

## Implementation of Pakistan's Language Policy and Marginalization of Sindhi: Teachers' Experiences at a Private School in Sukkur, Sindh

Bahawal Soomro<sup>1\*</sup>, Kamran Akhtar Siddiqui<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Language Policy (LP) plays an extremely crucial role in language management in multilingual contexts. While promoting one language, an LP may disregard or marginalize other (native) languages, creating serious political rifts among communities on linguistic grounds. Given the over-emphasis of LP on English and implicit marginalization of Sindhi, this study investigates the experiences of Sindhi language teachers regarding the implementation of Pakistan's LP and how Pakistan's LP affects the teaching and learning practices of Sindhi language at a private school in Sukkur, Sindh, Pakistan. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews from five purposively selected research participants. Thematic analysis of the data was conducted. It was found that teachers believe that Pakistan's national language policy tends to marginalize regional languages, particularly Sindhi, while promoting Urdu and English as dominant mediums of instruction. The findings also reveal that English is prioritized as the primary language of instruction in schools, followed by Urdu, whereas Sindhi is often sidelined despite its official and cultural status in the province. This paper argues that such marginalization reflects broader socio-political dynamics that favor linguistic capital over cultural heritage. Recommendations are made to ensure a more inclusive language policy that respects the multilingual fabric of Pakistan.

**Keywords:** Language policy, Sindhi, marginalization, Teachers' experiences, Pakistan.

### Introduction

Language has been a political issue in Pakistan. The elite and the powerful decide the status of a language in the country. Whitley (1983) claimed that decisions of language policy are always taken politically with certain ideologies. Therefore, it can clearly be said that language policy has

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer at Sukkur IBA University, Sukkur

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author's E-mail: [bahawal.soomro@iba-suk.edu.pk](mailto:bahawal.soomro@iba-suk.edu.pk)

Available online: 05-01-2026

This is an open-access article.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24312/ucp-jll.03.02.650>

nothing to do with linguistic issues; rather, it is completely a political issue (Manan et al., 2017). Mahboob (2002) stated that a shift in the use of local languages may represent a shift in the balance of power. He further said that to narrow the gap between the people living in society, English can work as a language of education for all. It shows how the English used their power to implement their language. English and Urdu have been used as languages of the elite, power in all aspects of jobs and education in Pakistan since the partition (Shah & Pathan, 2016).

Rahman (1998) stated that the symbolic significance of Urdu in Pakistan can be attributed to two factors: psychological and political. Urdu has been an effective tool employed by the nation's governing class to maintain national identity, with regional and indigenous languages being disregarded. Urdu's prominence has been challenged by ethnic nationalists, who view their language as the most significant legacy. They see the linguistic policy as killing their languages and identity by permitting one or two cultures to psychologically dominate over all other regional cultures. Since language and culture go together, humans have a close connection to their language because it connects them to their land (Errington, 2008). The history of humans is preserved in their language; loss of a language is loss of history, identity, culture, philosophy, and literature. Therefore, ethno-nationalists consider this killing to be a murder of their history, identity, culture, and literature. Phillipson (1992) considered this killing a genocide of regional languages.

Language policies in Pakistan have failed to prove fruitful as the multilingual language profile of the country was not taken into deep consideration (Abbas & Bidin, 2022). Abbas et al. (2020) stressed the competitive advantage of a strong language by arguing that a language with a greater capital value is seen as an asset. Conversely, it is imperative to consider strategies for preserving the minority languages. The consequences of the state's language policies are that the Sindhi language has lost its status. Because Sindhi language teaching is highly influenced by these hegemonic languages, the mode of communication is either Urdu or English. In fact, teachers discourage the Sindhi language as a mode of instruction. This is because there is no monetary value attached to the Sindhi language in Sindh. For example, Urdu or English is used in the judiciary, business, education, and other spheres of authority. Therefore, teachers in private schools use English as a medium of instruction (EMI) from Nursery and KG onwards (Rustamani & Umrani, 2022). Thus, it has been observed that students' proficiency in Sindhi is low. Students are unable to read and write well, even in government schools (Ahmed &

Shamsi, 2020).

Given the hegemonic nature of Urdu and English in academic settings and low proficiency of private school students in Sindhi, the primary focus of this study is twofold: the influence of Pakistan's language policy on the teaching of Sindhi in Sindh and the experiences of Sindhi language teachers regarding the implementation of Pakistan's language policy at IBA Public School, Sukkur. This study aims to answer the following research questions.

1. What are the experiences of Sindhi language teachers regarding the implementation of Pakistan's language policy at IBA Public School, Sukkur?
2. In the Sindhi language teachers' opinion, how does Pakistan's language policy affect Sindhi teaching and learning practices at IBA Public School, Sukkur?

## **Literature Review**

### **Historical context of Pakistani languages**

This section of the study provides an overview of Pakistan's regional languages and the language policy's effects on them. Pakistan had difficulties when it first started out in 1947 with the development of its linguistic policy. Different ethnic groups in Pakistan have expressed a desire to have their languages recognized as national languages. Bengali, which accounted for 54.6% of Pakistan's overall population at the time, and Urdu, which was spoken by only 7%, were two contenders. Mahboob (2002) stated that Urdu was advocated as the national language by Liaqat Ali Khan and Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Mr. Jinnah, in his address in Bengal, said, "It is up to you, the people of this province, to select what would be the official language of your region. Let me clarify, though, that Urdu would be the only language recognized as Pakistan's official state language." According to Mahboob (ibid), Bengalis reacted strongly to Mr. Jinnah's speech, demonstrating against Urdu's designation as the national language. Language, later, proved to be a primary factor in the separation of East Pakistan.

There was a variation in language policy due to a change in political structure. Ayub Khan imposed martial law in 1958. He considered the English language to be a language of modernity. He emphasized that all officers must be well-versed in the English language. Therefore, he made rules for military training that the mode of instruction must be in English,

undermining the value of local languages. Rahman (1996) stated that Ayub Khan united all four provinces into one to avoid provincial borders and set up a powerful central authority. Mansoor (1993) said that a commission was established in 1959 to investigate language-related concerns in Pakistan. The commission recommended that all government secondary schools use Bengali and Urdu as their official languages of instruction. After fifteen years, Urdu was expected to become the language of instruction (p. 10). Furthermore, plans called for Urdu to be the medium of teaching in government schools in Sindh starting in class 6. According to Rahman (1996), Sindhi responded to this choice by managing to obstruct a few of them. Moreover, Haque (1993) stated that East Pakistan broke away from Pakistan in 1971 and became Bangladesh on the international map. Bengali was eliminated in the language policy modification. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto reigned during this time; however, he did not alter the language policy in any way except for Bengali. According to Rahman (1996), in 1972, the political adversaries of Bhutto, including Baluchistan, the NWFP, and the NAP-JUI, backed the adoption of Urdu as an official language. Thus, it was explicitly declared in the 1973 constitution that Urdu, Pakistan's national language, will be an official language in 15 years and until provisions are completed to make Urdu an official language, English will be used as the official language. Bhutto, according to Rahman (1998), recognized the importance of Islam and Urdu as unifying symbols when facing the threat of ethnic division. Therefore, under Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto's PPP government, there were no notable modifications made to language policy.

The military commander, General Zia-ul-Haq, ousted this democratically elected administration in 1977 known as a third period under martial law. According to Haque (1993), there was a significant shift in language policy during this time. Urdu was seen as highly valuable and significant. Zia's "Islamization" policy prioritized Islam and Urdu. Mahboob (2002) pointed out that Urdu or any other province-recognized language should be taught in English-medium schools instead of English, as per a 1978 Education Policy. Each province had to choose a single language to be the primary language of instruction. The use of this strategy hurt other ethnic and regional groups, who believed their languages were being disregarded.

General Zia ul Haq encouraged "privatization". As a result, there were many private schools. According to Rahman (1996), General Ziaul Haq was in favor of English instruction at private schools. Students had two options: either take the exam in English or Urdu, and the government approved the use of English in science classrooms. The PPP and PML-N

administrations that took over after General ZiaulHaq died in 1988 did not change the language policy. Nevertheless, during her first time in power, Benazir Bhutto made a few changes. Mahboob (2002) stated that she gave schools the option to begin teaching all courses in English starting in class 1. Additionally, it was recommended that, rather than being covered as a topic in class 6, English be taught as an extra language beginning in class 1. The governments in Punjab and Sindh immediately acted on this ruling.

Later on, in General Musharraf's presidency, English came to be associated with progressivism. It was because General Parvez Musharaf's top priority was to increase foreign investments and grow the economy. To do this, entering the global market was viewed as possible with the use of English.

### **Language Hierarchy in the Pakistani Education System**

According to Mahboob (2002), the absence of corpus planning in Urdu made it impracticable to have Urdu as the sole official language. Due to this, three languages were introduced in Pakistan. English as an official language, Urdu as a national language, and the third one was a regional language. All provinces were directed to choose one regional language as the provincial language. This three- language structure was once again against other regional languages, which were marginalized and lacked market value. Rahman (1996) stated that indigenous languages were ignored in the country for creating a Pakistani-Muslim identity. Rahman (2011) further highlights that the hierarchy of languages in Pakistan reflects socio- economic divisions, where English represents elitism and upward mobility, Urdu symbolizes nationalism, and regional languages are seen as markers of local identity but with little market value. This linguistic stratification continues to affect language-in-education policies.

More recently, Kakar & Kaukab (2023) documented that language textbooks and classroom materials in regional languages are outdated, underfunded, and limited in critical thinking content, compared to those in English and Urdu. Moreover, students studying in regional languages internalize a sense of inferiority, which affects their academic performance and self-esteem. Parents think that if children are good at English at an early age, they will get great exposure, vocabulary, command, and proficiency in English as soon as they complete their matriculation (Manan et al., 2017).

English was added as a subject in class 1 by the National Education Policy (NEP) (2009), along with Urdu and one other regional language. In the math and scientific departments, English served as the main language of instruction. Urdu and English would be the first options, but after five

years, only English would be taught for these courses (p. 28). Thus, although giving regional languages a lot of attention, this policy gives priority to English and Urdu. The statement makes it rather clear that science and math classes should begin teaching in English in class IV. Sindhi, the native dialect of the Sindhis, is being marginalized because of state policies.

### **Sindhi Language Before and After Partition**

The Indo-Aryan language known as Sindhi is spoken in Pakistan's Sindh province. According to Bughio (2001), Sindh is home to eight different languages. Sindhi is the most frequently used language around 52.4%. Urdu 22.6% and Punjabi 7.7% are the most common languages used in Sindh, respectively. The remaining languages are Hindko, Saraiki, Balochi, Pashto, and Brahvi. According to Rahman (1998), the Sindhi language was widely respected before the separation. Sindhi as a subject was offered. Universities promoted it, and schools employed it as a teaching tool. Sindhi was also used in lower-level government, the judiciary, and journalism. Rahman (ibid) claimed that knowing Sindhi made it simple for someone to get work in Sindh. During this time, the Sindhi language held great importance in the country. Only Bengali and Sindhi were indigenous languages.

Moreover, it is claimed that the official languages of Sindh Province were English and Sindhi till 1947. But after 1947, English and Urdu—the language spoken by 7% of Indian-Muslim refugees—were designated as the national tongues. This decision led to a great deal of instability and ethnically motivated violence between the populations that speak Sindhi and Urdu. According to Rahman (2002), the arrival of Mohajirs who spoke Urdu from India into Sindh weakened the language's dominant status in the region. The language, culture, and politics of the Sindhi people were significantly impacted by the migration of Mohajirs who spoke Urdu in Sindh. Sindh was split into two groups: Mohajirs and Sindhis. The language of Sindhi began to give way to Urdu. Urdu gained recognition because of its connection to the "Islamic" identity. Tension arose between Mohajirs and Sindhis as a result. Linguistic and cultural tensions between the Sindhis and Mohajirs became so intense that it twice resulted in language riots: in January 1971 and again in July 1972. The value of the Sindhi language has been diminished as compared to its pre- partition status due to power struggles amongst various communities over linguistic supremacy.

### **Language Policy and the Marginalization of Sindhi in Schools**

Despite Sindhi being one of Pakistan's officially recognized regional languages and the provincial language of Sindh, it remains largely marginalized in educational settings, especially in urban and private-sector schools. The language policy at both national and provincial levels lacks effective enforcement mechanisms for promoting regional languages in practice (Rahman, 2011). Khoso & Memon (2022) found that Sindhi is frequently treated as an optional or symbolic subject, rather than as a core language of instruction. Many schools include Sindhi in their curriculum only to meet policy requirements, with little emphasis on developing proficiency or cultural appreciation. This *tokenistic* inclusion reflects a disconnect between language policy and classroom realities.

According to NEP (2009), Science and Math classes will be taught for five years using English, Urdu, or another official language from the region. It will eventually just be in English. The Sindhi language in the province of Sindh is criticized by this statement. Data from the National Educational Policy (2009) indicate that Sindh is marginalizing Sindhi language instruction. The language of instructions for all science courses must be English. Recent studies reinforce that this policy orientation persists, sidelining Sindhi and other regional languages. Javed & Karim (2024) argue that Pakistan's current educational frameworks still emphasize lower-order skills in regional languages, while advanced thinking and creativity are reserved for English-medium instruction. Similarly, Ali & Rahim (2023) demonstrate how language policy implementation remains biased, even in provinces like Sindh, where Sindhi is officially recognized.

These impacts are the outcome of language placement power dynamics. Bourdieu (1991) stated that language policy can uphold the dominance of privileged groups using educational institutions as a medium. Another way to look at language's role as a primary tool for discrimination in education is through the lens of power hierarchy. In reference to the Sindhi language, this is accurate. There are two issues facing the Sindhi language: the first is from national policy, and the second is caused by the division of Mohajirs who speak Sindhi and Urdu in Sindh.

Jatoi and Chandio (2023) highlight that parents, teachers, and administrators often perceive Sindhi as irrelevant to students' academic and professional futures. As a result, they invest more effort into English and Urdu instruction. This belief reinforces negative language attitudes and reduces motivation to teach or learn Sindhi effectively. Moreover, the lack of updated teaching materials, undertrained Sindhi language teachers, and the absence of pedagogical innovation have further contributed to its decline. Ali & Rahim (2023) note that regional language instruction often

relies on rote memorization and outdated textbooks, making it less engaging for students.

Language is not merely a tool for communication; it is also a carrier of identity, culture, and worldview (Spolsky, 2004). In Sindh, the Sindhi language holds deep historical, literary, and cultural significance, forming the core of the ethnolinguistic identity of its people. Yet, educational institutions have increasingly undermined this identity by privileging Urdu and English over Sindhi. Shah & Laghari (2022) argue that the erosion of Sindhi in classrooms reflects a broader cultural marginalization, where students are discouraged—implicitly or explicitly—from expressing themselves in their mother tongue. This leads to what Fishman (1991) terms “language shift”, where younger generations begin to abandon their native language in favor of more dominant ones.

Furthermore, Qureshi (2023) highlights that the absence of culturally responsive pedagogy in Sindhi-medium instruction has caused young Sindhi learners to feel detached from their linguistic heritage. Textbooks rarely include local stories, historical figures, or community values, resulting in a disconnect between language learning and lived experience.

This has deep pedagogical implications: students often fail to see the relevance of Sindhi in their academic journey, and teachers are not trained to use culturally meaningful methods. As a result, the symbolic and functional value of Sindhi continues to diminish, especially in elite or semi-elite schools like IBA Public School Sukkur, which associate success with English proficiency. Kandhro & Shaikh (2024) warn that without strong institutional support, the intergenerational transmission of Sindhi may weaken, putting the language at risk in educational domains. A lack of pride in one's mother tongue also affects students' self-esteem, confidence, and sense of belonging.

## **Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study draws on three interrelated constructs: language policy implementation, linguistic hierarchy, and language and identity. Together, they offer a comprehensive lens to understand how state-level decisions impact classroom practices, especially regarding the teaching and perception of the Sindhi language in schools like IBA Public School, Sukkur.

At the core is Spolsky's (2004) model of language policy, which distinguishes between language practices, language beliefs (ideologies), and language management. While policies may appear inclusive on paper,

the actual language practices and ideologies within institutions often diverge, leading to unequal treatment of regional languages such as Sindhi.

The framework also incorporates linguistic hierarchy theory, particularly Rahman's (2004) notion of "linguistic capital", which explains how English and Urdu are privileged in the education system due to their association with power, prestige, and socioeconomic mobility, while Sindhi is viewed as culturally important but academically non-essential.

Lastly, the identity dimension is informed by the work of Fishman (1991) and Norton (2000), who argue that language is a crucial site for identity formation and cultural continuity. The erosion of Sindhi in formal education can be seen as a threat not just to linguistic diversity, but also to students' cultural rootedness and sense of self.

This integrated theoretical framework allows the study to examine the gap between language policy and pedagogical practice, while also considering the emotional, social, and cultural consequences of Sindhi's marginalization in an urban, semi-elite educational context (See figure 1).

Spolsky's (2004) model  
of language policy

Linguistic hierarchy  
theory

Pakistan's language policy

language and identity  
Fishman (1991) and  
Norton (2000)



**Figure 1. Theoretical Framework**

## **Methodology**

This research is qualitative in nature. In qualitative research, a great deal of data is gathered to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon through document analysis and participant perspectives. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative research is widely acknowledged and can be applied to any type of methodology, apart from surveys. It consists of observation, documentary material, group interviews, and similar activities.

## **Data Sources**

In order to answer the above-mentioned research questions, semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from Sindhi language instructors at IBA Public School, Sukkur. Qualitative research, as Creswell (2013) emphasizes, is particularly suited to uncovering complex social phenomena through rich, contextualized data. It involves methods such as interviews, observations, and document analysis, allowing researchers to interpret meanings and experiences from participants' perspectives. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather data. It contained the following main items:

1. Can you please introduce yourself and describe your role at IBA Public School, Sukkur?
2. At what level Sindhi as a subject is taught? (ECE-1, primary, middle, ninth, tenth, first year, and intermediate)
3. How do you see the language policy and implementation of the Sindhi language?

4. Do your students find the Sindhi subject as easy or difficult, and how is their performance in the Sindhi language?
5. What are some of the challenges faced in teaching the Sindhi language at IBA Public School, Sukkur?
6. Have there been any initiatives or opportunities that have positively impacted the teaching and learning of Sindhi?
7. How do students generally perceive the importance of learning Sindhi within the school environment?
8. How do you think the broader community (parents, local authorities) views the teaching of Sindhi at the school?

## **Participants**

The participants for the study were selected using a purposeful sampling technique. This technique was employed because purposive sampling helps the researcher to select the participants based on his/her knowledge and experiences, which serves the purpose. For interviews, five teachers of the Sindhi language were selected. The study focused on Sindhi language teachers at IBA Public School, Sukkur, with five selected for interviews. The remaining two were excluded due to scheduling conflicts and limited teaching experience. The inclusion criteria required at least one year of teaching experience in the Sindhi language, current employment at the school, and willingness to participate in a recorded interview. Teachers with less than one year of experience or unavailable during the data collection time were excluded. All participants were native Sindhi speakers with bilingual proficiency in Urdu and varying levels of English, which was relevant to understanding their instructional practices and perspectives.

## **Data Analysis**

In this study, data is analyzed thematically. Thematic analysis was used to interpret interview data, identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within qualitative data. The six-phase process involved familiarization, initial coding, theme development, review, defining, and naming themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Transcripts were read multiple times to gain an immersive understanding of the data. Key phrases and concepts were coded manually, focusing on instructional challenges, pedagogical strategies, and language policy. Themes were refined for coherence and distinctiveness, and each theme was clearly defined and named to reflect its core meaning.

## **Findings**

### **Endangerment of Sindhi Language**

The data gathered from the interviews provides fascinating insights into the situation of Sindhi language education in Sindh, Pakistan, where the primary languages of the country have had a negative influence. A participant (P1) made the following statement regarding the use of language in class:

“The fact is that the Sindhi language and other regional languages are endangered, regardless of the policy in place. Numerous young Sindhi students who are illiterate in their own language serve as proof of this. At IBA Public school, Sukkur, Sindhi and Urdu are taught from the Early Child Education (ECE-1) class, but the mode of instruction is Urdu and English.”

The policy's effects include the endangered status of regional languages. Students' proficiency in their mother tongue is low. Because of institutional, they are unable to comprehend their native tongue. However, basic instructions in Urdu and Sindhi are provided. But, pupils who are solely of Sindhi descent perceive the surroundings differently, making it harder for them to comprehend the teachers' instructions. Because they believe others are more intelligent and energetic than them. The same participant reported, “Kids become too quiet and never bother to engage. At the start of class, this makes them feel like they are inferior.”

### **Language Instruction Challenges**

Another participant (P2) made the following observation:

“Sindhi language is offered [as a subject] in my school from class 1. Every subject has an English writing style. Starting with class one, Urdu is taught as a subject. In terms of the medium of instruction, English is prioritized in school settings. The inability to communicate in English makes a person feel inferior. Sometimes Urdu is used instead of English. Sindh's educational system has lost so much ground that students are unable to read and write in Sindhi.”

This statement shows that English or Urdu is used for communication between teachers and pupils. Instructions from teachers are best delivered in English. Teachers may establish rules requiring students to speak in English. If a pupil speaks a regional language by mistake, he/she is discouraged. Students avoid using Sindhi as a result, making it difficult for

them to concentrate on English. Students' learning is greatly impacted when English is given a lot of attention. It was noted by the participant that "the pupils' proficiency in reading and writing in Sindhi was lacking. They make numerous errors in their mother tongue."

### **Impact of Language Prioritization**

Another participant (P3) stated:

"We start teaching Sindhi in the initial classes. But students are encouraged to read, write, and speak English. Therefore, students' general proficiency in Sindhi, their mother tongue, has been impacted by this."

Even if they begin learning their mother tongue from the start, there hasn't been much of a development in their mother tongue because the emphasis is on having pupils speak, read, and write in English. This indicates that regional language is undervalued in private schools where pupils are not supposed to use their various mother tongues, including Punjabi, Sindhi, Urdu, Seraiki, and Brahvi.

### **Neglected Language Proficiency**

Furthermore, P3, in response to a question concerning whether teaching Sindhi is in danger, said that:

"English and Urdu are currently the most widely spoken languages; they are prioritized over Sindhi. Sindhi's historical stature is declining, and if this tendency continues, the language will suffer tremendously."

Regarding the state of the Sindhi language in Pakistan, the other two individuals (P4 & P5) made similar statements. P4 mentioned, for instance, that:

"In the school, Sindhi is taught as a subject from the very beginning. However, I must be quite honest with you—students' ability to communicate in Sindhi is not given much priority. The only curriculum adhered to is the Sindhi language textbook, which is finished on schedule regardless of whether pupils improve their language proficiency."

Even though Sindhi is taught in the beginning of the course, students do not understand the significance of the language for their future needs. Students are taught Sindhi only to satisfy course requirements; language proficiency development is not prioritized. Since speaking Sindhi is not encouraged, even students read the language to pass the course. As was previously noted, pupils who speak Sindhi (or any other language) are subject to embarrassment. Sindhi is discouraged in all settings, including classrooms, canteens, grounds, and assembly halls. They are pleased with

the students who can converse in English.

### **Declining Status of Sindhi**

Participant (P5) stated:

"The market value of the Sindhi language is the reason behind its poor status. Sindhi no longer has the same status as it did in the past. Because of this, students don't think it's as vital as Urdu and English."

According to a teacher, pupils understand Sindhi language has no commercial value. They are aware that languages such as Urdu and English are widely used in the industry for communication. The standing of the Sindhi language is not as high as it once was.

All teachers showed their concern about the Sindhi language at IBA PSS. Urdu and English are being studied, sponsored, and pushed due to their commercial value. Teachers believe that teaching Sindhi in Sindh would be threatened by the English and Urdu languages; therefore, the language's position is currently under attack. The survival of the Sindhi language is affected by pupils' low level of competency in the language. This is the result of Pakistan's language policy.

## **Discussion**

The research shows that although Pakistan has recognized regional languages, its language policy continues to add to structural inequalities that have marginalized Sindhi in the learning institutions. English and Urdu are predominant in teaching and communication areas with Sindhi playing the role of tokenism with most of its teaching being influenced by curriculum demands. This imbalance is in line with Spolsky (2004) language policy model that argues on harmony between language management, practices, and beliefs. This contradiction is portrayed through the theme of endangerment because the Sindhi-speaking students are frequently alienated in the English- and Urdu-dominated classrooms and feel inferior linguistically. This discrimination is combined with the theory of language and identity by Norton (2000), who assumes that the process of language learning and usage relates to the relations of power and perception of oneself. When students are undermined by their own mother tongue in the school setting, they lose a sense of belonging and confidence in studying, thus gradually neglecting native language in favor of stronger ones.

Linguistic stratification is strengthened by institutional policies, and English and Urdu are perceived as the ways to become a professional,

whereas Sindhi is deemed to be irrelevant. The descriptions given by teachers of finding students who speak Sindhi clearly illustrate the idea of symbolic power as portrayed by Bourdieu (1991) in that the hegemonic linguistic order is naturalized in the daily institutional activity. Conversely, Sindhi is still undermined linguistically as well as economically, whereas it is a culturally important language. The issue of the lack of proficiency is also shown when Sindhi is a subject to be taught, but not the language to be learnt. The low prestige attributed to Sindhi by teachers is attributed to its inability to ensure market prestige, and this is what Rahman (2011) has described: English is a symbol of prestige and mobility, Urdu a symbol of nationalism, and regional languages such as Sindhi are a symbol of local identity but not economic value. The results also show that the Pakistani schooling system maintains language hierarchies that perpetuate the class division and cultural estrangement, which attests to the validity of Bourdieu's (1991) concept of language as the means of reproducing the society.

## Conclusion

To sum up, the paper concludes that the language policy applied in Pakistan, including in the case of the IBA Public School Sukkur in the private schools, does not encourage linguistic equity. Although Sindhi has constitutional protection, it is routinely marginalized in any useful educational application because of ideological discrimination and socioeconomic pressure to favor English and Urdu. Such exclusion negatively affects the cultural diversity and integrity of the student identity, and hastens the process of language change in younger generations. To reverse this trend, policymakers and education leaders should go beyond the symbolic inclusion and embrace transformative approaches that can connect Sindhi to cultural pride, pedagogical creativity, and professional worth.

Practically, there should be the use of Sindhi as a medium of instruction in the first grades, which is supported by updated and interactive curricula that involve the use of local narratives (Shah & Laghari, 2022). The culturally responsive pedagogies of the teacher training (Qureshi, 2023) should be used to reconnect the language learning with the identity and community. In addition, the institutional level must also be encouraged to promote Sindhi proficiency through testing, recruitment, and communication in provincial levels. These interventions can reinstate the linguistic and economic capital of Sindhi and can make the language policy consistent with the principles of equity and inclusion that Spolsky (2004) and Rahman (2004) regard as ideals.

Finally, to maintain Sindhi in schooling, there must also be a change in ideology, as well as in the curriculum. Unless English and Urdu are stopped as the only indicators of success, regional languages will keep on declining in the academic arena. Sindhi preservation can therefore not be seen outside the context of linguistic justice, i.e., making certain that all children in Sindh are given an opportunity to learn, think, and speak in the language that best reflects their identity, history, culture, and heritage.

## Reference

Abbas, F., & Bidin, S. J. (2022). A critical analysis of language planning and policy (LPP) in Pakistan and its impact on the indigenous languages of Pakistan. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 85–96.

Abbas, J., Zaki, M., & Irfan, M. (2020). Implicit measure of language attitude: Study of Punjabi native speakers using the matched guise technique. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(1), 194–206.

Ahmed, M., & Shamsi, M. (2020). Assessment in public schools of Sindh: Practices, trends, and implications. *Global Journal for Management and Administrative Sciences*, 3(1), 211–221.

Ali, Z., & Rahim, M. (2023). Challenges of regional language teaching in public schools of Sindh: A pedagogical perspective. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 13(2), 45–58.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

Buglio, Q. (2001). *A comparative sociolinguistic study of rural and urban Sindhi*. Lincom Publishers.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study*. Sage.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203412497>

Errington, J. (2008). *Linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power*. Blackwell Publishing.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Multilingual Matters.

Haque, A. (1993). The position and status of English in Pakistan. In R. J. Baumgardner (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan* (pp. 83–95). Oxford University Press.

Jaspal, R. (2009). *Language and social identity: A psychosocial approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Javed, H. M. H., & Karim, D. S. (2024). Alignment between curriculum and textbooks of English language at secondary level: An evaluation of English language curriculum objectives. *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5345088>

Jatoi, R., & Chandio, S. (2023). Language attitudes of parents and school management in Sindh: Implications for Sindhi language education. *Pakistan Journal of Linguistic Studies*, 5(1), 78–92.

Kakar, Z. U. H., & Kaukab, S. R. (2023). An in-depth analysis of assessment design: Alignment between Baluchistan English language textbooks and Pakistan national curriculum. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(4), 4396–4409.

Kandhro, I., & Shaikh, S. (2024). Language shift and loss of identity: A sociolinguistic study of Sindhi youth in urban Sindh. *Journal of South Asian Cultural Studies*, 8(1), 33–47.

Khoso, F., & Memon, A. (2022). Language policy and curriculum neglect: A case study of Sindhi in urban private schools. *Journal of Language and Society*, 11(2), 22–36.

Manan, S. A., Dumanig, F. P., & David, M. K. (2017). The English-medium fever in Pakistan: Analyzing policy, perceptions, and practices through an additive bi/multilingual education lens.

*International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6), 736–752. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1080659>

Mansoor, S. (1993). Language planning in higher education: Issues of access and equity. *The Lahore Journal of Economics*, 8(2).

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Longman.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Qureshi, N. (2023). Culturally responsive pedagogy and regional language instruction in Pakistan: A missed opportunity. *Educational Review Pakistan*, 9(3), 61–74.

Rahman, T. (1996). *Language and politics in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.

Rahman, T. (1998). *Language teaching policies in Pakistan*. Sustainable Development Policy Institute.

Rahman, T. (2004). Language policy, multilingualism, and language vitality in Pakistan. In D. Curdt-Christiansen & K. Wei (Eds.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 73–94). Routledge.

Rahman, T. (2011). *From Hindi to Urdu: A social and political history*. Oxford University Press.

Rustamani, S., & Umrani, T. H. (2022). Perceptions of Sindhi intelligentsia towards English language learning. *Progressive Research Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 4(2), 15–28.

Shah, G., & Laghari, N. (2022). Cultural dislocation and language neglect: An ethnographic account of Sindhi students in English-medium schools. *Sindh Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 59–70.

Shah, S. W. A., & Pathan, H. (2016). Representation of Western culture in O'Level English language textbooks. *ELF Annual Research Journal*, 18, 23–42.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Whitley, W. (1983). Sociolinguistic surveys at the national level. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *Language planning and language education* (pp. 68–79). George Allen & Unwin.