



Investigation of Educational Language Policy of Pakistan: An Evaluative Study

Correspondence:	Kainat Dilawar <kainatdilawar123@gmail.com>	MPhil. Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Fauji Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
	Rizwan Haider <rizwanucp786@gmail.com>	MPhil. Linguistics, Department of English, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.
	Muhammad Dawood Hassan <dawoodzafar121@gmail.com>	MPhil. Applied Linguistics, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Publication details:		
Received: Jan 15, 2022	Accepted: February 25, 2022	Published: March 30, 2022

Abstract

Language policy and planning (LPP) is a mechanism of policy makers’ decisions and its implementation through documentational or non-documentational practices. This study has established stance around the term ‘Language Policy and Evaluation (LPE)’, which includes documents related to the language policy. The chief purpose of this study is to evaluate the policy planning with regards to evaluation of policy document ‘National Education Policy (NEP) 2017’, by applying proposed checklist on the basis of Haddad and Demsky’s (1995) framework for policy making and planning at macro-level. Therefore, the current study has critically investigated: how educational Language Policy in Pakistan is designed. For the analysis purpose, the policy document was collected through online source. The findings of this study revealed that policy has mostly discussed the elements said by the modal at macro-level. The conclusion and educational implications of this study suggest stakeholders and researches for ELP assessment and evaluation for further development of policies and the field of study.

Keywords: language policy and planning, language across educational documentation, power representation, critical discourse analysis, Urdu textbooks

1. Introduction

The present research is about Educational Language Policy and its Evaluation (ELPE). The notion of ELPE is related to inquest language reforms, spread, standardization, or unification (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Reagan, 2010) through documentational and non-documentational practices in the field of education. Currently, this study emphasizes documentational enactment (Liddicoat, 2004) under the term Language across Educational Documentation (LED) (Hassan & Shah, 2022; Anjum & Shah, 2022) which inculcates all kind of documents established by the authorities to manage the policy’s making, planning, and implementing: from policy framework document to classroom material. Prior studies have discussed LPP at different levels: nationalization, standardization, globalization, officialization, etc., at macro-level (Ferguson, 1996; Shouhui & Baldauf, 2012) and language shift, endangerment, bilingualism, medium of instruction policy, etc., at micro level (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; McCarty, 2002; Tollefson, 2002), in addition to that, modern researches are also dealing with meso-level (Shohamy, 2006; Cincotta-Segi, 2011; Johnson, 2013; Liddicoat, 2014; Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Hassan & Shah, 2022; Anjum & Shah, 2022) of the policy which bridges former two levels by giving evidential support to Ricento and Hornberger’s (1996) concept of policy as multilayered phenomenon. Albeit, in the context of ELPE, Cooper and Cooper’s (1989) work on acquisition planning empowers this fundamental domain of LPP. The recent study has focused on the macro-level to evaluate the policy through its document under the application of Haddad and Demsky’s (1995) model framework for the evaluation of ELP document of Pakistan.

The chief purpose of this study is to inquest ELPE of Pakistan at macro-level of LPP through the exploration: how Educational Language Policy (ELP) of Pakistan is designed and planned. To achieve the said purpose this study proposed the following question to meet the purpose of the study: How far the Educational Language Policy (ELP) has been designed at macro-level in Pakistan theoretically?

2. Literature Review

The following section of the study provides overview of the previously conducted studies in the field of LPP, purposefully distinguishing: researches conducted in other than Pakistani and within Pakistani context. In case of other than Pakistani context based studies following features have been emphasized: getting conceptual and theoretical understanding of LPP (Liddicoat, 2004; Lo Bianco, 2009; Johnson & Ricento, 2013; Nekvapil, 2016; Hornberger, Tapia, Hanks & Dueñas, 2018; Pérez-Milans & Tollefson, 2018; Tollefson & Pérez-Milans, 2018); evaluating implementations (Evans & Hornberger, 2005; Ruiz-Primo, 2006; Siiner, 2006; Wang, 2008; Nguyen, 2011; Bilotta, 2017) through investigating problems and mismatches in planning and its practice (Coady & Laoire, 2002; Yoshida, 2003; Nero, 2014; Leibowitz, 2015; Miranda, Berdugo & Tejada, 2016), and accessibility towards macro to micro levels of society (Tollefson & Tsui, 2014; Sibomana, 2018); exploring the role of LPP in historical (Ricento, 2000; Poon, 2010); political (Silver, 2005; Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Abdelhay, Abu-Manga & Miller, 2015), industrial (Gonçalves, 2020); and educational (Plüddemann, 2015; Hamid & Erling, 2016; Liddicoat, 2016; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2016; Hamel, Alvarez Lopez & Carvalhal, 2016; Wiley & García, 2016; Elyas & Badawood, 2016; Jaspers, 2018; Rahman & Pandian, 2018; Pinto & Araújo e Sá, 2019; Yevudey & Agbozo, 2019) realms; more specifically, language acquisition (Han, De Costa & Cui, 2019), indigenous languages (Hornberger, 1998; De Korne, 2010; Bradley, 2019), multilingualism (Adegbiya, 2004; Lundberg, 2018; Chen, Dervin, Tao & Zhao, 2020), globalization (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016), intertextuality (Johnson, 2015), ideology (Reagan, 1986; Hélot, 2003; Lawton, 2008; Rubdy, 2008; Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2009; Farr & Song, 2011; Dharmaputra, 2018; Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2019); and power (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2015) directed by agencies (Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Fenton-Smith & Gurney, 2016; Liddicoat, 2019) related areas.



While in Pakistani context based studies, following features have been focused by the researchers: Sikandar (2017) presented review study on the LPP in context of Pakistan; Rafique, Sultan, Ahmad and Imran (2018) and Shahzad, Shahzad, Ahmed and Jabeen (2018) worked on linguistic feature of evaluation of LPP’s implementations; while, Manan, David and Dumanig (2015), and Ammar, Naveen, Fawad and Qasim (2015) investigated problems and mismatches in planning and its practice, and accessibility towards macro to micro levels of society have been discussed; Moreover, political (Rahman, 2002; Manan, David & Dumanig, 2016), and educational (Mansoor, 2003, 2004; Ahmad & Khan, 2011; Tamim & Tariq, 2013; Bolander, 2018; Khan, Khan & Ahmad, 2019; Sikandar, Hussain & David, 2019) realms have been extensively discussed by the researchers; language planning regarding localization (Rahman, 2004), Medium of instruction (Amir, 2008; Shamim & Rashid, 2019), and print or electronic media (Hassan, 2018) have also been probed.

The review of the said studies has disclosed that studies other than Pakistani and within Pakistani context have not explored the construction of ELP of Pakistan according to any model. To fill this gap this study examined the NEP by proposing a checklist based on the model discussed by Haddad and Demsky’s (1995).

3. Research Methodology

Presently, this study focused on evaluation of policy making and planning at macro-level. As per demand of the study, qualitative approach was applied for the analysis of NEP and to answer the proposed question of the study.

At macro-level, this study dealt with the evaluation of NEP through the checklist proposed by Hassan and Shah (2022) and Anjum and Shah (2022) on the basis of policy framework established by the Haddad and Demsky (1995) to answer the research question. Model has been presented in table 1.

Table 1. Framework for Policy Analysis

Policy Making	Existing Situation	Country Background
		Political Context
		Economic Context
		Education Sector
		Dynamics of Change
	The Generation of Policy Options	Systemic Mode
		Incremental Mode
		Ad hoc Mode
		Importation Mode
	Evaluation of Policy Options	Desirability
Affordability		
Feasibility		
	Making the Policy Decision	
Policy Planning	Planning of Policy Implementation	

3.1 Formation of the Checklists

The current section provides the checklists proposed by Hassan and Shah (2022) and Anjum and Shah (2022). The checklist for NEP evaluation was designed on the basis of Haddad and Demsky’s (1995) framework for LPP at the level of policy making and planning, the checklist has been attached below (see Table 2).

Table 2. Proposed checklist for NEP: Policy Making and Planning

Framework for Policy Analysis		Checklist	
		No.	List of Questions
Policy Making	Existing Situation		
	Country Background	1	Has existing situation of country been discussed with respect to location, geography, population, culture or social patterns?
	Political Context	2	Do elites have prioritized educational development in current national political situation of country?
	Economic Context	3	Has economic condition been focused by the planners in respect to the following:
		3.1	-Income distribution
		3.2	-Employment rate
		3.3	-Inflation rate
		3.4	-Demographic shifts
		3.5	-Urbanization
		3.6	-Migration
	Education Sector	3.7	-Educational expenditures
		4	Have current issues related to the educational sector been outlined by planners in regards to the following:
		4.1	-Making sure the access of educational opportunities
		4.2	-Making sure equity in the distribution of educational services
		4.3	-Improving structure of the education system (enrolment and retention rate, etc.)
	Dynamics of Change	4.4	-Improving internal and external efficiency
		4.5	-Improving the institutional arrangements (infrastructure, etc.)
		5	Is there any potential for reforms in policy and planning by the interest groups?
		6	Have interest groups shown any policy dynamics? i.e., interest groups:
		6.1	-Parents
		6.2	-Learners
		6.3	-Teachers
		6.4	-Educational Professionals
		6.5	-Officials (Bureaucrats)
		6.6	-Other Consumers
	The Generation of Policy Options		
	Systemic Mode	7	Was systemic option of policy generation applied by the planners?
	Incremental Mode	8	Was incremental option of policy generation applied by the planners?
	Ad hoc Mode	9	Was ad hoc option of policy generation applied by the planners?
	Importation Mode	10	Was importation option of policy generation applied by the planners?

Policy Planning	Evaluation of Policy Options	
	Desirability	11 Has selected policy option considered the desirability factor?
		12 Under the desirability factors, has the impact of policy option on different stakeholder and interest groups been considered?
		13 Have the compatibility with the dominant ideology and targets of economic growth been articulated in national development plans?
		14 Have the impact of a policy option on political development and the stability been considered?
	Affordability	15 Have the affordability factors been defined under the particular policy option?
	Feasibility	16 Have the feasibility factors been mentioned by the policy planners?
	Making the Policy Decision	
		17 How was decision made - did it go through all the stages of policy analysis?
		18 How radical a departure is the decision from current policy?
		19 How consistent is the decision with policies of other sectors?
		20 Is the policy diffusely articulated or stated in a manner which is easily measurable?
		21 Does the policy seem operational or implementation implausible?
	Planning of Policy Implementation	
		22 Did circumstances relate to implementation constraints, cause policy modifications to take place?
		23 Was feedback obtained during implementation causes reassessment of aspects of the policy decision and subsequent modifications by policymakers?
		24 Were the mere translation of abstract policy intentions into concrete implementation causes re-assessment and re-design?

Source: Haddad and Demsky’s (1995) framework for LPP at policy making and planning

3.2 Data for the Study

For the current Macro-level study upon the ELPE, the study selected documental data which was collected from online sources by following the described procedure: 1) policy was searched on ‘Google’ with the key words for: national education policy 2017 and downloaded in the form of PDF-file.

3.3 Analysis of the Study

With concern to analysis of the data, the macro-level analysis was done through checklists (Hassan & Shah, 2022; Anjum & Shah, 2022) derived from the frameworks proposed by the Haddad and Demsky (1995).

The data analysis procedure included the following steps: initially, LED’s data was collected from online means (as mention in earlier section); secondly, proposed checklists derived from the model framework of Haddad and Demsky (1995), and lastly, the Microsoft excel was used for statistical calculation of the percentage of framework’s application.

4. Results and Discussion

The following section of the research discusses the results of the study along with the placement of discussion upon the outcomes with regards to the previous studies.

4.1 Results

This section presents the results of micro-level analysis of the study in the form of table about the application of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2017.

A) Micro-Level of ELPP Evaluation

Table 3. Tabular and Statistical Representation of ELP of Pakistan’s Evaluation: Overall Results

Que.	Marks					Percentages of Whole Category Marks				
	NP	LP	MP	HP	E-	NP	LP	MP	HP	E-
Existing Situation										
1			✓							
2				✓						
3										
3.1				✓						
3.2					✓					
3.3		✓								
3.4		✓								
3.5		✓								
3.6		✓								
3.7					✓					
4						4.8%	33.3%	4.8%	9.5%	47.6%
4.1					✓					
4.2					✓					
4.3					✓					
4.4					✓					
4.5					✓					
5					✓					
6										
6.1		✓								
6.2		✓								
6.3		✓								

6.4		✓				
6.5		✓				
6.6	✓					
The Generation of Policy Options						
7		✓				
8	✓		75%	0%	0%	25%
9	✓					
10	✓					
Evaluation of Policy Options						
11	✓					
12	✓					
13		✓	50%	0%	0%	50%
14		✓				
15	✓					
16		✓				
Making the Policy Decision						
17		✓				
18		✓				
19		✓	0%	0%	0%	100%
20		✓				
21		✓				
Planning of Policy Implementation						
22		✓				
23	✓		66.67%			33.33%
24	✓					

Table 3 provided whole sum view of the results related to the evaluation of NLP 2017 document about ELPE of Pakistan under the application of proposed checklist based upon policy framework given by Haddad and Demsky (1995) previously experienced by Hassan and Shah (2022), Anjum and Shah (2022), and Sikandar (2017) in context of Pakistan by placed criticism on the prior policies however Sikandar’s (2017) work was delimited up to the level of: policy making (existing situation, generation of policy options, evaluation of policy options and making the policy decision) and policy planning (implementation). Findings of the study expressed that recent policy of educational language in Pakistan bothered all the specific qualities described by the theorists and approved by the UNESCO (1995).

4.2 Discussion

This section elaborates the results of the study by providing examples for each point of the proposed checklist (Hassan & Shah, 2022; Anjum & Shah, 2022) on the model of Haddad and Demsky (1995).

B) Micro-Level

At macro-level of ELPE in context of Pakistan, this study examined the NEP 2017 document by focusing the features discussed by Haddad and Demsky (1995).

4.2.1 Policy Making

According to the conceptual schema proposed by Haddad and Demsky (1995), policy making should contain the described multiple elements: existing situation, generating policy options, evaluation of policy options, and making policy decision. The following headings exemplified the results of the study presented previously.

4.2.1.1 Existing Situation

The current section elaborates the country background, political context, economic context, educational sector and dynamic change through the extracts of policy document.

4.2.1.1.1 Country Background

According to Haddad and Demsky (1995), it deals with locational, geographical, demographical, cultural, and social classification patterns.

1.
- Pakistan has a history of developing detailed and well- designed education policies since 1947 we want to successfully compete in the comity of nations (p. 9)

The paragraph (1) exemplified that policy has discussed the contextual situation of Pakistan by critically reviewing the policy making and implementing process science 1947 to till yet and also shown the dedication of the authorities in improvisation of the policy matter. The italicized phrases highlight the focus of the policy in regards to the NEP.

4.2.1.1.2 Political Context

It examines the priorities made by the national political elite regards educational development (Haddad & Demsky, 1995).

2.
- Advisory Committee of Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training (MFE & PT) comments and observations of provinces, federating units and civil society. (p. 4-5)

The second example, presented above as (2), displayed the political involvement in the decision-making process as, amplified through the italicized phrases, and also the ideas and points recommended by those political and non-political bodies have been considered by the designers.

4.2.1.1.3 Economic Context

Haddad and Demsky (1995) proposed this heading by consider the current macro-economic and human resources related situation.

3. Pakistan is confronted with enormous socio-economic challenges. growth is 53.1 percent, manufacturing 21.6 percent and agricultural in 25.3 percent. (p. 68)

The retrieved text (3) exemplified that policy document has discussed the economic condition of Pakistan. The presented examples are the depiction of the past economic condition and also the betterment has been seen up to 2016. While other factors, such as: demographic, urbanization and migration, have been discussed at lower priority as already presented in results.

4.2.1.1.4 Education Sector

Education sector analysis is to disclose the issues related to educational access opportunities, equality in educational services, structure of the education system, internal and external efficiency and institutional marshaling for the sector management (Haddad & Demsky, 1995).

4. Early childhood education..... access/enrolment; improving the quality throughECE trained teachers.... (p. 5)

This section captured a number of examples to cover the all factors discussed by the policy makers in regards to all different levels of schooling. Although, the example (4) has provided the evidence that the policy makers have extensively discussed and focused all the points regarding: access, equity, education structure, efficiency and institutional management.

4.2.1.1.5 Dynamics of Change

Haddad and Demsky (1995) discuss dynamics of change as identification of the interest group of the policy.

5. Policy makers,about the importance and significance of early childhood education, care, and development. (p. 31)

As presented in the results of the study, policy dynamics have been prominently practiced by the educational professionals and the officials however other interest groups have not been seen active in the process of policy making. The provided example bothers evidences for the activeness of interest groups in policy dynamics (also see example 2).

To conclude that, the above-mentioned examples provided evidences about the discussion of existing situation of Pakistan, which have been previously not considered by the policy designers; as criticized by Sikandar (2017). Policy makers have discussed the background of the socio-economic condition of Pakistan and the process of policy designing since 1947; recognized the political situation of the country, which was not stable because of political instability, war imposed by the neighboring countries, and Martial laws; presented the economic downfall and then the raise of GDP in last five years up to 2016; modification in the educational sector at all the schooling levels keeping in view the access, equity, managerial structure, efficiency (inner and outer), enrolment, employment and infrastructure related factors; political, educational professionals and bureaucracies' concerns in relation to establish a better NEP to improve the literacy and economic structure of the country. Haque (1983); Ayres (2003); Ernsberger (2012); Shih (2012); Serem, Njeri, and Kara, (2013); and Sikandar (2017) discussed that the existing situation of the concerned countries should be necessarily considered by the policy makers, while Ernsberger (2012), Shih (2012), Serem et al., (2013) have evaluated the policies of regarded countries and recognized that existing situation have been discussed by the policy designers, as the educational development can only be made by improving the factors discussed above.

4.2.1.2 The Generation of Policy Options

The findings of the study exhibited that NEP 2017 of Pakistan's document have applied the systematic mode to generate the policy option. For the justification purpose of the study have attached examples below:

6. Situation analysis (facts and Figures, data, latest research) (p. 23)

The above stated instance shown that policy planners have performed analysis of the situation with in the educational sector with regards to the other sectors: public, research and development sectors. Advisory Committee of Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training (MFE&PT) established comity for the policy making and selected educationists, professionals, officials and civil representatives. Those comity members evaluated the situations, discussed the issues and generated chapters on the assigned tasks as discussed in example (2). Therefore, 25% of the systematic policy generation bothers more value than the 75% of the other options which have been conceded as 'not a priority' (see Table as 4.3 and 4.5; Figure 4.2) as Mansoor, (2004) and Sikandar, (2017) placed criticism on prior policies due to the selection of incremental approaches. Shih (2012), and Serem et al., (2013) found the same mode of policy option while working on the different situations.

4.2.1.3 Evaluation of Policy Options

The study results investigated that desirability and the affordability factors was exempted by the policy makers during the generation of policy option as the example (6) verified that whole process was systematic and based on the sector analysis by considering every situation and factors which may affect.

7. Focuses on teacher education..... standards; quality assurance of teaching personnel; andprofessional development (p. 6)

The previously attached example supported the stance taken by the researcher that option can be evaluated and applied on the basis of feasibility. The attached substance exemplified those human resources about teacher's education, development, training, etc.; fiscal resources regarding financial management, have been discussed by the policy makers. Detailed chapters have been presented in NEP document: Teachers Education (p. 61) and Financing of Education (p. 160).

4.2.1.4 Making the Policy Decision

The results of the study already represented that policy makers have designed NEP 2017 of Pakistan with in a controlled and systematic manner. Prior discussion on the basis of each section and sub section devised in the conceptual framework of Haddad and Demsky (1995) have justified the NEP's level of perfection. This verified that policy decision has been made after passing through each described stage of analyzing the policy and found the policy radical, consistent in making decision and providing required equipment and policy document was well aligned to be studied, applied and evaluated. These features and the evidence-based discussion in every section testified that policy seems operationally active.

4.2.1.2.5 Policy Planning

This section of the language policy and its planning particularly deals with the planning of the policy to elaborate its implementation in the policy document.

4.2.1.2.5.1 Policy Planning: Implementation

This section deals with the implementation of the policy by focusing the circumstances in which policy is being implemented, feedback and intentions to evaluate the need of re-assessment of the policy (Haddad & Demsky, 1995).

8. National Commission for Human Development (NCHD)and replication of innovative literacy programmes. (p. 43)

The results upon the guided questions of the study discussed that implementation related issues were discussed in policy document, as the example (2) provided evidence that policy draft was reviewed by the committee, and then modifications were made in the secondly prepared draft. However, the other two questions have been marked as ‘No’ due to lack of evaluation in any concrete situation to pilot the study; although policy have discussed that plans for piloting the study have been discussed by the policy designers.

5. Conclusion

This section of the study sums up this study with answers of the research question raised above-mentioned and inferences, implications and limitations for this study. In order to answer the question, Pakistani NEP (2017) document of ELPE has been studied and verified at theoretical level using Haddad and Demsky’s (1995) framework that was based on UNESCO standards, and the results lead this study to decide that the said policy has been mostly designed as per the chosen framework. This study proposed the checklist for the analysis purpose in terms of policy making; existing situation, generation of policy options, evaluation of policy option and making policy decision; and policy planning by investigating the planning of policy implementation. For the initial part (policy making), priority levels of the Likert-scale (Vagias, 2006) were selected but the other part (policy planning) was evaluated through nominal scale (Salkind, 2010).

This study implicates the benefits for the different stakeholders: government officials, policy planners and designers, curriculum planners and designers, textbook planners and designers, teachers and learners, and future researchers. The boundaries of the current study based on the macro-level of ELPE also face certain limitations: working just at macro-level and implication of the policy have not been considered.

Funding: This study was not funded in any shape or form by any party.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Bio-note:

Kainat Dilawar is an MPhil scholar in department of Applied Linguistics at Fauji Foundation University. Her research interests are in Theories of Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis and Applied Linguistics.

Rizwan Haider is an MPhil in Linguistics from the department of English at Riphah International University. He is currently serving as lecturer in English at Shiblee College and has served in different other institutes as lecturer of English.

Muhammad Dawood Hassan is an MPhil in Applied Linguistics, department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad. He is currently serving at University of Central Punjab as lecturer of English and has also served in multiple other institutes as lecturer of English.

References

- Abdelhay, A. K., Makoni, B., & Makoni, S. B. (2011). The Naivasha Language Policy: The Language of Politics and the Politics of Language in the Sudan. *Language Policy*, 10(1), pp. 1-18.
- Abdelhay, A., Abu-Manga, A. A., & Miller, C. (2015). Language Policy and Planning in Sudan. *Multidimensional Change in Sudan (1989–2011): Reshaping Livelihoods, Conflicts and Identities*, p. 263.
- Adegbija, E. (2004). Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5(3), pp. 181-246.
- Ahmad, A., & Khan, S. (2011). Significance of Language Policy Awareness in English Language Teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, pp. 1897-1900.
- Amir, A. (2008). Chronicles of the English Language in Pakistan: A Discourse Analysis of Milestones in the Language Policy of Pakistan.
- Ammar, A., Naveen, A. L. I., Fawad, A., & Qasim, K. (2015). Language Policy and Medium of Instruction Issue in Pakistan. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 5(1), pp. 111-124.
- Anjum, R., & Shah, D. S. K. (2022). Investigating Power in English Educational Language Policy and Its Implementation: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 5(1), pp. 79-107.
- Ayres, A. (2003). The Politics of Language Policy in Pakistan. *Fighting Words: Language Policy and Ethnic Relations in Asia*, pp. 51-80.
- Bilotta, J. (2017). A Critical Analysis of the Effects of Language Policy, Curriculum, and Assessment on Arabic L1 Student Performance in an ESL Classroom.
- Bolander, B. (2018). Scaling Value: Transnationalism and the Aga Khan’s English as a “Second Language” Policy. *Language Policy*, 17(2), pp. 179-197.
- Bradley, D. (2019). Language Policy and Language Planning in Mainland Southeast Asia: Myanmar and Lisu. *Linguistics Vanguard*, 5(1).
- Chen, X., Dervin, F., Tao, J., & Zhao, K. (2020). Towards a Multilayered and Multidimensional Analysis of Multilingual Education: Ideologies of Multilingualism and Language Planning in Chinese Higher Education. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 21(3), pp. 320-343.
- Cincotta-Segi, A. R. (2011). ‘The Big Ones Swallow the Small Ones’. Or do they? Language-in-Education Policy and Ethnic Minority Education in the Lao PDR. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(1), pp. 1-15.
- Coady, M., & Laoire, M. Ó. (2002). Mismatches in Language Policy and Practice in Education: The Case of Gaelscoileanna in the Republic of Ireland. *Language Policy*, 1(2), pp. 143-158.
- Cooper, R. L., & Cooper, R. L. C. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge University Press.

- De Korne, H. (2010). Indigenous Language Education Policy: Supporting Community-Controlled Immersion in Canada and the US. *Language Policy*, 9(2), pp. 115-141.
- Dharmaputra, G. A. (2018). Language Policy, Ideology and Language Attitudes: A Study of Indonesian Parents and their Choice of Language in the Home.
- Elyas, T., & Badawood, O. (2016). English Language Educational Policy in Saudi Arabia Post-21st Century: Enacted Curriculum, Identity, and Modernisation: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach. In *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education* (Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 70-81). Lehigh University Library and Technology Services. 8A East Packer Avenue, Fairchild Martindale Library Room 514, Bethlehem, PA 18015.
- Ernsberger, L. (2012). Implementing National Qualification Frameworks (S) In India: Challenges of Policy Planning in the Context of Human Development, the Demographic Dividend and the Informal Sector. *Unpublished MA Thesis, Institute of Education, University of London*. Available at <https://Ioeac.Academia.Edu/Leightonernsberger> (Retrieved 14 Jun 2014).
- Evans, B. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (2005). No Child Left Behind: Repealing and Unpeeling Federal Language Education Policy in the United States. *Language Policy*, 4(1), pp. 87-106.
- Farr, M., & Song, J. (2011). Language Ideologies and Policies: Multilingualism and Education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(9), pp. 650-665.
- Fenton-Smith, B., & Gurney, L. (2016). Actors and Agency in Academic Language Policy and Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(1), pp. 72-87.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistic Perspectives: Papers on Language in Society, 1959-1994*. Oxford University Press.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2009). Is Public Discourse about Language Policy Really Public Discourse about Immigration? A Corpus-Based Study. *Language Policy*, 8(4), pp. 377-402.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (2019). Language Ideologies of Institutional Language Policy: Exploring Variability by Language Policy Register. *Language Policy*, 18(2), pp. 169-189.
- Gonçalves, K. (2020). Managing People with Language: Language Policy, Planning and Practice in Multilingual Blue-Collar Workplaces. *Language Policy*, pp. 1-12.
- Haddad, W. D., & Demsky, T. (1995). *Education Policy-Planning Process: An Applied Framework. Fundamentals of Educational Planning* 51. UNESCO, 7 Place De Fontenoy, 75700, Paris France.
- Hamel, R. E., Alvarez Lopez, E., & Carvalhal, T. P. (2016). Language Policy and Planning: Challenges for Latin American Universities. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(3-4), pp. 278-297.
- Hamid, M. O., & Erling, E. J. (2016). English-in-Education Policy and Planning in Bangladesh: A Critical Examination. In *English Language Education Policy in Asia* (pp. 25-48). Springer, Cham.
- Hamid, M. O., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2016). Globalization, English Language Policy, and Teacher Agency: Focus on Asia. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 15(1), pp. 26-43.
- Han, Y., De Costa, P. I., & Cui, Y. (2019). Exploring the Language Policy and Planning/Second Language Acquisition Interface: Ecological Insights From an Uyghur Youth in China. *Language Policy*, 18(1), pp. 65-86.
- Haque, A. R. (1983). The Position and Status of English in Pakistan. *World Englishes*, 2(1), pp. 6-9.
- Hassan, A. (2018). Language, Media, and Ideology: Critical Discourse Analysis of Pakistani News Bulletin Headlines and Its Impact on Viewers. *SAGE Open*, 8(3), 2158244018792612.
- Hassan, M. D., & Shah, K. (2022). Power Representation in Educational Language Policy and Planning of Urdu: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Harf-o-Sukhan*, 6(1), pp. 143-169.
- Hélot, C. (2003). Language Policy and the Ideology of Bilingual Education in France. *Language Policy*, 2(3), pp. 255-277.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1998). Language Policy, Language Education, Language Rights: Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives. *Language in Society*, pp. 439-458.
- Hornberger, N. H., Tapia, A. A., Hanks, D. H., & Dueñas, F. K. (2018). Ethnography of Language Planning and Policy. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), p. 152.
- Jaspers, J. (2018). Language Education Policy and Sociolinguistics. *The Oxford Handbook on Language Policy and Planning*, pp. 704-723.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language Policy*. Palgrave and Macmillan, p. 53.
- Johnson, D. C. (2015). Intertextuality and Language Policy. *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide*, 4, p. 166.
- Johnson, D. C., & Johnson, E. J. (2015). Power and Agency in Language Policy Appropriation. *Language Policy*, 14(3), pp. 221-243.
- Johnson, D. C., & Ricento, T. (2013). Conceptual and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Planning and Policy: Situating the Ethnography of Language Policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2013(219), pp. 7-21.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*, Vol. 108. Multilingual Matters.
- Khan, T., Khan, I., & Ahmad, A. (2019). A Proposed Language Policy for Education in Pakistan. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, 5(4), pp. 809-816.
- Lawton, R. (2008). Language Policy and Ideology in the United States: A Critical Analysis of 'English Only' Discourse. In *Papers from The Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching* (Vol. 2, pp. 78-103). Lancaster: University of Lancaster.
- Leibowitz, B. (2015). The Problems with Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 14(1), pp. 36-49.
- Leppänen, S., & Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2009). Language Policy in the Making: An Analysis of Bilingual Gaming Activities. *Language Policy*, 8(3), pp. 261-284.

- Liddicoat, A. J. (2004). Language Policy and Methodology. *International Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), pp. 153-171.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). The Interface between Macro and Micro-Level Language Policy and the Place of Language Pedagogies. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), pp. 118-129.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Language Planning in Universities: Teaching, Research and Administration.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2019). Constraints on Agency in Micro-Language Policy and Planning in Schools: A Case Study of Curriculum Change. *Agency in Language Policy and Planning: Critical Inquiries*, pp. 149-170.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Language Planning (LP): Constraints and Applications of The Critical in Language Planning.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2016). Language Policy and Education in Australia.
- Lundberg, A. (2018). Multilingual Educational Language Policies in Switzerland and Sweden: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 42(1), pp. 45-69.
- Manan, S. A., David, M. K., & Dumanig, F. P. (2015). Disjunction between Language Policy and Children's Sociocultural Ecology—An Analysis of English-Medium Education Policy in Pakistan. *Language and Education*, 29(5), pp. 453-473.
- Manan, S. A., David, M. K., & Dumanig, F. P. (2016). Language Management: A Snapshot of Governmentality within the Private Schools in Quetta, Pakistan. *Language Policy*, 15(1), pp. 3-26.
- Mansoor, S. (2003). Language Planning in Higher Education: Issues of Access and Equity. *Lahore Journal of Economics*, 8(2), pp. 17-42.
- Mansoor, S. (2004). The Status and Role of Regional Languages in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(4), pp. 333-353.
- Mccarty, T. L. (2002). *A Place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and The Struggle for Self-Determination in Indigenous Schooling*. Routledge.
- Miranda, N., Berdugo, M., & Tejada, H. (2016). Conflicting Views on Language Policy and Planning at a Colombian University. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(3-4), pp. 422-440.
- National Education Policy, (2017). Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, Government of Pakistan. Link: <http://www.mofept.gov.pk/Policies>.
- Nekvapil, J. (2016). Language Management Theory as One Approach in Language Policy and Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(1), pp. 11-22.
- Nero, S. J. (2014). De Facto Language Education Policy through Teachers' Attitudes and Practices: A Critical Ethnographic Study in Three Jamaican Schools. *Language Policy*, 13(3), pp. 221-242.
- Nguyen, H. T. M. (2011). Primary English Language Education Policy in Vietnam: Insights from Implementation. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2), pp. 225-249.
- Pérez-Milans, M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2018). Language Policy and Planning: Directions for Future Research. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, pp. 727-741.
- Pinto, S., & Araújo E Sá, M. H. (2019). Language Education Policy in Portuguese Public Universities: The Voices of Institutional Stakeholders. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(2), pp. 140-159.
- Plüddemann, P. (2015). Unlocking the Grid: Language-in-Education Policy Realisation in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Language and Education*, 29(3), pp. 186-199.
- Poon, A. Y. (2010). Language Use, and Language Policy and Planning in Hong Kong. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(1), pp. 1-66.
- Rafique, N., Sultan, B., Ahmad, S., & Imran, M. (2018). Teachers' Role in Implementation of English Language Teaching Policies in Public Primary Schools of Rural Area in Punjab, Pakistan. *Language in India*, 18(4), pp. 252-260.
- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). The Chaotic English Language Policy and Planning in Bangladesh: Areas of Apprehension. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 26(2).
- Rahman, T. (2002). Government Policies and the Politics of the Teaching of Urdu in Pakistan.
- Rahman, T. (2004). Language Policy and Localization in Pakistan: Proposal for a Paradigmatic Shift. In *SCALLA Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 99, pp. 1-19.
- Reagan, T. G. (1986). 'Language Ideology' in the Language Planning Process: Two African Case Studies. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 6(2), pp. 94-97.
- Reagan, T. G. (2010). *Language Policy and Planning for Sign Languages*. Gallaudet University Press.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), pp. 196-213.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), pp. 401-427.
- Rubdy, R. (2008). Language Planning Ideologies, Communicative Practices and their Consequences. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 3, pp. 211-223.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A. (2006). *A Multi-Method and Multi-Source Approach for Studying Fidelity of Implementation*. Regents of The University of California.
- Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of Research Design*, Vol. 1. Sage.
- Samuelson, B. L., & Freedman, S. W. (2010). Language Policy, Multilingual Education, and Power in Rwanda. *Language Policy*, 9(3), pp. 191-215.

- Serem, D. K., Njeri, G. M., & Kara, A. M. (2013). Educational Planning: Analysis of Cost-Sharing Policy in Kenyan Public Universities.
- Shahzad, W., Shahzad, S. K., Ahmed, R. I., & Jabeen, R. (2018). The Study of Language Planning in National Educational Policy (NEP) 2017 in Pakistan. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(7), pp. 5-19.
- Shamim, F., & Rashid, U. (2019). The English/Urdu-Medium Divide in Pakistan: Consequences for Learner Identity and Future Life Chances. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(1), pp. 43-61.
- Shih, C. M. (2012). Policy Analysis of the English Graduation Benchmark in Taiwan. *Perspectives in Education*, 30(3), pp. 60-68.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. Psychology Press.
- Shouhui, Z., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2012). Individual Agency in Language Planning: Chinese Script Reform as a Case Study. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 36(1), pp. 1-24.
- Sibomana, E. (2018). Unpeeling the Language Policy and Planning Onion in Rwanda. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2), pp. 99-114.
- Siiner, M. (2006). Planning Language Practice: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Language Policy in Post-Communist Estonia. *Language Policy*, 5(2), pp. 161-186.
- Sikandar, A. (2017). Language Policy Planning in Pakistan: A Review. *Pakistan Business Review*, 19(1), pp. 267-272.
- Sikandar, A., Hussain, N., & David, M. K. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Research Consultations in Higher Education: A Case of Language Ideological Norm. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 22(2), pp. 1-17.
- Silver, R. E. (2005). The Discourse of Linguistic Capital: Language and Economic Policy Planning in Singapore. *Language Policy*, 4(1), pp. 47-66.
- Tamim, T., & Tariq, H. (2013). Language Policy, Languages in Education and Physical Wellbeing. *Editorial Board*, p. 1.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2002). *Limitations Of Language Policy and Planning*. Na.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Pérez-Milans, M. (2018). Research and Practice in Language Policy and Planning. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, pp. 1-32.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. (2014). Language Diversity and Language Policy in Educational Access and Equity. *Review of Research In Education*, 38(1), pp. 189-214.
- Vagias, W. M. (2006). Likert-Type Scale Response Anchors. *Clemson International Institute for Tourism & Research Development, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management. Clemson University*.
- Wang, H. (2008). Language Policy Implementation: A Look at Teachers' Perceptions. *Asian EFL Journal*, 30(1), pp. 1-38.
- Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language Policy and Planning in Language Education: Legacies, Consequences, and Possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), pp. 48-63.
- Yevudey, E., & Agbozo, G. E. (2019). Teacher Trainee Sociolinguistic Backgrounds and Attitudes to Language-in-Education Policy in Ghana: A Preliminary Survey. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(4), pp. 338-364.
- Yoshida, K. (2003). Language Education Policy in Japan: The Problem of Espoused Objectives Versus Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), pp. 290-292.