Anthropology & Education QUARTERLY

Language Policy and Language Ideology: Ecological Perspectives on Language and Education in the Himalayan Foothills

CYNTHIA GROFF
Leiden University

Ethnographic research in the Kumaun region of North India highlights different perspectives on this multilingual context and on national-level policies. Language policies that explicitly or implicitly minoritize certain linguistic varieties influence local discourses about language and education but are also interpreted through the lens of local language ideologies. Ecological metaphors and different scalar perspectives illustrate the complex relationship among languages as speakers of an unrecognized language reinterpret policy and express value for linguistic diversity. [India; language policy; linguistic minorities; perspective; scale]

A healthy ecosystem hosts multiple species, thriving together. Does the strengthening of one species necessitate the extinction of another? Can local conditions withstand the influence of external forces? The linguistic ecology of the Kumaun region of North India has been influenced by political changes throughout history, by national-level language and education policies, by state-level language and education decisions, and by the ideologies, discourses, and language use of Kumauni people as they ignore, embrace, or contest such policies at the local level. My conversations with Kumauni people such as Shoba-Didi and Govindi reveal a valuing of local linguistic diversity that stands despite the influence of national-level language policies. Mother tongue, medium of instruction, and additive language learning are matters of perspective.

My research in the Kumaun sought, among other questions, to address how national language policies and local ideologies about language and education are reflected in this multilingual context. Policies look different when seen from different perspectives, just as the relationships among languages appear different when analyzed from different scale levels. This paper explores the complex linguistic environment in the Kumaun as perceived by individuals whose home language, Kumauni, is marginalized in relation to the regional and school language, Hindi, and the languages learned as school subjects, English and Sanskrit. The views of Kumauni individuals regarding language, as presented here, provide an alternative perspective on the national language policies of India, which give constitutional status to twenty-two languages but leave many other languages and so-called "dialects," like Kumauni, without official recognition. While national-level language and education policies do influence educational practices and local discourses surrounding language in the Kumauni context, the ways in which those policies are appropriated locally reflect a value for linguistic diversity in local language ideologies.

A thorough description of the relationships among languages and their environment in a given context, reflecting an ecological perspective (Haugen 1972; Hornberger 2002), involves attention to the agency of local actors and the policies, discourse, and ideologies that surround them, as defined below. I then describe the language and education policy context in India, followed by an explanation of my involvement and research. The findings sections describe policy-inspired discourses circulating in the Kumaun that influence

Anthropology & Education Quarterly, Vol. 00, Issue 0, pp. 1–18, ISSN 0161-7761, online ISSN 1548-1492.
© 2018 The Authors. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of American Anthropological Association.
This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
DOI:10.1111/aeq.12235

school-level decisions and village-level language practices that seem to contest linguistic hierarchies. In interpreting an ecological metaphor, one young informant utilized a shift in scale, beautifully illustrating how changes in perspective alter the appearance of the relationship among the languages.

Minority Voices and Linguistic Ecologies

My ethnographic research in the Kumaun region of North India is grounded in the valuing of local voices and perspectives. Diverse streams of literature have emphasized the importance of those voices that have been traditionally undervalued or ignored. This literature highlights, for example, the priorities of the poor and of the individual in economic development (Chambers 1983, 1997; Sen 1999), the cultural situatedness of literacy (Barton et al. 2000; Street 1993, 2005), and the needs of linguistic minorities in education (Daswani 2001; Heath 1983; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001; Hornberger 2002; Mohanty 2006; Mohanty et al. 2009). Similarly, research and theorization on language planning and policy have shifted away from a merely descriptive focus to place more emphasis in recent years on agency, language ideology, and the ecology of language (Hornberger 2006; Ricento 2000). The theoretical framing for this paper centers around the interconnection between these three areas of emphasis in language planning and policy as applied to a multilingual context such as India, where common western assumptions about linguistic categories are called into question.

The ecology of language metaphor draws attention to the multiple contextual factors influencing languages and, as I emphasize here, the speakers of those languages. Attention to the relationships among languages within their social contexts heightens awareness of multilingual realities and issues of power between and among linguistic groups (Blackledge 2008; Haugen 1972). In the ecology of language metaphor, languages, like living species, are seen as changing over time, as influenced by other languages in their linguistic environment, and as facing the threat of extinction in the face of more powerful languages (Hornberger 2002). Such power dynamics among languages in turn influence the speakers of those languages, particularly linguistic minorities whose home languages differ from the powerful languages of the nation.

In describing linguistic ecologies, the role of human agents is always relevant. Attention to human agency in language planning and policy involves recognition of bottom-up rather than simply top-down language planning and recognition of the various layers of language planning, from language policy at the supranational level to individual choices about language practices (Kaplan 1989; Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Shohamy 2009). The human dimension of a linguistic ecology I see as mediated through local language ideologies, which are made evident in part through language use practices and discourses about language. Language ideologies also influence the making, interpretation, and implementation of language planning and policy at all levels.

Language ideologies have been defined 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" (Irvine and Gal 2000, 402). Ideas about language, Woolard (1998) says, can vary as much as the form of languages. The dominant "one nation–one language" ideology, for example, carries assumptions about the normality of monolingualism within nation-states, an ideology spread around the world in part through colonization. In discussing language ideologies and the power of majority languages, Blackledge (2008) asserts that:

> Very often, multilingual societies that apparently tolerate or promote heterogeneity in fact undervalue or appear to ignore the linguistic diversity of their populace. An apparently liberal

> orientation to equality of opportunity for all may mask an ideological drive towards homogeneity, a drive which potentially marginalises or excludes those who either refuse, or are unwilling, to conform. (36)

Thus, ideologies may simplify the sociolinguistic field through what Irvine and Gal (2000) call *erasure*. Certain linguistic varieties become—from certain perspectives—invisible.

In the Indian context, multilingualism has long been the norm, with children learning and using multiple languages and with indistinct boundaries between linguistic varieties (Annamalai 2001; Khubchandani 1981, 2001). However, changes caused by globalization and the spread of English are said to have altered India's linguistic ecology, changing the relationships among Indian languages (Mohanty 2006; Vaish 2004). English is highly valued as the dominant language of private and higher education, while regional languages outweigh other varieties.

Calling into question assumptions about language in general, Makoni and Pennycook (2007) argue that "the concept of language, and indeed the 'metadiscursive regimes' used to describe languages are firmly located in Western linguistic and cultural suppositions" (27). While languages and the metalanguages used to talk about them are inventions, they say, the consequences of these inventions are real and material, with implications for language policies, education, and the labels with which people identify themselves. Even language planning that advocates multilingualism, they suggest, is based on the assumption of language as "objects" and would benefit from an alternative understanding. Jørgensen (2008) also argues that language as a phenomenon is not separable into "packages which can be counted." (164). In describing the implications for linguistic anthropology of deconstructing language categories, Makoni and Pennycook (2007) say that "the question becomes one of asking how it is that languages are understood locally" (19). Such local understandings or language ideologies, reflected in the language and discourse choices of human agents, help to define the linguistic ecology of a region.

In exploring the complexity of a multilingual situation in all its contextual richness, a framework such as the continua of biliteracy provides a useful tool, highlighting also the power dynamics inherent in such situations (Hornberger 1989; Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester 2000). Contexts of biliteracy, for example, can be analyzed from macro to micro perspectives and along the oral-literate and monolingual-bilingual continua (ibid.). Although I take a consciously local viewpoint in my research, focusing on more micro-level contexts, I consider also the broader context and the connections among perspectives, using shifts along the micro to macro continuum to explore a complex biliteracy situation from different perspectives.

Another useful tool that became relevant to my analysis is the concept of scale, used by sociolinguists in looking beyond micro–macro dichotomies regarding context in analyzing phenomena such as speech events (Blommaert 2010; Hult 2010). This includes analysis of "*the jump from one scale to another*" (Blommaert 2007, 4), though the definition and implications of scale-jumping remain in discussion. Of particular relevance to this paper is the observed notion that "reality, seen from within one scale-level, is quite different from reality seen from within another scale-level" (11). Canagarajah (2013) has asserted that people invoke scale rather than being shaped by scales: "Interactants construct the context that is operative in their talk by invoking different scales of time, space, and social life" (155. See, e.g., Groff et al. 2016). Thus, the ways in which participants chose to present and interpret their linguistic and educational circumstances in my study are also analyzed with reference to the scales they choose to invoke.

Throughout this paper, I return to the more general concept of *perspective*. As I saw throughout my analysis and exemplify below, much depends on the point of view from which or the lens through which one is looking. Understanding other interpretations of a

situation is much facilitated by an understanding of the perspectives from which others approach the situation and, thus, the language ideologies involved and the discourses and scales invoked in describing the situation.

Language and Education Policies in the Indian Context

With a population of over 1.23 billion, India is a country of great diversity in terms of caste and social class as well as language and ethnicity. India is home to about 6.4% of the world's living languages and has a score of 0.916 on Greenburg's Diversity Index, representing the probability that any two people of the country, selected at random, would have different mother tongues (Lewis et al., 2013; Lieberson 1985). Means of addressing this linguistic diversity are described in the following historical summary of language policies in India, drawn in part from Annamalai (2001), Daswani (2001), Dua (1985), Das Gupta (1970), Groff (2007, 2017), Jayaram and Rajyashree (2000), Khubchandani (1981), and Kumar (1985).

Since independence in 1947, India has been making efforts to build unity in a nation of great diversity. The Constitution of India made Hindi, written in the Devanagari script, the official language of the Union, with English remaining as an auxiliary official language for at least fifteen years. This concession was important for the non-Hindi-speaking states, where Hindi would not be accepted as the sole link official language, and when the time came to re-evaluate the status of English, its use for official purposes was not terminated. The decision to continue the use of English in the national government was intended to prevent an undue advantage to the Hindi-speaking states, acknowledging the importance of other regional languages. The language-based reorganization of the state borders in the 1950s further advanced the use of regional languages, allowing each state to promote its own language for official purposes within the state government and education system. In its Eighth Schedule, the Constitution of India recognized fourteen languages in a list known as the "scheduled languages," which now includes twenty-two languages thanks to amendments in 1967, 1992, and 2003. Although the stated purpose of this list was to allow these languages to contribute to the development of Hindi—a corpus planning goal—the list has, in practice, become more important for recognizing and promoting the status of the language, and, in educational contexts, the teaching of the languages. Because many of India's languages have not received this recognition, the official listing of twenty-two languages brings as a consequence a minimization of the remaining, less-dominant Indian languages. Meanwhile, the Constitution does address the protection of linguistic minorities by assuring their right to establish educational institutions and prohibiting language-based discrimination.

Besides constitutional provisions, some national-level education policies have served to promote the status and educational function of India's regional languages. The Three-Language Formula, first presented by the Central Advisory Board of Education in 1956, has promoted the teaching of three languages through primary and secondary education. Those languages are specified as: (1) the mother tongue or regional language, to be taught for 10 years; (2) an official language, Hindi or English, to be taught for 6 years minimum; and (3) another modern Indian or foreign language, to be taught for 3 years minimum. A primary intention of this policy was the promotion of Hindi as well as the promotion of the regional languages (Annamalai 2005). Students in non-Hindi-speaking states were to learn Hindi, and students in the Hindi-speaking states would ideally learn a regional language from one of the other states. The ways in which the Three-Language Formula has been taken up and implemented at the state level have varied, however, with adaptations to the original intention of the policy. Many southern states have focused on teaching English rather than Hindi, and many of the northern states have focused on teaching Sanskrit

rather than one of the modern regional languages. Although Sanskrit can be considered a classical language, its status among the constitutionally scheduled languages makes it a legitimate choice under the Three-Language Formula. These loopholes taken at the state level have served to subvert the original intention of the formula as defined at the national level. National-level policies have addressed not only the languages to be taught in school but also the medium of instruction, including a series of recommendations for providing education in the mother tongue. Again, at the state level, implementation has varied and provisions for mother-tongue education have been limited in the case of India's many linguistic minorities.

The number of languages in India depends on who is asked and how language is defined. The 2001 Census of India reports 122 languages, the Ethnologue (Lewis et al. 2013) lists 454 languages, and the People's Linguistic Survey of India has thus far documented 780 spoken languages. The complexity of counting languages in the Indian census is apparent in the reported numbers: In 1991, about 10,000 mother tongues were returned on the census forms. From this number, the Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner produced a list of 1,576 "rationalized mother tongues," which were then classified into 114 languages. This process, called linguistic rationalization, is explained as follows: "These vast raw returns need to be identified and classified in terms of actual languages and dialects to present a meaningful linguistic picture of the country" (Census of India 2013).

This linguistic rationalization, conducted for the reporting of census results, can be seen as a covert form of language planning, resulting in the minimization of certain linguistic varieties and the minimization of diversity (Groff 2007, 2017). As stated by Mahapatra (1986), "the government through its language census has. . .vastly increased the figure of scheduled languages to 95 percent of the total population in India and thus relegated the non-scheduled language speakers to a mere 5 percent" (208. See also Khubchandani, 2001). Diversity is minimized as many linguistic varieties are classified as "dialects" under the broader category of a few dominant "languages," thus accounting for the majority of the Indian population under the twenty-two scheduled languages. Besides reflecting a national concern to emphasize unity, such ambiguities surrounding the number of languages are, of course, relevant to the emerging literature on the invention of languages as concrete, countable entities (Groff 2013; Makoni and Pennycook 2007). The ambiguity in these numbers is further complicated by different concepts of "mother tongue," with possibilities for multiple allegiances and identities, as described below.

On one hand, India's recognition of linguistic diversity contrasts with the policies of many so-called monolingual nations, and concern for the educational needs of linguistic minorities in India has been increasing in recent years. Yet, linguistic categorization and rationalization have resulted in the erasure of much linguistic diversity in national-level discourses. Vaish (2004) points to "assimilationist forces" that, despite pluralistic language planning, result in "the homogenizing of linguistic data in the census and sidelining minority languages in the school system" (37). While policies may seem generous in their acknowledgment of linguistic diversity from an international perspective, they may seem restrictive in light of local linguistic diversity.

Research Methods and the Kumauni Context

In order to explore the linguistic ecology of the Kumaun from local perspectives, I headed to the small town of Kausani in the Himalayan foothills with ethnographic methods as my tools. Thus, I approached each situation as a learner, paying particular attention to the language and education situation in the Kumaun as experienced by local individuals. Although my dissertation research was not framed as an ethnography of

language policy (Johnson 2009), I paid attention to the interplay between national-level language policies and local language practices, while painting a more general ethnographic picture of the linguistic ecology of the Kumaun at that point in time. Through informal interviews, observation, and interaction in Hindi and in English, I gathered data on local language practices and analyzed discourses and ideologies being expressed in the Kumaun, particularly by a group of Kumauni young women and educators.

The Kumaun region of North India makes up the eastern portion of the state of Uttarakhand, which was formed in the year 2000 from the mountainous northern region of the much larger state of Uttar Pradesh. With over two million native speakers (Census of India 2013), Kumauni is classified by linguists as an Indo-Aryan language among the Pahari languages spoken on the southern Himalayan slopes. University courses are available for studying Kumauni, and the state of Uttarakhand has recently moved to introduce Kumauni as a subject in primary schools, beginning in 2017. Locally it is recognized as a unique linguistic variety, with multiple subvarieties. From a national perspective, Kumauni is often considered to be a dialect of Hindi: Kumauni is not listed among the twenty-two scheduled or recognized languages in the Indian Constitution and is categorized under the Hindi language for census purposes. These labels and categories were, I found, relevant to local views regarding language status. Other languages contributing to the multilingual ecology in the Kumaun are Hindi, Sanskrit, and English, besides smaller linguistic varieties and immigrant languages such as Nepali. Kumaunis are often perceived as "backwards" rural people, and labor migration is common as men seek work in the plains. Although caste and economic status play an important role in Kumauni society, these categories were not central to my research because of my focus on language issues as well as the minimization of these categories by my Gandhian informants.

My specific research context was the small town of Kausani in the Almora district of Uttarakhand and the Lakshmi Ashram girls' boarding school built high on the hillside near Kausani. Lakshmi Ashram was established in 1946 by a British follower of Gandhi who, along with a group of Kumauni women, dedicated her life to the "uplift" or empowerment of women in the Himalayan foothills. The girls' boarding school based at Lakshmi Ashram continues to support disadvantaged girls from the Kumaun, regardless of caste, and to promote Gandhian philosophies of self-sufficiency, high thinking, and practical, hands-on education through Gandhian Basic Education or *Naii Taaliim*. For more on gender, empowerment, and development issues in this context, see Groff (2010, 2018) and Klenk (2010, 2014).

I lived at and near Lakshmi Ashram for nine months of primary field work from July 2007 to April 2008, having previously joined the Ashram community for a study abroad internship in 2000, a short visit in 2004, and preliminary research in 2006. Although my blond hair and blue eyes set me apart, I heard this compliment repeatedly during my fieldwork: "You seem Indian!" I wore simple *salwar kamiiz* [Punjabi suits] and parted and braided my hair, making every attempt to act and speak in a way that would minimize my differences. Having studied Hindi for seven years, I was able to converse comfortably and conduct interviews in Hindi during my fieldwork. Even as a *didi* [elder sister] at the Ashram, however, I remained a foreigner. My status as a foreigner allowed me to ask many questions, which were patiently answered by my Kumauni friends and acquaintances, but those patient answers were constructed, of course, for a foreigner. My limited Kumauni restricted communication with elderly village women, but for most of my informants, Hindi is a natural means of communication, claimed as their own alongside Kumauni, as described below. Language and wording biases were hopefully ameliorated through long-term interaction and observation as I adjusted to a local lens.

During my field work, I immersed myself in community life at the Ashram, focusing on a group of young women who had completed 10th grade and were participating in a

special Gandhian studies course. I spent time with these young women, hearing and analyzing their experiences and perceptions of language and education issues relevant to their future prospects and dreams. I also spent time observing and interviewing teachers and students at the local government high school or "intermediate college" and visited surrounding villages, primary schools, district teacher training centers, and Kumaun University (See Groff, 2010, 2018). I recorded some semistructured interviews and kept careful field notes of informal interviews and conversations. I analyzed those voices inductively, constructing relevant themes from what emerged in the data and taking into account the broader regional, national, and international contexts, including the national-level language and education policies described above. In citing examples from my field notes and interviews, I identify the language being used as Hindi (H), Kumauni (K), or English (E). I then differentiate between field notes (FN), written in my own voice regarding recent observations on the field; paraphrased quotes (PQ), constructed from my field notes in the voice of the original speaker; and direct quotes (DQ), including recorded interviews and quotes that I had written word for word in my field notes. FN, PQ or DQ are followed by the year, month, and day of the event or interview. Translations are mine, and pseudonyms are used when appropriate. The following sections explore the linguistic ecology of the Kumaun as described by Kumaunis, as influenced by national-level language policies, and as permeated by local language ideologies.

Language Use and Appropriated Discourses in the Kumaun

A group of young women walk single file along a narrow hill-side trail, large bundles of grass balanced on their heads—fodder for the cows. Village women pause for a cup of chai on a stone terrace overlooking the Himalayas. Students and teachers work together in the ashram gardens, weeding the radishes, and, in the kitchen, peeling potatoes or making chapatis. In all of these contexts, Kumauni is the default means of communication—the language of the village and the home for Kumaunis, and often the unofficial language of informal interaction at Lakshmi Ashram. Yet during my first three-week visit to Lakshmi Ashram, with my (then) beginner's knowledge of Hindi, I was scarcely aware of Kumauni despite my interest in minority languages. The Kumauni identity and the natural use of Kumauni in daily interactions were almost invisible to an outsider, unmarked and unremarkable in our discussions of education and development issues in the region. This invisibilization of Kumauni reflects the national-level designations that categorize many linguistic varieties under the umbrella of Hindi.

When the students sit together on floor mats in their classroom in the afternoons, the default language becomes Hindi, the official language of schooling and of wider communication in the region. Having been exposed to Hindi most of their lives and receiving informal support in Kumauni, few of the girls have difficulty with the transition. As a Gandhian school with ties to the independence movement, Lakshmi Ashram is particularly zealous in promoting Hindi over English as the medium of instruction. The Three-Language Formula is satisfied, as in the local government schools, through study of English and Sanskrit as exam subjects. Sanskrit is also used in prayers and creeds, chanted together morning and evening at the ashram. Kumauni is not taught or used formally in education.

I began to understand the nuances in the roles and the value of each of these languages as I forefronted the issue of language in my conversations in the Kumaun. When discussions tended towards the relationship between English and Hindi, I raised questions about the role and status of Kumauni as well. To illustrate some of the language-related discourses and ideological nuances I encountered in the Kumaun, I summarize two conversations below, one with a Kumauni educator at Lakshmi Ashram and one with a

Kumauni young woman studying there. Through such conversations, I observed the role of national-level policies in local discourses surrounding "language," "dialect," and "mother tongue," but I also encountered perspectives on the relationships among languages that depend on the context, on the lens through which one is looking, or on the scale that is being analyzed or invoked.

Language at Lakshmi Ashram: Perspectives of a Gandhian Educator

A conversation with one of the Ashram leaders whom I call Shoba-Didi highlighted for me the ambiguity in the concepts of "mother tongue" and "dialect," and the importance of mother-tongue education at Lakshmi Ashram. We sat together one morning during my preliminary fieldwork on the thick mat carpeting in the Ashram office. I had explained my research briefly to her, regarding the intersection of language and education as well as issues of development and empowerment in the Kumaun. She said that this is a big dilemma now and a very relevant issue:

> People don't understand this issue of language in education. English is so popular. Everyone wants English. Everyone wants English-medium education: the nice tie, etc. But this is just outward/external, not inward/internal. They don't think about the full development of the child. (E; PQ:06Jul26)

The prestige of going to an English-medium school and of wearing the nice uniform attracts many people, but according to this Gandhian activist for holistic education, the full development of the child is neglected. She then went on to tell me that she believes that only through education in the mother tongue can the child be fully developed from the beginning.

This last statement caught my attention because of my interest in mother-tongue education. It was clear to me in this moment, however, that Shobha-Didi was making a contrast with English-medium education and referring to Hindi as mother tongue. To confirm my understanding, I asked "What about Kumauni?" She replied:

> It is not used in schools at all. Hindi is what they call the mother tongue here. If we think about it, Kumauni is our mother tongue, but there are not books in Kumauni—although there is some poetry and stories written in Kumauni—but it's not used in school. Hindi is considered to be the mother tongue. (E; PQ:06Jul26)

In the educational context in the Kumaun, Hindi is regarded as the mother tongue. Even though, "if we think about it, Kumauni is our mother tongue," Hindi is accepted as the appropriate mother tongue for use in education. The available literature and textbooks in Hindi and its official status nationally set it apart from Kumauni and legitimize its status as school language. Shobha-Didi went on to explain the importance of mother-tongue education at the Ashram: "At the ashram the mother tongue is very much promoted. I don't know what others believe or say about this, but I believe that education should be in the mother tongue" (E; PQ:06Jul26).

Education in the mother tongue was a value promoted by the Ashram founder, Sarala Behen, and by her mentor Mahatma Gandhi as well. Gandhi promoted the use of the mother tongue for teaching throughout primary and secondary school, with other languages to be introduced after fifth grade. Shobha-Didi explained that this was the reason that Hindi is used at the ashram and that English is less emphasized. Although the girls do have to prepare for the exams in English as a subject and should, according to Shobha-Didi, also learn practical communication skills in English, this is not the highest emphasis at the school (E; FN:06Jul26). Thus, the value of Hindi-medium education is explicitly emphasized

relative to English-medium education, which is becoming increasingly popular even in the small town of Kausani.

Wanting to understand more about the status of Kumauni from this educator's perspective and in relation to the concepts of "mother tongue" and "mother tongue education," I redirected the conversation again, asking Shobha-Didi, "If Hindi is mother tongue, then what is Kumauni?" She replied, "Kumauni *is* a language. I don't know what they have put it as officially, but it should be a language. But mostly it is used as a dialect. It is considered to be a dialect" (E; PQ:06Jul26). Shobha-Didi recognized the ambiguity coming through in this conversation regarding mother tongue, language, and dialect. She wanted to emphasize the importance of Hindi over English in education, an issue important in Gandhian philosophies about education, and yet she did not want to undervalue Kumauni, expressing her own certainty that it is a language. She emphasized the prevailing discourse that Kumauni is not considered to be a language, justified in part by its lack of official status and (then) lack of an official function in schools. A Hindi professor at Kumaun University similarly told me that "Kumauni is developed as a language, but it is used as a dialect" (E; PQ:08Feb25). For more discussion on this issue, see Groff (2010, 2018).

The power of official policy to influence local discourses about linguistic varieties is evident in Shobha-Didi's references to higher-level language policies. Hindi is "what they call the mother tongue" and is (hence) "considered to be the mother tongue." Beyond this conversation, the question of language versus dialect and the related question of what is considered to be mother tongue continued to grab my interest throughout my fieldwork, especially as they relate to issues of medium of instruction and mother-tongue education. While "[i]f we think about it, Kumauni is our mother tongue," the reality of "what they have put it as officially" is important in local discourses and in educational practices.

Discourses Shaped by Policy: Official and Unofficial Mother Tongue

Is the mother tongue of a Kumauni person considered to be Kumauni or Hindi? The answer in this rural Indian context is not always either/or. While Hindi is often listed as the mother tongue of Kumaunis for official purposes, Kumauni is usually the language spoken in the home, particularly in rural areas, and is acknowledged locally, as by linguists, to be quite distinct from Hindi. This ambiguity is often explained as follows: Kumauni is not a *bhasha*. It is a *boli*. Although the approximate translations of these Hindi terms are "language" and "dialect" [or "spoken variety"], I found the use of the terms in local discourses to be informative. Through my conversations in the Kumaun, I explored local understandings of bhasha and boli—a distinction that can involve the form of the linguistic varieties, their functions, and the status attributed to them by the government (Groff 2010, 2013). From a linguistic perspective, the differences are significant enough to designate Kumauni as a language (Lewis et al. 2013, Sharma, 1988), and Kumauni is taught at Kumaun University through a literature course at the BA level. However, in basic education, the educational function has thus-far belonged to Hindi, and from a national-level policy perspective, Kumauni is categorized under Hindi as a boli. The official status attributed to a linguistic variety by the government does influence local perceptions of whether it can be considered a bhasha or a boli.

For official purposes, and likely following the discourses learned at school, most rural Kumaunis seem willing to accept their spoken variety as not having the status of a language. When I raised questions about the status of Kumauni and the difference between bhasha and boli, I was often given an explanation about the fact that Kumauni is not yet recognized as a language by the Indian government—or, more specifically, that Kumauni has not been listed in the nation's Constitution. Many Kumaunis respect the constitutional

designation of “scheduled” languages to the extent that this influences their definition of a language. From that perspective, Kumauni is not considered a language because it is not listed among the twenty-two constitutionally scheduled languages. For this same reason, many Kumaunis claim Hindi as their mother tongue for census purposes, because Hindi is a language legitimized in the Constitution. A professor at Kumaun University explained that this is a technical problem in the Census. Because Kumauni has not found a place in the Indian Constitution, it comes under the area of Hindi. However many Hindi boli there are, he said, they are all considered dialects of Hindi. This professor does not question the situation but sees a potential for change, saying, “When Kumauni gets a Constitutional position, then it will be counted [in the Census].” Taking this approach, the citizen’s group Yuva Garhwal Sabha has actively promoted the inclusion of Kumauni and neighboring Garhwali in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

Alternatively, one of the proposals raised at a seminar on Kumauni language held in Kausani was that, when reporting their mother tongue for the Census, everyone should write Kumauni instead of Hindi. This approach, we were told, played an important role in the movement for getting the Santhali language recognized in the Constitution, demonstrating a successful bottom-up effort to change national discourses regarding the status of a particular language. Most Kumaunis do not push back against national language policies in such an explicit way, but the local use of Kumauni in (unofficial) educational practice, the valuing of Kumauni in local discourses, and the power of Kumauni at the village level, as described below, reflect the value of boli and of linguistic diversity in local language ideologies.

Language Ideology and Valued Diversity in the Kumaun

When I talked with my group of young women at Lakshmi Ashram about comparisons between language and the environment, the focus of their response was on diversity: “Yes! Just like the environment is different from place to place, so language is different” (H; PQ:08Apr21). They expressed the value of each language and of diversity, citing the popular saying, “Every mile the water changes, every four miles the language.” Just as the flavor of the water in the mountain streams differs from place to place, the linguistic varieties used from village to village differ. The naturalness of ecological diversity in the Himalayan foothills compares easily with the naturalness of linguistic diversity there. Differences are expected in linguistic varieties and in language use from place to place, in different environments, as exemplified by Govindi, whose experiences have given her the perspective of both outsider and insider in Kumauni village life.

Language in Kumauni Villages: Govindi’s Experiences and Perspectives

Seventeen-year-old Govindi is unique among the young women with whom I spent time in that all of the others had Kumauni as their home language. In Govindi’s home, though her family is Kumauni, everyone speaks Hindi. She explained that they had been living in a research institute compound where everyone spoke Hindi, so from her childhood it had been that way. Then they moved back to her father’s home village just after she had completed fifth grade. When they arrived in the village, she and her sisters did not speak Kumauni, but they were soon to begin learning it, realizing that without Kumauni they could not communicate or show proper respect, especially to elderly people in the village: “So out of consideration for them... we learned to speak Kumauni” (H; DQ:07Oct24). It also seemed natural to Govindi that in coming to live in the mountains, she should learn the local language, which was also her parents’ language: “Because if someone lives in the Kumaun, they should know Kumauni” (H; PQ:07Oct24).

For Govindi and others with whom I spoke in the village context, Kumauni clearly has value in its place. That young women would learn Kumauni in order to communicate in the villages is a good sign for Kumauni vitality. But our conversations did not remain focused on the village context. When we zoom out in perspective and the international context takes focus, English begins to dominate. During our interview, I asked Govindi about changes in language use over time. "First there was Kumauni," she said. She paused, shifted scales and zoomed out:

> I'll tell you about today's international situation. On the international front, if we speak Hindi, it doesn't have much VALUE. If we know English, we will be SPECIAL. And other people will [say]: "Wow! She speaks English!" Isn't that how it is? (H; DQ:07Oct24)

Words in capital letters were spoken in English, inserted naturally into the Hindi sentence. Besides this lexical borrowing, Govindi's knowledge of English was extremely basic and not adequate for conversation. The status of English and the status attributed to a person who speaks English are clear in the present-day, macro-level situation that Govindi describes. In the international context, even Hindi seems small, and Kumauni seems even smaller:

> And speaking Hindi… they'll think, "She doesn't know English." If someone doesn't know English, people think s/he doesn't know anything. That's how they think, isn't it? Because English has become INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE. So such a distinction has come, that Pahari speakers are considered to be tribals *[adivaasi]*. (H; DQ:07Oct24)

The term *Pahari*, meaning "of the mountains," is often used locally to refer to Kumauni. In Govindi's comment, there is clearly a negative association with being considered an *adivaasi*, tribal person. The term is usually reserved for those Scheduled Tribes designated in the Constitution as requiring governmental support and protection. They usually live in remote places, are generally not Hindu, and are considered culturally distinct. Kumaunis are not adivaasi. However, it seems that in comparison with English and the respect that speaking English generates, Kumauni has been bumped down to a lower status. Govindi continues:

> In the old times, those who were Indian had Hindi and for the village people, they spoke their own village language, the old language of their own area. But now everyone has joined together. Because outside people come in and people from here go outside. (H; DQ:07Oct24)

Interestingly, the village languages, so often referred to as dialects with implications of inferiority, are considered to be the old, original varieties in this discourse. As Govindi points out, the villages are no longer as isolated as they once were. Just as at the village level, at the international level as well there is increasing exchange of people. She went on to describe, in her own way, the transfer of educated people from India to other countries in search of higher salaries, emphasizing their neglect for the development of their own country.

The way Govindi sees the language situation in India, English, as the international language, has taken first place, while Hindi comes in second, now having "less honor," in her words. "What about Kumauni?" I asked. "Kumauni is such a tiny, tiny language. I don't know on what thousandth number it would be, right? Because we shouldn't just look at the village. We should talk about all of India and all of the world" (H; DQ:07Oct24). Govindi has explicitly maintained an international perspective in her response. If Kumauni seems so small in the international context, perhaps its chances are slim. We zoom in again to the situation in the Kumaun and the issue of language shift. Does Govindi think that the

day may come when Kumauni would no longer be spoken? Now she shifts scale with me, and the prospects for Kumauni appear less grim. She thinks that it will still be spoken in the future, though much less:

> I'm not saying that people shouldn't learn English. I, myself, want to learn English because for speaking, for business and for all things, to know someone else's feelings—that's why learning language is essential… Also learn them, but don't forget your own language. If you want to learn, learn it all. But forgetting one's own language, forgetting one's own birth life and taking someone else's—that should not be. Don't you also agree that it shouldn't be? (H; DQ:07Oct24)

This additive notion of language learning was one that I heard frequently in the Kumaun. Learning another language does not (and should not) necessitate the loss of one's own. However, as other languages enter more domains, Kumauni may be at risk of being forgotten. The tendency to leave behind one's birthplace and, at least in the next generation, one's language continues. Govindi does not like the perspective of those who are leaving Kumauni behind: "Throwing away one thing and taking up another isn't good" (H; DQ:07Oct24). She also expressed the importance of using each language in its appropriate context.

Govindi drew from her own experience of moving to a Kumauni village and only knowing Hindi. She explained that, while she and her family do not feel superior, the villagers would assume that they think highly of themselves, that "I am everything. I know Hindi. What do you people know?" (H; DQ:07Oct24). Thus, a Kumauni who speaks Hindi in the village seems to be putting him or herself above the others. There is clearly some resistance to the invasion of Hindi in the village context. Hindi is the higher-status language at school and in wider society, but Kumauni has an important role as the language of the home and village. Govindi continued to describe the reaction in the village to her not speaking Kumauni (or Pahari):

> They will speak of us badly. They will say, "Even though she's Pahari, she's not speaking Pahari." They sometimes speak in this way… "*Are! Baap re!* Have you forgotten your own language? Now she goes around speaking Hindi!" (K/H; DQ:07Oct24)

Govindi takes the voice of the village accuser who uses a common expression of surprise and brings public attention to an infringement of the linguistic norm in the village. Having experienced this kind of reaction to her use of Hindi in the village, Govindi had the motivation she needed to learn Kumauni. While Govindi recognizes trends towards language shift on the larger scale and the growing importance of English, her own experience at the village level reflects the strength of Kumauni within its context. She and those around her value multilingualism. Using the language of the village is socially important, and learning another language does not imply loss of the former.

Language Ideologies Shaping Discourse and Practice

The language ideologies evident through my observations and interviews in the Kumaun reflect a value for multilingualism. Each of the languages of relevance in the Kumaun—including Kumauni, Hindi, Sanskrit, and English—is valued within its context and in its specific role. Each language has a function, and one language need not be lost when another language is learned. "It's OK to learn English, but people should also keep using Hindi and Kumauni," a Class 9 student at Lakshmi Ashram told me (H; PQ:08Apr8). In another context, a Class 12 student said: "People should know their own language! It's OK for them to learn other languages also, but they should know their own" (H; PQ:07Dec1). Another student told me that learning English is important but that people

should not throw away Hindi in the process. Although each language is valued in its place or role, status differences among the languages do exist, influenced in part by national-level language policies.

From a village-level perspective, Kumauni is valued and respected as distinct from Hindi. Whether rural Kumaunis accept the designations of bhasha or boli, they value Kumauni for its role in the home and in the community, regardless of official designations. More often than references to Kumauni being "just" or "only" a boli, I heard about the value of Kumauni and the value of boli. The possibility of having allegiance to multiple mother tongues reflects the multilingual realities of India, just as children from multilingual families have multiple mother tongues. But the embracing of multiple mother tongues also reflects an acceptance for diversity in local ideology and the natural adoption of multiple identities (Groff 2013). In this case, scale also plays a role as Kumaunis embrace the mother tongue of the home and the village at one level and the mother tongue of the nation at another.

Educational implications for Kumauni's status—or lack of status—as a language include its official absence in government schools, where Hindi is the official medium of instruction. From my observation and interviews in the Kumaun, however, I discovered that, despite official designations of Hindi as medium of instruction, Kumauni often does have an unofficial role in schools. Though the practice is not acknowledged as standard educational practice, Kumauni teachers often use the home language in explaining content to their students, besides in informal interactions. In this way, Kumauni often serves as an unofficial medium of instruction through which teachers build on the linguistic resources that students bring to school (Groff 2010, 2013). The above examples reflect the value of multilingualism and acceptance of diversity in local language ideologies as influencing the appropriation of language policies and policy-inspired discourses regarding language. The following ecological metaphor and Govindi's interpretation of it shed further light on the complex relationship among the languages of the Kumaun as seen from various perspectives, on various scales.

Dominant Trees and Dominant Languages: A Matter of Perspective

A strong species of pine trees dominates in the foothills of the Himalayas in the Kumaun. These pine trees grow quickly, are not easily harmed by insects, are not eaten by cows when they are young, and are not easily destroyed by forest fires. Their current dominance is also due to previous forestry regulations that favored the pines. In a purely monetary economy, the pine tree is preferable over other trees, valuable for resin and timber under the jurisdiction of the forestry department. The pine trees often grow alone as a species, their thick carpet of pine needles hindering the growth of other young trees and plants. Contrasting with the thin pine forests are the denser, mixed forests. Locally, the mixed forests are seen to be clearly superior, both for the environment and for the daily needs of the village people. They hold the topsoil better, allow for the growth of a variety of species, and are a valuable source of firewood and fodder.

Local forest resources are very much a part of the students' lives at Lakshmi Ashram, as groups of students venture into the forest daily to collect firewood for the school kitchen and fodder for the school's cows. The students also learn about important ecological issues beyond the village. News reports about dam construction and water shortages throughout India are read and discussed in the daily school assemblies. Sometimes Ashram members join foot marches and protests related to environmental issues. Groups of older students perform songs and skits for environmental awareness-raising campaigns in the villages. I discussed with my group of 11th-year students some comparisons between environmental and language issues.

Regarding the dominance of some trees over others, the young women agreed that the pine dominates over other trees. I asked which language would go with which tree here. “There are lots of pine trees here, so that would be Kumauni,” Govindi replied. “But—No—if we take all of India, it would be English! Because English is the INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE. In India, English is first; then Hindi is second; then the other languages” (H; PQ:08Apr21). Her analysis first of Kumauni as dominant and then English reflects not so much a change in opinion as a shift in scale—a shift in perspective, from micro to macro. The interpretation of the metaphor depends on the perspective taken or the scale invoked. When looked at from the village perspective, Kumauni seems to dominate, spoken by all and unmarked in conversations within the village where Hindi and English seem out of place. But from national and international perspectives, English dominates. Like the pine forests, English is not easily stopped; its economic advantages outside of the village promote its spread, and it has the reputation for excluding smaller varieties and hindering diversity. Between these two levels is Hindi, which dominates in the school, in the region, and in the nation when compared to other Indian languages. A shift in scale changes the appearance of the relationships among the languages.

From village to national to international perspectives, the metaphor of the mixed forest works. Neither solely Kumauni nor solely English is desirable, according to the Kumaunis with whom I spoke. The village and the environment thrive in diversity. The ecology of language metaphor reminds us that the relationships among various languages in a social environment influence the ways they change and their long-term fate. The example of the forests also highlights the various benefits of those linguistic relationships to those involved. Diversity has more value at the local level but seems less important to those who can benefit economically or politically from uniformity. Much as the diverse, mixed forests provide valuable resources for village life, linguistic diversity has a valued role in the rural Kumaun. Much as the homogenous pine forests prove more valuable for more macro-level economic interests, the suppression or minimization of linguistic diversity may serve a purpose on other scales.

Although in contexts of biliteracy, the macro tends to be valued over the micro, the literate over the oral, and the monolingual over the multilingual (Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester 2000), these power dynamics can shift or be reversed in different contexts (Pak 2003). Power dynamics change depending on the lens or perspective. On a more micro level, young women in Kumauni villages feel pressure to use the language of the place, Kumauni, where the use of English and of Hindi is mocked.

Still, the fact that Govindi and her sisters, as Kumauni girls, grew up speaking only Hindi when living outside of the Kumauni environment reflects a broader reality. Outside of the Kumaun, the importance of the Kumauni language shrinks. Though dominant in a Kumauni village, the language and its speakers are depreciated as backwards and underdeveloped from urban, national, and international perspectives. Even in the Kumaun, some parents are speaking to their children in Hindi, wanting to give them advantages in school and beyond the village. The more macro-level power dynamics among the languages have an influence at the local level, and the language of the place may be shifting, especially for the younger generation and certainly in urban areas. While discourses of additive multilingualism are strong still, in practice, emphasis on learning Hindi and English may come at the expense of Kumauni in the younger generations.

With this in mind, my rural friends talked about the importance of valuing and maintaining Kumauni. Regarding the greater honor given to Hindi, one of the young Ashram teachers said:

> I don’t like it, because Kumauni also has some honor *[mahatva]*. People think when they are at home that Kumauni has some honor, but then they go outside and they see that Hindi is more important.

> No one understands them when they speak Kumauni. They see that Hindi has honor, and they start thinking that Kumauni doesn't. (H; PQ:07Dec1)

In going beyond the home and the village, to the urban areas and to the plains, Kumaunis face the diminished role and diminished honor for the Kumauni language. The perspective changes. Hierarchies are evident in the ecological relationships among the languages of the Kumaun, and yet those hierarchies shift depending on the perspective taken, the lens used, or the scale invoked.

Conclusion and Implications: Language Policy and Language Ideology in Ecological Perspectives

The language and education situation in the Kumaun resembles that of other minoritized communities around the world whose linguistic varieties are invisibilized in educational contexts and in national discourse. The Kumauni example demonstrates how local ideologies and perspectives can preserve spaces for minoritized linguistic varieties regardless of official policy: spaces for unofficial mother tongue, unofficial media of instruction, and additive notions of multilingualism.

In attempting to understand a complex linguistic ecology, we make choices about which perspective to take, which lens to use, which scale to invoke. The local perspectives made available through ethnography provide an important lens for analyzing macro-level language and education policies—for illuminating how national policies are interpreted and appropriated at local levels, influencing discourses about language, and how local ideologies mediate perceptions about language regardless of those policies. The distant snow-capped peaks of the Himalayas, each known by name, look different from different vantage points in the surrounding foothills and valleys. I have used *perspective* to describe, in simplest terms, the different vantage points from which a certain situation can be understood or analyzed or from which a certain policy can be interpreted or contested. I imagine an observer looking through a spyglass, choosing to zoom in or out on different spatial or temporal scales, focusing on different dimensions of social life, and looking through particular ideological lenses. (See also Hult's 2010 microscope analogy).

National-level language policies in the Indian Constitution as well as in census practices and educational provisions have left space for regional languages and yet have invisibilized many minority linguistic varieties. In explaining these choices, I note the political expediency at a particular point in time, with a focus on national cohesion at India's independence. Language-related discourses and practices have been influenced by those policies down to the village level in the Kumaun. Shift perspectives and note the international spread of English and a concern for promoting Hindi, as enacted at Lakshmi Ashram and as expressed by Shoba-Didi. At Lakshmi Ashram, the medium of instruction is consciously and explicitly Hindi as opposed to English. From a national perspective (spatially), and indeed a nationalist perspective (ideologically), this policy favors mother-tongue education, understood by a categorization of Hindi as the mother tongue or *matra bhasha*. Thus, the language of the classroom is Hindi, although much informal interaction at Lakshmi Ashram happens in Kumauni. Attitudes toward English also depend on ideological perspective: whether the language is associated with colonial domination, as at the Gandhian Ashram, or with modern global opportunity, as at English-medium schools.

Shift perspectives again and note the opposite international trend towards promoting minority identities and indigenous rights. Though invisible at the national level, Kumauni has a valued role at the local level and is being promoted for national recognition by some activists.

In my conversations with Shoba-Didi and with Govindi, the perspective was initially focused at a more macro level on the relationship between English and Hindi—on the

importance of Hindi as "mother tongue" and on its relatively low status internationally. When I shifted the focus of the conversations to Kumauni, I also triggered a scale shift—a shift to a place where Kumauni matters, to a point where linguistic hierarchies shift, local linguistic variety is valued, additive multilingualism is the norm, and "what they have put it as officially" shrinks in importance. Although national-level policies, reflecting more homogenizing ideologies, may influence local discourses and practices, including which languages belong in schools, the interpretation and appropriation of those policies are also influenced by the local ideological environment. Govindi experiences the power of Kumauni at the village level, despite its relative weakness when considered from a global perspective. The acceptance of Hindi as mother tongue for educational purposes reflects the superiority of Hindi at the national level, and yet the valued role of Kumauni at the village level demonstrates an appreciation for diversity in this multilingual context regardless of external linguistic hierarchies. Approaching a situation from different spatial and/or ideological perspectives changes the analysis of that situation, influencing interpretations of policy as well.

Returning to the pine forest, seventeen-year-old Govindi provides an analysis of language dominance that varies depending on perspective, reflecting the power of human agents to shift the focus to different realities. We have seen that the trees can be construed as representing different languages depending on whether one is thinking of the local or of a broader context. Discourses and interpretations of a situation vary depending on the lens through which one is looking or the scale one is invoking. India's multilingual policies emphasize diversity from one perspective but seem to obscure diversity from another. Mother tongue can seem to be Hindi from one perspective or Kumauni from another. When looked at from the village perspective, Kumauni seems to dominate, spoken by all and unmarked in conversations within the village where Hindi and English seem out of place. But from national and international perspectives, English dominates. At the risk of mixing metaphors, I believe that the images presented above help to highlight important insights within the broader ecology of language metaphor. The richness of diversity as understood from a local, Kumauni perspective contrasts with the homogenizing nature of the dominant pine forests. The interpretation of dominance and the categorization of linguistic varieties is a matter of perspective, as is the distinction between mountains and hills. The expected uniqueness of village speech varieties is valued, as are differences in the water of mountain streams. Researchers and policymakers at all levels would do well to consider these various vantage points in making language decisions. Analyses from more perspectives, with multiple foci, on different scales, and through various lenses will provide a fuller picture of a situation and, in this case, will contribute to a fuller understanding of linguistic hierarchies, language and education policies, and educational implications for young women and their educators in the Kumaun and beyond.

Cynthia Groff is currently a Marie Curie research fellow at Leiden University College, The Hague. The research described here was conducted during her doctoral studies at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education. (cgroff@alumni.upenn.edu)

Note

Acknowledgements. This research was supported in part by the American Association of University Women. I am grateful to my Kumauni sisters who have shared their lives with me and to my academic community who made this analysis possible.

References Cited

Annamalai, E. 2001. *Managing Multilingualism in India: Political and Linguistic Manifestation*. Vol. 8. New Delhi, India: Sage.
————. 2005. "Nation-Building in a Globalised World: Language Choice and Education in India." In *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice*, edited by Angel M. Y. Lin and Peter W. Martin, 21–38. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Barton, David, Mary Hamilton, and Roz Ivanič, eds. 2000. *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Psychology Press.
Blackledge, Adrian. 2008. "Language Ecology and Language Ideology." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, edited by Nancy H. Hornberger, 2923–36. New York: Springer US.
Blommaert, Jan. 2007. "Sociolinguistic Scales." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4 (1): 1–19.
————. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Practices*. New York: Routledge.
Census of India. 2013. Official Website. Accessed April 21. http://www.censusindia.net.
Chambers, Robert. 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Harlow: Longman.
————. 1997. *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London: Intermediate Technology.
Das Gupta, Jyotirindra. 1970. *Language Conflict and National Development*. Berkeley: University of California.
Daswani, C. J., ed. 2001. *Language Education in Multilingual India*. New Delhi: UNESCO.
Dua, Hans R. 1985. *Language Planning in India*. New Delhi: Harnam.
Groff, C. 2007. "Status and Acquisition Planning for Linguistic Minorities in India." *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 22 (1): 15–41.
————. 2010. "Language, Education, and Empowerment: Voices of Kumauni Young Women in Multilingual India." *Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations.* Accessed October 31, 2017. http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/115.
————. 2013. "Multilingual Discourses and Pedagogy in North India." In *Bilingual Education and Language Policy in the Global South*, edited by J. A. Shoba and F. Chimbutane, 190–206. London: Routledge.
————. 2017. "Language and Language-in-Education Planning in Multilingual India: A Linguistic Minority Perspective." *Language Policy* 16 (2): 135–64.
————. 2018. *The Ecology of Language in Multilingual India: Voices of Women and Educators in the Himalayan Foothills (Palgrave Studies in Minority Languages and Communities)*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Groff, C., A. Pilote, and K. Vieux-Fort. 2016. " 'I Am not a Francophone': Identity Choices and Discourses of Youth Associating with a Powerful Minority." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 15 (2): 83–99.
Haugen, Einar. 1972. *The Ecology of Language: Essays*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
Heller, Monica, and Marilyn Martin-Jones. 2001. *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
Hornberger, Nancy H. 1989. "Continua of Biliteracy." *Review of Educational Research* 59 (3): 271–96.
————. 2002. "Multilingual Language Policies and the Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Approach." *Language Policy* 1 (1): 27–51.
————. 2006. "Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning." In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, edited by T. Ricento, 24–41. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Hornberger, Nancy H., and Ellen Skilton-Sylvester. 2000. "Revisiting the Continua of Biliteracy: International and Critical Perspectives." *Language and Education: An International Journal* 14 (2): 96–122.
Hult, Francis. 2010. "Analysis of Language Policy Discourses across the Scales of Space and Time." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202:7–24.
Irvine, J., and S. Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*, edited by P. V. Kroskrity, 35–83. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
Jayaram, B. D., and K. S. Rajyashree. 2000. *State Official Language Policy Implementation: A Geolinguistic Profile in Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
Johnson, David Cassels. 2009. "Ethnography of Language Policy." *Language Policy* 8 (2): 139–59.
Jørgensen, Jens Normann. 2008. "Polylingual Languaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5 (3): 161–76.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1989. "Language Planning vs. Planning Language." In *Language, Learning and Community*, edited by C. H. Candlin and T. F. McNamara, 193–203. Sydney: NCELTR.
Khubchandani, Lachman M. 1981. *Multilingual Education in India*. Pune: Center for Communication Studies.
————. 2001. "Language Demography and Language Education." In *Language Education in Multilingual India*, edited by C. J. Daswani, 3–47. New Delhi: UNESCO.
Klenk, Rebecca M. 2010. *Educating Activists: Development and Gender in the Making of Modern Gandhians*. Idaho Falls, ID: Lexington Books.
————. 2014. "Gandhi's Other Daughter: Sarala Devi and Lakshmi Ashram." *Himalaya, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies* 34 (1): 94–104.
Kumar, Arun. 1985. *Cultural and Educational Rights of the Minorities under Indian Constitution*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep.
Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, eds. 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Seventeenth edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International. Accessed October 31, 2017. http://www.ethnologue.com.
Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley: University of California.
Mahapatra, B. P. 1986. "Language Planning and Census in India." In *Language Planning: Proceedings of an Institute*, edited by E. Annamalai, B. Jernudd and J. Rubin, 43–72. Mysore, India: CIIL.
Makoni, Sinfree, and Alastair Pennycook, eds. 2007. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Mohanty, Ajit. 2006. "Multilingualism of the Unequals and Predicaments of Education in India: Mother Tongue or Other Tongue?" In *Imagining Multilingual Schools*, edited by O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, and M. E. Torres-Guzman, 262–279. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Mohanty, Ajit, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson, and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. 2009. *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. Telangana, India: Orient Blackswan.
Pak, Holly R. 2003. "When MT Is L2: The Korean Church School as a Context for Cultural Identity." In *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice*, edited by Nancy H. Hornberger, 269–90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Ricento, Thomas. 2000. "Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (2): 196–213.
Ricento, Thomas, and Nancy H. Hornberger. 1996. "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional." *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3): 401–27.
Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
Sharma, D. D. 1988. "Kumauni Language and Dialects." In *Kumaun, Land and People*, edited by K. S. Valdiya, 120–136. Nainital, India: B.L. Consul for Gyanodaya Prakashan.
Shohamy, E. 2009. "Language Policy as Experiences." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 33 (2): 185–89.
Street, Brian, ed. 1993. *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
Street, Brian. 2005. *Literacies across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Carlon.
Vaish, Viniti. 2004. "Vidyashakti: Biliteracy and Empowerment in India. The Continua of Biliteracy in Action." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
Woolard Kathryn A. 1998. "Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry." In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity, 3–49. New York: Oxford University.