‘IT IS A DIALECT, NOT A LANGUAGE!’— INVESTIGATING TEACHERS’ BELIEFS ABOUT MEWATI

PRERNA BAKSHI

The Education University of Hong Kong

Abstract

There is a paucity of research on dialect awareness among teachers, particularly in South Asia. This paper investigates teachers’ beliefs about Mewati, a vernacular language variety spoken by the Meo people living in Haryana, India. Data was collected primarily through detailed semi-structured interviews from local native Mewati speaking Meo and non-Meo teachers working in rural government and urban private schools. Nearly all teachers expressed unfavourable beliefs towards Mewati and discouraged its use in the classroom. This despite teachers candidly admitting students struggle, often as late as the eighth grade, with the standard language(s) of Hindi and/or English adopted as the medium of instruction. Viewing this as a rite of passage all students must go through, teachers normalized the status quo by calling it a ‘natural’ and ‘transitory’ phase. This article argues, however, that these teachers’ beliefs and practices leave students struggling for far too long during their crucial years of learning and development. 50% of students leave school before reaching the eighth grade in India (UNICEF, 2005). These high dropout rates found across Mewat and India more generally could partly be explained by student alienation. Part of this alienation is a result of disregarding students’ first languages which are stigmatized as ‘dialects’.

Keywords: language policy, language ideology, language attitude, teachers’ beliefs, mother tongue

Bakshi, P. (2020). ‘It is a dialect, not a language!’—Investigating teachers’ beliefs about Mewati. L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 20, 1-24.
https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2020.20.01.06
Corresponding author: Prerna Bakshi, The Education University of Hong Kong, email: prernabakshi84@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

For over five decades, sociolinguists have demonstrated that all language varieties are equal from a linguistic perspective, as equally rule-governed, complex and fully communicative systems (Labov, 1969). While sociolinguists have long accepted the claim 'all languages are equal' as an "unquestioned truism" (Sampson, 2009, p. 1), it has been challenged in the last several years on the basis of, among others, grammatical complexity in that not all languages are equally complex with some being more complex than others, thereby not being equal (Dahl, 2009). One of the challenges making it difficult to test the accuracy of this claim is the presence of several questions that currently go unanswered, for example it remains unclear: how one defines a language (how one delineates where one language begins and another ends, what principles or criteria guide such decision-making and are they uniformly or fairly applied), under what conditions a language is said to be 'equal', and how does one measure this 'equality' (Weston-Taylor, 2013, p. 4).

More recently, sociolinguists have questioned the very notion of language as a bounded, fixed, and nameable system and have argued that 'languages' are not separate, autonomous, and countable entities but instead are characterized by their fluidity, exist on a continuum, and are deployed as semiotic resources from a linguistic repertoire of an individual (Blommaert, 2010; García & Wei, 2014; Makoni & Pennycook, 2005). As a result, questioning the relevance of language per se particularly in the bilingual context, García (2009) recommends focusing on students' "multiple discursive practices" that constitute "languaging" (p. 40). This practice of "engaging in bilingual or multilingual discourse practices" is called "translanguaging" (García, 2009, p. 64). These sociolinguists argue what speakers often use is language features and not 'languages' per se and as such shifting our attention from treating 'languages' as the level of analysis to 'resources' could bring about a change in notions such as 'competence' (Blommaert, 2010, p. 102). However, the manner in which competence is perceived and measured in education still rests on the assumption that languages are separate entities, not necessarily equal in terms of their educational value. Thus, while it can be said that all languages are capable of performing any task, rendering them equally valid, certain language varieties nevertheless continue to be stigmatized and excluded from the educational domain (Siegel, 2006, p. 157). The monolingual mindset is all-pervasive and has long dominated language in education policy. Ndhlovu's (2015) idea of 'ignored lingualism' suggests there is resistance to the normalcy of multilingualism and the associated "diversity of language practices and conceptualizations" (Ndhlovu, 2015, p. 398).

Wolfram (2008) posited that knowledge of language and in particular dialect diversity is virtually non-existent in the public education system (p. 189). He argued that this trend is noticeable among students and teachers alike, in that neither the learning outcomes nor the teacher training programs incorporate knowledge about language diversity (ibid). Thus, he noted that despite the significance that is usually attached to dialect diversity programs for their role in teaching and learning

practices, very few linguists and classrooms teachers have been engaged in programs dealing with this issue (ibid). Consequently, dialects usually suffer from linguistic subordination where deep prejudices are held against them within the school environment, and in society and the community more generally.

This study seeks to bridge this gap by examining teachers' beliefs about varieties labelled as 'dialects', such as Mewati which is subsumed under Hindi (GOI, 2001a) and exploring the role (or lack thereof) such language varieties play in classrooms. The primary question this study seeks to answer is: What are teachers' beliefs regarding the use of learners' mother tongue, Mewati, in the classroom?

Before discussing the literature on language beliefs, it is important to place Mewati in relation to Hindi and other dominant languages. For this, it is pertinent to look into the language-in-education policy (LiEP) in India. Following this section, is a discussion of arguments regarding the use (or lack thereof) of L1 (first language) in L2 (target language) classrooms. When it comes to dialects and standard languages, there is often confusion between what qualifies for a first or second language. In Mewat for instance, what is often taught as learners' L1 (Hindi as a medium of instruction and subject), in reality is closer to being students' L2. Jhingran (2009) noted this trend became common across India from the late 1960s with the introduction of the Three Language Formula that became part of India's LiEP (p. 275) which is discussed below. Finally, there is a review of the scholarship on language beliefs.

1.1 The Three Language Formula (TLF): Historical overview of India's LiEP

Mohanty (2006) once argued, "[E]ducation in India is only superficially multilingual, and it remains monolingual at an underlying level. The official three-language formula is more abused and less used" (p. 279). Back in 1956, the All India Council for Education recommended TLF as India's LiEP (Vaish, 2008, p. 14). Following a series of modifications, the TLF finally came into effect in 1968 (ibid). All these actions demonstrated the complex situation of language politics in India, "which the government thinks is best left untouched" (ibid). The TLF was seen as an educational strategy that was best designed to cope with India's multilingualism and language diversity by introducing languages of/in education at the national, regional and local levels (Srivastava, 2007, p. 43).

The TLF formula suggested teaching: "a) The regional language and mother tongue when the latter is different from the regional language, b) Hindi, or in Hindi speaking areas, another Indian language, and c) English or any other modern European language" (Dasgupta 1970, p. 244). One of the most significant problems with TLF about minority languages (defined as spoken by those who may be a minority numerically or groups belonging to religious/ethnic/linguistic minorities) is that 'mother tongue' often gets equated to 'regional language'. States have, thus, interpreted this formula differently to suit their requirements and agendas, with the result that most minority languages find themselves pushed out of the educational domain (Vanishree, 2011, p. 350).

Since regional languages deemed as 'official' carry political weight and are usually spoken/understood by a large population, in addition to being taught as mandatory subjects in schools, this invariably affects the fate of minority languages. The rationale given to justify the exclusion of minority languages from schools is that they are not fully developed and lack standardised scripts and as a result are 'ill-equipped' to become languages of education (Koul & Devaki, 2000, p. 121). In the case of so-called non-standard varieties, including children's mother tongues, Jhingran (2009) claimed, they are often supplanted by their standard variety, usually the official regional language (p. 275).

This exclusion of minority languages from schools is a form of "submersion education" or "sink or swim model" that leads to "subtractive learning" i.e. second language learning at the expense of the mother tongue for learners who do speak the dominant language of the classroom (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, pp. 582-587). This gives rise to grave problems. According to Jhingran (2009), in India "...almost 25% of primary school children face moderate to severe problems in the initial months and years of primary school because their home language differs from the school language" (p. 267). Amongst others, one such group is that of those "who speak a language that is considered a 'dialect' of the regional language" (ibid).

The results of this study, as will be discussed later, confirmed this assertion by Jhingran. Almost all the teachers interviewed in this study admitted that Mewati speaking children, who constitute the majority of the student population, faced great difficulty in the initial years of primary school. They failed to comprehend Hindi, the medium of instruction used in schools.

This research was conducted in the region of Haryana, where Hindi is the state's official language. The failure of TLF implementation means that the standard variety, Hindi, is conflated with students' mother tongue, Mewati, and is taught as their first language in schools. As Jhingran (2009) pointed out, for most children in India, the standard regional language which is taught in schools is their second language, rather than their first language, particularly in the early primary stage (p. 275). This practice violates Article 350(A) of the Indian Constitution, which states that the primary education of the pupil must be in their mother tongue (Benedikter, 2009, p. 142).

The need for using the students' mother tongue in education was noted as early as 1953, when a UNESCO committee made a case for mother tongue in education and how it will be of benefit to students psychologically, sociologically and educationally (UNESCO, 1953, p. 11). A plethora of research exists that highlights the importance of using mother tongue in education, and though discussing it is beyond the scope of this paper, Mohanty (2009) asked a valid question: "Why then are the mother tongues neglected despite persuasive evidence to the contrary?" (p. 5). It is this issue that underpins this research.

From the pedagogical and acquisition of content knowledge perspective, learners, especially in the initial stage of learning, are likely to learn new concepts and content more effectively if the language used in the classroom corresponds to the

language they know best. As Pattanayak (1988) remarked, "If both the form (i.e. the language of instruction) and the content (for instance, scientific concepts) are foreign at the time of the presentation, you make the task impossibly difficult for the child, and defy the pedagogical principle" (p. 387).

In the field of second language acquisition and teacher education, the use of mother tongue or L1 as a medium of instruction in L2 classrooms has been a controversial issue for teachers as well as researchers. Talking about the lack of agreement that exists on using the student's L1 inside the classroom, and the role it plays, Littlewood and Yu (2011), suggested: "Positions range from insistence on total exclusion of the L1, towards varying degrees of recognition that it may provide valuable support for learning, either directly (e. g. as an element in a teaching technique or to explain a difficult point) or indirectly (e.g. to build positive relationships or help manage learning") (p. 64). The next section provides a brief overview of this debate.

1.2 Arguments regarding the use (or the lack thereof) of L1 in L2 (target language) classrooms

Since the 1880s, most teaching methods have discouraged the use of L1 in the L2 classroom (Cook, 2001, p. 404). An "anti-L1 attitude" has continued to persist (Cook, 2001, p. 405). According to Howatt (1984), "the monolingual principle, the unique contribution of the twentieth century to classroom language teaching, remains the bedrock notion from which the others ultimately derive" (p. 289). The medium of instruction or the use of L1 in L2 classrooms has been hotly contested.

However, second language acquisition literature points to several studies that conclude the use of L1 in the classroom can have several benefits. These include: classroom management, student control of learning, learning to make decisions on issues which emerge outside the classroom, developing metacognitive awareness of language learning strategies, thinking critically, exploring alternatives, and developing empathy for others' perspectives (Auerbach, 1993, p. 11).

That said, there are a variety of reasons why students' L1 is avoided in the classroom. Cook (2001) listed them as follows: The "argument from L1 learning" suggests L2 should be taught as exclusively as L1 was taught to monolingual speakers in the hope that this would result in a similar outcome, which it seldom does, and help them achieve the goal of being native speakers. The "argument from language compartmentalization" suggests L1 and L2 should be kept separate. The "argument for second language use in the classroom" suggests the learner needs to be exposed to the L2 language to learn it, and the aim should be to maximize exposure to L2 and avoid the use of L1 in the classroom (pp. 406-410).

The overall point is to use L1 sparingly, but as Cook (2001) stated, "this tenet has no straightforward theoretical rationale. The pressure from this mostly unacknowledged anti-L1 attitude has prevented language teaching from looking rationally at ways in which the L1 can be involved in the classroom. It has tended to

put an L2 straight jacket on the classroom which stifled any systematic use of the L1" (p. 410). Behind the non-use of L1, in part, lie underlying beliefs that prevent its use within the classroom.

1.3 The role of beliefs

Pajares (1992) provided a thorough review of beliefs, which he saw as a "messy construct" (p. 307). He argued since beliefs "travel in disguise and often under alias", it is hard to pin them down (p. 309). Aside from different terminologies that are often used to describe the same phenomenon, there is an added confusion when it comes to differentiating between knowledge and beliefs; often, it is hard to distinguish between the two (ibid). Pajares (1992) explained, "[b]elief is based on evaluation and judgement; knowledge is based on objective fact" (p. 313). That said, Pajares (1992) considered beliefs far more influential than knowledge when it comes to "determining how individuals organise and define problems and are stronger predictors of behaviour" (p. 311).

Following a review of dozens of works by prominent researchers, Pajares (1992) highlighted some critical dimensions of beliefs. One of them was that "the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter" (p. 317). This has significant implications in the context of education. Teachers' beliefs are formed early in life, partly as a result of their prior experience as learners, what Lortie (1975) called the "apprenticeship of observation", and these beliefs have the potential to shape teachers' assumptions, behaviour and classroom practices. Accordingly, Pajares (1992) claimed, "Individuals tend to hold on to beliefs based on incorrect or incomplete knowledge, even after scientifically correct explanations are provided to them" (p. 325).

Thus, to bring about any improvement, the individuals in question first have to be made aware of unconsciously held beliefs (Crandall, 2000, p. 35). This is consistent with Pajares (1992) who said, "Beliefs are unlikely to be replaced unless they prove unsatisfactory, and they are unlikely to prove unsatisfactory unless they are challenged, and one is unable to assimilate them into existing conceptions. When this happens, an anomaly occurs—something that should have been assimilable is resisted. Even then, belief change is the last alternative" (p. 321). However, "[t]his is not to say that beliefs do not change under any circumstance but that they do not change even when it is logical or necessary for them to do so" (Pajares, 1992, p. 317).

This is especially true in education where educational linguistic and sociolinguistic research show that despite the number of studies concluding that all 'non-standard' varieties are equally rule-bound, logical and well-formed systems as the standard varieties (e.g. Labov, 1969), prejudices continue to exist among teachers. As Scott, Straker and Katz (2009) cautioned, once teachers absorb these prejudices about language variation, the pedagogical damage is likely to occur (p. 179). Such prejudices have an impact on students by reducing teacher expectations for student abilities (Baugh, 2000; Scott et al., 2009, p. 179). This can lead to a self-fulfilling

prophecy where reduced teacher expectations cause weaker student performance (Scott et al., 2009, p. 179). Thus, it was important to see what beliefs were held by teachers in Haryana towards Mewati and its use within the classroom.

When it comes to beliefs regarding L1 or mother-tongue use in education, some common myths continue to persist. Heugh (2002), in her influential paper, laid bare some of them. Talking about bilingual and multilingual education in the context of South Africa, she asked why myths regarding mother-tongue education continue to persist, "despite evidence which is flimsy at best" (p. 177). She posited, "Claims are made about public perception", often without much evidence, but because they "are restated with such frequency, they become mythologized" (ibid).

Taken together then, the discussion on the role of beliefs as a psychological construct along with scholarship on the use/non-use of L1 in L2 classrooms and the historical account of India's LiEP frames the main reasoning of this article. The core question addressed is: What are teachers' beliefs regarding the use of learners' mother tongue, Mewati, in the classroom? The next section discusses the methodology employed.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research context

This study was conducted in the Mewat district of Haryana, a state that neighbors the capital of Delhi. Haryana's official language is Hindi. Two sub-districts were visited: Ghaghas village in Ferozepur Jhirka (rural government schools) and Nuh (urban school). According to the 2001 Census, Mewat's literacy rate was 44.07%, which was lower in comparison to both the state average of 68.59% and the national literacy rate of 65.38% (GOI, 2001b). Mewat is named after its traditional inhabitants: Meos. Meos are largely a pastoral-peasant Muslim community, classified as an 'other backward class' (OBC) by the Indian Government, meaning they are recognized as being socially and economically deprived. They speak Mewati which belongs to the Indo-Aryan family and is considered a dialect of Hindi. As per the 2001 Census, Mewati is spoken by 645,291 people as a mother tongue of which the majority live in the state of Haryana (347,260) (GOI, 2001c, p. 248).

2.2 Research design

This study employed a qualitative case study approach because it is useful in the exploratory phase of research when little is known about the phenomena in question (Yin, 2003, p. 9). In the absence of any sociolinguistic study with a focus on Mewati, an exploratory case study was considered the most appropriate strategy. A multiple-case study comparative design was adopted as schools in India affiliate to different boards which differ in textbook, curriculum, syllabus, and medium of instruction. Depending on the region and type of school, each school follows a different language

policy. In the state of Haryana, where this study is located, schools are broadly divided into rural or urban and Hindi medium or English medium schools. Therefore, a comparative analysis based on these two types of schools was deemed to be a logical starting point for this research. It provided a typical account so findings could be broadly transferable or compared to other similar contexts. Consequently, participants from two types of schools were chosen: Case 1: Hindi-medium/rural government school; Case 2: English-medium/urban private school.

Case 1 comprised of teachers from rural government/Hindi-medium schools A, B and C. From school A, the researcher collected detailed interviews with four teachers, all of whom were non-Meo, non-Muslim male teachers. The entire teaching staff comprised of non-Mewati speaking teachers who migrated from other parts of Haryana in order to fill teacher shortage concerns in the region. They expressed their frustration at a lack of transparency in transfer decisions and reported feeling 'stuck' in Mewat and wanted 'a way out'. In order to rectify this, data was collected from two Muslim Meo teachers who spoke Mewati as their first language, as this allowed for a local voice to emerge. They belonged to schools B and C. Both schools B and C were similar to School A regarding school type (rural/government), medium of instruction (Hindi), textbook and curriculum (State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT)), board of affiliation (The Board of School Education, Haryana), infrastructure (poor), students' socioeconomic background (low-income household) and location (Firozepur Jhirka), thus, enabling the generation of a single case (Case 1). According to the teachers, 90% of school students were Meos. The average student-teacher ratio was approximately 60:1. This compares unfavorably to government guidelines set under the Right to Education Act (2009) which stipulates a teacher-student ratio of 30:1. All teachers complained of lack of resources and poor educational outcomes.

Case 2 comprised of Meo and non-Meo teachers from School D, located in the district headquarter of Nuh, a relatively urbanized area in contrast to the rural setting of Schools A, B and C in Case 1. Meo students were estimated to be around 80-90% and the student-teacher ratio was 47:1, relatively better than Case 1 school type. Also, relatively better was the representation of Meo teachers in that Meo teachers constituted around 8 to 9 of the total teaching staff of 53. The infrastructure of this school was impressive and was significantly better than Case 1. Officials in School D boasted of being one of the best schools in Mewat producing high quality results each year. All the teachers interviewed, along with the principal and the education officer, mentioned that the official policy of the school was English. To provide quality education, this English medium school affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE), considered a prestige marker in India (ranked higher than schools affiliated to the State Board as in Case 1), was established as a model for other schools in the region to follow. In terms of textbooks and curricula, School D teachers took pride in being associated with the National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT), perceived as more prestigious than its state

counterpart SCERT. School D had a strict admission procedure which ensured only the 'best students' could get through. It did so through an 'admission test' at the nursery level.

2.3 Sampling approach

Purposeful sampling was used by selecting cases that could provide rich information (Patton, 2002, p. 230). Care was taken to include in the sample an equal number of Meo and non-Meo teachers to ensure balance and to bring a variety of views from those who spoke Mewati as their mother tongue to those who did not. A shortage of Meo government school teachers in Case 1, for instance, was resolved by a recommendation from non-Meo teachers from School A. Their recommendation, thus, led to interviewing Meo teachers from other similar schools (B and C). This sampling continued until informational redundancy or theoretical saturation was achieved i.e. no new information was revealed. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested, in a qualitative case study such as this, sample selection should continue "to the point of redundancy…If the purpose is to maximise information, the sampling is terminated when no new information is forthcoming from new sample units; thus, redundancy is the primary criterion" (p. 202).

2.4 Data collection method and analysis

In total, ten in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted, equally representing the voices of both Meo and non-Meo teachers working across these schools. This was done to elicit their beliefs regarding Mewati and reasons for its use or non-use within the classroom. Interviews ranged from thirty minutes to two hours, with most interviews lasting over an hour. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to the interviews. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and translated by the researcher. Data was analyzed through thematic analysis (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994).

The thematic framework analysis involved five analytical stages (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994) that guided the research process from data collection, analysis and writing up the final report. The first stage involved familiarization, i.e. getting familiar with the data. The researcher transcribed and translated the data, fully immersing herself by listening to the audio recordings, reading and re-reading all the interview transcripts, fieldnotes and memos taken during the study in order to make sense of the data, later listing initial codes on the margins of all the transcripts. The second stage was identifying a thematic framework. This involved identifying key issues, concepts and themes that were repeatedly invoked. For instance, a recurring theme noticed throughout interviews was 'purity of language', upon further reflection, it was further refined and collapsed under one of the core themes of 'hierarchization' as it became clear this was the underlying mechanism through which purity of the standard language was preserved by keeping the 'deviant' nonstandard variety isolated.

This process of constructing a tentative thematic framework underwent revision several times in the event any new themes emerged or if earlier ones required merging. Microsoft OneNote made this process easier and was used to organize a large volume of interview transcripts. New concepts and categories could easily be color-coded, highlighted, added, merged or refined, moved between pages within each section or across sections. The third stage was indexing. This was a fluid and iterative stage where the thematic framework was continuously refined to ensure responses were indexed as accurately as possible, grouped logically under well-defined themes that addressed the research question, and were in line with the research aim before proceeding to the next stage. The fourth stage was charting. This involved presenting and rearranging data in such a way that corresponded to an appropriate theme. The final stage was mapping and interpretation. Mind maps were used to map relationships between themes and sub-themes, seek explanations, and interpret the findings to reflect the broader patterns of associations between three key themes that emerged during the analysis stage.

Table 1 below provides an overview of participants chosen for this study. Pseudonyms have been used to preserve confidentiality.

2.5 Researcher's stance

Since beliefs could "strongly influence perception" (Pajares, 1992, p. 326) and I set out to explore teachers' beliefs, it is important to be explicit about researcher's reflexivity, i.e. about the values and beliefs carried by the researcher during the research process. This was a critical inquiry into both political and linguistic concerns uncovering how vernacular varieties continue to be marginalized. I draw on Pajares (1992) who argued that beliefs influencing perception is unavoidable, hence any endeavor undertaken about researching the construct of belief system is bound to be "messy" (p. 307). However, the best way to approach such an enquiry, Pajares (1992) reminded, is through a qualitative research methodology (p. 327).

In any qualitative research, the researcher is the main instrument involved in collecting, analyzing, interpreting and representing data (Merriam, 2002, p. 5). By giving an account of teachers' beliefs and reported practices regarding a non-standard variety, and the institutional and policy constraints that influenced those choices and behaviors, it is hoped an accurate representation of teachers' inferred beliefs has been portrayed. Ultimately, as with any research that investigates complex construct such as beliefs, Pajares (1992) proposed: "The result is a view of belief that speaks to an individual's judgment of the truth or falsity of a proposition, a judgment that can only be inferred from a collective understanding of what human beings say, intend, and do. The challenge is to assess each component so as to have confidence that the belief inferred is a reasonably accurate representation of that judgment" (p. 316).

Table 1—Participant overview

Teacher names	School type	Ethnic background	Teaching experience (years)	Academic qualification	Grades taught	Subjects taught
Krishna	Rural A	Ahir	5	MA, BEd	6-8	English, Social Sciences, Science, Maths
Shastri	Rural A	Jat	1.5	JBT (Junior Basic Training)	1-5	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS (Environmental studies)
Deep	Rural A	Jat	1	BSc, MSc	1-5	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS
Aseem	Rural A	Ahir	5	BA, BEd, JBT	1-5	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS
Rasul	Rural B	Meo	15 total (8 in Rural B)	MA, BEd, JBT	1-5	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS
Aslam	Rural C	Meo	6	MA	1-5	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS
Vikram	Urban D	Jat	10 total (5 in Urban D)	MA (English), BEd	11-12	English
Murid	Urban D	Meo	3	MCA, OCA	11-12	Computer Science
Qurban	Urban D	Meo	3	BA (Urdu), MA (Urdu), BEd	1-8	English, Hindi, Maths, EVS (1-5), Urdu (6-8)
Imran	Urban D	Meo	5	BSc, MSc (Physics), BEd	11-12	Physics

3. FINDINGS

The research question asked was: What are teachers' beliefs regarding the use of learners' mother tongue, Mewati, in the classroom? The three broad themes that emerged from the data analysis included hierarchization, marginalization and normalization.

3.1 Hierarchization

All participants were asked how they felt about Hindi, English and Mewati. There was a strict emphasis on maintaining and legitimizing hierarchy between different

language varieties, with teachers ranking English at the top, followed by Hindi, and Mewati at the bottom. English was seen as a global language, recognized for its high instrumental value and upward social mobility. Hindi was espoused as a marker of nationalism by all teachers and was termed "matra-bhasha (mother tongue) and rashtra-bhasha" (national language) of all Indians". As Shastri (Case 1) stated: "After all, Hindi has now become everyone's mother tongue." Similarly, Aseem (Case 1) reported: "It is India (*Hindustan*) so of course Hindi should be promoted. The language policy of our school is to teach Hindi, speak Hindi and teach through Hindi". This idea of Hindi as the "national language" repeated throughout by the teachers is particularly interesting as according to the Constitution of India (1950), Hindi is not the national language but is only an official language. The constitution does not specify a national language, it only recognizes Hindi and English as co-official languages.

Teachers' unfavorable views towards Mewati were based on several grounds. One of which included aesthetics. Terms such as "gaali-galoch" (rough sounding) were often used to describe the variety as opposed to Urdu which was described as a language of "mithaas" (sweet sounding) or "shehad" (honey). Sharp boundaries were drawn between what teachers called "bhasha" (languages) and "boli" (dialects). Throughout the interview, the researcher was corrected, nearly by all teachers on several occasions, for mentioning Mewati as a language, instead of as a dialect. Doing so evoked strong reaction among all teachers, particularly among non-Meos, who were seen visibly upset. Teachers' hostile beliefs towards Mewati could be gauged by their reluctance even to acknowledge it as a language in its own right.

One of the ways teachers justified this language-dialect hierarchy was by way of emphasizing that Hindi was the 'standard/pure' language, and Mewati was its 'deviant' form. Lippi-Green (2004) called it the standard language ideology and defined it as "a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, non-varying spoken language" (p. 293). It is the assumption that a standard language is somehow ethically or logically superior because of its monolithic and stable characteristics and therefore, why nonstandard varieties should conform to this ideal type (ibid).

Nearly all teachers in both Case 1 and Case 2 emphasized the need for using "shuddh" (pure) Hindi and English. It was the "mixed" and "khichdi" (porridge-like) character of Mewati (as the Meo teacher, Rasul, from Case 1 called it) that made it appear less pure in the eyes of teachers who deemed it unfit to be used in education. All teachers interviewed in this study stressed upon the "purity" of language, a constantly recurring sub-theme noticed throughout the interviews.

For the purposes of this study, categorizing 'linguistic purity' as a sub-theme under one of the core themes of hierarchization was considered most appropriate due to its association with nationalism (Haugen, 1987) and standard-language ideology (Lippi-Green, 2004). Teachers reported using "pure Hindi" (Sanskritized standard form) and "pure English" in the classroom was their ultimate goal. This was because they could set a better example for students, so they would start speaking Hindi and English instead of Mewati. However, when being asked how they would rate their proficiency in Hindi and English, teachers candidly admitted to not being entirely

good at using either of these languages themselves. They attributed this lack of proficiency to their background, that being speakers of non-standard varieties such as Haryanvi and Bagri among others spoken in the Haryana region, of which Mewat is a part.

Aseem from the rural government school A in Case 1, lightly remarked on behalf of other non-Meo teachers who migrated from other regions: "[We] always strive for using pure Hindi, though students do not understand…but struggle with it [ourselves], because [we] can't get rid of [our] Haryanvi accent". Haryanvi, though considered as a 'dialect' of Hindi itself, is held in higher regard than Mewati in terms of prestige. This abstract notion of speaking 'pure Hindi' or 'pure English' was held as an ideal by all teachers interviewed in this study, including native Mewati speaking Meo teachers.

Rasul, a local Muslim Meo Mewati speaking teacher from the rural government school B in Case 1 reported that his emphasis and that of his school was to "make students read, write and speak shuddh (pure) Hindi". To achieve this goal, he contended "shuddh Hindi is used when communicating with students". This is done "so students get habitual in using shuddh Hindi so they can travel interstate and get jobs in future".

Similarly, Vikram from School D in Case 2 emphasized: "My goal and the goal of school authorities, education department and CBSE (Central Board of Secondary Education) is one: to make students comfortable in English, to speak to them in English. A student can become and feel English only when he thinks in English… language style in English...everything in English."

Due to the standard language ideology (Lippi-Green, 2004), nearly all teachers believed that Mewati carried no intrinsic value, either in education or otherwise. Teachers were asked if they thought Mewati should be used at home and in school. Most teachers—Meos as well as non-Meos—perceived Mewati as an obstacle, rather than an asset or a resource. They believed it acted as a hindrance for students' overall learning and development process. Non-Meo teachers in Case 1 went as far as to say that Mewati should be slowly discarded at home. For instance, Shastri remarked firmly: "It should not be used at home. At home, it should be replaced by Hindi. It should be slowly discarded." The nature of beliefs held towards vernacular varieties nearly by all teachers could be further gauged by the statement of the Meo teacher Imran (Case 2) who drew a sharp link between education and Mewati: "To educate oneself is to remove Meos from Mewati culture and Mewati language." Teachers attributed students' poor academic performance to the 'bad habit' of using Mewati at school and at home. For instance, the Meo teacher, Qurban (Case 2), said: "Meo students should not use Mewati at home. They should instead use Urdu or Hindi as these are literary and prestigious languages, aside from being widely understood." He further related children using Mewati in school to "bad habits" and remarked: "Primary students end up speaking Mewati in school usually due to bad habits of using it at home with family members."

All teachers who participated in this study believed Mewati should not be used inside the classroom as it served no real purpose and it would negatively affect the cognitive development of students. Teachers' responses revealed that even local Meo teachers, like most other non-Meo teachers, failed to adequately value and build on students' prior linguistic resources. Teachers' statements showed that either they were not well informed of the benefits of using mother tongue in education or that they were aware but did not value it enough. This was striking considering all teachers in Case 1 and Case 2 admitted on several occasions that there existed a significant communication gap between them and the students. However, teachers normalized this communication barrier and viewed the hierarchy between languages and dialects as acceptable and natural, thereby further reinforcing it. This will be later discussed in the normalization theme that emerged as a result of this finding.

In summary, the hierarchization theme demonstrated that nearly all teachers subscribed to the strict language-dialect dichotomy that arose as a result of the standard language ideology. This partly led them to hold unfavorable beliefs towards Mewati and discouraging its use within the classroom. Some popular fallacies on the part of teachers contributed towards its marginalization and exclusion. This is discussed below.

3.2 M*arginalization*

The language-dialect hierarchy brought on as a result of beliefs regarding aesthetics and perceived instrumental value or standard language ideology, were not the only driving forces behind the exclusion of Mewati. Certain fallacies held by teachers further led to its marginalization inside the classroom. Phillipson (1992) described five fallacies in the context of English language teaching, namely: the monolingual fallacy; the native speaker fallacy; the early start fallacy; the maximum exposure fallacy; the subtractive fallacy (p. 185). These apply in the situation under study too where Hindi occupied a hegemonic position. These fallacies were identified in teachers' responses to questions such as: what teaching methods they used; what problems they faced while teaching; who according to them was the ideal teacher; what learning problems students encountered, what were the reasons, and how best to improve the outcome.

Firstly, a widespread belief in the monolingual fallacy was noticed among all teachers. Nearly, all teachers believed that a language is best taught monolingually and that the teaching of a second language, whether Hindi or English, should entirely be through the second language, excluding students' first language. In both Case 1 and Case 2, Hindi was regarded as students' first language, instead of Mewati. The difference between Case 1 and Case 2 was that while the rural government school teachers (Case 1) stressed using the "direct method" for teaching, largely through Hindi, the urban private school teachers (Case 2) stressed using the "bilingual method" which involved teaching through Hindi and English, despite the school taking pride in calling itself 'English medium'. This finding was striking considering

teachers in both Case 1 and Case 2 reported that teaching through Hindi and English exclusively posed significant challenges in that students struggled to follow teachers' instructions and daily lessons in the classroom.

Secondly, the native speaker fallacy, found its way into this study as nearly all teachers candidly admitted that their non-Hindi dialect backgrounds prevented them from teaching Hindi as purely as a native Hindi speaker would. They believed that the ideal teacher was the native speaker and as such attaining this native-like proficiency was their eventual goal. Thirdly, teachers in both Case 1 and Case 2 firmly believed in the early-start fallacy. They thought that the earlier Hindi and English was taught, the better the outcome would be. Fourthly, all teachers believed in the maximum-exposure fallacy. They asserted that the more Hindi or English was taught, the better the results would be. Finally, nearly all teachers believed in the subtractive fallacy, which meant they thought using students' first language, Mewati, in the classroom would result in lowering the standard of Hindi and English, and that consequently, its use had to be avoided.

One of the other key fallacies noticed is what I term the 'written literature fallacy'. Most teachers, and non-Meo teachers in particular, failed to acknowledge Mewati had a rich and profound legacy of oral literature. Almost all of them were completely unaware of the existence of oral literature which played and continues to play a central role in Meo history, traditions and culture. Mayaram (2003), when discussing Meo oral tradition and literature, contended: "Orality has often been the linguistic associate of marginality." (p. 42) It is this unconsciousness and/or bias against the oral literature which considerably affected non-Meo teachers' beliefs regarding Mewati, its history and its speakers. This is illustrated by Aseem's (Case 1) statement who put it bluntly: "Mewati has no real history. No literature." Every single one of the non-Meo teachers, on being asked if they had any knowledge about the history of Mewat or Meos, collectively admitted to not know much. They stated emphatically that Mewat had no real history or literature of its own. Nearly all of them migrated from other regions in Haryana. They all regarded working in Mewat as a 'punishment post' and described feeling 'stuck' there. This had implications for education in that since most teachers were from the non-Meo background teaching students who were predominantly Meos, teachers' prejudices and/or lack of knowledge with regard to students' history and culture arguably interfered with the development of a healthy teacher-student relationship.

The above-listed fallacies led to Mewati's marginalization and exclusion from the classroom. In the case of non-Meo teachers, arguably religious bias additionally could have played a role. However, in order to address this point, the contemporary and historical forces and events that have influenced Hindu-Muslim relationships would have to be thoroughly discussed; a comprehensive account of this history and dynamic, though relevant, is outside the scope of this paper. This marginalization of Mewati consequently, as the teachers reported, led to students feeling alienated primarily because its exclusion widened the communication gap. Teachers,

nonetheless, normalized student alienation. This is discussed in the subsequent section.

3.3 Normalization

The communication gap between teachers and students was a recurrent theme throughout the study. Teachers were asked what communication challenges they faced while interacting with students who mostly spoke Mewati. Teachers in both cases admitted, on several occasions, that students struggled to understand the medium of instruction employed in the classroom (Hindi in Case 1 and Hindi and English in Case 2), especially in the primary stage of education. This was best reflected in the statement of Krishna, a non-Meo teacher (Case 1): "There is a gap in communication between us and Meo students. Students, especially at the primary level, do not understand Hindi well enough. For example, we would say in Hindi, 'sar mein dard ho raho' (I have a headache), they won't understand this. They would say this in Mewati as 'moond bhatak raho ji' [laughs]. For so many days, we had no idea what they meant."

Thus, seemingly ordinary and easy statements such as the one above posed significant communication barriers between teachers and students. Another non-Meo teacher, Shastri (Case 1), also echoed the same sentiment: "There are many challenges faced when teaching solely in Hindi as students do not understand and learn properly. Students are not that competent in speaking and understanding Hindi, particularly in the initial years. Moreover, since we lack competence and comprehension in Mewati, sometimes we even have to consult someone, so we understand a few words [laughs]."

Similarly, the local Meo teacher, Rasul (Case 1) also confirmed this: "When they [non-Meo teachers] teach, they use their own language variety or Haryanvi. For the first few years children just stare at them. The first two-three years just pass by with children trying to figure out what teachers even meant. The students don't understand them fully...sometimes even we as teachers cannot understand them, how would a child then?"

Teachers in Case 2 shared the same sentiments. Murid, a Meo teacher from the urban private school noted: "There exists a communication gap between non-local teachers and Meo students, as children arriving from a village, in particular, struggle to understand either pure Hindi or English. For two or three years, they have no clue." This communication gap, he believed, led to students feeling hesitant to participate fully in the classrooms. As he remarked: "Students usually feel hesitant to ask questions to non-local teachers, whereas they are at ease if given an opportunity to ask questions to local teachers in Mewati."

When asked why students felt more at ease and preferred local teachers over non-local ones, Murid attributed it to the shared linguistic and cultural identity. He insisted: "Meo students are more attached to local teachers as they both share the same language and culture and are less attached to non-locals. The local Meo

teachers understand students' social and psychological problems better than non-Meo teachers." Although Murid's school (Case 2) had comparatively more local Meo teachers, he still insisted that the school needed to recruit more local teachers. Other teachers in Case 2 said the same. Mewat may need more local teachers to make up for the severe shortage in the teaching workforce. However, the findings indicated that the local Meo teachers were just as capable of internalizing, harbouring and normalizing negative beliefs and prejudices towards local 'dialects' (including Mewati), and in that sense, were not much different from non-local teachers.

Despite this shared linguistic and cultural background, Meo teachers still had apprehensions towards Mewati. Most of the Meo (and non-Meo) teachers did not view Mewati as an asset to be deployed for teaching and learning purposes, when being asked if they thought it could be used inside the classroom. The exclusion of students' L1, Mewati, resulted in non-comprehension of Hindi (and English) on the part of students. Teachers, however, perceived it as a natural and transitory phase that "children must go through" before "things make sense", as Aseem (Case 1) opined. Most teachers also did not perceive the lack of space given to Mewati in the school curriculum or classroom as a problem. Instead, when probed, all non-Meo teachers from the rural government school in Case 1 replied: "By the time students are in the 6th or 8th grade, they start to slowly get better."

This fatalistic belief on the part of teachers is political as it normalizes and legitimizes Mewati's current status. This normalization has practical and real consequences for students, their literacy and educational outcomes. It alienates children and leaves them struggling for far too long, especially during the crucial years of primary and upper primary educational levels. Teachers' beliefs tried to normalize student alienation. The LiEPs adopted actively excluded and marginalized students' L1 that teachers passed off as part of a 'natural' and 'transitory' phase—something that students must go through before things start to make sense eventually. This was particularly alarming considering one in four children in India leave school before reaching the 5th grade and almost half leave before reaching the 8th grade (UNICEF, 2005). Arguably, this alienation resulting out of the exclusion of students' L1s, partly explains the high dropout rates found in schools across Mewat particularly and India generally.

To sum up, almost all the teachers interviewed in this study believed that Mewati (L1) being a 'non-standard dialect' should be avoided and the best way to teach students is directly through the target language (L2). Both school types, Case 1 and Case 2, conflated Mewati with Hindi as students' L1. Thus, while the TLF policy required schools to use students' mother tongue as much as possible, at least in the initial years of primary education, in reality this is seldom the case. Either Hindi was the exclusive medium of instruction as in Case 1 or Hindi was used alongside English as in Case 2.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings point to the continued stigma attached to dialects and their use in the classroom. This study showed that despite years of educational and sociolinguistic research indicating that all 'non-standard' varieties are equally rule-governed, logical, and well-formed systems as the standard varieties (e.g. Labov, 1969), prejudices continue to exist among teachers. The idea that Mewati is considered a misfit in education has origins in teachers' conceptualization of 'dialects' being inferior forms of 'standard' languages. Those who supported this "deficit" view maintained that a more 'elaborate' language system (Hindi) should be taught in the place of a 'restrictive' code (Mewati) spoken among lower classes (Meos) (Bernstein, 1970). Teachers espoused these beliefs and socio-cultural-political prejudices, despite, as Romaine (2000) noted, it could be easily shown that dialects are just as structurally complex and rule-bound as standard languages, and as a result, equally capable of expressing logical arguments as standard varieties (p. 214).

Another key finding of this paper was that teachers in both cases, Case 1 and Case 2, continued to conflate students' mother tongue (Mewati) with the official state/regional language (Hindi) as though it was students' L1. This goes against the TLF LiEP in India, which specifically recommends using students' mother tongue, at least, during the initial years of primary education. The findings of this study are in line with Vanishree (2011) who argued that TLF fails to be followed in practice because state governments continue to equate mother tongues with regional languages (p. 350).

Several teachers admitted that the use of Mewati in the classroom, if used judiciously, could prove to be an appropriate strategy—especially in the initial years of primary education—considering standard Hindi posed acute educational problems to Mewati speaking students. Despite this, teachers in practice persisted with standard Hindi, even if by their own admission, its use affected student-teacher interaction, students' motivation and performance inside the classroom. This was the case with nearly all Meo and non-Meo teachers. Exceptions included a couple of Meo teachers, like Aslam from School C (Case 1) and Murid from School D (Case 2), who allowed students to use Mewati on occasion and believed it had the potential to play a part if used judiciously when all other options had failed. In contrast, other teachers showed complete disapproval towards its use and held reasonably negative beliefs towards Mewati.

An inextricable and inviolable link was found between Hindustan-Hindustani-Hindi, where Hindi was regarded as a national and linguistic identity "of all Indians (*Hindustanis*)". This finding confirmed the ethnographic study of LaDousa (2006) who studied Hindi and English medium schools in Banaras commenting that "Hindi medium education derives its nationalistic, community-affirming ethos from the idea that Hindi is the "national language" or Indians' "mother tongue"" (p. 42). Furthermore, emphasis on the "purity" of Hindi that was noticed throughout the study indicated a nationalist tendency, as "purism is closely connected with national feeling" (Haugen, 1987, p. 87).

Teachers' beliefs influence teachers' behavior and guide the types of decisions they make inside the classroom. Pajares (1992), for instance, remarked that beliefs could "strongly influence perception" as well as behavior (p. 326) and stated that its filtering effect "ultimately screens, redefines, distorts, or reshapes subsequent thinking and information processing" (p. 325). This combined with the fact that these belief systems, as Pajares (1992) argued, provide individuals with a sense of direction, stability or order in their lives, makes them so resistant to change (p. 318). Beliefs become even harder to change as they take the form of habits and acquire an emotional dimension and with time, people grow comfortable with them (ibid).

This filtering effect of beliefs partly explains teachers' language practices and choices made inside the classroom despite knowing that it may not serve students well. This also helps explain why when the researcher used the word "bhasha" (language) for Mewati instead of "boli" (dialect), it evoked an emotional reaction among all teachers. Nearly all teachers, particularly non-Meos in the rural government school A (Case 1), refused to acknowledge that a language and dialect can ever be used in the same breath, let alone allow the possibility of a dialect to be used inside the classroom. This belief, therefore, regarding an arbitrary dichotomy between language and dialect was notably strong among all teachers.

The central argument of this paper is that if teachers' biases and beliefs about language varieties labelled as 'dialects', like Mewati, have to be countered then as Crandall (2000) argued, teachers first have to be made aware of those unconsciously held beliefs (p. 35). Pajares (1992) also shared this view when he said unchallenged beliefs cannot be altered (p. 321). Teachers' beliefs affect the way they make decisions (Pajares, 1992, p. 307).

Since beliefs guide teachers' behavior and strongly affect the materials and activities they use in the classroom (Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001, p. 43), beliefs have an impact on teachers' professional development (Richards et al., 2001, p. 41). Moreover, since language preferences and prejudices could be learned or acquired early in life, the earlier these beliefs become part of a teacher's thought process, the harder it is to change them (Pajares, 1992, p. 317). Therefore, this study has major implications for teacher education, teacher change and professional development.

This study showed that nearly all interviewed teachers held unfavorable views towards Mewati and its use within the classroom. Teachers' insistence on restricting its use meant that students, as the teachers themselves acknowledged, often struggled (till elementary/upper primary/grade 8 stage) to grasp anything. One of the ways teachers showed their disapproval of Mewati was by refusing even to acknowledge that it was a language in its own right.

Non-Meo teachers justified Mewati's status as a dialect by denying that it even had any history or literature of its own. This was in contrast to several Meo teachers who acknowledged Mewati's oral history and tradition, despite arguing against its use within the classroom. When asked if non-Meo teachers were aware of the local history of the region, all responded in the negative. In line with Pajares' (1992)

assertion, they were found reluctant to revise their position even after being informed about Mewati's oral tradition and history by their (Meo) colleagues.

All non-Meo teachers (Case 1) resolutely held on to their prior biases and beliefs regarding Mewati and insisted upon its exclusion from the classroom. This was despite them candidly admitting that students continued to remain mostly clueless as late as the eighth standard because the language of instruction was a Sanskritized form of standard Hindi, with which most students were unfamiliar. This alienation, among other factors, appears to play a part in high dropout rates found amongst students in India as "about 30% of children fail to complete Grade V (primary), about 50% drop out before completing Grade VIII (upper primary), and 60% do not finish Grade X (lower secondary)" (Lewin, 2011, p. 382).

That teachers maintained prior beliefs in the face of contrary evidence could be best explained by Nisbett and Ross (1980), who argued that individuals tend to maintain deeply held beliefs, even in the face of contradictions or even when presented with evidence (as cited in Pajares, 1992, p. 317). They concluded that "there is substantial evidence to suggest that beliefs persist even when they are no longer accurate representations of reality, and they could find no literature showing that individuals pursue, even in minor ways, strategies that aid in the alteration or rejection of unreasonable or inaccurate beliefs. This is not to say that beliefs do not change under any circumstance but that they generally do not change even when it is logical or necessary for them to do so" (ibid).

It is for this reason that Pajares (1992) advocated, teachers' beliefs "should become a focus of current educational research" and that "teacher preparation programs can ill afford to ignore the entering beliefs of preservice teachers" (p. 322). It could be equally argued that beliefs of in-service teachers hold just as much relevance as entering beliefs of pre-service teachers, for, after all, today's students would make tomorrow's teachers. Since "beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate, preserving even against contradictions caused by reason, time, schooling, or experience" (Pajares, 1992, p. 324), it becomes crucial to examine in-service teachers' beliefs. That said, the only way to change teachers' pre-existing beliefs is by first making them self-aware (Pajares, 1992, p. 320). Only when teachers critically reflect upon their beliefs, can they be able to potentially replace or reorganize them.

5. CONCLUSION

This article aimed to examine teachers' beliefs, and in light of the findings above, it is suggested that positive change is required in teachers' views towards Mewati and other vernacular languages. Most teachers interviewed in this study held negative views towards Mewati and discouraged its use in schools. Teachers' views and discouragement of Mewati did not differ significantly based on what grades they taught, but rather had more to do with the institutional context in which they worked and its mandated or preferred medium of instruction, teachers' own past beliefs, the way Three Language Formula (TLF) is implemented in India which

conflated students' L1–if it happens to be a vernacular variety–with the standard regional language, and the continuing lack of professional teacher training and education with regard to dialect awareness programs. This study thus argued that for any meaningful change to occur, teachers must be made explicitly aware of their tacit beliefs and assumptions towards language varieties, in order for them to see the potential role they may play in teaching and learning processes.

Since teachers' views indicated a lack of sensitivity to dialect diversity, equality and maintenance, this study makes a pressing appeal to teacher educators and trainers to make appropriate changes in their programs to inform and educate teachers regarding dialect discrimination. One way this can be achieved is through introducing dialect awareness as part of a teacher education curricula. Teacher trainers could introduce sociolinguistic, accommodation and contrastive components of dialect awareness that would normalize dialect variation and uncover underlying cognitive patterns that lie behind such variation and touch upon history that led to one variety being accepted as the standard form, show dialects' role in music and literature and ways in which they could be accommodated into the classrooms, and look into rule-governed patterns and systematic differences between the dialect variety used by students, teachers, and the standard variety used in schools (Siegel, 2006).

Wolfram (2008), who has done pioneering work on dialect awareness programs, advocates possible ways this could be accomplished through vocabulary exercises and interactive sessions wherein teacher trainees learn that dialect variation is natural and that dialects are just as rule bound as other varieties. Other means include playing videos and audio recordings where teacher trainees are exposed to social and regional dialects and they reflect upon how these dialects differ from their own as well as the standard variety used in schools (ibid). Group discussions could offer interesting insights into how different members of communities perceive the dialect in question and that of one another, their attitude could expose basic myths and stereotypes popularly held by members of communities, thereby sparking a discussion on language discrimination which could help in dispelling common misconceptions and prejudices held regarding non-standard varieties (ibid).

This study, therefore, contributed to teacher education field by suggesting teachers and teacher educators need to reflect upon their beliefs and the subsequent role these beliefs may play in (language) teaching. It is suggested that teachers and students need to be informed about dialect awareness programs that counter popular myths about dialects and explore possibilities of how dialects could be used, acknowledged and respected inside the classroom. This study, thus, has implications "for the professional preparation and continuing development of language teachers" (Borg, 2003, p. 106). By shedding light on how dialects continue to be replaced by standard languages and the potential consequences that result from this policy in the form of failure of students to follow classroom lessons and teachers' instructions effectively, this research contributed to second language teaching.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This work was supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

REFERENCES

Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949

Baugh, J. (2000). *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic pride and racial prejudice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Benedikter, T. (2009). *Language policy and linguistic minorities in India: An appraisal of the linguistic rights of minorities in India*. Berlin, Germany: LIT Verlag.

Bernstein, B. (1970). Postscript. In Gahagan, D. M. & Gahagan, G. A. (Eds.), Talk reform. Explorations in language for infant school children. (pp. 115–17). London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845307

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review on research of what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(1), 81-109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London, UK: Continuum.

Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language* Review*, 57*(3), 402–423. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Crandall, J. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20*, 34-55. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500200032

Dahl, O. (2009). Testing the Assumption of Complexity Invariance: The Case of Elfdalian and Swedish. In G. Sampson, D. Gil, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Language Complexity as an Evolving Variable* (pp. 50–63). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dasgupta, J. (1970). *Language conflict and national development: Group politics and national language policy in India*. London, UK: University of California Press.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*(1), 47-65. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188960380104

Farrokhi, F. (2007). Teachers' stated beliefs about corrective feedback in relation to their practices in EFL classes. *Research on Foreign Languages Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities, 49*(2), 91-131.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

GOI (2001a). *Census: Abstract of speakers' strength of languages and mother tongues-2001*. Retrieved from: http://www.censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/Statement1.aspx

GOI (2001b). *Handbook for education guarantee scheme and alternative & innovative education*. Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource and Development, Government of India.

GOI (2001c). *Working group report on elementary and adult education: Tenth five year plan 2002-2007*. Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource and Development, Government of India.

Haugen, E. (1987). *Blessings of babel: Bilingualism and language planning, problems and Pleasures.* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110862966

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/38.4.279

Jhingran, D. (2009). Hundreds of home languages in the country and many in most classrooms: coping with diversity in primary education in India. In Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A.K., & Panda, M. (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 263-282). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-017

Koul, O., & Devaki, L. (2000). *Linguistic heritage of India and Asia*. Mysore, India: CIIL Printing Press.

Labov, W. (1969). The logic of nonstandard English. *Georgetown Monograph on Language and Linguistics, 22*, 1-44.

LaDousa, C. (2006). The discursive malleability of an identity: A dialogic approach to language "medium" schooling in North India. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 16*(1), 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2006.16.1.036

Lamb, M. (1995). The consequences of INSET. *ELT Journal, 49*(1), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.1.72

Lewin, K. M. (2011). Expanding access to secondary education: Can India catch up? *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(4), 382-393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.01.007

Li, L. & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': Looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 39-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2011.562657

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8

Littlewood, W. & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 64-77. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago press.

Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and re(constituting) languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 2*(3), 137-156. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427595cils0203_1

Mayaram, S. (2003). *Against history, against state: Counter perspectives from the margins*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mohanty, A. K. (2006). Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Torres Guzman, M. (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Language in Education and Glocalisation*. (pp. 262-283). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598968-014

Mohanty, A. K. (2009). Multilingual education: A bridge too far? In Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A.K., & Panda, M. (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-004

Ndhlovu, F. (2015). Ignored lingualism: Another resource for overcoming the monolingual mindset in language education policy. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 35(4), 398-414. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2015.1087365

Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307

Pattanayak, D.P. (1988). Monolingual myopia and the petals of the Indian lotus: Do many languages divide or unite a nation? In Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Cummins, J. (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle.* (pp. 379-389). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal, 1*(1), 41-58.

Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (1994). Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In A. Bryman, & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analysing qualitative data* (pp. 173–194). London, UK: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203413081_chapter_9

Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford; New York, NY: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450026404X

Sampson, G. (2009). A linguistic axiom challenged. In G. Sampson, D. Gil, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Language complexity as an evolving variable* (pp. 1–18). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Scott, J. C., Straker, D. Y., & Katz, L. (2009). *Affirming students' right to their own language: Bridging language policies and pedagogical practices* (Eds.). New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203866986

Siegel, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education, 17*, 157-174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2006.08.002

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education - or worldwide diversity and human rights.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Srivastava, A. K. (2007). Multilingualism and school education in India: Special features, problems and prospects. In D.P. Pattanayak (Ed.), *Multilingualism in India*. New Delhi, India: Orient Longman Private Limited.

UNESCO (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

UNICEF (2005). *Education*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/india/education.html

Vaish, V. (2008). *Biliteracy and globalization: English language education in India*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690340

Vanishree, V. M. (2011). Provision for linguistic diversity and linguistic minorities in India. *Language in India, 11*(2), 304-375.

Weston-Taylor, L. (2013). *Are all languages equal?* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1143/e7aed99901f7bd4ca29635807e6216ede10f.pdf

Wolfram, W. (2008). Language diversity and the public interest. In King, K. A., Schilling-Estes, N., Fogle, L., Lou, J.J., & Soukup, B. (Eds.), *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties: Defining, documenting, and developing.* (pp. 187-202). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.