity. This could only be explained in terms of the students’ strong beliefs about Urdu as a symbol of national unity and identity—the qualitative data themes—which have been corroborated in the quantitative data (Q20 and Q30 discussed above). As already discussed in this thesis, prestige planning for Urdu, together with requiring it as a compulsory subject, has significantly shaped the attitudes of educated Pakistanis in favour of Urdu.
Table 6.2: Integrative attitudes to English (E), mother tongue (M) and Urdu (U); N=90.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to integrative value of languages</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>%age Agree &amp; S. agree combined</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>%age Disagree &amp; S. disagree</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20. The use of this language helps me identify with the wider population nationally.</td>
<td>E: 25</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>52.10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 38</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72.20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. One cannot be considered a Pakistani if he/she doesn’t speak this language.</td>
<td>E: 1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 19</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 58</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>78.80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Using this language will impede our national unity.</td>
<td>E: 15</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>41.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 19</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 15</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. I love this language because it is the language of my ancestors/forefathers.</td>
<td>E: 8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>67.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 57</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>41.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Without this language I would miss out on many rewarding and enjoyable parts of culture, such as folk music and literature.</td>
<td>E: 27</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 39</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>72.10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 23</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>61.00%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. I want to speak/read this language because I love the culture and literature of the native speakers of this language.</td>
<td>E: 22</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>31.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 25</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>56.50%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54.40%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. This language must be accepted as language of education in schools in KP if pride is to develop among native speakers.</td>
<td>E: 38</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72.20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 29</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 17</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. One cannot be considered a Balochi/Pashtun/Punjabi/Sindhi etc. if he/she doesn’t speak this language.</td>
<td>E: 14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: 45</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U: 10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>36.60%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the whole the quantitative data confirm the integrative attitudes that students expressed about the three languages in the qualitative data, with only a few exceptions. For instance, as explained above, the results of Q24, Q16, Q31 and Q29 show some divergence from the qualitative data findings. As regards the qualitative data theme of Shame associated with MT, no statement in the questionnaire could be related to the theme. This is probably a limitation of the concurrent mixed methods design of this study. I administered the questionnaire at the same time as I collected the qualitative data. Thus when I coded data several weeks after I collected it, I found that a couple of emergent themes had not been covered in the questionnaire.

6.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I analysed and discussed language attitudes related data to explore answers to my second research question: What are the stakeholders’ attitudes towards languages (English, Pashto and Urdu) in general, and L-i-E policy in particular? Views of other
stakeholders, teachers and parents, were also discussed to triangulate the students’ qualitative data.

The chapter has revealed that the students of the elite English-medium schools perceive the three languages, i.e. English, Urdu and Pashto, differently, and ascribe different roles to them. Strongly positive attitudes were expressed towards the instrumental value of English, not only by the students but also their teachers and parents. English was seen as indispensable in areas such as education, employment and careers in overseas countries. At the same time, the participants emphasised the pragmatic aspect of the high status and prestige of English in Pakistani society. Status value was also associated with Urdu as a national lingua franca and as a language promoted by government and its institutions. The students’ mother tongue (Pashto) was seen as least useful in terms of its instrumental value.

In the integrative category, the participants’ focus shifted from English to Pashto and Urdu. Urdu was seen by many as a symbol of national unity; at the same time they believed that any effort to enhance the role of indigenous languages in education would be tantamount to weakening the unity of the Pakistani nation, a view contrary to what Coleman (2010) and May (2008) advocate. Interestingly no one saw any issue with English which, according to the National Education Policy (Government of Pakistan, 2009, p. 20), “works as one of the sources for social stratification between the elite and the non-elite”. A similar position is taken by Ramanathan (2005a) in his examination of the English-medium and vernacular-medium education in the context of India. While participants were quite clear about their attitudes towards English and Urdu, ambivalence characterised their attitudes towards Pashto. Nevertheless, for all its perceived instrumental worthlessness, Pashto was strongly associated with Pashtun identity, and a source of pride—a view which was minimally shared by parents and teachers. At the same time, a theme in which shame was associated with MT in certain contexts also emerged in the students’ qualitative data. As a result of this feeling the students reported that in some situations they tend to switch from Pashto to Urdu or English. The finding is in line with the view of identity as variable (Fishman & Garcia, 2010); i.e. the speakers compare their own social group and out-groups and undergo linguistic adaptations to identify with the group they view more positively (Giles & Johnson, 1987).
Lastly, the aim of the quantitative data analysis was to corroborate findings in the qualitative data and to obtain a big picture of the students’ language attitudes in the context of the two schools. Quantitative data results were in line with most of the qualitative data themes with few exceptions. One issue that arose in this regard pertained to the methodological design of this study. Since I administered the questionnaire together with the qualitative data collection, one of the emergent qualitative data themes, *Shame associated with MT*, could not be discussed in the quantitative data as I had not anticipated it at the time of designing the questionnaire.
CHAPTER 7: LANGUAGE USE, PROFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE AND SHIFT

In this chapter I look at the language preferences and practices of the elite school students with regard to English, Urdu and Pashto. These language choices and practices are investigated in terms of domain (school, home and outside home) and in terms of language use for leisure and information. As with the previous chapters, I mainly draw on the reported data from interviews, focus group discussions and observations. Similarly, even though the main focus is on the language practices of the students, comments of their parents and teachers are also considered as all these actors in this micro-level language planning and policy (LPP) context are closely related. I also report some significant findings from the questionnaire, to obtain a general view of the students’ language use patterns and tendencies as well as to corroborate the qualitative data findings.

Investigating language practices in domains, such as the home and outside the home, may appear tangential to the main focus of this study, i.e. the school. However, numerous studies have reported that various domains do not operate in isolation and that one domain influences the other vis-à-vis the use of language (Barkhuizen et al. 2006; Dittmar, Spolsky and Walters, 2002; Spolsky, 2009). Spolsky (2009) notes that family is not a closed unit as its practices and beliefs are open to the influence of school. Likewise, Barkhuizen et al. (2006) report that children bring with them (to school) preferences for language policy and that children are the link between home and school. This view is further reinforced by Spolsky (2004, p. 14) who argues that “beliefs both derive from and influence practices”. It is evident from this statement that the language practices of the students in the elite schools, which are strictly monolingual (English-only), may inculcate in them certain attitudes and beliefs which they carry to domains outside the school, and consequently influence their practices in those domains. In addition to this, two groups of participants in this study, i.e. the students and their parents, are actors not just in the domain of school, but also at home. This natural link between the domains and the overlapping and influencing roles of the actors and their use of languages, therefore, warrants an integrative and dynamic approach to understanding micro-level LPP (Spolsky, 2004).

I find it necessary to indicate how this chapter is different from the previous two findings and discussion chapters. Chapter 5 explores the dynamics of the school L-i-E policy; two
of these dynamics are: 1) medium of instruction and 2) policy for language use in general in school. The evidence of language use in school which I discuss in Chapter 5 is essentially related to the L-i-E policy of the schools as conveyed to the students in class, and to the teachers in staff meetings. On the other hand, in this chapter I discuss data in which the students reflect on their language use in the school domain in general, i.e. their language practices in non-academic domains like the playground, cafeteria and within peer groups, where they enjoy more freedom to choose their language(s). Likewise, in Chapter 6 (attitudes towards languages) there are a few occasions where there is specific reference to the use of language(s). For instance, in Section 6.1.5 there is a comment: “But sometimes my father urges me to speak English at home, and also when we speak English some of our friends feel proud of it if they speak English or Urdu” (FG#5, S2). This comment embodies the student’s and his father’s attitude towards the high status value of English and Urdu; at the same time, it has significance for the theme of language use in the home domain. There are also references to the use of English and Urdu in government offices, and the use of Urdu (the national lingua franca) with non-Pashto speaking persons. The comments, when seen in their actual contexts, explain the students’ attitudes towards the status and prestige values of these languages. In this chapter, however, I discuss findings in which the students (and other participants) specifically talk about their preferences and practices of languages in a range of different domains.

While the main focus of the chapter is on language practices, I also discuss the students’ reported proficiency in the three languages and its implications for language maintenance or shift. The theme of language proficiency is inherently linked to the theoretical design of micro-level language planning on which this study is based. Explaining the three dimensions of language planning at a micro-level, of which one is the language practices of individuals, Spolsky (2009, p.6) links language practices to language proficiency: “language behaviour is determined by proficiency”. Likewise, the correlation between proficiency and (positive) language attitudes has already been pointed out, among others, by Baker (1992). On many occasions in this study when students talked about their language use, they also reflected on their communicative ability in a certain language. Finally, an understanding of the students’ language proficiency is justified because the elite schools follow the English-only immersion oriented L-i-E policy according to which the use of MT as a subject, and for routine communication, is strictly excluded.
7.1 Domain-wise language use

7.1.1 School

Chapter 5 (Section 5.4.3) showed that as the students move up to senior classes (i.e. from O level to A Level), they tend to speak English as a personal choice rather than as a compulsion in the mainly English-only environment of the school. In other words they reach a stage where they are free to choose the language(s) they want to speak. This section sheds further light on the patterns and dynamics of the students’ language choices in the school domain.

English emerged as the students’ most dominant language, followed by Urdu and Pashto. This pattern of language use seems obvious because the schools have a strict English-only policy. The policy outside the classroom, however, is not so strict, especially in the case of School A. A student in School A noted that it is not compulsory that “we talk in English outside the class, but we do speak [English]” (Student 2). Similarly, a student in a focus group observed that “at college, mostly I speak English with everyone” (FG#1, S1). Reflecting on her most spoken language at school, a student observed that “in school it is basically English and at times outside the class we use Urdu and Pashto but mostly English” (Student 2). A number of students revealed that even though their home language is Pashto, they speak English and Urdu at school “because it has become a habit” (Student 12). In terms of language use at school, the pattern of mentioning the three languages in a series, with English first, Urdu second and Pashto last, was found in the responses of many students. For instance, this student referred to the three languages when she reflected on her language choices: “I use three of the languages in my daily life. It is like I speak English and Urdu in school and sometimes Pashto” (Student 10).

The students’ views were also confirmed by their teachers and parents. A teacher, who was also the head of the girls section, confirmed that “the foremost and dominant language of students in our school is English” (Teacher 6). By this she meant the use of English not only in classes, but also in outside-the-class domains. Another teacher observed that “you are going to hear them [students] in and out of the class; they are going to speak English, whether it is informal or formal but they prefer to speak English” (Teacher 3). Similarly,

31 See Chapter 5 for details.
32 The senior section (Class 11 to 12) of the school is also referred to as college. The students, however, mostly use “school” even if they are at the college level.
no second opinion was found among the parents about the language practices of their children at school: “My children speak English at school” (Parent 5).

English is the students’ most dominant language at school. This is understandable when one considers the fact that the elite English-medium schools put so much emphasis on the use of English that the students develop the habit of using it even on the playground and during break time. The influence of the schools’ L-i-E policy on the students’ language choices at school is certainly there. However, it is interesting to note that after English it is Urdu that is the preferred language at school even though it is not the MT and is not given any importance in the school L-i-E policy33: “At school we are now used to speaking Urdu and English. So it has become a natural choice for almost all of us” (Student 7). In Chapter 5 I pointed out that the students do not have positive attitude towards Urdu as a subject. However, when it comes to speaking, they seem to give it preference over Pashto: “Most of my friends are having Pashto speaking background, but they use Urdu and English in school because it has become a habit” (Student 12). A student was able to grasp the reason behind it and summed it up in these words: “I guess they take it more as a communication language rather than literary or something” (Student 4).

There were numerous responses in which the respondents talked about the non-use of Pashto in school, mostly with reference to the school policy, i.e. prohibition of Pashto. Since I have already dealt with this topic in Chapter 5, I will not repeat those responses. Nevertheless, what I have said above about the preference and use of English and Urdu also indirectly reveals the status of Pashto as far as the students’ personal language choices in school domains are concerned. A student summed up the status of Pashto in school in these words: “Pashto at school is negligible; I wouldn’t even count it” (Student 7). Further, a student explained that “since most of the day is spent in classes, so English would be at the top, then Urdu, and Pashto is very little” (Student 9). Similarly, in the following response a student revealed her own shame or fear of a negative backlash with regard to the use of Pashto in the school domain:

   English, just because it has become a habit right, if I am talking to a teacher I talk to her usually in Urdu or English and then if suddenly I start speaking in Pashto, it looks weird. And if you go to your principal and start talking in Pashto, so it looks weird. It is just to avoid those weird situations. (Student 3)

33 Chapter 5 showed that the students are punished for speaking MT and Urdu (except in Urdu class).
Despite the dominance of English and Urdu at school, a couple of responses revealed the use of MT by the students. A teacher, for instance, referred to the students’ surreptitious use of MT: “They do speak Pashto whenever they get a chance” (Teacher 7). This comment, however, relates to junior or newly enrolled students who still have MT as their dominant language and have not acquired the level of proficiency in English to use it habitually. A student explained how Pashto is surviving in the private talk of the students in spite of the English-only language policy: “At school level, Pashto isn’t being promoted by the teacher, but the students are promoting it. Like when we are interacting with each other in Pashto, so we can say there is Pashto around us” (Student 8). Views such as these, however, were very rare in the data.

This section has revealed that English is the dominant language of students even in domains outside the classroom. Urdu is the second most preferred language for routine communication in school even though the students do not prefer it as a subject. The use of Pashto in school is minimal. The dominant use of English in the private talk of the students in outside the classroom domains, warrants further examination, particularly with regard to the dynamics which influence language choice among peer-group members.

7.1.1.1 Peer-group influence on language practices

Normally language management or language-in-education policy in the micro context of schools is associated with what the schools teach or the way the students’ language behaviour is controlled through language-specific rules, instance of which I have discussed in Chapter 5. Little attention is paid to how some students influence the language attitudes and practices of their fellow students. Ralph Waldo Emerson’s famous quote “I pay the school master but it is the school boys who educate my son” makes greater sense when it comes to the group members’ influence on languages. This aspect of micro-level language policy which involves language use at a personal or individual level is relevant in the context of school because “we are all engaged in continual language policy as we converse, and this personal programme of planning our subjective self is located on a continuum with a collective, public action of institutions” (Lo Bianco, 2010, p. 165).

In this regard a teacher in School A revealed that the language choices of the individual students are determined by peer groups: “Because of their peer-group culture they speak
English even outside the classroom” (Teacher 3). I can confirm this phenomenon through ample observational evidence based on the time I spent in the computer room, library, cafeteria, and pathways along the school grounds over the weeks and months. Fluent speakers of English are often prominent among peer groups. A teacher for instance observed that “the students admire those students who speak good English” (Teacher 5). A context in which attitudes towards English is highly positive, it is quite likely for the fluent speakers of English to dominate peer groups, become role models for their fellow students, and be the most sought after for friendship. This is not only the case with students. I observed during my interaction with the teachers and students that the fluent speakers of English are also the favourite of their teachers. They are admired because by virtue of their proficiency in English they do well in studies in general. Moreover, these students occupy positions like class monitors, house captains and heads of various societies. As such their influence on their fellow students is quite significant.

The majority of students who are fluent in English are Pakistanis who have returned from overseas, mostly from the UK and USA. They speak English almost like native speakers. Among the 15 students I interviewed individually, five of them were either born or lived in western countries for several years. A teacher told me that about 30-35% of their students are those who have returned from overseas. Another teacher reported that “many of our students have been either living or travelling abroad, so they always opt for a school which will provide them the opportunity for the same language, i.e. English” (Teacher 5). The tendency of the families returning from overseas to consider the elite schools as the first choice for their children is easy for me to understand because I too have been living in New Zealand for five years with my children. As I am planning to move back to Pakistan after the completion of my studies, I have already deliberated on the choice of education for my children there; I am sure elite schools would be the first choice (but for reasons more important than English). The intention is the same for almost all of my colleagues who joined the University of Auckland with me on the government sponsored PhD program five years ago. The trend could be attributed to two reasons: 1) as already discussed, these schools provide far better facilities and quality of education than the government schools, and 2) parents whose children have acquired prestigious native-like fluency in English would not want their children to lose it. However, amidst this planning and enthusiasm for English, none of these parents who I know as friends or those I
interviewed, give any consideration to the native language for their children. This influence is clearly reflected in an A Level student’s response:

But when I am sitting in a group, and you know like some people are from England and these places, they cannot speak Urdu and some are from like Punjab side, they cannot speak Pashto. So that is just to maintain a balance; we have been taught to speak English with friends and everywhere, so that has become a habit. (Student 3)

Another student hinted at preferring to make friends and speak English with students “who have come from some foreign country” (Student 8) and speaking English with them. Similarly, one student reported that they tend to speak the language which friends in the group feel most comfortable with: “like some people have come from abroad, so they are more comfortable when you speak with them in English” (Student 9). Sometimes the code is determined by an explicit request from a group member, as illustrated in this comment: “When we are in a group and if we speak Pashto, those who do not understand they say, ‘please translate’, and then you have to switch to Urdu or English again. So I think there we have some problem because then we have to speak in Urdu or English” (FG#2, S4). In a group situation, Pashtuns generally care for the non-Pashtun members and tend to avoid Pashto and speak the language that is mutually understandable. A student’s comment aptly reflects this practice: “in group even if there are many Pashtuns, there will be or there must be a single person who doesn’t understand Pashto, so in order to mingle him up in the conversation we switch to Urdu which is understandable everywhere” (Student 8). In the context of the elite schools, it would be very rare that all members in a group would speak Pashto\(^3\); so a situation like the one described by the student in the previous comment could be expected more often.

Gender was another peer-group dimension which favoured English. A fairly salient sub-theme of language use in school suggests that girls have a greater tendency to speak English. Although unsure about the reason, this A Level student accepted that the girls mostly speak in English: “But mostly girls speak in English; I don’t know why” (Student 2). This could be one of the reasons why boys prefer to switch to English when they talk to girls: “At school I usually interact in English, like especially when we talk to the opposite gender [girls]” (G#3, S2). Linking language choices in the context of mixed-gender groups to the status and prestige of languages, one student put it quite unequivocally:

\(^3\) This could be due to the presence of the non-Pashtun students in the group or due to the Pashtun students who prefer and speak English habitually.
It is a co-education school after all, and all of us have come from boys-only and girls-only schools to this co-education school. So if we start mingling, we are not going to be that proud of our Pashto or Urdu; we try to impress the other sex by speaking English. That’s what everybody tries over here. (Student 5)

When I sought the students’ views about the tendency of boys and girls to talk in English, a focus group student remarked: “That happens when we are in that area [pointing to open area behind the class rooms where A Level students hang around in break]” (FG#2, S6). A similar perception about the girls’ propensity to use English surfaced in interviews with a couple of teachers. A teacher in School A noted: “I think the use of English or tendency towards it is more in girls as compared to boys” (Teacher 5). The girls’ preference for English and Urdu, and their negative attitude towards Punjabi, has also been reported by Mansoor (2005) in her language attitudes study on Punjabi students.

The discussion of findings so far has revealed that the peer-group situation favours Urdu and English among this majority Pashto-speaking community. Partly out of courtesy (social norm), friendship and partly out of their own preference for the languages of prestige, Pashto-speaking students tend to switch easily to English or Urdu when they are in a group. At the same time, it is inconceivable that any group member would understand and speak only Pashto, and that other members would switch to Pashto for his/her sake because everyone can understand and speak Urdu and/or English. Thus Urdu as a national lingua franca and English as the dominant language of the school have a significant edge over Pashto, especially when it comes to choices for multilingual peers interacting in a group. At other times, however, the language choice is dictated indirectly without explicit requests or demands:

For example if I want to use Urdu and they [peers], all of a sudden, start speaking in English. They don’t want Urdu. So I have to respond in English. I am compelled. Even if I want to try and improve myself in Urdu; I really can’t because you know the peer pressure. (Student 6)

The need for switching to Urdu or English for courtesy or demand from a member in the group is a routine act:

Actually we hang out in a group so in order that everyone understands we use all languages, mostly it is Urdu because that is the most common and sometimes it is
English but it is like a habit. People speak half sentence in Urdu and half in English, and very little in Pashto. (Student 9)

In summary, this section has revealed that the peer-group dynamics favour English and Urdu as the most preferred and practised languages of the students in a group situation. In the following section I move from school to explore language use patterns at home.

7.1.2 Home

At home, MT emerged as the most dominant language, followed by English. Only a few students reported the use of Urdu. One student in a focus group noted that “I speak a little bit of English at home; mostly it is the mother tongue because everyone at home speaks Pashto” (FG#5, S3). Some tried to give a more precise figure of their language use: “60% of my day would be Pashto and 40% would be Urdu or English, so most of the time I speak Pashto” (Student 9). A number of students also reported more or less equal use of English and Pashto at home: “Pashto and English, pretty much proportionate at my home; maybe a little more English” (FG#1, S3). A larger number still reported the use of only Pashto: “With my family I speak Pashto most of the time” (FG#6, S4). While talking about their use of MT at home, several students referred to the identity value of Pashto: “I usually speak Pashto at home since I am a Pashtun” (Student 13). The view of Pashto as the home language of students was also reported by a few parents. For instance, a parent reported that “at home the children speak mother tongue, Pashto” (Parent 2). This view was held by several parents. There was not much evidence among the teachers regarding the students’ home language use. Only one teacher reported that parents would choose mother tongue as the preferred language for their children at home: “So my perception is that at home the Pashtun parents will try to encourage more usage of Pashto and the non-Pashtun will encourage Urdu or Hindko” (Teacher 3).

As I mentioned earlier, a significant proportion of students also reported the use of English at home. In this respect a student said that he mostly speaks “English at home with Mom, and little bit of Pashto” (FG#3, S3). Another student linked his use of English to his exposure to English: “I listen to English music and most of the time we speak English at home since childhood, so we mostly read and listen to English” (FG#4, S3). Some of the participants reported an explicit language policy, favouring English at home. A parent, for instance, argued that students of elite schools use English at home “because parents don’t
encourage speaking Pashto at home” (Parent 1). A teacher for instance explained how she, as a mother, had devised an explicit language policy at home: “Before he [her son] started going to school I planned and started talking with him in English, and he understands me. Me and my husband talk in English all the time so he keeps on picking up the words” (Teacher 1). A similar opinion about the home language policy was echoed in the comment of another teacher: “When they [her children] were younger, yes there was a policy [English at home] because English is everywhere in our lives” (Teacher 9). A student also referred to an implicit home language policy: “My Dad is more comfortable with English sometimes, so I speak English and Pashto at times” (Student 3). The students’ and their parents’ preference for English at home, as reported here, reflects a unison between the school and the home language policies in many, if not most, cases.

Within the home, the use of language varied with the roles and status of the participants. For instance, among those students who reported a dominant or proportionate use of English at home, many said that they use English with siblings only. A student explained that “I speak Pashto most of the time, but there are people at home with whom I speak English, like my siblings and my Dad. And it is quite natural, like we switch to English from Pashto very unnoticeably” (Student 5). Parents also encourage their children to talk in English among themselves: “My Mom sometimes says that we should speak English with our siblings” (Student 3). On another occasion in the interview she confirmed that she uses English with her brother (Student 3). A parent, who previously reported that his children speak Pashto at home, later added, “but amongst themselves they speak English most of the time” (Parent 5). Several students specifically explained that they speak Pashto with parents and English with siblings: “At home I speak Urdu, Pashto and English; Pashto with my mother and father, Urdu with my grandmother, English with my sister” (FG#1, S1). Likewise, a student reported in a focus group discussion the use of 95% of English and 5% of Pashto with his sister (FG#1, S1), and later in the individual interview reported that “we speak about 90% in English and 10% in Pashto” at home (Student 1).

There was no adequate evidence to indicate the use of Urdu exclusively or at least proportionately with English or Pashto at home. Among the few students who reported the use of Urdu at home, either one of the parents was non-Pashto-speaking or they brought the habitual use of Urdu from the school to the home domain. The lack of evidence for the use of Urdu at home is interesting because Urdu was reported as the second most dominant
language at school in routine non-academic domains. Analysis of the language use pattern revealed in the survey (Section 7.5.1) offers more accurate insights into this otherwise complex multilingual situation of the elite school.

7.1.3 Outside domains

Greater and more complex diversity in language use patterns emerged in domains other than home and school, such as markets, friends’ circle, parties and non-Pashto-speaking contexts. There is, however, variation in language choice from context to context; moreover, there is contradiction in the students’ responses about language choice even in one particular context, such as parties. The overall analysis of these domains shows that Pashto is more dominant than Urdu and English.

The majority of the students who reported the more frequent use of Pashto in these domains attributed it to the status of Pashto as a regional lingua franca. In this regard a student in a focus group remarked: “Of course I am trying to speak Pashto as well because everyone else here speaks Pashto” (FG#4, S4). In this comment it is evident that even though Pashto is not the students’ dominant language, he tends to speak it in outside domains because it is helpful. Similarly, another student noted that “when you go anywhere in this province, mostly people speak Pashto. So it will be easy to speak in Pashto rather than in Urdu” (Student 10). In the following subsections I discuss the students’ language choices in four major domains.

Markets: The participants reported the exclusive use of Pashto in markets and shopping centres in Peshawar. A student explained that shopping is convenient if one speaks Pashto: “Pashto is like the dominant language here. If I didn’t know how to speak Pashto it would be difficult to converse in markets and stuff like that because everyone speaks Pashto” (Student 9). For some the ease of communication in Pashto also had a pragmatic dimension. A teacher’s reflections were noteworthy:

It will be easier to communicate, for instance if you go shopping and you know Pashto, it will be easy and they will not put you in a bracket that this person cannot communicate with us. So communicating in your native language is good. It is easy for you to blend; you don’t stand out from the rest. (Teacher 2)
In this comment the teacher’s reference to “not standing out from the rest” depicts her belief in the advantage that a Pashtun identity could give to a customer in the Pashtun dominated merchandise business. Since a large number of customers from other parts of Pakistan also come to Peshawar for shopping, it is generally believed that the shopkeepers can easily trick them into buying their products at higher prices.

Friends’ circle: English and Urdu are the most dominant languages in the domain of the friends’ circle in outside domains. In the following comment, for instance, although there is an initial reference to the proportionate use of the three languages, the final phrase puts English on top of all: “Outside I speak Pashto, with some guys Urdu and with some English, but mostly English” (FG#1, S1). There was a strong and recurrent indication of the students carrying their language choices and practices from the school domain to home (as discussed in Section 7.2) and outside domains, at least in the company of friends. A student thus reported that “if I meet the same group of friends that I have in school, then we definitely speak in English” (Student 5). The view was echoed in the response of another student: “if it is a friend outside home and school, so it is the same language that we use in school” (Student 1). A student who reported the habitual use of English in school also confirmed carrying the habit to the outside domains: “I speak English with my friends [outside the school], most of the time because it has become a habit” (Student 3). One student maintained that he speaks Urdu with his cousins even though “they know Pashto, but as a habit they speak Urdu” (Student 12). Some also reported a combination of Urdu and Pashto: “When the friends get together, it is mostly Urdu or Pashto” (FG#3, S2). Only a few students reported the use of Pashto with friends: “My friends are mostly Pashtuns, so I have to interact with them in Pashto” (Student 8).

Finally, for some students it was the explicit home language policy that motivated them to speak English even outside the school. In this respect, one student noted that “my father wants me to speak English when I am talking to friends even on phone or mobile as he says this will improve my English, and says you belong to an English-medium school so you should speak English” (FG#5, S1). The last part of the comment is apt evidence of
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35 The non-Pashtun customers from outside the KP province are not fully aware of the dynamics of shopping in Peshawar, where a huge variety of foreign products smuggled from Afghanistan are sold at relatively cheaper prices. The local customers are more adept at shopping, due to their sound negotiating and bargaining skills. Hence, a customer speaking Pashto with a shopkeeper is more confident of not getting duped as compared to a Punjabi customer.
how the language policy at home is linked to or influenced by the school language policy in the context of micro-level language planning.

**Parties:** Opinions about the use of language at parties (weddings, birthdays and usual get-togethers) were contradictory. In other words, all the three languages are used in these contexts. The balance is slightly tilted in favour of English and Urdu because interaction in parties is mostly with friends, and, as I have noted before, the influence of the language practices at school is manifested clearly in the language practices of peer groups outside the school.

A salient pattern of language use showed that the elite school students tend to use English and/or Urdu in parties. The view was echoed in the response of another student: “But when I go to parties certainly it is a trend to speak in English” (Student 10), a view that was confirmed by several students: “When there are parties where friends are around then it is English or Urdu” (Student 9). Although not as dominant as Urdu and English, the use of Pashto was also reported in the domain of parties: “I like to speak Pashto whenever I am at a party like wedding etc. with my cousins. So like if they understand Pashto, I speak Pashto” (Student 3).

**Non-Pashto-speaking contexts:** Due to the multilingual and multi-ethnic nature of Peshawar, there are greater chances for a Pashto-speaking person to switch to Urdu where there is uncertainty about the linguistic background of the interlocutor, such as a shopkeeper, taxi driver or a government official. Several students reported that Urdu is the best choice in such a situation: “Yes [Urdu] because we never know which language the person is speaking; and Urdu is understood in this area” (FG#1, S5). However, once a linguistic common ground (Pashto in this context) is established, the speakers tend to switch to Pashto: “Usually the first language that we speak in the market is Urdu because everyone understands it, but if the person is a Pashto-speaking person we switch to Pashto then” (FG#1, S5). It is generally very rare that the speakers continue to talk in Urdu if they are aware that both of them are Pashtun.

Finally, the important cities of Pakistan outside the KP province, where Urdu is the main language, also turned out to be an important domain for the use of Urdu for these youngsters. A student explained:
Urdu is important as when we go to Lahore and Islamabad we need Urdu, even within Peshawar, we have relatives with whom we speak Urdu; like they do speak Pashto but they grew up in Islamabad and Lahore, so they are more comfortable with Urdu. (Student 9)

The students’ ability to speak Urdu, therefore, gives them pragmatic advantage. Pashtun students often visit these important cities for study, jobs, entertainment, and meeting relatives.

In addition to the domains of language use discussed above, an important domain is the offices of government and private business where the students prefer to use English or Urdu due to the status and prestige value of these languages. Since I have dealt with this theme in detail in Chapter 6 (Section 6.3.1), I will not repeat it here.

Figure 7.1 graphically sums up the language use pattern of the three languages in terms of dominance in the three domains (school, home and domains outside the home and school). English has emerged as the most dominant language at school followed by Urdu; Pashto is used minimally. At home however, it is Pashto which is dominant, even though among the siblings there is a greater tendency to use English. Urdu is quite rare at home. In the outside the school and home domains, the students use the three languages in varying proportions, depending on context. The use of Pashto is dominant owing to its status as the main language of the area. Urdu is mostly used in situations where there is uncertainty about the linguistic background of the interlocutor as well as in situations where the Pashtun youth are in other cities of Pakistan. The use of English as the dominant language of parties and with friends reveals the carrying of school language preferences and habits to the outside domains. Interestingly, while the students of the elite schools are taking the school language, English, to other domains, there is little evidence of the students carrying their home language to school. I explore this interaction between the school and the home language choices in more depth in the following section.
The school L-i-E policy influence on language use in general

Some evidence discussed in the previous section showed that in certain situations the students tend to transpose their language preferences at school to domains outside the school. In this section I discuss findings in which the participants explicitly confirm that the schools influence the students’ language practices even in domains outside the school. A student, for instance, referred to how English has replaced his MT as a dominant language even in domains outside the school:

We speak English so frequently and we stress upon it so much that even at home when I can’t express something in Pashto I use English because I know English better now, and the way I perceive Urdu now is different from the way I used to perceive it when I was in 2nd or first grade in a school where they used to speak Urdu only. So when I joined School A, it kind of changed my perception. (FG#3, S4)

In the second half of the comment the student refers to change in his language attitudes and practices when he left his previous school, a non-elite one, and joined the elite school. One student’s impression was typical: “At school we are now used to speaking Urdu and English; so it has become a natural choice for almost all of us [even outside the school]” (Student 7).

There are many instances in the data in which the participants referred to deliberate attempts by the school to influence the language practices of the students at home and other domains. A student noted that “for me it [language attitude and practices] has
changed because most of the time with my family, straight from the school, we have to speak English because they [school] encourage us to speak English” (FG#3, S2). This view was confirmed by another student: “We are told [at school] that we should speak English at home, watch English movies and read English novels etc., and read Urdu books” (FG#4, S2). Several students linked their habitual use of English to school: “We have been taught to speak English with friends and everywhere, so that has become a habit” (Student 3).

The teachers’ views concurred with those of the students: “We always talk to their parents that they should provide them an opportunity so that they should sit in front of the TV and listen to English programs … instead of Urdu programs” (Teacher 5). This view was echoed in the response of another teacher: “I personally encourage parents that their children should speak English at home. I also encourage them they should expose their children to English programs” (Teacher 8). A parent also reported that the school provides an environment in which students are encouraged to use English at school as well as home (Parent 5). Only a few students did not agree with the view that the school L-i-E policy has anything to do with the home language: “I think the schools don’t really play a part [in language choice at home]” (Student 5). Although there is no explicit evidence in the data to explain why some of the students hold this view, one may attribute it to the role of electronic media. Interspersed in the data of this study are quite a few responses in which the participants consider media as a strong force in influencing language attitudes and practices.

This section has revealed that English-only policy of the elite schools is not only confined to the domain of school but it also influences the language practices of the students in other domains. The finding is in tandem with Spolsky (2009) who argues that language “management may influence speakers to modify their practices”. Moreover, the finding concurs with the view that “language behaviour is determined by proficiency” (Spolsky, 2009); elite school students show a high level of proficiency in English (see Section 7.4.1). Having discussed the domain-wise language practices of the students, in the following section I turn to their language use for leisure and information.
7.3 Language choice for leisure and information

In this section I focus on the students’ choice of language(s) for entertainment and for getting information or knowledge. Both of these purposes are realised either through reading, such as novels, poetry and newspapers, or listening and watching such as music, movies, TV and computer/internet.

English emerged as the most dominant language for the students to use for information and entertainment. A student explained that “the younger generation mostly reads the English newspaper…. Similarly they prefer watching English movies and English channels rather than Urdu channels” (Student 7). One student was quite forthright in his assessment of his language choice for music: “98.5% of the songs that I listen to are in English; 1% in Urdu and 0.5% isn’t Pashto, it is foreign language; reading literature, again in English” (Student 1). The purpose for watching particular media in a particular language varied. For instance, a number of students reported watching English movies and TV channels because they do not properly understand the Urdu channels: “Again English because, even when I am watching Urdu news I don’t know what the guy is saying. So I switch to an English channel” (Student 6). The view was reflected in the response of another student: “Music in English. Reading also in English because I am really bad at reading Urdu” (Student 2). But for some it is a necessity to improve their English: “Like I watch English programs, listen to English music, read English novels and I speak English, so my English is improving with that” (Student 12). In a way it is the extension of the school language to the home domain; in the previous section I noted that the elite schools urge parents to expose their children to English movies and TV programs. Reading habits developed at school were also maintained at home. A student in this respect reported: “As regards literature, I don’t know much about Urdu or Pashto literature, so it is English. I was forced to read Shakespeare in school, so that kind of attachment with English literature [is still there]; and music also is basically English” (FG#3, S2). A teacher attributed the students’ preference for English not only to schools but also to the media and entertainment industry: “Yes of course English is dominating a lot in the curriculum, even the entertainment is mostly in English, like the songs, movies, and cartoons whatever” (Teacher 3). One may question this argument because there is also a reasonable presence of media in Pashto in which the students have shown minimal interest.
The subject matter of the songs also turned out to be a strong factor on the basis of which music in a certain language was preferred and rejected. A student prefers English music because he appreciates the content and the message: “I like the English music as it has a point [theme], and [reading] literature again it is English. I have got a collection of so many authors that I can’t even remember” (FG#3, S4). One student reflected on the subject matter of songs in the three languages in more depth:

I like the English music as it has a point, Pashto I don’t get the point and Urdu I really don’t listen to because so many meanings are not conveyed in Urdu and Pashto music. … and here in Pashto they only talk about one thing, love, girls, beloved, that’s it. You see it gets frustrating after a while. (Student 6)

A similar negative attitude was expressed by another student who ascribed his lack of interest in Urdu and Pashto music to a lack of variety in genre and themes: “No Urdu or Pashto [music] because they are just talking about one single thing, like Pashto is all about Janan, Urdu is all about ghazal36, and there is nothing like someone’s traditions, or someone’s life or some tragedy” (Student 8).

Several respondents expressed their disregard for Pashto music, movies and TV channels due to their declining quality. A student, for instance, noted that “some people come up with very cheap songs… You cannot listen to that kind of music in front of the elders” (Student 3). Certain students found movies in Pashto as “really degrading”. Some of the comments about Pashto media were quite harsh: “There are about two channels [Pashto TV channel] and hardly anyone watches them, and mostly they show nonsense; you cannot watch them” (FG#4, S1). One student compared them with the English and Urdu channels: “Media is strong mostly in Urdu or English in Pakistan. The Pashto ones have no standard. Looking at them one feels as if they are defaming the Pashtuns. Their dramas and stories also lack standard” (FG#4, S3). As a member of the community to which these students belong, I would say they are a little too harsh in their evaluation of the quality of local music and TV channels. Although I agree with their view about the poor standard of movies in Pashto, quality music and TV programs are certainly being produced in Pashto. It is mostly a matter of taste and attitude, which develop with exposure. The elite school students’ tendency to show scepticism about local languages, and their capacity to meet the
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36 Janan in Pashto means beloved. Ghazal is a kind of poetic expression in Urdu and Pashto with the central theme of love and separation.
demands of modern time has been a salient feature of the findings in this study. This could be ascribed to the dominant and prestigious status that English and Urdu enjoy in the society at large and at the elite schools in particular.

Scepticism about Pashto was not just confined to the students; some of the parents and teachers were also pessimistic about native literature and culture. A parent was quite candid in questioning the usefulness of Pashtun history and culture: “By the way, no one is interested in histories, poetry and culture” (Parent 5). Similarly, a teacher reflected on how people have lost interest in Pashto poetry: “Things have stopped as progressive as it should be in Pashto. People are losing interest, why? If there is a Mushaira\textsuperscript{37} or something in Pashto there is just a handful of interest. The rest no, especially the youth; you tell any youngster [ever attends] these Mushairas” (Teacher 7). This comment further substantiates the view that the elite schools youth is not interested in local culture and literature; rather they know more about foreign cultures and literature than their own. The teacher’s impressions about this situation were quite detailed:

We know Iqbal, we know Ghalib, we know A, B, C but we don’t know Rahman Baba and Khushal Khattak\textsuperscript{38}…. I feel guilty; because I can’t quote, my own knowledge is not sufficient. I have not read any book [in Pashto]. It’s all on hearsay; you tell me something about any poet or any warrior, I’ll know it, but I don’t know the details. And I will never make that effort because that interest is not there to make research and go into the details. And you don’t see any utility or benefit in knowing them. No we don’t see anything by the government, by the schools. It should have been right from the beginning. (Teacher 7)

The paradox which this comment reveals is typical of many educated Pashtuns. On the one hand she repents that she knows little about Pashto literature, on the other she questions the pragmatic significance of reading it. At the same time, she blames the government and the schools for the situation.

Despite a general sense of pessimism about Pashto literature and music there was a certain amount of support especially vis-à-vis the identity value of Pashto (see Section 6.2.3). For instance a student declared that: “I really love music in Pashto, I like the lyrics and the

\textsuperscript{37}Mushairas are gatherings of poets in which poems are recited.

\textsuperscript{38}Iqbal and Ghalib are the famous poets of Pakistan who wrote in Persian and Urdu. Khushal Khan Khattak and Rahman Baba are poets of Pashto. This is a fact that since Urdu is the national language and is taught from Class 1 to 12 as a compulsory subject, people of various ethnic backgrounds, including Pashtuns, know more about Urdu literature than their own.
rhythm and everything. I don’t like Urdu that much. But Pashto is my own language, I really feel proud of it” (Student 14). Some students referred to the sublime quality of the poetry of famous poets such as Khushal Khan Khattak and Rahman Baba. A student proudly talked about his experience of reading a famous history book on Pushtuns: “I came to know about Pashtuns’ history from a few books written by British civil servants who served in this region during the British rule. I found them very interesting and informative, like *The Pathan* by Olaf Caroe” (FG#5, S2). Similarly, a student showed her trust in the new generation of singers: “Pashto music definitely ya. You know Zaib and Hanya; they had their performance in New York in Pashto, and Urdu. So I think people are interested to listen to music (in Pashto)” (FG#2, S2). As such, despite an aura of scepticism about Pashto music and literature, a few of the students were quite positive about them.

This section shows that the preferred language of the elite schools’ students for entertainment and information is English. The students read English novels and newspapers; they watch movies and TV programs and listen to music in English. Even though a few students show their love for Pashto poetry and history due to their consciousness of their Pashtun identity, the majority of them reject Pashto movies, TV channels and songs for their low quality. Evidence suggesting the role of schools in developing these habits and tastes has also been discussed. The finding is in line with (Omoniyi, 2009, p. 61) who refers to the mission of elite schools as “anticipatory socialisation” which includes “all aspects of culture—morals, social practices, tastes in entertainment, sports, and so on”. Having discussed the language practices of the students, I now turn to their reported proficiency in the three languages.

### 7.4 Language proficiency, loss and maintenance

In this section I discuss the students’ self-evaluation of their proficiency levels in English, Pashto and Urdu. Although proficiency is mainly seen as the oral or spoken ability, a considerable number of responses also take into account the academic aspect of proficiency, such as their reading and writing skills. As in the discussion of themes in this and in previous chapters, views of teachers and parents about the students’ language proficiency are also taken into account to corroborate the students’ perceptions of their own proficiency. In the following two sub-sections I discuss the students’ self-reports of their oral and academic proficiency (i.e. their reading and writing skills) in terms of the
three languages. The next sub-section focusses on the students’ perceptions of their language maintenance, loss and/or shift.

7.4.1 The students’ oral proficiency

In terms of oral proficiency the students reported a high level in English and Pashto and a moderate level in Urdu. A student in a focus group attributed his fluency in English to his schooling: “Since we have been taught it [English] and we have been speaking it since very young age, so it is quite good” (FG#2, S4). I have already discussed the influence of school L-i-E policy on the language practices of the students in domains other than the school. A student, while explaining his reason for speaking English with his peers, revealed that “among Pashtuns [elite school students] there are some who speak English more fluently than their MT; so that is why they stick to English and that’s why I am speaking English” (Student 5). Almost every student reported a high level of fluency in English. I can confirm this finding on the basis of my observation of the students at various locations such as the computer room and the library, where I spent considerable time, and also the corridors and playgrounds which I frequented quite often. A teacher had no doubt about the English proficiency of her students and the school’s instrumental role in acquiring the proficiency: “They speak English with such a beautiful accent, because they have been learning it like that in schools from the beginning” (Teacher 6). Similarly, when asked about the proficiency level of her students, a teacher tried to give a more realistic account of their English proficiency:

I would rate them [junior classes] 5 out of 10, whereas the senior, O Level, students get a lot better, so I would rate them 7 out of 10. A Level has some students who are very fluent and eloquent in the use of English. Some of them I would rate 10 out of 10, and others may be 8 or 9 out of 10. So as they progress over the years they get better. (Teacher 3)

The students’ language proficiency pattern in this comment sounds logical because I have already reported that as students advance to senior classes, their proficiency in English increases; at the senior level they reach a stage when they enjoy significant freedom for their language practices and use English habitually (See Section 5.2.3 and 7.1.1.1). This also explains why English is the students’ personal choice even in domains outside the classrooms in school. The parents’ reflections were similar: “They love English, they are fluent in it” (Parent1).
Opinions, beliefs and claims with regard to oral fluency in mother tongue (MT), Pashto, reflected a mixed picture. While the frequency of responses in favour of fluency in MT was marginally below English, juxtaposition of oral fluency in MT with minimal reading and writing skills and the recurrent reporting of loss of MT (which I discuss in the following sections) creates a dilemma as far as the students’ oral proficiency in Pashto is concerned. I observed that most of them took their fluency for granted: they believe that since they are using it on daily basis, they are proficient. However, what was apparently a satisfactory situation for MT fluency turned out to be a little alarming as discussions on MT fluency proceeded. A student in a focus group reported: “Well in Pashto speaking is very good, but writing is nil, reading a little bit, about 30-40%” (FG#2, S7). Juxtaposition of oral fluency in MT with weak reading and writing skills occurred on many occasions: “We can speak in Pashto but we can’t read in Pashto; so the way they [writers of books in Pashto] have written everything is very hard to understand” (FG#3, S1). Still there were some students who had no doubts about their MT: “Pashto is my own language so I am quite fluent [in it]” (Student 14).

As well as reporting oral fluency in MT, almost as many students reported limitations in expressing themselves in Pashto, something which was never said about English. A student, for instance, maintained that “in Pashto I am slightly weaker because we use English and Urdu” (Student 11). This view was expressed more elaborately by another student: “We speak English so frequently and we stress upon it so much that even at home when I can’t express something in Pashto I use English because I know English better now” (FG#3, S4). A student reflected on the MT proficiency of his friends in these words: “There are a few friends who are Pashtuns but they can’t speak Pashto. Like they know Pashto but it is not that strong because they don’t speak it” (Student 12). Evidence pertaining to this theme abounded in the data. A parent for instance reported the language mixing tendency of his children and was not sure if their Pashto was correct: “Well, spoken, is Pashto. But it is not pure Pashto; rather it is a mixture of Urdu, English and Pashto and I am not sure if it is grammatically correct” (Parent 3). Most of the teachers expressed a similar view. A teacher, for instance, referred to the students’ superficial knowledge of Pashto: “But I don’t think they know it [Pashto] that deeply” (Teacher 2). Another teacher had a totally different view: “You have those people who have grown up here within the Pashtun community and for them speaking Pashto is not such a big deal, so they can be easily rated 10 out of 10 in that [spoken] area” (Teacher 3). This view,
however, does not seem to reflect the ground reality, which is how I observed it during my stay in the schools and my interaction with the students.

With regard to oral fluency in Urdu, the trend was more or less balanced between those who reported themselves to be good speakers and those who reported problems in speaking Urdu. This is interesting when seen in the context of Urdu as the second dominant language of the school after English, both in terms of general use and as a subject from Class 1 to 12. In this respect a student reflected on her friend’s Urdu proficiency: “One friend of mine [class fellow] is Pashto speaking but she can speak Urdu very fluently; so she talks in Urdu” (Student 9). A focus group student was also confident about his speaking fluency in Urdu: “I can speak Urdu well” (FG#2, S 7). However, there were several students who were quite disappointed with their Urdu and found it only “good enough to communicate” in (Student 1). Quite a number of students were not happy with their Urdu accent: “But the way I speak it, is terrible and awkward because of my typical Pashtun accent” (Student 5). Another student concurred with the opinion: “Because I have problems with speaking Urdu, I am not very fluent” (Student 9). In School A, a teacher reflected on the most common problems that Pashtun speakers of Urdu face: “The children do speak Urdu but Pashtun children face problems in expressing gender (masculine and feminine) of the inanimate objects in Urdu39” (Teacher 6). In chapter 6 I pointed out how Pashtun students of the elite schools prefer to use Urdu to develop appropriate accent and to avoid shame in front of non-Pashtun speakers. Urdu, after all, has a higher prestige value than Pashto. This perhaps explains why Urdu is the second most dominant language in routine school communication. In the following section I discuss the students’ academic proficiency in English, Pashto and Urdu.

7.4.2 The students’ academic proficiency in languages

The previous section showed that the students have a high level of oral proficiency in English and Pashto, and a moderate level in Urdu. This section shows that their academic proficiency, i.e. their reading and writing skills, is best in English, moderate in Urdu and

39 In Urdu inanimate objects are assigned grammatical gender quality; there is no rule to explain why Sooraj (Sun) is masculine and Zameen (Earth) is feminine. This gender quality of the objects (noun) is basically expressed through the associated verbs. Pashto also has grammatical gender for inanimate objects, but the sound of the word helps determine the gender easily. Due to this, Pashtun speakers of Urdu often use wrong gender-verb for objects in Urdu. For instance, Spogmai (Moon) in Pashto is feminine and Chaand (Moon) in Urdu is masculine. Non-Pashtun speakers often use this as light-hearted humour, targeting Pashtuns.
only minimal in MT. Students as well as their teachers were unanimous in their views about the high proficiency level of the students in reading and writing in English. A student reported that “I can speak [English] about 80%, I can read 90-95% and I can write about 90%” (FG#2, S7). Another student asserted that “my English is the strongest [of all languages] because I can read write and speak it” (FG#2, S2). The opinion was echoed in the response of another student: “I think it is English [strongest in reading and writing] because we read books in English; so our vocabulary is more flexible in English” (Student 9). Likewise, several parents reported their children’s good standard of “reading and writing in English” (Parent1) as compared to other languages.

As far as the reading and writing ability in Urdu is concerned, generally the students in Pakistan do well in Urdu because Urdu is taught as a compulsory subject from Class 1 to 12. However, the case of elite schools is an exception. Here students reported great difficulties in coping with the Urdu subject (see Chapter 5). With the exception of a couple of students, a majority of them reported problems of one sort and another. A student, for instance, reported strong writing and weak reading ability in Urdu: “Urdu like reading is weak…. But I can write it very well” (FG#2, S3). Only one student among the participants reported excellent academic skills in Urdu: “I can speak Urdu well, I can write about 80% and I can read it 100%” (FG#2, S7). The majority of them, however, held a different view. A focus group student explained: “Urdu I think I am the weakest, even though I am comfortable in speaking it, and I am really bad at reading, besides writing those normal words, I cannot write anything complicated in it; spelling is pretty pathetic” (FG#2, S2). The view was reflected in the response of another student: “I don’t read Urdu because my vocabulary is very limited. I mean it is good enough that I can communicate, but I can’t read in it a book” (Student 1). Several other students reported “difficulty reading” Urdu and taking a longer time than usual to “grasp it” (Student 4).

In terms of academic skills in a language, most of the discussions (in interviews and focus groups) revolved around the students’ home language, Pashto. Several students reported that “people speak Pashto but they cannot read it” (FG#1, S4). This view was endorsed by a student in another focus group: “Pashto I can speak it fluently, but I can’t write it; I can read it a bit” (FG#2, S2). Most of them linked their lack of reading and writing ability in Pashto to its exclusion from the schools. A student in this respect argued: “But since we haven’t taken it as a subject since we were kids, we don’t know how to write or read it”
Another student expressed similar thoughts on the issue: “But I can’t read or write Pashto because I never tried to do so; and it wasn’t taught to me at any stage in my schooling” (FG#2, S3). A parent, physician by profession, confirmed his son’s oral fluency and minimal reading and writing skills in Pashto in these words: “His Pashto is stronger than his Urdu. I mean spoken Pashto only, as he can’t read or write it” (Parent 4). Another parent, who is a well-educated businessman, termed his own reading and writing in Pashto as “pathetic” (Parent 2). I also came across many students who held the perception that reading and writing in Pashto is very difficult: “Pashto is way too difficult, like never in my life I have read a single sentence of Pashto because it is difficult; I don’t know how to write or read Pashto (Student 6). I explored the theme of difficulty of learning Pashto in detail in the context of the stakeholder’s opposition to it in education in Chapter 5.

A number of students referred to an intergenerational decline in Pashto, especially in the spheres of reading and writing, among Pashtuns. A student, in this regard, revealed that “all my grandparents know how to read and write Pashto and my parents, though they put great effort into it, but they are not fluent at all” (FG#1, S5). This view was reflected in the comment of another student: “It’s really sad because my grandfather was a poet in Pashto and he wrote quite a few books which are still there in our home. But unfortunately we can’t read any of them” (FG#1, S5). Similarly, a few students reflected on the teaching of Pashto in the past: “In the past I think there were classes for Pashto as well. People used to choose it as a subject. My own grandfather chose Pashto as a subject and he knows how to write and speak it” (Student 10).

Despite the emergence of a generally bleak picture for reading and writing skills in Pashto, some comments embodied a positive attitude towards the importance of academic proficiency in Pashto for Pashtuns. A student for example maintained that “Pashtuns should know how to read and write in their MT, at least read if not write” (Student 7). A few students showed genuine interest in knowing Pashto as evidenced in this response:

> I have interest to see how Pashto is written; I want to learn how to write Pashto…. I mean I don’t read any books but when I am sitting in my car, I read the billboards or posters I read them. And sometimes when you watch TV there are things written in Pashto so I can read them. (Student 10)
Similarly, one student explained that studying Pashto will help improve her spoken ability: “When you can speak a language then you should know how to write it. The teaching of Pashto will enable us … to write in Pashto; then we will be able to speak it properly” (FG#2, S7). This response highlights the link between maintenance of a language and its teaching at school. Among the parents, even though most of them did not find the teaching of Pashto useful, some were positively oriented: “I would really like them to read and write it like they read and write English or Urdu” (Parent 6). Support for Pashto among the teachers, however, was lacking. This could be mainly due to the fact that the teachers I interviewed only taught English. Moreover, as I noted in Chapter 5 (Section 5.3.2), the majority of teachers are influenced by an assimilationist immersion (Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Spolsky, 2009) approach towards foreign language teaching, and hold the view that the use of MT could interfere with and slow down the students’ second language learning.

In summary, this section has revealed that the students of elite schools are highly proficient in reading and writing in English. At the same time, the majority of them reported difficulty in these skills in Urdu. Minimal reading and writing skills in Pashto were reported as none of the students learnt Pashto at any stage of their schooling. Having discussed the students’ self-evaluation of their language proficiency, in the next section I report on their perceptions of language maintenance and shift.

7.4.3 Language maintenance and shift

When I discussed the students’ reported oral fluency in MT in Section 7.4.1 I used the word “dilemma” because, based on my observations and interactions with the participants, I knew they had been taking their MT for granted when reporting their oral proficiency in MT. The emergence of MT attrition as a salient theme confirms my doubts with regard to the students’ apparent complacency about their oral proficiency in MT. Data collection in this study was iterative and based on a triangulation design, involved multiple tools. It is possible that as the students’ engagement in this research proceeded, some of them might have changed their opinion. For instance, initially they might have thought they were fluent in their MT as most of them were speaking it at home. However, as more deliberations on language proficiency and maintenance issues took place as the data collection proceeded, many of them might have obtained a better understanding of their proficiency in MT.
The majority of students talked about different problems they had with their MT. In this section I discuss responses in which the participants explicitly talk about mother tongue attrition. I also discuss responses in which they refer to the intergenerational loss of Pashto. A student in this respect compared his proficiency with that of his elders and concluded that “we are losing it [MT] because we haven’t got that proficiency; I mean my grandfather… knew a lot more words of Pashto than I do in Pashto… it could be in thousands” (FG#1, S3). Another student reflected on the gradual and unnoticed attrition of his MT: “We are definitely losing our MT, although we don’t notice it” (FG#4, S2). In a way, this comment also confirms the students’ initial complacency about their MT fluency, which I referred to in the previous section. A number of students attributed their mixing of languages to their weakness in MT: “I do quite frequently shift to Urdu, like if there is a word that I can’t find in Pashto, I shift to Urdu” (FG#2, S4). One student found it easy to switch to English: “Same with me; if I don’t know what to say in Pashto then I speak English” (FG#2, S2). Some of them even lacked ordinary vocabulary. A student’s impression for instance was noteworthy:

Yes, even for common words like vegetable, I sometimes forget the Pashto word and so I use the English [word]. I don’t know what to call ‘laces’ in Pashto, so I use the English word laces with my servants. Even my servants have picked many of the English words I use. Because we use them often, even my brothers use them so frequently, so the servants also use them. (Student 6)

One student attributed her MT attrition to her limited use of MT and revealed some interesting information about home language use:

I think it [MT] is declining. Yes it is. Because at home, even though we use MT, because of the schedule thing [study, internet browsing, reading, entertainment], I don’t find much time to interact with my family and use my MT. So ya, it is being affected. So when I am speaking Pashto at times I feel there are expressions I want to use but I can’t in Pashto. And then I switch to Urdu. And I also struggle with the vocabulary. (Student 7)

Figure 7.1 (domain-wise language use) shows Pashto as the dominant language at home. However, the responses which led to this summary of the students’ domain-wise language use were mainly based on the students’ interaction with parents, and to some extent siblings and servants, etc. Owing to the prolonged use of media like web surfing, online chat, movies and mobile phones by today’s youth, most of which are done through
English, one may question whether Pashto really is that dominant at home. One student linked the loss of MT to the on-going process of social change in society: “The thing is that gradually everything is shifting to modernization and they prefer Urdu over Pashto and English over Urdu. This is I think what is happening. So the first language is gradually suppressed” (Student 7). The teachers, however, were cautious in their opinions about the students’ MT proficiency level. A teacher, for instance, did not foresee a loss of MT for the students in the near future: “Maybe in the distant future [they may lose MT]; because of the on-going generational changes students and others might decide to adopt the use of English altogether [and shift from MT]” (Teacher 3). The comment of another teacher echoed a similar opinion: “I think they are losing it [MT]. Of course, if they are not using it, they will lose; but they will not lose or forget it completely because after all it is their mother tongue” (Teacher 1). Perceptions among the parents were more or less similar. A parent was quite sure about the loss of MT by his children because he himself experienced MT attrition: “I think it [education in English] will definitely have a negative influence on [the children’s] Pashto. Let me give you my own example. I also got my education in English-medium school. I think my Pashto is not grammatically correct” (Parent 2). Another parent reported that “Pashto is the weakest” of all the languages he knows (Parent 1).

The participants were unanimous in their view that the exclusion of Pashto from school is responsible for the students’ MT attrition. A student for instance linked his low proficiency in Pashto to its exclusion from school: “It [MT] is not at all encouraged. My Pashto will improve if it is taught in schools” (FG#4, S5). Expressing a similar view, a student referred to the policy of the abandonment of native languages at the cost of other dominant languages: “The government is also trying to promote Urdu, and not native languages. So I think after 20 or 25 years Pashto will not be spoken by many” (FG#5, S1). The view was supported by another student: “Because it has not been promoted; I have not seen a single institution that has been doing anything for Pashto. It is because Pashto has not been given that role. Not because nobody wants to. It has not been given the value” (Student 7). One student attributed her weakness in mother tongue to English and Urdu: “I think in Pashto I am slightly weaker because we use English and Urdu” (Student 11). Another student explained multi-dimensional reasons for the decline of her Pashto:
It is because of the school because all of our books and courses are in English, that’s why the school is the primary reason for that. And that’s not their fault and that’s not our fault. And also the media too has a role. Like Urdu is spoken around the whole country and broadcasts around Pakistan are all in Urdu because everyone understands it; so no one is going to get any interest in Pashto. So ya it is because of the media and our education. (FG#4, S4)

Similarly, while one parent noted that the “government is also responsible” (Parent 2), another put the responsibility directly on the school: “School does have a role since there is no Pashto in the school” (Parent 1). There were no comments from the teachers in this respect. Even though the majority of the students and some parents reported MT loss, mainly due to their exposure to English and Urdu as a result of their schooling, there were some who painted an ideal picture of stable-multilingualism. A student, for instance, reported that “I have been using all the three 33.3% daily, so I don’t think I am losing any” (Student 8). One student reflected in detail on the possibility of a stable multilingual situation:

I think they can be maintained easily but if you want to improve on a language you may have to keep the other one on board. On board, not completely at bay … like read in English and then try and speak in English at all times … and keep Pashto or Urdu at bay for a little while. But don’t completely block the language away. Speak it at home if you really want to improve on your English, so they can be maintained easily and kept at the same level. (FG#1, S3)

The condition of uniform usage of the various languages that the student refers to for obtaining stable multilingualism, however, has not been found in the case of the elite school students. The teachers were more supportive of the view of stable multilingualism among the students. A teacher in this respect asserted: “Yes, they can maintain them [languages]. There are examples in our daily lives. It is not difficult, but in fact its start is difficult” (Teacher 4). The view was endorsed by another teacher: “You see they have exposure to other languages at home. Here they totally speak in English, but at home they have exposure to other two languages as well. So the languages are going parallel; I think they are not going to lose it [MT]” (Teacher 5). A parent who had earlier reported MT loss of his children affirmed that “they will be competent and fluent in three of them [languages]. Pashto is our MT, Urdu is our national language and English is our need. So they have to learn and maintain three of them and I am sure they can” (Parent 2).
This section has shown that the elite school students are undergoing a gradual and unnoticeable MT loss. Most of them ascribe this to the dominant role of English and Urdu in their lives, and to the exclusion of MT teaching at schools. In the following section I report on the quantitative findings vis-à-vis the students’ language use and proficiency patterns.

7.5 Language use and proficiency patterns in the quantitative data

The purpose of the survey questionnaire was to complement and validate the qualitative data findings in this study which is based on a triangulation design (Dörnyei, 2007). The main themes that have been discussed in the qualitative data findings in this chapter are: domain-wise language use, language use for leisure and information, and the students’ proficiency level in the three languages. Although I also discussed themes like language loss and maintenance, and the schools’ role in influencing the language practices of the students, the questionnaire had sections only about the language use domains, language choice for leisure and information, and language proficiency. Data from the language proficiency section, however, is also expected to offer insights into the language maintenance and situation in the context of the elite schools.

7.5.1 Patterns of language use

Table 7.1, depicts the frequency distribution of the students’ responses to statements about language use in various domains and situations. As I did in Chapters 5 and 6, the percentage value of the responses are the sum total of All the time and Most of the time. The data is also shown in Figure 7.2 in which the frequencies counts, as shown through bars for each language, are the sum total of the numbers (not percentages) of All the time and Most of the time responses.

The results of Q1 (77.7% E, 20% M, 23.3% U\textsuperscript{40}), which pertain to the use of languages in the school domain, mostly reflect the qualitative findings with regard English as the dominant language at school. However, the results for MT in Q3 (51% E, 42.1% MT, 25.5% U) are significant. While the qualitative data showed that English is the most dominant language followed by Urdu, the quantitative data depict Pashto as having a slight

\textsuperscript{40} E= English, M= Mother tongue, U= Urdu
edge over Urdu. Hence in domains outside the classroom, Pashto is more dominant than Urdu. Playgrounds, corridors and cafeteria are the domains where students, particularly those who have not acquired the ability to use English habitually, find greater freedom for the surreptitious use of MT in defiance of the strict English-only policy.

Results for language use at home (Q4, 5, 6 and 7, covering language use with parents, siblings, relatives and guests respectively) mostly confirm findings of the qualitative data in which I reported the students’ dominant use of Pashto at home. Findings for language use with parents (Q4: 18.8% E, 83.3% MT, 18.8% U) reflect the same situation that transpired in the qualitative data analysis. However, the figure for siblings in Q5 (33.3% E, 77.7% MT, 16.5% U) is in contrast to what the students and even parents in some cases reported. Most of them reported the frequent use of English among siblings in the qualitative data. Many also linked the practice to school where they are encouraged to use English not only at school but also at home. With regard to the use of language with relatives in general, the results (Q6:14.3% E, 88.8% MT and 19.9% U) are as expected. However, the same cannot be true for the cousins (relatives), who also happen to be friends in most cases, because in the qualitative data the students reported preference for English and Urdu with friends even in the outside domains. There is no explicit question with regard to friends in the domain section in qualitative data that could have shed further light on the use of language with friends. In the qualitative data on the other hand, there is a strong pattern in the students’ reports indicating English as the most common language of peer groups not only inside the school but also outside. Results for Q7, i.e. language use with guests (17.7 % E, 78.8% MT and 32% U), also indirectly reinforce the pattern of Pashto as the main language at home that emerged in the qualitative data.

Question 8, 9, 10 and 13 target language use in domains other than school and home, such as markets, social gatherings, mosques and government offices respectively. Results for Q8 (5.5% E, 73.2% MT and 46.6% U), targeting language use in markets, are in harmony with the qualitative data findings, which revealed a dominant use of Pashto followed by Urdu in the outside domains. However, the figure for English and Pashto for parties in Q9 (27.7% E, 71% MT and 38.8% U) is not completely in agreement with the students’ use of language in the qualitative data, as responses in favour of English for this particular domain were more or less proportionate to Pashto. Results for language use in mosques (Q10: 4.4% E, 65.4% MT and 21% U) are as expected; Pashto is the language used by the
Imam\textsuperscript{41} of a mosque in his weekly sermons as well as by worshippers in the Pashtun community. Q13 solicited information about the use of language in the domain of government offices.

Although this domain has been discussed only briefly in the qualitative data in this chapter, the results (Q13:47.7% E, 22.1% MT, 51.1% U) corroborate the pragmatic value of English and Urdu in government offices—a theme which I discussed in Chapter 6 (Section 6.3.1). The students reported (in Chapter 6) that if they use English or Urdu in government or private business offices, they usually get more supportive treatment from the officials. The more frequent use of English and Urdu in government offices than Pashto, which otherwise is very strong in the outside domains, confirms the high prestige as well as instrumental value of the two languages.

Q 12 and 14 solicit information about the students’ choice of language for discussing topics such as culture, sports and politics. Since these are mostly peer group topics, the results corroborate the qualitative data findings related to language use in peer groups, both inside and outside the schools. The results for Q12 (41% E, 50% MT and 42.2% U), which pertains to discussing a cultural topic, portray a fairly balanced picture for the three languages. Pashto has a slight edge over the others, which is understandable because a discussion of local culture would naturally involve more Pashto. Results for Q14 (54.3% E, 39.9% MT and 45.4% U), which is about the students’ language choice for discussing sports, music and movies—typical peer-group topics—confirm English as the main language among peer-group members; this theme was explored in Section 7.1.1.1 in the qualitative data discussion.

\textsuperscript{41} Imam is the religious head of a mosque.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to domain-wise use of English, MT &amp; Urdu</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>% age</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>% age</th>
<th>All the time &amp; Most of the time Combined</th>
<th>% age</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>% age</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>% age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. This language is the medium of communication in my school.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. The language I speak with friends outside the class (canteen, playground etc.).</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. The language I speak with my parents.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. The language I speak with my siblings/brother(s) and sister(s).</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. The language I speak with relatives.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. The language I speak with guests at home.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. The language I speak in market / fast-food spots.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. The language I speak at weddings and parties.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. The language I speak inside and outside the mosque.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. The language I speak to express my ethnic cultural values and talk about issues relevant to my ethnic group.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. The language I usually speak in government offices.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. The language I use when I talk about sports, music and movies.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Domain-wise language use (all the time and most of the time percentage values combined); N=90
Figure 7.2: Domain-wise language use (all the time and most of the time actual frequency numbers combined).

7.5.2 Language choice for leisure and information

The frequency distribution pattern for statements related to the use of language(s) for leisure and information (such as reading novels and newspapers, watching TV and surfing internet) reflects a more or less the same picture as emerged in the qualitative data. As depicted in Figure 7.3 and Table 7.2, questions 15-18 solicited information about the preferred languages for leisure and information through the mediums of reading, listening and watching. As reported in the qualitative data, a very high percentage of students use English for reading novels, stories (Q15: 95.5% E, 4.4% MT, 17.7% U) and newspapers (Q16: 86.6% E, 2.2% MT, 30% U), followed by Urdu. The use of Pashto is minimal in this respect. In the sphere of television and radio (Q17), even though English is the most dominant with the figure of 84.4%, Urdu too is doing fairly well with 56.5%; only 13.2% students watch or listen to media in Pashto. As I have already discussed, one of the advantages of Urdu is that it is the main language of television as well as the Indian movies which are very popular among the Pakistani youth. Although Pashto has been there for long for its allocated duration on national TV and a couple of private channels have also been launched, the elite school students report little interest in Pashto channels. Similarly, in the results of responses for Q18 (99.9% E, 13.2% MT, 21% U) the highly dominant use of English in emails and text messages is also according to the prevailing norm among the educated youth in Pakistan. All in all, English has emerged strongly not only in qualitative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to the use of English, MT &amp; Urdu for leisure and information</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>All the time &amp; Most of the time Combined</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q15. The language I use to read stories and novels.</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td><strong>95.5</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q16. The language I use to read newspapers.</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td><strong>86.6</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q17. The language I use to watch/listen to TV and radio programs.</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td><strong>84.4</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td><strong>56.5</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q18. The language I use to exchange texts/emails.</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Language use for leisure and information (all the time and most of the time percentage values combined); N=90
data but also in the quantitative data with regard to the students’ language choice for information and entertainment.

Figure 7.3: Language use (leisure and information) frequency distribution (all the time and most of the time values combined). The bars show the sum of actual number of response; N= 90

7.5.3 Language proficiency

The language proficiency section of the questionnaire consisted of 32 statements, 8 each for listening, reading, speaking and writing skills. The scale by which the students rated their proficiency level was: 1) I cannot do it at all, 2) I can do it but with great difficulty, 3) I can do it but with some difficulty, 4) I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty and 5) I can do it comfortably. As in the analysis of quantitative data in previous sections, here I combine the percentage values of scales 4, 5 and 1, 2. I am ignoring scale 3 because it did not produce any significant results. I am discussing only the general trends with regard to language proficiency, which are quite obvious from Figure 7.4. Details of statements, and frequency of responses for each scale, each language and each statement are given in the Appendix E.

Figure 7.4 shows a visual pattern of frequency for language proficiency in various language skills that is consistent with the qualitative data findings. Questions 1-8, which target the listening comprehension of the students in English, MT and Urdu, show a fairly uniform distribution of responses for the three languages. The students report a high listening proficiency in the three languages. Confirming once again English as an overall dominant language, bars for English show slightly higher listening proficiency than the
**Figure 7.4**: Language proficiency: Listening (Q1-8), reading (Q9-16), speaking (Q17-24) and writing (Q18-32) abilities in English, MT, and Urdu.

*I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty* and *I can do it comfortably* values combined; The Bars show the actual number of response; (N=90)
Other languages. In the reading section (Q9-16), although the overall picture is in harmony with what I discussed in the qualitative data, results for MT are relatively better than what was revealed in the qualitative data, in which students reported minimal reading and writing proficiency in MT. The frequency distribution pattern for speaking skills (Q17-24) reflects a fairly balanced multilingual situation in the survey data. With regard to MT, I observed and inferred from the interviews and focus groups that the students took their oral fluency in MT for granted, or overrated it. I draw this conclusion because the students also reported MT loss and as a consequence of that they tend to shift either to English or Urdu. A few students explicitly confirmed my understanding with regard to their MT loss: “We are definitely losing our MT, although we don’t notice it” (FG#4, S2). Finally in the sphere of writing (Q25-32) the results reflect the qualitative data in which the students reported a high proficiency level in English, moderate in Urdu and minimal in MT. In the interviews, they attributed this to the fact that they never studied MT at school in their entire career.

7.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored the two essential aspects as well as consequences of language policy at the micro-level: 1) language practices of the elite school students in terms of domains and in terms of leisure and information, and 2) language proficiency, loss and maintenance. The language use patterns of the students in school, home and outside the home/school domains were explored in depth. While English emerged as the dominant language of the schools mainly due to the curriculum and strict English-only policy, senior (college) students also use English habitually, and under the influence of peer-group culture. Urdu was reported as the second most dominant language at school. Mother tongue, Pashto, turned out to be the most spoken language at home followed by English and Urdu. There was sound evidence in the data to suggest the influence of the school L-i-E policy and language practices on language choice at home. According to Spolsky (2009), language management may “influence speakers to modify their practices”. In the outside domains, MT emerged as the dominant language, followed by Urdu and English. English was found to be spoken mostly with peers, which confirms that language practices at home and outside the home are open to the influence of peers and the school (Spolsky, 2009).
With regard to leisure and information, however, English was reported to be the most dominant language. The students read English novels and newspapers; they watch movies and TV programs and listen to music in English. Several students also reported the use of Urdu, along with English, as the medium for watching Indian movies and listening to music. Only a minimal use of MT as medium was reported for entertainment and reading. Despite showing strong feelings for Pashto as the symbol of their identity, the majority of the students reject Pashto movies, TV channels and songs for their low quality.

Data related to the students’ self-evaluation of their proficiency in the three languages revealed the students’ high oral proficiency both in English and Pashto while accent and grammar issues were reported with regard to Urdu. Despite the students’ reporting of their oral fluency in Pashto, a salient theme in Chapter 7 revealed that the students of the elite schools are undergoing gradual and unnoticeable MT loss. On many occasions in the data the students referred to situations where they find themselves struggling to express an ordinary word or idea in Pashto; consequently they shift to either Urdu or English. In terms of academic proficiency, both the qualitative and qualitative data proved that the students are the most proficient in English, followed by Urdu, and only minimally proficient in Pashto. There was consensus among the participants that the students’ overall weakness in MT was due to its exclusion from education.

The quantitative data depicted a more or less similar picture for domain-wise language use as the qualitative data, with some exceptions. For instance, contrary to the qualitative findings, MT took precedence over Urdu as the second dominant language after English in non-academic situations at school. Similarly, although the students’ qualitative data responses revealed English as the main language among siblings at home, the quantitative data results showed Pashto to be the siblings’ common language. An interesting finding in the quantitative data is the dominant use of English and Urdu by the students in government offices even though it is neither mandatory for them nor the officials to use these languages. This finding also corroborates the theme of the status and prestige of English and Urdu under the instrumental value of language category (see Chapter 6), in which the students talked about the supportive and friendly treatment of officials if they are addressed in either English or Urdu.
In the sphere of proficiency, English also took overall precedence over Pashto and Urdu. Even though the students’ claims of oral proficiency in English and Pashto were nearly similar, a significant number of responses suggested MT loss and shift. In the areas of reading and writing, the gaps among the three languages were significantly wide, with English as the most dominant followed by Urdu. Results for the mother tongue were very disappointing as many students reported that they never studied MT at school. A similar pattern of proficiency also emerged in the quantitative data.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

This investigation set out to examine language planning and policy (LPP) with particular focus on language-in-education (L-i-E) planning at the micro-level of two English-medium schools in Peshawar, the capital of KP province where Pashto is the dominant language. The study attempted to take a holistic view of LPP with the stakeholders’ attitudes and practices being the focus. Ethnographic case study as the strategy of inquiry helped in understanding L-i-E policy in its natural setting, allowing observations and insights into what lies beneath the stakeholders’ language practices and attitudes.

This study makes a significant contribution to research on LPP in Pakistan. Although several studies exist which examine LPP in Pakistan, most of them are driven mainly by theory and/or history; only a few investigate L-i-E policy empirically. Yet, no study exists that takes such a holistic and, at the same time, in-depth investigation of micro-level LPP in its natural setting, one that explores the complex interaction between official policy and its micro-level implementation in the context of elite schools in KP.

Findings revealed that micro-level actors, i.e. the elite English-medium schools, enjoy significant influence in their L-i-E planning. At the same time, the macroscopic influence of the official language policy—a product of political, ideological and global forces—is also evident in the language practices and beliefs of the actors at a grassroots level. Owing to their unchallenged power, the schools strictly adhere to an English-only assimilationist L-i-E policy. Despite constitutional provision, the students’ home language is not only excluded from the curriculum, its use in and outside the classroom is discouraged. It was found that the policy negatively influences the students’ attitudes towards MT; their language use patterns also showed domain shrinkage vis-à-vis MT. A major finding of this study confirmed that the schools’ L-i-E policies contribute significantly to subtractive bilingualism which many of the students experience.

The purpose of this chapter is to tie together the various issues that this thesis has covered and to reflect further on their meaning. I revisit my research questions and provide answers to them. I summarise the key findings of this inquiry which have been reported and discussed in Chapter 5, 6 and 7 and partly through Chapter 3. This chapter also highlights the theoretical implications of the study with respect to LPP in a complex multilingual
situation such as the one in this study. Then I discuss implications and recommendations for the schools, the individual stakeholders and society at large. The chapter also reflects briefly on the study’s limitations and gives direction for future research.

8.1 Research question one

The first research question was: What are the dynamics of language-in-education planning at the micro-level context of elite schools in Pakistan, and to what extent does the schools’ L-i-E policy reflect the official language policy of the government? This question brings the macro and micro aspects of LPP together in the context of this study. I purposefully retained the two-part question because I wanted to explore the nature and extent of harmony, convergence and/or divergence between the two levels of LPP in the context of elite English-medium schools. LPP at the micro-level, as such, was examined both as an extension of macro-level planning and as a local activity with no macro roots (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). In doing so I subscribe to the view of LPP as the product of its history and social context, which combines the past with current LPP practices both at the macro- and micro-levels (Baldauf, 2008; Foucault, 1991; Moore, 2002; Pennycook, 2000; Tollefson, 2006).

The macro-policy aspect of this research question was mostly illuminated in Chapter 3, which revealed that for political, ideological and social reasons the policy makers have always given a dominant and high prestige value to English and Urdu. The first initiative, which established English as a language of high status, was taken during the colonial era when T. B. Macaulay’s recommendations for teaching English to Indians were implemented and English replaced Urdu and Persian. While the policy anglicised the Indian elite, the masses struggled with English at school and universities (Rahman, 2005). Despite this major language policy shift, Urdu was retained at lower levels of administration and education in parts of India which now comprise Pakistan. Thus both English and Urdu “gained currency as standard languages throughout the region” (Shackles, 2007, p. 104). As regards LPP in the Pashtun areas, the British preferred Urdu as the medium of education over Pashto for two reasons. First, as Rahman (2002) observes, the British believed that it was politically more expedient for Pashtuns to be Indianised by teaching them Urdu. The second reason, which is basically couched in the first, was to soften the impact of the movement of the pro-congress Pashtun nationalists, also known as
the *Khudai Khidmatgars*, led by Abdul Ghaffar Khan. In their struggle for the liberation of their land from the British, the nationalists sought to use Pashto as a marker of Pashtun identity. They resisted Urdu, which was patronised by the British, and established their own schools where education was provided in Pashto. The impact of the nationalists’ efforts on Pashtuns’ attitudes towards Pashto as a medium of education, however, was not significant.

In the post-independence era, the policy of giving high status to English was retained. Durrani (2012, p. 33) regards the prevailing LPP in Pakistan as “a spectre of Indian colonial heritage” in which “denigrating and negative ideologies are ascribed to vernacular language”. The indigenous languages, except Sindi, remained largely neglected. Much of the language controversies revolved around tensions between Urdu and Bengali in Bengal, and Urdu and Sindi in Sind. While these controversies continued and the various commissions were formed to address these issues, English remained entrenched as the official language of state institutions, such as the armed forces, the judiciary, and the bureaucracy, and in the sphere of education, particularly at the higher level. The provinces of NWFP, Punjab and Baluchistan by and large had no major issues with the dominant role of Urdu and English and the marginalisation of their indigenous languages. This attitude has remained until today, except in KP where the nationalists, since coming to power in 2008, declared the teaching of indigenous languages (Pashto, Hindko, Kohistani, Saraiki and Khowar) compulsory from Class 1-12 in the government as well as in the private schools.

With regard to the dynamics of the micro-level LPP, Chapter 5 revealed that the elite schools enjoy unquestionable authority in terms of devising and implementing their MoI policies, language teaching pedagogy, and policy for the general use of language(s). The teachers exercise limited authority as in most cases they are required to follow the language-related general rules as well as the prescribed course content and pedagogical principles based on the curricula of native English-speaking countries. The schools have a well-established system of training their teachers so that they meet the standards of pedagogical principles and skills that the schools uphold. The attitudes of several teachers were found to have been influenced by the school language policy and expressed views

42 The government completed its tenure in March 2013; the nationalists were defeated in the May 2013 elections. At the time of writing this thesis, the new government’s education policy is not yet clear.
about foreign language teaching similar to those held by the schools. The parents who are
seen as valuable customers also enjoy considerable influence; their voice is taken seriously
in language and academic matters.

Owing to their power in L-i-E policy, the elite schools strictly adhere to the medium of
instruction (MoI) policy which is immersion-oriented (Fortune & Tedick, 2008), leading to
subtractive bilingualism. The students are strictly prohibited from speaking any language
other than English in and outside the classroom. Although Urdu is taught as a compulsory
subject, as mandated by the constitution, the students’ home language is excluded from the
curriculum. Intertwined in this language teaching approach is the belief that if the students
use their home language at school, their English proficiency will be affected. The practice
is contrary to the official policy which recommends the teaching of at least one regional
language along with Urdu and English. The English-medium schools have been practising
this policy for decades; even in the era of General Zia (1979-1988) there was great
emphasis on Urdu and Arabic. This clearly indicates that the state and its official LPP give
tacit approval to the L-i-E planning of the English-medium schools. Paradoxically, the
dualistic system of LPP, involving English and Urdu-medium streams of education, is
thriving in spite of its hidden ills. The National Education Policy of 2009 acknowledges
that the parallel education system, i.e. English and Urdu-MT medium schools, gives
advantage to the students of the elite schools because fluency in English is a key
requirement in getting white collar jobs. The policy also contributes to the division of
society on social and linguistic lines (Government of Pakistan, 2009). Inaction, despite this
realisation, suggests that there is a tacit harmony between the macro-level policy makers
(politicians, bureaucrats, educationists) and micro-level actors (elite schools, teachers and
parents).

Developments after the 18th amendment, which delegated education as a provincial
responsibility (see Chapter 3), however, put the macro-level actor (the provincial
government) in opposition to the micro-level actors (schools and parents) when the
provincial government declared MT as a compulsory subject. Expressing strong
reservations about the policy, several participants reported that the motive of the new
policy was political. Yet, many of them believed that there was no need to teach MT in
schools because the students already speak it at home. In short, while the elite schools
resist the official and explicit LPP by ignoring the regional languages, they serve as effective institutions where the state’s implicit priority of promoting English is realised.

8.2 Research question two

The second research question was: *What are the stakeholders’ attitudes towards languages (English, Pashto and Urdu) in general, and the L-i-E policy in particular?* Chapter 6 sought to answer this question by reporting and discussing findings related to the stakeholders’ attitudes towards English, Pashto and Urdu. Following Baker (2006), the attitudes related themes were grouped into two categories, i.e. instrumental and integrative attitudes. Instrumental attitudes included themes which considered the usefulness of the three languages in education, employment, overseas careers and means of wider communication. The themes under the integrative category included those in which respondents expressed their association with or membership of a group, community, nation, province or country; the participants’ attitudes towards languages vis-à-vis national unity, patriotism, ethnic pride and identity were also included in this category.

Strongly positive attitudes were expressed towards the instrumental value of English, not only by the students but also the teachers and parents. English was seen as indispensable in areas such as education, employment and careers in overseas countries. At the same time, the participants emphasised pragmatic aspects of the high status and prestige of English in Pakistani society. Status value was also associated with Urdu as a national lingua franca and as a language promoted by government and its institutions. The students’ mother tongue (Pashto), however, was seen as least useful in terms of its instrumental value.

While instrumental attitudes emerged as clearly defined themes, integrative attitudes emerged as complex, ambivalent and at times contradictory. The participants unanimously considered Urdu as indispensable for the national unity of Pakistan. This unifying role of Urdu was often juxtaposed with the role assigned to indigenous languages; a number of participants were of the view that the inclusion of indigenous languages in education would promote regionalism and would, therefore, be detrimental to national unity.

The students’ integrative attitudes towards MT were marked by ambivalence. A salient theme in this context was based on their belief that Pashto is the marker of their Pashtun
identity. The majority of the students took pride in their Pashtun identity and in Pashto. At the same time, the students also revealed that in certain situations they feel ashamed when they speak Pashto. The feeling of shame was related to the low status and prestige of Pashto and was often compared with the high status that Urdu and English enjoy. Several students referred to religious extremism and lawlessness in the Pashtun region as something which makes them feel ashamed of their ethnic and linguistic background. A significant number of participants attributed the low status of MT to the government’s LPP in which MT is excluded from education, at least in the context of English-medium schools. They argued that the government should promote MT because its status is declining. However, for various reasons, mostly related to the low pragmatic significance of MT and the fear of additional academic burden, they are reluctant to learn Pashto as a school subject. Similar contradictions vis-à-vis MT were noted among the teachers and parents.

8.3 Research question three

Chapter 7 discusses findings which address answers to the third research question: What are the students’ language use and proficiency patterns? What are the implications of these patterns for the students’ language maintenance and/or shift? The first section of this chapter attempted to make sense of the students’ domain-wise language practices as well as their language choice for leisure and information (reading, watching and listening). The data revealed that English is the most spoken language not only in classrooms as mandated by the schools’ strict English-only policy, but also in non-academic domains where students exercise their own freedom to choose language(s). Peer-group culture in this regard was strongly dominated by English and Urdu. At home, Pashto was reported as the main language followed by English. Siblings were found to use mostly English at home. This, however, was contradicted in the quantitative data. Some participants reported that their use of language at home is governed by some kind of language policy. In the outside-the-home domains, the students mainly speak Pashto, which they attribute to the prevailing status of Pashto in the KP province at large. Urdu was reported as the second most frequently used language, mostly in situations where the students are not sure about the linguistic background of their interlocutor, and when they travel to cities like Islamabad and Lahore. The use of English was reported in two contexts: One is the friendship domain, which mostly includes school peer-group members, and the second is social
gatherings such as birthday or wedding parties. A salient theme in this chapter revealed that the schools’ language policy influences the language attitudes and practices of the students in and outside the school.

With regard to the use of language for leisure and information, the influence of English was most dominant. The students read English novels and newspapers; they watch movies and TV programs and listen to music in English. Several students also reported the use of Urdu, along with English, as the medium for watching Indian movies and listening to music. A few students expressed their love for Pashto poetry and history due to their affiliation with Pashtun identity; the majority of them, however, disdain Pashto movies, TV channels and songs because of their low quality. Only a few students revealed that they read Pashto books, but relatively few when compared with English and Urdu.

Data related to the students’ self-evaluation of their proficiency in the three languages revealed their high oral proficiency both in English and Pashto. Accent and grammar issues were reported with regard to speaking ability in Urdu. Chapter 7 revealed that the students of the elite schools are undergoing gradual and unnoticeable MT loss, particularly with regard to vocabulary. On many occasions in the data the students referred to situations where they find themselves struggling to express an ordinary idea in Pashto; consequently they shift to either Urdu or English. In terms of academic proficiency, both the qualitative and quantitative data showed that the students are most proficient in English, followed by Urdu, and only minimally in Pashto. There was consensus among the participants that the students’ weak MT was due to its exclusion from education.

8.4 LPP in a state of flux

Concepts, according to Cohen, Lawrence and Morrison (2000), express generalisations from particulars. In other words, concepts enable us to impose some sort of meaning on the world; through them reality is given sense, order and coherence (Cohen et al., 2000). The purpose of this section is to present conclusions of this study by emphasising the conceptualisation of those conclusions within their respective theoretical context (Leshem & Trafford, 2007). The theoretical framework which was established in Chapter 2 to define the territory of this research will be revisited in light of the major findings of this study. Even though some conceptualisation of the specific findings has already taken place in the
discussion of findings chapters, in this section I tie together the major findings to establish coherence between the empirical findings and conclusions on one hand, and the various theoretical constructs that guided this study on the other.

The various components of LPP at the micro-level and their sub-parts that I briefly recapitulated in Section 8.1 are not placed in isolated, static and dormant positions. Rather they are essentially interlinked in a state of flux. The relationships and forces that influence, shape and/or reduce certain components of LPP in the context of this study are multidirectional. Figure 8.1 is a graphical representation of the possible patterns and relationships in the complex phenomenon of LPP in this context, and in the paragraphs that follow I attempt to give them meaning. I categorise the relationships as: 1) causative, 2) mutually reinforcing, and 3) resistive. It is on the basis of these relationships and forces, and the dynamicity and integrity that they impart to micro-level LPP, that I propose a conceptual framework representing the outcomes of this study. These relationships are shown in Figure 8.1 by means of their relevant line symbols. One particular component can have more than one relationship; for instance, a causal outcome of one component can have a mutually reinforcing relationship with another.

**8.4.1 Causative relationships**

Causative relationships here refer to the unidirectional influences of a relatively dominant body or ideology on the policies, practices and beliefs of other bodies and individuals. For the sake of clarity and coherence I discuss this relationship by moving from general to specific or abstract to concrete.

*The influence of political, ideological and global forces on official LPP:* This study has shown that LPP in Pakistan has been influenced by political, ideological, social and global influences. These influences, as shown in Figure 8.1, have been instrumental in the status and prestige planning for Urdu and English. Status and prestige planning for Urdu has been quite explicit as manifested in its national status, despite the Urdu-Bengali and Urdu-Sindi controversies. The 1973 constitution specifically espouses that “arrangements shall be made for it [Urdu] being used for official and other purposes within 15 years” (Constitution of Pakistan, 1973). The status of Urdu in official LPP was further strengthened when General Zia-ul-Haq promoted it as a symbol of national identity and
patriotism (Mahboob, 2002). The status planning for English, on the other hand, has been implicit, deriving its strength from institutions like the armed forces, the judiciary and the bureaucracy which robustly sustained their British era administrative and linguistic norms. The status and image further improved with the dawn of globalization, the free market economy and the development of information technology. The official LPP in Pakistan, as such, has been significantly influenced by these political, ideological and global forces in a top down unidirectional manner.

![Figure 8.1: Conceptual framework for LPP at the macro and micro levels](image)

- **E** = English, **M** = mother tongue, **U** = Urdu
- **Relationship Symbols:** Essential link/relationship (---), causative (→), mutually reinforcing (↔), and resistive ambivalent (~~~).
Implicit influence of official LPP on micro-level bodies and individuals: One of the main findings of this study establishes that L-i-E policy at the micro-level of the elite schools functions with considerable autonomy. However, a deeper analysis of the stakeholders’ language beliefs revealed that the high priority given to English by the schools is essentially because of the status and prestige value which English enjoys in society at large, mostly under the influence of the official LPP. Figure 8.1 shows how the implicit policy at the top level influences the elite schools. By making English the dominant language, the schools are practically implementing, in terms of prestige and acquisition planning, what the official language policy is implicitly espousing and encouraging (exceptions to this are discussed in Section 8.2.3). Urdu too is prominent and is taught in schools by virtue of its status as the national language.

Influence of the schools’ L-i-E policy on language practices and proficiency: Another causative relationship, as shown in Figure 8.1, pertains to the influence of the elite schools’ L-i-E policy on the students’ language practices and proficiency. This is in line with Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 122), who maintain that L-i-E planning is “the most potent source for bringing about language change”. Language change for the elite students, with regards to proficiency, has turned out to be positive in the case of English (and to some extent Urdu) and negative in the case of MT. The schools’ curriculums, which include MoI policy, teaching language as a subject, pedagogical approaches and worldview of second language teaching, are strictly geared to enhance the students’ proficiency in English. Consequently, the students are losing their MT; they switch to English or Urdu when they cannot express something in their MT. Aware of the influence of the L-i-E policy, most of the students attribute their MT loss to the education system, which never provides for them opportunities to learn it. Consequently, while their academic proficiency in English and Urdu is very high, their academic skills in MT are relatively poor. Schools, as the primary sites where language policy is implemented and contested, certainly influence “the behavior of others with respect to acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their codes” (Cooper, 1989, p. 45).
Influence of official LPP on language attitudes: Most aspects of the instrumental attitudes towards languages that are discussed in Chapter 6 can be seen as the outcome of official LPP. For instance, the emergence of the theme of English as key to success in education was expected because education at the higher level is almost entirely in English (see bottom-left boxes in Figure 8.1 for instrumental attitudes). Moreover, since proficiency in English is a key factor in recruitment for white collar jobs in government and private organizations, it was natural for the stakeholders to associate high instrumental value with English in getting employment. In addition to this, the overall high status and prestige which Urdu and English enjoy in official LPP also enhance the pragmatic significance of these languages. An instance of this is the friendly and cooperative treatment that people receive in government offices when they speak English or Urdu. Finally, the stakeholders’ reporting of low pragmatic value associated with MT too is a reflection of its marginalized status in official LPP.

The direct, causal influence of official LPP is also manifested in the stakeholders’ integrative attitudes towards languages. While the recent critical and postmodern scholarship on LPP advocates plurilingualism or linguistic diversity, official LPP in Pakistan still tends to adhere to the classical view of linguistic homogeneity according to which “linguistic diversity presented obstacles for national development, while linguistic homogeneity was associated with modernism” (Ricento, 2000, p. 198). The influence of this policy can be clearly seen in students’ integrative attitudes towards languages. Reflecting on the status of Urdu, the majority of the students in this study believe that they must learn and give preference to Urdu for the sake of national unity. At the same time, they believe that promotion of regional languages would divide Pakistan as a nation. In short, there is a clear causative relationship between official LPP and the stakeholders’ language attitudes.

8.4.2 Mutually reinforcing relationships

The previous section highlighted the causal relationships in which certain strong ideological forces and bodies influence attitudes and practices at micro-level contexts such as schools and individuals in a top-down linear direction. In this section I explore
relationships between different actors and components of LPP that are mutually reinforcing. In other words the influence is bidirectional.

The schools’ L-i-E policy and parents or community: The noteworthy relationship in this regard is between the stakeholders’ language attitudes and the schools’ L-i-E policy. As Figure 8.1 (see box in the centre) depicts, the schools shape and influence the language beliefs and attitudes of the students. They also influence the parents’ language beliefs by advising them to encourage their children to speak English, read English books and watch English TV programs. At the same time, parents also influence the language policy of the schools. For instance, this study has shown that the parents have high expectations of the elite schools with regard to their children’s English proficiency development; likewise, the parents show minimal interest in their children’s home language as far as their schooling is concerned. In Chapter 6 I reported the students’ and parents’ displeasure over the teachers’ use of Urdu or Pashto in class. In summary, the schools have devised a L-i-E policy that responds to the expectations of the community and the parents. At the same time, the schools inculcate in the students, and to some extent the parents, certain language related beliefs and attitudes. As such there is a two-way mutually reinforcing relationship between the schools and parents with regard to language attitudes.

Students’ language attitudes and language practices: The previous paragraph shed light on how language management or L-i-E policy influences and is influenced by the stakeholders’ attitudes. Within the collective rules of the L-i-E policy, it is the specific measures, such as the medium of instruction and the policy related to the use of a language in general, that have a direct bearing on the students’ beliefs and attitudes towards that language. To take only one instance, this study revealed that the policy of prohibiting students from using their home language at schools leads to negative attitudes towards MT among the students. This, together with other social and political reasons, develops the feeling of shame that the students associate with MT in some situations. They also become skeptical about the worth of their MT in education and for enhancing their career prospects. Interestingly, the feeling of shame regarding their MT sometimes forces them to make linguistic adaptations; hence, they switch to either English or Urdu in some situations. As such the language attitudes and practices at school influence the students’
attitudes, which in turn influence their practices in other contexts; this entails mutually reinforcing relationships (see students’ language attitudes’ box in the center of Figure 8.1) between language attitudes and practices.

Students’ language attitudes and language proficiency: A mutually reinforcing relationship can be seen between the students’ language attitudes and language proficiency. The study has revealed that the effort that schools put into the acquisition planning for English not only promotes the students’ fluency in English over the years, but also develops highly positive attitudes towards English. As an essential part of this planning, the elite schools exclude MT from their curriculum. Moreover, the use of MT is discouraged in school even outside classrooms; students are encouraged to use English in domains outside the school. Consequently, they develop negative attitudes towards their MT. These language attitudes are not only coupled with the domain shrinkage of their MT, they also undergo gradual and often imperceptible MT attrition. The correlation between proficiency and (positive) language attitudes has been pointed out, among others, by Baker (1992) and Korth (2005). Many studies have focused on language learning and students’ affective reactions to various languages in the classroom context (e.g. Lukmani 1972; Norris-Holt 2001; Saville-Troike, 1989). Such studies attempt to show a causal link between positive or negative language attitudes and success in language learning (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010).

Language practices and language proficiency: A reciprocal relationship also exists between language proficiency and language practices (see boxes on the right side in Figure 8.1). This study has revealed that the more the students are fluent in a language the more they use it, and vice versa. In this regard we have already been informed by Spolsky (2009) that language behaviour is influenced by proficiency. The mutually reinforcing interplay of influences between language attitudes, practices and proficiency has been depicted in Figure 8.1 (see box in the centre, fourth from top). Figure 8.2 presents this particular relationship separately for the sake of clarity.
8.4.3 Resistive relationships

In this section I reflect on the relationships that show resistance of one actor or body to the policies of another; likewise, ambivalence with regard to languages that the stakeholders feel and experience is also highlighted in this section.

Micro-level LPP and the official policy: The most obvious resistance is manifested in the L-i-E policy of the elite schools, which strongly opposes the teaching of indigenous languages (see second and third boxes in the centre of Figure 8.1). The official LPP has a provision for the teaching of regional languages, and the mainstream government schools do teach them as subject up to Class 8; the medium of instruction in these schools is either Urdu or the local language. The English-medium schools, however, do not teach the students’ home languages. In a way, the tacit approval of this practice at the English-medium schools by the official LPP reveals contradiction inherent in the official LPP.

The resistance to official LPP is more clearly evident in the response of the elite schools and parents to the new language policy of the provincial government of KP province. As I discussed in Chapters 3 and 5, the 18th amendment in the constitution led to the devolution of some powers in the sphere of education from central government to the provinces. Subsequently, the KP government took the historic decision to make compulsory the teaching of the students’ home languages in schools (both mainstream government and English-medium) from Class 1 to 12. The decision was aimed to slow down and even reverse the decline of the main regional languages of the province, such as Pashto, Hindko, Saraiki, Kohistani and Khowar. Findings in this study show that the elite schools as well as the parents associated with these schools are unanimous in opposing the new policy.
Ambivalent attitudes towards languages: Tension and resistance is also reflected in the students’ ambivalent attitude towards mother tongue (see bottom-right boxes in Figure 8.1). Findings related to the stakeholders’ language attitudes revealed the salient theme of ethnic pride associated with Pashto. However, another theme showed that the students are ashamed of their MT in certain contexts, where they tend to avoid it, for example, and switch to either Urdu or English. Another important theme reveals that the students consider Pashto as a marker of their Pashtun identity, i.e. identity in the sense of social group or ethnolinguistic identity (Giles & Johnson, 1987; Tajfel, 1974, 1981). However, when they are in a situation where they feel shame, they resort to “masking” that identity by switching to either Urdu or English. Identity for the elite school students, therefore, is contextualised (Fishman & Garcia, 2010) and is dynamic across time and space (Norton, 1997). In summary, the students’ association of ethnic pride and identity with MT and, at the same time, their masking of ethnic pride and identity in other contexts puts them in a paradoxical situation.

The purpose of this section was to present a conceptualisation of this study’s main conclusions by tying them together. LPP has been shown to exist in a fluid and dynamic situation in which various actors and bodies relate to others either in a causal, mutually reinforcing or resistive manner. An account of these influences has presented the salient themes and findings in this investigation in a more coherent manner. This section has shown that language planning and policy at the micro-level is a complex and dynamic process. Despite its significant power, the micro-level LPP of the elite schools seems to align with what the official policy espouses tacitly. While it is receptive to some top-down influences of the official LPP, it resists others. It operates in a fluid situation in which the various actors, both institutional and individual, influence, are influenced and resist language policy activities through attitudes as well as behaviour. These influences have various implications for the different languages in this complex multilingual setting.
8.5 Implications and recommendations for students, parents and schools

This study has raised a number of implications for language planning and policy in general for Pakistan and in particular for the community in the KP province. More specifically, the study has implications for the students of the elite schools, their parents, and the schools themselves. Although the recommendations and implications of this study are based on data collected at School A and B, they are also applicable to, and provide research impetus for, English-medium schools of the elite category which follow similar L-i-E policies in other parts of the KP province and in the country as a whole.

This study has revealed that the English-only L-i-E policy of the elite schools, which is mostly geared towards an assimilationist or subtractive bilingual approach, has a bearing on the students’ other languages, particularly the home language. Lack of academic proficiency in MT as well as its gradual loss can have a serious impact on the students’ cognitive abilities, identity and self-esteem. While proficiency in English is indispensable for a person’s successful career, due to its status, a stable bilingual or multilingual L-i-E situation can also be maintained.

The schools’ role is crucial because parents entrust them to educate and equip their children for a successful career. As this study has shown, parents have expectations from the schools with regard to the language their children should master and the language their children do not need to learn. The schools respond to the parents’ expectations by implementing a strict English-only L-i-E policy and by drawing on the curricula of foreign English-speaking countries. The impact of the policy, however, is not just confined to the education of the students inside the school domain; it influences the students’ language attitudes and practices in domains outside the school. In the whole process, the students’ home language is not only excluded from the school, its use is declining in most of the formal domains of the students. In this regard, Spolsky (2009) cautions that absent pluralism, which entails emphasis on only one dominant and prestigious language, leads to disdain for a home language. The previous section has shown that negative attitudes towards language, together with the absence of that language in education, has direct implications for the speakers’ proficiency and maintenance of that language.
Based on this implication, this study recommends a L-i-E policy which is based on the principle of additive bilingualism. The pedagogical advantages of such an approach to education have been highlighted in the works of many researchers (Baker, 2006; Benson, 2002; Coleman & Capstick, 2012; Cummins, 2000; Dutcher, 2001; Youssef, 2002). In this respect, Cummins (2000) informs us that bringing the culture and language of the home into the school is important for identity and for personal as well as group empowerment. Similarly, Benson (2004) contends that using the first language to learn helps teachers and students interact more naturally and negotiate meanings together. A balanced bilingual program is believed to promote biliteracy (Hornberger, 2002) and the learners’ motivation and self-esteem (Dutcher, 1995).

8.6 Implications and recommendations for LPP in Pakistan

The findings of this study have important implications for official LPP in Pakistan, both at national and provincial levels. It has been revealed that the policy of giving dominant status to English at national level, and the existence of two parallel systems of education (one English-medium and the other Urdu-MT based), is leading to the stratification of society along social and linguistic lines. The children of the affluent class, including the rich and employees of the civil and military institutions, have an obvious advantage at the higher level of education, which is almost completely in English. Similarly, they have an edge over mainstream school students in getting the best jobs, for which fluency in English is a key criterion. This suggests that language(s) play a significant role in determining social status.

This study recommends the adoption of serious measures to reduce this chasm in the education system, including some balancing of the status and acquisition planning of the three languages. The indigenous languages deserve a genuine role in national affairs and nation building. Multilingualism as a national asset and strength is now embraced throughout the world (May, 2008; UNESCO, 2003). Even though English is taught in most

---

43 After the 18th amendment in the constitution education has become a provincial matter. However, there is still lack of clarity about the extent of and mechanisms for the devolution of this authority.
of the countries of the world, due to its status of global lingua franca for business, media and diplomacy, there is a growing realisation in the world of the need to preserve and promote indigenous languages. Based on their thorough investigation of L-i-E in Pakistan, Coleman and Capstick (2012) also emphasize the need for the state to change its ideological position vis-à-vis the indigenous languages in Pakistan. They recommend adoption of a linguistically equitable education system because discriminatory education systems lead to social division with “huge numbers of undereducated, unemployable and frustrated young people” (Coleman & Capstick, 2012, p. 74).

The study also highlights the implication of the prevailing LPP for national unity. The promotion of national unity at the cost of linguistic diversity (May, 2000) has not been a successful experience in Pakistan. There has been sustained resistance to Urdu by various ethnic groups (Rahman, 2004a, 2004b). The Urdu-Bengali controversy was one of the key factors in the separation of Bengal from Pakistan in 1971. The findings in this study have revealed that the L-i-E policy of the elite schools, dominated by English, have a significant role in the overall social and ideological stratification of Pakistani society. For this and other reasons, this study recommends the promotion of indigenous languages through education. An enhancement of their status, as promised in the constitution of 1973, will redress grievances of various ethnic communities and ensure harmony and unity through diversity. Coleman (2010) and Coleman and Capstick (2012) suggest that the adoption of multiple languages in primary school education will strengthen the loyalty of ethnic minorities to the state, rather than the reverse, because all ethnic groups will perceive themselves to be equally respected. In this regard Coleman (2010) contends that “the long term decline and death of indigenous languages, and ethnic marginalisation is leading to the growth of resentment among ethnic minorities. Pakistan is considered to be one of the countries most exposed to these risks” (p. 25).

There are also some implications for the provincial government of KP province, which took the important decision to make the teaching of the province’s indigenous languages compulsory at schools (Classes 1-12). Owing to the declining state of regional languages in Pakistan, this was a significant and bold decision. However, as discussed in Chapter 3, it was not possible to hide or suppress the political repercussions of the new policy in the
ever politically charged society of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{44} The political undertones of the policy, true or perceived, appear to be a significant factor in the placid response to the policy from stakeholders. The present and future governments can build on what the previous government achieved with regard to MT teaching policy. A significant measure in this regard would be the weaning away of the policy from politics. If the project is assigned to an empowered body of scholars, educationists, linguists rather than ministers and bureaucrats, it would appeal to the masses more strongly. Similarly, the support of religious scholars and Moulvis\textsuperscript{45} could be sought as they exercise significant influence on the people. In the socio-political context of Pakistan the promotion of Pashtun ethnic language, identity and culture is always seen with scepticism due to the political ideology of the nationalists (see Chapter 3). Nationalism based on ethnicity is considered illegal by a dominant school of Islamic thought\textsuperscript{46}. As such, the complex interaction of politics, religion and nationalism in Pashtun society is taking its toll on Pashto.

One implication that has been raised pertains to a specific pedagogical view of second or foreign language teaching. The opposition to MT as a subject has mainly come from the private English-medium schools, who together with their clients (parents) have a shared belief that only a subtractive immersion (Fortune & Tedick, 2008) or submersion (Baker, 2006) approach to language teaching could guarantee the students’ English proficiency. An advocacy and awareness campaign through print and electronic media and through holding workshops would be useful to reduce such misperceptions among parents, teachers and school administrators/owners. The concerned stakeholders could be informed about the benefits of bilingual or multilingual education and the dangers of an assimilationist or subtractive bilingual approach in education.

\textsuperscript{44} In Chapter 3 I discussed the political background of the Pashtun nationalists who are in power (at the time of writing this thesis) and who took the decision to make the teaching of the major regional vernaculars compulsory.

\textsuperscript{45} The religious pundits in KP are more inclined towards Urdu than Pashto as most of the religious books are written in Urdu. For their Friday prayer sermon, however, they mostly use Pashto. In Chapter 3 I discussed how the previous provincial government of MMA (a coalition of religious parties) ignored Pashto and promoted Urdu in KP, following their religious and political ideologies.

\textsuperscript{46} Moderate, liberal and ordinary Muslims do not see any problem with this position as long as it is not racist or fascist in nature.
Another aspect of the English-medium schools’ opposition to MT is the additional cost that adding a new subject is likely to incur. In this regard I recommend that the government provides adequate assistance to schools, both government and private. Lack of teachers has been a major concern in implementation of the policy. The universities in KP could be engaged to initiate teacher training programs for MT teaching. This would not only address the issue of teacher shortage, it would also enhance the image of MT with regard to its pragmatic value. Its teaching at schools would entail the creation of thousands of job opportunities.

The new government that came to power in KP after the defeat of the nationalists in the May 2013 elections will need to streamline the MT as subject policy. Despite their ideological differences with the nationalists, they cannot afford to roll it back. Concrete measures based on the above tentative recommendations might steer the destiny of regional languages in the right direction. One advantage that the new government will enjoy in implementing this policy is that their measures would not be seen as politically motivated, as was the case with the nationalists.

8.7 Limitations of the study

Although I conducted this research in a careful and thorough manner in order to achieve its aims, I am aware of some of its limitations and shortcomings. First, like most case studies, the scope of this study is limited; I have focussed on only two schools. Nevertheless, the study is not completely devoid of generalization because the theory, ideas and processes that have evolved through this study also help to make sense of other situations (Dörnyei, 2007, citing Maxwell, 1992) – what I have referred to ‘transferability’ in the methodology chapter (Chapter 4). Moreover, the investigation has enabled me to understand the study context in depth, and to provide a full, thick description of the school communities I explored.

Second, in the concurrent triangulation design that I followed, although most of the qualitative data themes were supported by quantitative data, there were a few discrepancies between these qualitative and quantitative data. Creswell (2009) regards such discrepancies as one of the limitations of a concurrent mixed methods design. In some cases disparity in
the data, however, afforded me deeper insights into a particular theme. An instance of this can be found in contradictory responses to English with regard to its identity value in two similar, but differently worded, statements (see discussion of Q 20 and Q 30 in Section 6.3.2).

Third, owing to my participants’ time and commitment constraints, my data collection involved three months physical engagement with the study sites and participants, followed by on-going interaction through email and telephone. Whilst the period was adequate for me to understand my research contexts and to collect my data, a longer period of engagement might have deepened my understanding of the research sites and participants.

Finally, the discussion of my findings has tended to be somewhat more descriptive than critical. This is the nature of an exploratory study such as mine; one which is a first attempt to explore language attitudes and practices with regard to LPP at the micro and macro levels in Pakistan and/or specifically in KP province. As such, the ethnographic case study approach I adopted has led me to describe in detail the study context, the participants and their practices, and their attitudes in order to achieve my research goals. Moreover, since I took a holistic view of understanding L-i-E policy, I needed to cover all micro-level stakeholders for data, as well as, where necessary, relate my findings to the macro-level (official) LPP.

8.8 Directions for future research

While this study has attempted to understand the L-i-E policy of two elite schools and the students’ language attitudes, practices and maintenance patterns, further studies in similar schools would provide greater illumination on the language attitudes and practices of the stakeholders. Moreover, since language attitudes and practices are also influenced by both linguistic and non-linguistic forces at work at macro- and micro-levels (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), further research targeting the role of L-i-E policy as well as the role of social (media in particular), political and global forces would uncover finer and more diverse nuances behind the language attitudes and practices of the grassroots actors. Furthermore, future inquiries might involve comparison of the language attitudes and practices of English-medium and Urdu/vernacular-medium schools.
In terms of research methodology, future researchers could apply a sequential triangulation design which involves qualitative data preceding quantitative data. The qualitative data, therefore, serves as a pool of ideas for the questionnaire, enabling more reliable comparison of qualitative and quantitative data. Finally, large-scale quantitative studies would help build a bigger picture of language attitudes and patterns of language practices, proficiency and maintenance. This, together with in-depth ethnographic case studies like mine, would provide a stronger impetus to overhauling LPP at the official level.

8.9 Afterword

I set about this project by reflecting, in the introduction, on my journey that started at an elite school more than twenty years ago. With Pashto as my home language I had to grapple with the challenge of learning a second language, Urdu, and a foreign language, English. Having the privilege of going to a high quality school, I was able to overcome the challenges of acquiring these languages fairly easily. A sound level of competence in English thus helped me complete my education with flying colours. I pursued a successful career as a teacher of English. Over all these years, however, I remained oblivious to the transformation that my schooling had stirred in terms of my attitudes towards languages and language-in-education policy, and the latent threat that they posed to my native language. I took everything for granted. Twenty years later when I joined the University of Auckland for further education, my new knowledge and awareness steered that transformation in a different direction; in fact, it was a turning point in terms of my beliefs and ideologies about languages and language-in-education policy. This motivated me to embark upon a new journey; a journey of going back to the schools to explore the beliefs and practices vis-a-vis the languages and their teaching. What are those beliefs and practices? What lies behind them? How are they shaped and in turn how do they shape the beliefs and practices of the students and parents? In a way it was an exploration of my practices in the past under the influence of a paradigm that had changed significantly in terms of time, space and attitudes.

I entered the research site with an ideological position rooted in the critical and postmodern theory of LPP that I had recently become familiar with. I had developed an increased awareness of social, linguistic and economic inequalities (Ricento, 2000), the idea of
“linguistic imperialism”, and the realization of safeguarding “linguistic human rights” (Phillipson, 1997; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994). I had learned that language shift, and the subsequent loss and death of small languages is not a natural phenomenon, but “a manifestation of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups – and their languages – hierarchically within a society” (Ricento, 2006). While I still subscribe to these positions, I made sure that I embarked on my exploration with an open mind; I set aside my assumptions as much as possible as I entered the research sites. My aim was to explore the language attitudes and practices in the context of elite schools. Even though the memories of my past language practices in the school flashed back to me from time to time, which sometimes helped in understanding my findings, things had changed drastically, both for me and the school. I was able to maintain a by and large balanced position, both emic and etic perspectives. I positioned myself as a researcher and as a student who was curious to understand the language attitudes and practices in the participants’ natural setting.

As well as this ideological position, I had to make sure that I altered my positioning in relation to the participants if I wanted to gather reliable data. More educated and experienced than most of my participants, the power differential was mostly in my favor. I had to make a conscious effort to minimize it; however, I was not able to completely prevent the participants from constructing a particular image of and position for me. My engagement in the research sites was fairly long and intensive, formal as well as informal. It is quite likely that I might not have been able to completely camouflage my position in relation to power and ideology. The participants must have been influenced by such positionality. An instance of this influence can be found in the discussion of the findings in Chapter 7. Discussing the MT proficiency of the students, I highlight the emergence of two contradictory themes; i.e. the students’ high proficiency in MT (Section 7.4.1) and their MT loss (Section 7.4.3). Interpreting the findings, I note that some of the students might have changed their original opinion during data collection. For instance, initially they might have thought they were fluent in their MT as most of them were speaking it at home. However, as more deliberations on language maintenance issues took place over time, many of them might have obtained a better and maybe different understanding of their proficiency in MT.
As I reflect on the whole process of my engagement with the research sites—from the collection and analysis of the data to its final reporting in this thesis—I can feel the imprints that this project as a whole and some of its findings in particular have left on me. The situation of indigenous languages in Pakistani society in general, and in L-i-E planning in the context of elite schools in particular, is going from bad to worst. As in many parts of the multilingual world where both research and activism are geared towards protecting and reviving marginalised languages, Pakistan will have to follow suit. Having seen the situation from close quarters, I can now foresee for myself an earnest role in those endeavours.

8.10 Concluding remarks

This study has illuminated the complexity of the L-i-E policy of the schools on one hand and the complex interaction between macro- and micro-level LPPs on the other. Enjoying significant power in their L-i-E policy, the elite schools adhere to a rigid and unchallenged English-only policy. Although Urdu is taught as subject as mandated by the constitution, the exclusion of MT from the school means that the language teaching approach is replacive-immersion and assimilationist oriented. As shown in this study, this approach to language teaching leads to the students’ negative attitudes towards their MT, domain shrinkage in terms of MT use, and MT attrition/loss in certain contexts where they are forced to switch to English or Urdu. This study has also shown that the government’s official LPP, which has been influenced by social, political, ideological and global forces, has trickled down to and has deep imprints on the attitudes and practices of the actors at the grassroots level, both individual and institutions.

Although the conclusions drawn from any findings cannot be generalized, this study as the first attempt of its kind in the context of Pakistan offers ample food for thought for all stakeholders—the government, the ministry and allied departments of education, the parents, students and language activists—to reflect on their beliefs and practices with regard to language in education. The world has changed since it was dominated by the
eighteenth century ideology of one nation, one language. A multitude of scholars in the field have highlighted the grave consequences of language policies whereby the hegemony of the dominant languages (global, national) pose serious threats to the indigenous (minority, ethnic, indigenous) languages. At the same time, a great body of scholarship is dedicated to emphasizing the significance of indigenous languages as personal and societal resources, markers of identity, sources of self-esteem and personal and group empowerment, and essential not only for basic literacy, but also for balanced bilingualism. To all these endeavors, UNESCO (2003) extends complete support through various conventions and declarations.

In the prevailing LPP situation in Pakistan, the indigenous languages, with the exception of Sindi, remain highly neglected and disadvantaged. Owing to the low prestige and low pragmatic values of the indigenous languages, the speakers develop negative attitudes towards them. Consequently, the educated, affluent and elite sections of society, especially in urban centres, are gradually and unnoticeably shifting from their native languages to English and Urdu to achieve power, wealth and prestige (Abbas, 1993; Rahman, 2006). This means that in the current LPP system languages are being used by the dominant social groups to establish and maintain social hierarchies (Tollefson, 2002). It is for this reason that Ricento (2006) calls for understanding language shift as a manifestation of asymmetrical power relations based on social structures and ideologies that position groups – and their languages – hierarchically within a society. English-medium schools of the elite category, whether in the private or public sectors, serve both as centres of acquisition planning for English and as symbols of status for the affluent class. At the same time they are the sites where the policies practised and the attitudes nurtured are potently averse to the students’ home languages. As such, no investigation of LPP, L-i-E policy or language maintenance and shift in a multilingual situation like the one focussed on in this study can afford to ignore the English-medium schools.

As a final note, Pashto is not an endangered language, because Pashtuns in general are proudly attached to it. The elite English-medium schools represent a small fraction of Pashtun society. Nevertheless, some of the ideas about the L-i-E policy and languages in general that this study has illuminated have implications far beyond the context of elite
schools. If we are to accept the way May (2006) looks at language shift, Pashto, and for that matter most of the other ingenious languages in Pakistan, are certainly passing through the first stage of language shift, which the first stage, according to May, involves increasing pressure on minority language speakers to speak the majority language, particularly in the formal domain. This stage is often facilitated by the introduction of education in the majority or dominant language.

However, despite the overall grim situation for indigenous languages, there are also glimmers of hope. Slowly but surely, Pakistanis are realizing the gravity of the situation. Discussions around indigenous languages issues often surface in the media and in parliament. With education becoming a provincial subject after the 18th constitutional amendment, there is now a greater hope for the revitalization of these languages through education. On the scholarly front, the few Pakistani authors that I have referred to in this study are making significant efforts to highlight minority language issues through their publications and participation in seminars and conferences. Coleman and Capstick (2012) produced a detailed report on language in education in Pakistan in a follow-up to Coleman’s study in 2010, sponsored by the British Council. The report, which also includes a case study of the language profile of KP, derives its data from policy dialogues (among eminent academics, linguists and government officials), conference presentations, consultations with a group of provincial (KP) ministers, and interactions with the public through radio, letters and emails. The authors’ recommendations include, among others, the use of MT as MoI for at least the first few years of education, and the teaching of Urdu and English at points when the child is ready for them. At the same time, the authors believe that “there are still too many misapprehensions and myths which influence the perceptions of stakeholders and in consequence there is still too much apprehension about the risks of change” (p. 69). They therefore propose a comprehensive research-oriented program to arrive at a stable multilingual education policy: original research, data mining and dissemination, advocacy, establishment of a national consortium and local working groups, and research training. A serious consideration of this program could move LPP in a positive direction. Most recently the Lahore Declaration on Language Sciences and the Developing World (Tupas & Mahboob, 2013), signed by 23 national and international scholars of applied linguistics, proposed a robust overhauling of the prevailing LPP. The
recommendations include, among others, the development of research on local languages, policies and pedagogies that are multilingually oriented, and the development of resources on and in local languages. This study, I hope, serves as a useful contribution to all those efforts. Finally, with L-i-E policies and the fate of indigenous languages hinging on the political decisions and ideological stances of people in power, ultimately it has to be the grassroots actors—people, schools, groups and community—who make prudent decisions with regard to their languages.
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Appendix B: Participant information sheets and consent forms were given to students, teachers, principals and parents. Here I give only the students’ forms.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title: A study of the language attitudes and use of English-medium school students in North West Pakistan

Researcher Name: Ajmal Khan

To: Students

My name is Ajmal Khan. I am a PhD student in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, University of Auckland. As part of my research I am investigating the language-in-education policy of the government of Pakistan with special focus on the English medium school curriculum. I am also examining the secondary and higher secondary school students’ language attitudes and use of the three languages that are normally used in Pakistan; i.e. English, mother tongue and Urdu. I request your cooperation in data collection for this project. This research will help students, teachers, parents and school authorities by raising their sensitivity to language issues such as: language attitudes and use, language loss and maintenance, bilingualism, and language policy. The research is funded through the scholarship of higher Education Commission (HEC), Pakistan, and the University of Auckland doctoral research fund.

To get an understanding of the students’ attitudes towards and use of the languages, students will be asked to fill in a questionnaire, participate in focus groups, and hold individual interviews. In addition to this, the researcher will also observe English lessons according to the teacher’s convenience over a period of 3 months. The questionnaire has 5 sections and takes an average of 25 minutes to complete. Section 1 contains questions about the patterns of language use; section 2 elicits information about the instrumental value of the three languages; section 3 contains questions about the students’ beliefs about the pride, prestige and identity value of the 3 languages; section 4 elicits students’ perceptions of their own proficiency level in the three languages; and section 5 asks the background information about the participants. Three focus groups of about 4-5 students will also be formed. Students will be asked to discuss a topic related to language for about 40 minutes. The individual interviews will be held with students from the focus groups. To ensure accurate collection of data, I would like to videotape the focus groups discussion and audiotape the individual interviews.

Participation in this research is voluntary. Your school principal has given assurance that your participation or non-participation in this study shall not in any way affect your grades or relation with the school. You may agree to participate in any one or all of these. You will have the right to withdraw your information, except the focus groups, within 25 days after data collection. You may agree to the interview but may not agree to the audio recording. You can also request to stop recording at any time. In that case, I will make handwritten notes. The video recording of focus groups cannot be stopped. However, you will have the option of not answering any question or leaving the focus group when you wish.
I will report the information in a way that you will not be identifiable. The data collected in this project is for my PhD research and related publications. All collected information will be kept in a locked cabinet and the electronic files on a secure network in the university, and will be destroyed/deleted after 6 years. If you or your school would like to have a copy of the summary of results it will be provided. The final report of this study will be submitted to the supervisor at the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics and to external examiners in the form of a thesis in 2012.

Thank you very much for your time and help in making this study possible. If you have any queries or wish to know more please contact me by any means shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address in New Zealand</th>
<th>Address in Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ajmal Khan (ID: 4576066)  
Dept of Applied Language Studies & Linguistics, The Faculty of Arts, University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Email: akha099@aucklanduni.ac.nz  
Contact (Auckland): 0064-2102973878 | Ajmal Khan  
Mohallah Sana Khel, V & P.O Topi, NWFP Pakistan  
Email: ajmal_bazmi@yahoo.com  
Contact (Pakistan): +92-938-271312 |

OR

You can contact my supervisor or Head of the department whose contact details are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Professor, Gary Barkhuizen</th>
<th>Head of the Dept: Professor Yan Huang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Room 906, Fisher Building, Dept of Applied Language Studies & Linguistics, The Faculty of Arts, University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Email: g.barkhuizen@auckland.ac.nz  
Phone: +64 9 373 7599 ext 88197 | Room 804, Fisher Building, Dept of Applied Language Studies & Linguistics, The Faculty of Arts, University of Auckland, New Zealand  
Email: yan.huang@auckland.ac.nz  
Phone: +64 9 373 7599 ext 87809 |

For any queries regarding ethical concerns please contact:

The Chair, the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee  
The University of Auckland, Office of the Vice Chancellor  
Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142  
New Zealand, Tel: 64 9 373 7999 ext. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON .......... for ..........years on ........, Reference Number 2010/......
CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENTS

THIS CONSENT FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF SIX YEARS

Title: A study of the language attitudes and use of English-medium school students in North West Pakistan

Researcher: Ajmal Khan

I have been told about this research project and I understand what it is about. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

I understand that I am free to leave the research at any time without giving a reason.

I understand that the Principal of the School has given permission for this study, and has given assurance that my participation or non-participation in this study will not affect my grades.

I understand that I will fill up a questionnaire, participate in a focus group and in interview. Also I understand that my English class will be observed.

I understand that the interview will be audio recorded and that the recording can be stopped at any time on request.

I understand that focus groups will be videotaped, and that the video recording cannot be stopped. However, I will have the option of not answering any question or leaving the focus group when I wish.

I understand that I have the right to withdraw my data up within 25 days after data collection. I understand that the focus group data cannot be withdrawn.

I understand that my name will not be used in the research report and I will not be identifiable.

I understand that data will be stored for 6 years in a locked cabinet on university premises and then the data will be deleted/destroyed by deleting the files and shredding the hard copies.

Please encircle your preferred options below:

• I agree / do not agree to participate in survey questionnaire.

• I agree / do not agree to participate in focus groups.

• I agree / do not agree to participate in individual interviews.

  Agree / do not agree to audio recording

• I agree / do not agree to my class observation.

• I would like / would not like to obtain a copy of summary of results of my data.

Student’s name: ______________________

Signed: ________________________________ Date:

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON .......... for ........ years on ......., Reference Number 2010/......
Appendix C: Urdu translation of the parents Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form
بالدين كم لمنى احزة نامه فارم

اس بوالات اسكتش 6 سال بوني.

عنوان: تجربة كتابة ومحادثة باللغة الإنجليزية كطريقة لتحسين قدرة اللغة والتعبير.

كما نحن نحقق النتائج التي قبضت على أي الناس، حيث تأتي إلى أخذ كتبة وموتورب، ونستخدم المعرفة في مجال اللغة والتعبير.

من المتوقع أن يكون هذا البحث مفيداً في مجال اللغة والتعبير، حيث يمكنه استخدامه في مجالات اللغة والتعبير المختلفة.

سراج محمد

---

درج ذي مقرر لابن مستخدم شهد دليل للمهاجرين.

من خلال التقارير، نستطيع أن نرى مدى تأثير استخدام هذا المقرر.

من خلال التقارير، نستطيع أن نرى مدى تأثير استخدام هذا المقرر.

من خلال التقارير، نستطيع أن نرى مدى تأثير استخدام هذا المقرر.

---
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Appendix D: Questionnaire

SECTION A: PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE USE

1. This language is the medium of communication in my school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I study this language as a subject at this school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The language I speak with friends outside the class (canteen, playground etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The language I speak with my parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The language I speak with my siblings/brother(s) and sister(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The language I speak with relatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The language I speak with guests at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The language I speak in market / fast-food spots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The language I speak at weddings and parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The language I speak inside and outside the mosque.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The language I speak when I have to express sentiments like love and anger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The language I speak to express my ethnic cultural values and talk about issues relevant to my ethnic group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The language I usually speak in government offices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The language I use when I talk about sports, music and movies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The language I use to read stories and novels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The language I use to read newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The language I use to watch/listen to TV and radio programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The language I use to exchange texts/emails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Some time</th>
<th>Almost none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B: ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH, PASHTO & URDU

Instructions: For the following items, please indicate your answer with a tick (✓) in one space on the scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly disagree) for each language.

1. I prefer to speak this language because it is necessary for getting jobs in Pakistan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I prefer to speak this language because it is necessary for getting a job abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. This language is essential if I want to promote my business in Pakistan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Up-to-date information/knowledge can be acquired through this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I like this language because it is an international language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. It is easy to study science subjects like physics, maths, computer science, biology and geography in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. It is easy to study arts subjects like literature, Islamic studies and history in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The use of this language in government and business offices helps in getting things done easily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The development of our country is possible if people are competent in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. It is easy to learn this language because textbooks and teaching aids (like online resources, TV programs) are easily available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I find it easy to discuss movies, sports and music in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I find it easy to discuss politics, the economy and industrial products in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. I would like to have this language as medium of communication in every school in my province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I think learning will be easy and interesting if this becomes the language of communication at schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The academic standard of my school will fall if this becomes the language of instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Using this language will impede our national unity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Education will not be successful due to shortage of vocabulary in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I like learning/speaking this language because it helps me to know various cultures and to interact with people from diverse backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. The fluent use of this language helps me make friends easily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. The use of this language helps me identify with the wider population nationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The use of this language helps me identify with the wider population internationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I love/enjoy music in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. When I hear someone speak this language well, I wish I could speak like him/her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I want to speak/read this language because I love the culture and literature of the native speakers of this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I love this language because it is the language of my ancestors/forefathers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Feelings and emotions (e.g. love, anger, sympathy) can be easily expressed in this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. My ability to be fluent in this language makes me feel superior to those who cannot speak it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. My ability to speak this language fluently is a matter of pride for my parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. One cannot be considered a Balochi/Pashtun/Punjabi/Sindi etc. if he/she doesn’t speak this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. One cannot be considered a Pakistani if he/she doesn’t speak this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. This language must be accepted as language of education in schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa if pride is to develop among native speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Without this language I would miss out on many rewarding and enjoyable parts of culture, such as folk music and indigenous literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

In this section you rate yourself how well you can perform in various activities/situations in terms of the 4 basic skills (Listening, Reading, Speaking, and Writing) in English, Mother Tongue and Urdu. Rate how well you can perform the various activities in the three languages on a scale of 1 (cannot do it at all) to 5 (can do it comfortably). Circle the appropriate level.

**SCALE**
1. I cannot do it at all.
2. I can do it but with great difficulty.
3. I can do it but with some difficulty.
4. I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty.
5. I can do it comfortably.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LISTENING PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MOHER TONGUE</th>
<th>URDU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I can follow clearly expressed speech directed at me in everyday conversation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I can understand phrases, words and expressions related to areas of sports, politics, business etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I can understand the main points of radio news bulletins and simpler recorded material on topics of personal interest delivered relatively slowly and clearly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I can watch and understand a TV program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I can understand simple technical information, such as operating instructions for everyday equipment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I can understand films without too much effort.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I can understand nearly everything that a native speaker says at normal speed, although occasional repetition may be necessary.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MOHER TONGUE</th>
<th>URDU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I can understand the main points in short newspaper articles about current and familiar topics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I can read columns or interviews in newspapers and general magazines.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I can guess the meaning of single unknown words from the context thus deducing (i.e. assuming/infering) the meaning of expressions if the topic is familiar.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I can skim (i.e. get the general idea) short written texts (e.g., news summaries) and find relevant facts and information (e.g., who has done what and where).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I can understand the most important information in short simple everyday information brochures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I can understand simple messages and standard letters (for example from businesses, clubs or authorities).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 In private letters I can understand those parts dealing with events, feelings and wishes well enough to correspond regularly with a pen friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I can understand the plot of a clearly structured story and recognise what the</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>MOHER TONGUE</td>
<td>URDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I can start, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can ask for and follow detailed directions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can narrate a story.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can explain and give reasons for my plans, intentions and actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can give detailed accounts of experiences, describing feelings and reactions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can express and respond to feelings such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest and indifference.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can describe dreams, hopes and ambitions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can orally express the main ideas of short written passages in my own words.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITING PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MOHER TONGUE</th>
<th>URDU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can write simple connected texts on a range of topics within my field of interest and can express personal views and opinions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can write simple paragraphs and compositions about experiences or events, for example about a trip, for a school newspaper or a club newsletter.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can write personal letters to friends or acquaintances asking for or giving them news and narrating events.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can describe in a personal letter the plot of a film or a book or give an account of a concert.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In a letter I can express feelings such as grief, happiness, interest, regret and sympathy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can reply in written form to advertisements and ask for more complete or more specific information about products (for example a car or an academic course).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can convey – via fax, e-mail or circular – short simple factual information to friends or colleagues or ask for information in such a way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can write about my future plans and the reasons for them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Age: ........................................
- Gender: ......................................
- Class / Year: ..................................
- Number of years in this school: ..................
- Language of communication in your previous School..................
- Number of years in your previous school..................
- Mother tongue / native language: ..........................
- Father's native language: ..........................
- Mother's native language: ..........................
- Number of years you lived in a city/country where the general population spoke a language other than your mother tongue (If not applicable, leave it) ..................................
Appendix E: Detailed results of the students’ proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

### Appendix E: Detailed results of the students’ proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

#### Listening proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

| **I cannot do it at all. (1)** | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |   |
| **I can do it but with great difficulty. (2)** | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |   |
| **I can do it but with some difficulty. (3)** | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 9 |   |
| **I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty. (4)** | 13 | 12 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 22 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 26 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 30 | 17 | 28 | 20 | 13 | 23 |   |
| **I can do it comfortably. (5)** | 69 | 63 | 56 | 62 | 56 | 52 | 59 | 49 | 46 | 65 | 47 | 47 | 59 | 36 | 66 | 61 | 43 | 46 | 48 | 46 | 48 | 60 | 61 | 49 |   |

#### Reading proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

| **I cannot do it at all. (1)** | 1 | 32 | 5 | 1 | 35 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 6 | 1 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 2 | 1 | 29 | 2 |   |
| **I can do it but with great difficulty. (2)** | 3 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 3 |   |
| **I can do it but with some difficulty. (3)** | 4 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 12 | 14 | 17 | 6 | 16 | 15 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 11 |   |
| **I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty. (4)** | 27 | 14 | 27 | 22 | 12 | 24 | 31 | 14 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 32 | 25 | 12 | 28 | 19 | 16 | 22 | 14 | 11 | 29 | 22 | 18 | 29 |   |
| **I can do it comfortably. (5)** | 55 | 15 | 38 | 62 | 12 | 31 | 42 | 19 | 23 | 53 | 19 | 32 | 60 | 20 | 41 | 64 | 20 | 50 | 65 | 20 | 41 | 58 | 16 | 42 |   |

#### Speaking proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

| **I cannot do it at all. (1)** | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 6 |   |
| **I can do it but with great difficulty. (2)** | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 3 |   |
| **I can do it but with some difficulty. (3)** | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 10 |   |
| **I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty. (4)** | 36 | 14 | 22 | 24 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 34 | 17 | 28 | 28 | 13 | 11 | 25 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 17 | 22 |   |
| **I can do it comfortably. (5)** | 48 | 59 | 52 | 59 | 52 | 56 | 57 | 50 | 52 | 54 | 54 | 51 | 47 | 53 | 44 | 55 | 61 | 57 | 54 | 55 | 47 | 54 | 54 | 48 |   |

#### Writing proficiency in English, mother tongue and Urdu

| **I cannot do it at all. (1)** | 0 | 37 | 4 | 1 | 44 | 4 | 1 | 47 | 5 | 1 | 49 | 7 | 2 | 46 | 4 | 1 | 47 | 7 | 1 | 48 | 11 | 1 | 51 | 6 |   |
| **I can do it but with great difficulty. (2)** | 0 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 5 |   |
| **I can do it but with some difficulty. (3)** | 5 | 5 | 17 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 5 | 13 | 15 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 9 | 15 |   |
| **I can do it fairly well but with occasional difficulty. (4)** | 27 | 8 | 35 | 19 | 4 | 34 | 23 | 5 | 23 | 24 | 3 | 28 | 16 | 4 | 24 | 20 | 6 | 28 | 27 | 7 | 30 | 20 | 5 | 24 |   |
| **I can do it comfortably. (5)** | 56 | 12 | 27 | 61 | 6 | 27 | 58 | 3 | 39 | 56 | 4 | 34 | 58 | 5 | 35 | 58 | 6 | 29 | 54 | 5 | 26 | 62 | 6 | 38 |   |
Appendix F: Interview Guidelines (teachers, students and parents)

Teacher background

- Please tell me about your mother tongue?
- How long have you been teaching English?
- Have you received any formal qualification/training for teaching English as a foreign language? Was it school sponsored, or your own effort?
- In school, which language do you normally speak with students, with other staff members, and outside school?

School language policy

- Is the language-in-education policy of (name of school) appropriate in principle?
- Why?
- What guidelines or requirements has your school authorities given you on how you should teach English?
- Is there any restriction on the use or non-use of any language(s) in class and outside the class?
- In the implementation of the code of language usage, do you tend to follow the school policy?
- Would you support the school initiative of introducing MT as a compulsory subject like Urdu/English till class 12th? Why?
- What is the language of communication in other subjects like Physics, Maths, Pakistan Studies etc.?

Philosophy of teaching and language beliefs

- Is the mother tongue of the students taught as a subject in this school?
- By excluding the mother tongue altogether from the school curriculum, do you think the school policy is doing harm to the students MT?
- Do you think the students who have studied in this school over the years are fluent enough in English to speak effortlessly on various themes, in a variety of context?
- Do you think that students can get command over the three languages (English, Urdu, MT) at the same time? Why?
• Please tell me about what you believe is the best way to learn and teach a foreign language?
• As a teacher how would you describe the three languages in terms of importance for your students? What role do you think MT plays in terms of the acquisition of the other two languages?
• Do you think subjects like science and social studies could also be taught in MT? How? And Urdu? How?
• What impact, in your opinion, would it have on the school vision, and goals etc. How do you perceive the parents’ reaction?
• Do you think the students at your school are in a difficult position to gain knowledge and develop skills like reading and writing in a foreign language? Why?
• Why do you think learning English is important for your students?
• As a teacher of English, have you noticed any influence of foreign culture and values, and loss of local values in your students?

Strategies

• Which language(s) do you and your students use in class? Outside the class?
• What is your approach to students using their first language in the classroom?
• Which language do you encourage your students to speak outside the class.
• When your students have problem in understanding what you say in English, what do you do?

Perception of societal/parents’ expectations

• Do you see any advantage for the students if they are taught in their MT?
• In your meetings with parents, what sort of opinions do you usually get in terms of the language of instruction?
• Do you think your students have certain language related goals when they study in this school? And their parents?

Students’ Interview Questions

• Which language do you normally speak in class?
• Is it the school and/or teacher policy or you feel yourself that you should speak this language?
• Which language do you and your teachers speak in classes of other subjects like physics, Pakistan Studies, Islamic studies etc.?
• Do you think you can learn subjects like science and arts in Urdu? And in mother tongue?
• Which language do you generally speak during games and at canteen or café?
• Which of the three languages (English, Urdu, Pashtu) you think is your dominant language?
• Ok, so this (name the language) is your less dominant or weak language. Can you think of any reason why it remains your weak language? And why can’t you use this language with a native-like ability?
• Do you sometimes feel that your ability of one language is a hindrance to your fluency in the other? If yes, can you discuss with some examples?
• Do you sometimes feel peer pressure not to use a particular language in school time?
• Do you sometimes feel peer pressure not to use a particular language outside the school?
• How do your friends react if you speak a language they do not expect you to speak?
• Are there any activities at your school that are dedicated to recognizing your ethnic language and culture?
• Do your teachers discuss with you the importance of various languages? How would you summarise their views about the three languages?

Parents’ interview questions
• Could you tell me why have you sent your son/daughter to (name of school)?
• Are you satisfied with the language-in-education policy of the school?
• Any ideas/suggestions for the school in terms of the language-in-education policy?
• How would you compare this school, which is purely English medium, with a government school, which may be Urdu medium, or partially English medium?
• How would you rate the three languages (English, Urdu, Mother tongue) in terms of importance for your children?
• Which language do you normally speak with your children at home?
• Which language would you like your children to speak fluently outside the home; i.e. in school? Why?
• Which language would you like your children to speak fluently at a social gathering like a wedding? Why?
• Which language would you like your children to speak fluently at government offices? Why?
• Do you think your child can become proficient in three languages at the same time?
• How would you rate your child’s proficiency in the three languages: English, Urdu and MT?
• Do you think that one language can become a hurdle in the proficiency of the other?
• Can you give some specific example from your child’s experience?
• Would you support the initiative of the school introducing mother tongue as a compulsory subject, like Urdu? Why?
• Do you think your child’s MT is rich enough for education at school and higher level?
• To put it simply, do you think your child will easily grasp concepts of science and improve skills (reading writing etc.) if the language of education is MT? Why? And if it is Urdu or English? Why?

**Focus Group Interview Guidelines**

The discussion will revolve around the following topics:

• The role of languages in coping with the challenges of globalization
• Language and identity
• Your perception of the importance of English, Pashto and Urdu
School A

Computer Room Observations

- As I enter the room, the teacher greets me.
- Introduces me to the class.
- Says a few words, and seeks their consent for observation and voice recording once again (written PIS & consent already done).
- Lesson starts; Topic: Figures of Speech.
- Teacher recapitulates the previous lesson.
- Talks in English.
- Asks some Qs about previous lesson.
- Students respond in English.
- Students are asked to read a passage, a piece of literary prose, and identify figures of speech, metaphors, and so on.
- Silence for about 10 min.
- Student, sitting closer to me, chat from time to time, discuss the passage.
- Conversation is in English.
- Discussion between the teacher and students follows.
- Class ends after 40 minutes.

As the class comes to end I did not hear any language other than English.

Student–student conversation too was in English.

No specific instructions about language in the class. Use of English appears to be a usual practice.
Wednesday 22 Sep (2010)
School A
Class: A Level

- I have been told to wait in the computer room for 40 minutes until a teacher is free for an interview.
- About 10 PCs and 6 Tables with chairs in the room.
- Three students are already sitting at the table near me.
- As I check my emails and surf the net, I can hear them using a mixture of English and Pashto.
- Non-academic sports related topic
- More students enter the room.
- Two girls and one boy join the ones near me.
- Others occupy the remaining tables.
- They seem to be discussing a group project.
- Medium of communication now is predominantly English, with occasional switches to Urdu and Pashto.
- I get up to interview the teacher.
Appendix H: Detailed conceptual framework

Detailed conceptual framework for LPP at the macro and micro levels
E= English, M=mother tongue, U=Urdu
Relationship Symbols: Essential link/relationship (---), causative (---→), mutually reinforcing (←→), and resistive/ambivalent (⊥⊥⊥⊥).
Appendix I: The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority Bill, 2011
(selected clauses)

The Data below belong to the previous tenure (2008-2013), new data is under the process and will be uploaded when the new elected honorable MPA’s complete the forms circulated by the IT section. The Election Process of newly elected Speaker Hon’ble Asad Qaiser Khan & Hon’ble Deputy Speaker Imtiaz Shahid Qureshi has been successfully completed.

The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority Bill, 2011.

A BILL

to provide for the establishment of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Regional Languages Authority for the purpose of teaching and promotion of regional languages in the Province of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

WHEREAS clause (3) of Article 251 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan provides that without prejudice to the status of the National Language, a Provincial Assembly may by law prescribe measures for the teaching, promotion and use of provincial languages in addition to the national language;

AND WHEREAS Article 18 provides further that subject to Article 251, any section of citizens, having a distinct language, script or culture shall have the right to preserve and promote the same and subject to law establish institutions for the purpose;

AND WHEREAS it is the natural aspiration and desire of the people of the Province of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa to promote the teaching and use of widely spoken regional languages in the Province of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

6. Powers and functions of the Authority.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act and the rules, the Authority shall exercise such powers, as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(2) Without the prejudice of generality of the foregoing sub-section (1), the Authority shall—

(a) consider ways and means for promotion of regional languages and to make all necessary arrangements in this regard for teaching, promotion and use of regional languages;

(b) coordinate and ensure correct use of regional languages;

(c) promote the use of regional languages through general publications and to undertake preparation and publication of dictionaries, encyclopedia, reference book, scientific literature and periodicals;

(d) arrange translation and publication of technical terms in science, home economics, humanities and commerce subjects;

(e) announce and arrange prizes, awards, seminars, lectures and adopt any other measures for promoting any of the above objectives;

(f) recommend to Government a curriculum and syllabus for the gradual teaching of the regional languages spoken in the Province; and

(g) take any other steps which is incidental or consequential to any of the aforesaid functions.
17. **Annual Report.**—(1) The Authority shall, as soon as possible after the end of every financial year, submit an annual report to Government on the conduct of its affairs for that year, and on its proposals for the next ensuing financial year.

   (2) The annual report referred to in sub-section (1) shall, as soon as possible, be laid by Government before the Provincial Assembly of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

18. **No discrimination on linguistic basis.**—Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, no person shall be discriminated against on the basis of his regional language.

19. **Public Servants.**—The officers, officials, consultants and advisers of Directorate shall, while acting or purporting to act in pursuance of the provisions of this Act, or the rules or regulations made thereunder, be deemed to be public servants within the meaning of section 21 of the Pakistan Penal Code 1860.

20. **Indemnity.**—No suit, prosecution or other legal proceedings shall be initiated against the Authority, its Chairperson, members, Executive Director, officers, officials, advisers and consultants of the Directorate in respect of anything in a good faith done and indemnity to be done under this Act.

21. **Power to make rules.**—Subject to the provisions of this Act, Government may make rules for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

22. **Power to make regulations.**—Subject to the provisions of this Act and the rules, the Authority may, with the approval of Government, make regulations, as may be necessary, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

23. **Application of this Act.**—The application of the provisions of this Act shall be in a manner that it shall not prejudice the use of the national language.

24. **Removal of the difficulties.**—If any difficulty arises in giving effect to any provision of this Act, Government may, in consultation with the Authority, issue orders, not inconsistent with the Act or the rules made thereunder, for the removal of the difficulty.

**STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS**

Pashito, being one of the ancient languages of the world, represents a rich and deep culture. Over time, due to negligence, this language has begun to erode. Similarly, other regional languages spoken in the Province i.e. Hindko, Saraiki, Kohar and Kohistani etc. have not received proper attention for their promotion so far. There is an immediate need to preserve, protect and promote these languages to conserve the very cultures they represent, in terms of Article 251 (3) of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Hence this Bill.