

# Role of Awards and Punishments in Managing English-Only Norms in Schools

Suryansha Rawat<sup>1</sup>, Sarath Chandra Yanamandra<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Giving awards, rewards, and punishments to reinforce English-only norms in educational institutions has long been a source of discussion. This research investigates the role of such incentives and deterrents in managing and implementing English-only standards in the educational setting.

This paper challenges the reward/punishment system's applicability in developing language skills and attitudes towards it by reviewing studies and current practices. Furthermore, it analyzes the implications of such teaching strategies for the psychological well-being of learners, including meeting short-term instructional goals and the potential positive or negative impact of value instruction on learners' self-esteem and their sense of linguistic selves. As the study contrasts the reasons behind English-only policies with the real-life situations of people affected by such regulations, it aims to shed light on the interplay between language policy, educational psychology, and learners. The paper concludes with a reflective discussion on how rewards and penalties can either build up or derail the concept of making education rich in culture, language, and diversity. Answering the following research question: **How do rewards and punishments influence the enforcement of English-only norms in educational institutions, and what are the broader implications for students' linguistic rights, psychological health, and academic achievement?**

**Keywords:** English-only norms, Linguistic rights, Multilingual education, Educational psychology, Rewards and Punishments, Bilingual advantages, Language policy, Psychological effects, Academic Achievement, Cultural identity

## INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the complex interplay between language policy in educational settings, focusing on the effects of imposing English-only norms through rewards and penalties and the broader ramifications for students' academic achievement, psychological health, and human rights (Athanasos & Heath, 1999). This study examines several topics, such as language-based discrimination and punishment, the effects on educational results, the human rights issues these policies raise, the advantages of bilingual education initiatives, and the legal and policy frameworks that protect linguistic rights (Right to Education Initiative, n.d.).

Using the student's mother tongues is discouraged in schools through several punitive techniques based on language exclusion and punishment (Connolly, 2012). This includes situations where students like Miranda Washinawatok are chastised for using their mother tongue (Hindustan Times, 2020). This conveys an undeniable message: to be understood and taken seriously, one must adhere to the prevailing linguistic norm. In addition to imposing an environment where only English is spoken, these policies marginalize and make pupils from different linguistic backgrounds invisible, which breeds inferiority complexes (DeGraff, 2020). This exclusionary practice can be understood as part of the broader dynamics

of cultural capital, where mastery of the dominant language is equated with social capital, reinforcing existing power structures (Bourdieu, 1986).

It is conventional to argue that enforcing an English-only policy in schools would promote harmony and raise student performance (Berger, 2001). However, this approach fails to consider the significant emotional and cognitive costs of making students give up their native tongue. Research consistently disproves the notion that students gain from immersion in the dominant language while suppressing their mother tongue. Instead, studies show that bilingual education, which incorporates instruction in students' native tongues, enhances learning results overall, increases academic comprehension, and increases self-assurance (Vasquez, 1977).

The effectiveness of bilingual education projects strengthens the argument against regulations limiting language use to English (Athanases & Heath, 1999). Allowing students to learn in their native tongue has provided a more inclusive, courteous, and productive learning environment—starkly contrasting the notion that English-only rules are beneficial (OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2012). This highlights the need for educational reforms that safeguard linguistic variety and promote multilingualism to ensure students are not penalized for their linguistic background.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### THEMATIC ANALYSIS AROUND THE MONOLINGUAL MINDSET

The referenced sources highlight a monolingual perspective's widespread and complex existence, predominantly favoring English, within international educational systems (Right to Education Initiative, n.d.). This viewpoint diminishes the value of languages aside from English and supports the idea that English proficiency is crucial for achievement in educational and social settings (Athanases & Heath, 1999). This study highlights the various negative consequences of this mindset, including individual psychological effects and broader socio-cultural and human rights implications (DeGraff, 2020).

The exclusion and punishment of students based solely on their language in educational contexts exemplify the ongoing valuation of English (Connolly, 2012). The preference for a dominant language, often English, over minority languages is demonstrated by numerous global instances, as detailed in the research of Hurwitz and Kambel. Instances include the penalization of French language use in a Flemish-speaking suburb of Brussels and the reprimand of a Menominee Tribe member in Wisconsin for employing her native language (Hindustan Times, 2020). These activities violate linguistic human rights principles and foster an environment where children associate language assimilation with success and social acceptability (OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2012). This corresponds with Bourdieu's (1986) concept of cultural capital, where mastery of the dominant language functions as a type of capital influencing an individual's social standing and opportunities.

The incentive structures that favor English over other languages perpetuate a monolingual perspective. The analysis by Lucinda M. Wilson and Deborah A. Corpus of academic incentive systems uncovers an educational ideology that frequently links success to adherence to English dominance (Vasquez, 1977). Based on behaviorist theories, this method neglects the cognitive advantages and intrinsic motivation linked to bilingual education, emphasizing creating a competitive atmosphere in which English proficiency is viewed as a standard for academic and personal achievement (Berger, 2001).

The studies demonstrate the notable cognitive dissonance between the current execution of English-centric policies and the acknowledged advantages of bilingual education (Athanases & Heath, 1999). Linguistic

minorities encounter systemic obstacles that impede academic success and cultural expression, reducing educational outcomes and social inequality (DeGraff, 2020).

The study highlights a monolingual perspective's extensive cultural and socioeconomic consequences, demonstrating how educational practices reflect and perpetuate social norms and power structures (Right to Education Initiative, n.d.). The focus on English in educational systems is linked to broader socio-political contexts that relate the language to modernity, economic opportunities, and global integration rather than existing in isolation (Vasquez, 1977). This affiliation corresponds with the colonial context that fosters the supremacy of Western languages and knowledge systems, simultaneously marginalizing multilingualism and cultural diversity (OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2012).

### EXAMINING THE CONSEQUENCES OF AN ENGLISH-ONLY STANDARD BASED ON THE CITED SCHOLARLY WORKS

Various factors encompass the influence of language-based discrimination and disciplinary measures on academic achievements, the human rights consequences of language regulations in educational institutions, and the efficacy of multilingual education initiatives in promoting improved learning settings (Bourdieu, 1986; DeGraff, 2020; Right to Education Initiative, n.d.).

1. **Linguistic Exclusion and Punishment:** Studies also show that if the authorities adopt aggressive measures against using learners' first languages in classrooms, it has adverse mental and academic effects. For instance, Miranda Washinawatok, an Indigenous woman from the Menominee Tribe, was pulled up for speaking her native language. From this incident, students who are subjected to such actions suffer from emotional distress, and the feeling of being ignored was well reported in Hindustan Times.
2. **Human Rights Implications:** Banning local languages in educational settings raises major human rights concerns like rights to education, freedom of speech, and anti-discrimination, mainly based on race or language. These infringements were, however, highlighted as being triggered by the lack of a language-friendly school that seeks to ensure that all languages are welcomed in educational facilities (OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2012).
3. **Impact on Educational Performance:** The idea that one has to saturate students with English and refraining them from their first language, which can be highly beneficial for students' performance, is a myth. Previous studies have noted that the use of the first language not only improves understanding of content, self-esteem, and other achievements but also results in better educational performances (Athanasas & Heath, 1999; Vasquez, 1977). This goes against the thinking that measures that encourage the application of English only are advantageous to the learners.
4. **Multilingual Education Programs:** Research indicates that multilingual education programs enhance students' learning experiences. The student's right to be allowed to learn knowledge in their L1 in addition to the compulsory L2 has been found to enhance the acquisition of the two languages, academic performance, and feelings of the students (Athanasas & Heath, 1999). These programs blur the one language usage, especially considering the probability of having many languages in the education system.
5. **International Instruments and Treaties:** Consequently, this review will look into other international instruments and treaties that have provisions for the right to education and linguistic rights, which include the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Universal Declaration). These documents stress the anti-discrimination policy and

the importance of the child's best interests, which are often negated by the practices that advocate the use of English only in schools (Right to Education Initiative, n.d. ).

6. **Calls to Action:** Stressing the need for institutional and educational shifts and language policy towards establishing multilingualism and respect for linguistic rights in education. As the literature emphasizes, human rights educators, advocates, and policymakers should challenge English-only standards and support language policies that recognize and value the diversity of languages.

Ultimately, using rewards and punishments to enforce English-only norms undermines students' rights and educational achievements and goes against the principles of fairness and inclusivity (Bourdieu, 1986). Adopting multilingual education and ceasing language-based disciplinary measures can cultivate a more inclusive, respectful, and efficient learning atmosphere for all students.

## LANGUAGE ECONOMICS

Pierre Bourdieu's influential research on the economics of linguistic exchanges sheds light on the various and complex outcomes of enforcing monolingual norms. It highlights the social aspects of language usage and the significant effects on individuals' sense of self, educational opportunities, and rights (Bourdieu, 1986). Language can be utilized to exclude individuals from society and exert power over them. All these theoretical sources, including Bourdieu's theoretical perspective, are unanimous in highlighting the role of language in maintaining social marginalization and in using language as a tool of domination (Bourdieu, 1986; DeGraff, 2020). Linguistic practices, precisely ESL educational policies, justify how linguistic practices enhance social hierarchies by neglecting non-English speaking individuals while privileging people who abide by the monolingual norms (Athanases & Heath, 1999; Vasquez, 1977). This is evident in penalties meted out on students for using the native language as this stifles linguistic diversity and promotes the continuation of the dominant mono-linguistic realm that supports other socially established inequalities such as the Right to Education Initiative, (Hindustan Times, 2020).

### **The Impact of Language Skills on Academic Achievements**

Bourdieu's notion of linguistic capital offers a valuable perspective for analyzing the collective papers, illustrating how the dominance of English-only norms in schools increases the worth of English linguistic capital while diminishing the value of other linguistic skills (Bourdieu, 1986). This process not only diminishes students' educational experiences by separating learning from their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, but it also worsens social inequalities by limiting access to educational success and opportunities for those who have or can obtain this particular form of capital (Athanases & Heath, 1999; OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2012).

### **The Role of Educational Institutions in Sustaining Linguistic Inequality**

The crucial role of educational institutions in maintaining linguistic inequality aligns with Bourdieu's criticism of the education system as a place where the dominant language is enforced and validated (Bourdieu, 1986). Schools function as arenas for the exchange of linguistic capital. English-only policies are implemented to establish and reinforce monolingual standards and customs, thereby systematically placing students who do not adhere to these standards at a disadvantage (Athanases & Heath, 1999; DeGraff, 2020). This institutionalization goes beyond the confines of the classroom and impacts students' social identities, feelings of being included, and prospects for the future (Right to Education Initiative, n.d.).

### **Resistance and the Possibility of Linguistic Plurality**

The papers discuss how the enforcement of English-only norms demonstrates the use of language to exert

power and exclude others. Additionally, they explore the concept of resistance and the possibility of embracing linguistic diversity. This statement aligns with Bourdieu's argument for acknowledging the societal factors influencing language usage. It implies that effecting change necessitates confronting language market power dynamics (Bourdieu, 1986). To avoid the detrimental impacts of monolingual politics, there is a need to support multilingual education and policies to ensure that all languages are considered. This approach promotes the principles of equality, non-discrimination, and inclusive education regarding the value of language diversity in school settings (DeGraff 2020, Right to Education Initiative).

## **DIFFERENCES FROM AND ADDITIONS TO EXISTING RESEARCH**

### **Linguistic Repression and Its Penalties**

This paper focuses on the cruel and unrelenting rules and regulations exercised on individuals who use another language apart from English in class. It offers vivid examples of what occurred and detailed descriptions of the benefits and consequences of language practices. This contributes to the literature that often addresses issues of a broader nature, such as language policy, the benefits of bilingual education, and the justification of linguistic human rights (Hurwitz, 2020; Kambel, 2020). Studies like those by Hurwitz and Kambel address the more general effects of language-based exclusion and provide programs like the Language Friendly School, which try to do away with language-based penalties (Kambel, 2020).

### **Empirical vs. Theoretical Approaches**

Our dataset offers first-hand empirical information from people directly impacted by language policy, in contrast to the literature's mostly theoretical focus. Scholars like Slaughter and Cross usually focus on plurilingual pedagogies and critical assessments of monolingual prejudices in their writings, examining theoretical frameworks and pedagogical approaches for language usage (Slaughter & Cross, 2010). Our empirical method, which grounds theory in authentic experiences, provides a nuanced dimension to our understanding of these challenges.

### **Specificity of Punishments and Incentives**

The study provides unique information on language-related punishments, such as standing or kneeling outside classes, and incentives, such as prizes in language contests. This uniqueness contrasts sharply with the literature's intellectual debates, which frequently focus on systemic problems without exploring individual experiences (DeGraff, 2020). For example, whereas DeGraff analyzes the possibilities of using Creole in a Haitian educational setting, he concentrates primarily on the issues of power and the impact of educational processes.

### **Resolutions and Suggestions**

These outcomes imply that more attention should be paid to language policy and its possible modification, as we have finally documented individual impacts. This helpful insight encourages the development of schooling contexts that are highly appreciative of all languages and can facilitate the development of targeted interventions and models for instruction as captured by the Language Friendly School project (Kambel, 2020).

### **Demographics and Contextual Diversity**

This study offers insights directly applicable to English language policy in this region by concentrating on a particular demographic: students and teachers from particular Indian institutions and Indians in the USA. This focus on specific demographics provides a crucial empirical counterbalance to general international literature, frequently extrapolating findings across different educational contexts. Our research adds to the



growing knowledge of educational practices in multilingual settings by highlighting the importance of localized solutions and understanding (Hurwitz, 2020; Kambel, 2020).

### **APPLICATION OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS**

The existing reward and punishment type is widely used in education to motivate learners to use English or to punish them for speaking other languages. Such practices may be carried out formally and informally. For instance, a student who demonstrates high levels of mastery in English may be rewarded, given higher scores, or get more opportunities to be involved in co-curricular activities. On the other hand, if the native languages used in school are other than English, the students may be punished, experience a decline in performance, or be socially excluded ((Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Degraff, 2020).

### **THE NATURE OF THESE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS**

The nature of the rewards and punishments that dominate the classroom in advancing achievement and reducing learning-related actions are essential and not insignificantly so.

The rewards may also range from mere words of encouragement or reprimanding to stern actions involving scholarship or detention, depending on the punishment. At times, students may be given the responsibility to lead their class or may be rewarded for fluency in English, making them models for the rest of the learners. On the other hand, consequences may entail demotion from the class, embarrassment in front of other students, or even physical punishment in extreme cases, especially when the native language is used rather than English (Bourdieu, 1986; Right to Education Initiative, n. d. ).

### **THE UTILIZATION OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS**

The underlying justification for these rewards and punishments is complex and has multiple facets: The underlying justification for these rewards and punishments is complex and has multiple facets:

**1. Linguistic Assimilation:** An unstated assumption that people generally accept is that shifting to an English-speaking language environment will promote unity and improved performance in schools. English has been viewed as the global language with which people with different native languages can communicate, and it is necessary for achieving good results in education and acquire future job opportunities.

**2. Social Control and Power Dynamics:** Using rewards and punishment and configuring policies based on English only in the playground serve as social regulation objectives in educational control, developing and strengthening power relations in education. It perpetuates societal inequities and advantages those already proficient in English, rendering it beneficial only for those with existing language expertise.

**3. Cultural and Linguistic Homogenization:** Educational institutions promote cultural and linguistic uniformity by encouraging the usage of English and punishing the use of other languages. This practice often undermines the value of students' language and cultural diversity, fostering a monolingual standard that aligns with broader societal standards.

There is a significant focus on seeing language variety as an opportunity rather than a challenge. Implementing a multilingual education policy might provide equitable and inclusive learning opportunities. These methods would not only affirm the intrinsic value of all languages but also respect and uphold the many linguistic identities of students, fostering an educational atmosphere that mirrors a multicultural society.

## SECTION II: THE SURVEY

This section comprises the following:

Survey tool

Participants Data Processing Quantification Metrics

(a) Reward Findings (b) Punishment Findings

Patterns

Discussion Conclusion

### 2.1 SURVEY TOOL

Utilizing Google Forms as a survey instrument is both easy and accessible, as shown by the evaluation of English-only language rules at educational institutions. Google Forms has a straightforward interface that facilitates the creation of surveys with several question types, including multiple-choice and essay questions. Consequently, the scale used in the present investigation facilitates the generation of comprehensive and varied data. This argument is supported by several concrete findings about punishment, feeling, and the public justifications that such a system facilitates.

This saves the time and effort of physically administering and physically collecting the survey, as all this is made possible using email or shareable links, and the responses are obtained in real time. It allows the analysis once the survey has been closed. By joining other Google services, such as Sheets, the researcher or educator can quickly categorize and sort data. With this integration, it is possible to analyze some trends and patterns of sentiment and behaviors referring to the language used in educational settings. This is evident by the sentiment of responses, which welcomes an extensive array of data that encompasses numerical ratings and opinions to ensure that a huge level of understanding is reached using the tool. Furthermore, their availability and ease of use contributed to increased response rates, thus ensuring that scenarios captured a broad spectrum.

Using Google Forms to administer this survey also improved the process in terms of organization and the ability for the respondent to express their views elaborately. This made it possible to have a broader understanding of the underlying consequences of language policies for educational situations.

### 2.2 PARTICIPANTS

The involvement of academics, educators, and university students in the Google Forms survey offers a comprehensive viewpoint on implementing English-only language legislation. Due to this varied population, the study may contain a broad spectrum of experiences and perspectives, extending beyond the direct effects on children to incorporate the educators responsible for implementing these policies.

College students have the maturity to contemplate their educational experiences and provide insightful perspectives on how English-only policies may have influenced language competency, academic paths, and cultural identity. Their responses may also indicate the ongoing influence of these practices on their perspectives on language and schooling.

Professors possess advanced pedagogical insights that allow them to evaluate the educational justification for enforcing regulations mandating the exclusive use of English. Due to their extensive intellectual background, they are equipped to evaluate policy results and effectiveness at an academic level. They may support or oppose certain activities depending on educational ideologies and outcomes.

Instructors are crucial for implementing policies and consistently evaluating their outcomes. They provide valuable insights into the impact of the regulations by sharing personal observations of student reactions

and adaptations. The responses from educators may also underscore the advantages and practical difficulties of sustaining a classroom where just English is used.

Integrating these many perspectives via a Google Forms poll enhances the data with various experiences, knowledge, and subjective judgments. This underscores the complex interplay between educational programs and their beneficiaries, stressing the need for policies that account for language acquisition's pedagogical, emotional, and cultural dimensions. This comprehensive dataset is essential for policymakers, educators, and academics in evaluating and shaping language education programs.

## 2.3 DATA PROCESSING

The data gathered from instructors, professors, and college students via Google Forms was processed using an integrative method. Initially, Google Sheets was used to aggregate the responses automatically gathered by Google Forms. This facilitated the rapid compilation and calculation of quantitative data, including reported mood and severity of punishment evaluations.

A content analysis examined qualitative data, remarkably open-ended responses about punishments and rationales for implementing English-only laws. The process included categorizing the written responses thematically to discern reoccurring themes and distinct perspectives.

Thematic analysis revealed the underlying causes and emotions, while descriptive statistics offered a comprehensive understanding of the numerical components.

The amalgamation of numerical patterns, detailed personal narratives, and expert perspectives on linguistic regulations in educational contexts provided a holistic approach. This comprehensive combination of quantitative and qualitative data yielded a profound knowledge of the implications of these programs.

### 2.3.1 METRICS FOR QUANTIFICATION

Quantification refers to the process of expressing or representing something in numerical terms.

Standards for incentives:

Awards and recognitions are granted at the institutional level.

Regional Level (2): Includes accolades at the district level, participation in school competitions, and notable accomplishments.

National Level (3): Refers to competitions, assessments, or honors held nationally, such as the National Level ICFAI, spelling competitions, and national debate championships.

Specialized Achievement (4): Exceptional performance in standardized evaluations (e.g., CBSE), fulfillment of specialized coursework, and participation in distinctive training programs for specific events.

Global Level (5): International accolades such as the International English Olympiad and rankings of worldwide importance.

Assessment Scale Sanction

Minor sanctions include verbal admonitions or informal reprimands.

Intermediate repercussions include exclusion from the classroom, monetary penalties, or written tasks.

4 to 5: Severe punishments, including physical suffering or humiliation, such as prolonged kneeling or corporal punishment.

Sentiment Evaluation Scale:

Apathy or absence of emotional reaction to the penalty.

From 2 to 3: Slightly adverse feelings, however not substantially impactful or lasting attitudes.



4 to 5: Severe negative feelings, including embarrassment, deep bewilderment, or anguish.

**Rationale for Sanction:** This section elucidates each penalty from the student's perspective, highlighting its relation to implementing linguistic regulations, cultural influences, or a synthesis of both.

### 2.3. 2 (A) REWARDS FOR CONFORMING TO THE ENGLISH-ONLY NORM

**TABLE 1: REWARDS TABLE**

Award/Reward	Rating
English Olympiad	5
Best speaker in Mock Parliament Debate	4
IOEL Olympiad	5
Full score in 10th class CBSE Board Exam	4
CLAT rank, answer writing, and projects	4
Competitions, publications, professional advancement	3
Proficiency in English language (school scoring)	2
Elocution, debate, theater	3
Best composition, best poetry	3
School Level	1
Parliamentary debate competitions	3
Best essay award	3
Spell bee, elocution, debate, extempore, creative writing	3
National Level, ICFAI	3
Spelling bees, essay competitions	3
Claps in class, debates, annual day functions	2
ASISC English Creative Writing Competition	4
Academic excellence	4
Accolades in debates, MUNs, CLAT	4
International rank in the English Olympiad	5
Written English	2

Extempore Speaking	3
ASISC Declamation, editorial board, debating cups	3
School-level, District-level	2
AISSE School Topper in English	4
Essay writing competitions, high SAT scores	4
Assimilation in non-Hindi speaking regions	2
Prizes for literary and speakers events	3
Spelling Bee and English Olympiads	5
International level	5

## RESULTS:

- Valuable incentives and worldwide acknowledgment:** The system prioritizes international accomplishments, as evidenced by the prestigious awards received in the English Olympiad and its high rankings on a global scale. The focus on international recognition highlights the significance placed on English language skills in a worldwide context.
- Specialized Recognition:** - Exceptional accomplishments in English, such as being the top orator or showcasing outstanding academic performance, are highly valued and act as strong incentives for students to improve their English proficiency, highlighting the educational emphasis on specialized language abilities.
- Differentiation between National and Local Recognition:** National recognitions are distinguished by a moderate grade, differentiating them from local accomplishments. This suggests that while local accolades are esteemed, wider recognition has more significance. This stratification indicates a trend wherein local achievements may lead to national and, eventually, global opportunities.
- Improving English Proficiency:** - Offering incentives for achieving a high level of English proficiency in schools illustrates a supportive educational atmosphere that promotes the use of English in many contexts. The diverse range of these awards, including creative writing and public speaking, demonstrates the significant integration of English throughout the curriculum.
- Encouraging English Usage:** The rewards system provides incentives for using English in many contexts, including academic and extracurricular activities. Informal acknowledgment approaches, such as receiving applause in an educational setting, may boost English language ability. This highlights the inherent advantages of using the language in routine academic activities.
- Acknowledgment of English as a Catalyst for Progress:** - Awards that highlight career advancement and adaptability in domains where Hindi is not dominant emphasize English as an essential skill, crucial for academic achievement and professional flexibility, and demonstrate a significant recognition of the language's practical importance.
- Cultural and Linguistic Tension:** The integration of linguistic diversity, the conflict among indigenous languages, and the supremacy of English highlight a cultural aspect of the incentive system.

This may uncover a fundamental process of cultural negotiation, in which English competence is seen as advantageous and indicative of adherence to global standards, perhaps compromising one's original linguistic identity. The broad use of incentives to enhance English proficiency highlights the language's importance in education. Proficiency in English is seen as a considerable asset, symbolizing cultural literacy and serving as a criterion for academic accomplishment and prospective career success.

Overall, the benefits of being proficient in English in educational institutions appear to be a reflection of a complex system that recognizes English as more than just a language but also as a crucial element for achieving academic success, cultural knowledge, and global competency. Although this system seems to encourage the development of English language skills, it also highlights the importance of adopting a fair and inclusive approach that acknowledges and values the diversity of languages and cultural heritage.

**2.3.2 (B) PUNISHMENTS FOR NOT CONFORMING TO THE ENGLISH ONLY NORM**

**TABLE 2: PUNISHMENT TABLE**

Class	Punishment	Rating	Sentiment Expressed	Rating	Reason for Punishment
3rd	Kneeling down for an hour	5	Felt like a dumb kid; didn't understand why	4	Teacher offended; enforcing 'English only' rule, set an example
Primary school	Standing outside holding ears	4	Confused	3	To encourage English speaking and discourage vernacular usage
3rd	Stood in class for the next 2 classes	4	Definitely bad; registered need to speak English	4	To teach spoken English and ensure fluency for a better career
7th	Fine and red card	3	Didn't care, continued speaking Malayalam	1	To stick to speaking English and master it
8th	Note names speaking other language	3	No worries	1	(Reason not provided)
6th	Black star	2	Indifferent	1	(Reason not provided)
Grade 6th or 7th	Verbal warning	2	Didn't really bother me	1	English mandated as medium of

					communication
8th	Stand out in the corridor	3	Felt bad (ashamed) and as if i deserved it	4	Could have spoken English instead
Class 5th	Fine of 100rs	3	Confused	3	School rule prohibiting other languages than English
Kindergarten Level 2	Verbal reprimand	3	Felt could not speak or communicate in mother tongue	4	Strategy to inculcate English speaking, thinking, and writing from an early age
6th	100 rs fine	3	Bad	2	Speaking languages other than English
Second grade	Parents called	4	Shameful and humiliated	4	Colonial legacy of English as the superior language
4th	Cancellation of games period	3	Wondered why speaking in Hindi was disgraceful	5	Encouragement of speaking English
Primary (1-4)	Don't remember	1	Felt pity on the education system	3	Not fitting into the "norm"
UKG	Stand outside the class	3	Liked it, played with an empty bottle	1	Couldn't speak English and didn't want to
School	Class ke bahaar khada kardiya	3	Nothing	1	Not speaking the official language
6th	Write in notebook 25 times	3	Moderately dissatisfied, felt like a crime	3	Indian inclination to regard English as superior
9th	Rs.200	4	Bad	2	Speaking

	fine				Hindi in an English medium school not allowed
5th	10 rupees fine, future communications in English	3	Suppressed and bonded	4	English portrayed as a hallmark of literacy and class, Hindi seen as low
6th	Fine of 10 rs	2	Not great	2	Broke a "rule"
7th Std.	Fine of 100 rupees	4	Absolutely mortifying and helpless	5	Speaking Hindi seen as contravention of school rules
Class 1	Scolded and hold ears	3	Sad and humiliated at the time, funny in retrospect	3	Punished for violating school rules, speaking Bengali
5th-6th	Asked to leave the classroom	3	Not fair	2	Hindered apparent decorum
4th	Write an essay in English	3	Unnecessary	2	Obsession with English, Neo-colonialism
8th grade	Asked not to speak it	3	Felt alright at the moment, but anxious later	3	Setting a precedent to only engage in English
6th	An apology	2	Anxious	3	Rule to speak only English in class
4th	Told to get out of class	3	Confused, language at home looked down upon	4	Considering every other language as substandard compared to English
6th-10th standard	Fine, beating with a stick	5	Sad	4	Not learning English



7th	Reprimanded in front of class	3	Didn't feel like a mistake but was punished	4	Against the school rules
-----	-------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------

**RESULTS:**

Severe and invasive punishments, such as kneeling, classroom exclusion, and monetary fines, are consistently linked to negative emotions, albeit with significant variation in intensity. This highlights a complex emotional landscape in which the intended deterrent effect of punishment may not correspond with the actual feelings it evokes.

The distinction between severity and sentiment: A prevalent trend suggests that harsher fines elicit negative feelings; however, certain instances demonstrate a discrepancy where severe punishments lead to indifference or neutral emotions. This suggests that certain pupils demonstrate increased resilience or defiance in response to these tactics.

Parental involvement in the disciplinary process represents a critical emotional event that underscores the wider social implications of punishment, extending beyond the educational context.

The adverse response to the utilization of local languages, including Hindi, indicates an underlying cultural conflict. The inclination to conform to societal norms and the resultant guilt linked to the use of one's native language illustrate a conflict between official language policies and individual or cultural identity. Punishments function not only to uphold language regulations but also as corrective measures to enhance English proficiency. The research indicates that these measures may not consistently yield the desired outcomes, as students occasionally utilize their native language regardless of the repercussions.

The indifference exhibited by certain students regarding specific disciplinary measures demonstrates their lack of effectiveness. Engaging in activities like manipulating a water bottle in response to punishment illustrates the application of coping mechanisms that reduce the effectiveness of the intended punishment. The educational strategy aimed at improving English proficiency from an early age can elicit a range of emotions, such as anxiety and confusion. This suggests that teaching and reinforcing language skills should incorporate the emotional and psychological well-being of children.

Language serves as an indicator of social class and literacy, with English positioned as a symbol of higher literacy and social status, while other languages are regarded as less prestigious. This mentality, potentially arising from the effects of colonialism, may foster feelings of oppression and limitations among students for whom English is not the primary language.

When enforced through punitive measures, English-only language policies in educational institutions can provoke diverse emotional reactions and are frequently perceived as unjust or unnecessary by students. The study highlights the necessity for schools to reassess their communication strategies and the implementation of language policies, ensuring these measures are academically effective, culturally sensitive, and emotionally supportive.

**PATTERNS IN THE DATA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FINDINGS AND THE LITERATURE REVIEW**

The examination of the data and literature regarding English-only norms in educational settings indicates that the implementation of these norms relies on a framework of incentives and sanctions. The primary patterns identified are as follows:

1. Importance of English Proficiency: English proficiency is significantly valued, as evidenced by the elevated ratings assigned to achievements like the English Olympiad and international accolades. This indicates a sustained preference for the English language relative to other languages.
2. The severity of punishments correlates with the intensity of negative emotions experienced by students, whereby harsher penalties lead to heightened negative sentiments. The data suggest that an increase in punishment severity correlates with a greater likelihood of significant emotional distress.
3. Discrepancy Between Punishment Severity and Sentiment Intensity: While a correlation often exists between severe punishments and negative sentiments, there are instances where this correlation fails, indicating a complex relationship between punishment and its emotional impact. The penalties for using languages other than English illustrate a recurring theme of cultural conflict and the marginalization of students' native languages and identities.
4. Ineffectiveness of Punishments: A consistent pattern indicates that punitive measures are ineffective, as students continue to use their mother tongue or exhibit indifference towards the penalties imposed.
5. The Behavioural Approach to Language Management employs rewards and punishments to condition students' language use, embodying a behaviorist perspective within educational contexts.
6. The data indicates that language management policies provoke a range of psychological and emotional responses, such as confusion, shame, indifference, and resistance.
7. Linguistic diversity: The enforcement of English-only norms via punitive measures threatens linguistic diversity, especially when students are dissuaded from using their native languages.
8. Recognition and Rewards for English Proficiency: A consistent practice of recognizing and rewarding individuals for their proficiency and achievements in English may unintentionally devalue the importance of being bilingual or multilingual.

These patterns indicate that managing language norms in educational institutions requires a comprehensive and diverse approach, which has important consequences for students' linguistic growth, emotional welfare, cultural identity, and educational fairness.

### **ANALYZING THE TRENDS AND PATTERNS:**

The patterns observed in the data can be ascribed to several pivotal factors:

1. The emphasis placed on English proficiency reflects broader cultural values that link the language to modern trends, global interconnectedness, and economic advancement. This notion is prevalent in educational policy, leading to a preference for English over other languages and thus affecting the system of incentives and sanctions.
2. The emotional responses to punitive measures indicate that the psychological ramifications of language regulations are significant. When students encounter disciplinary actions for using their native language, it might evoke feelings of shame, alienation, and a complicated linguistic identity. Conversely, rewards for English proficiency may bolster self-confidence, however they may inadvertently reinforce the notion that just a single language ought to be spoken.
3. Behaviorist methodologies in education use reinforcement and punishment to regulate language in academic settings. It is presumed that pupils will demonstrate a desire to use English when incentivized and will be dissuaded from its use when confronted with adverse repercussions for noncompliance. Nonetheless, behaviorism inadequately accounts for underlying emotional and cognitive processes, leading to inconsistent efficacy.

4. Linguistic Hegemony and Power Structures: English is often depicted as the dominant language in educational institutions, mirroring its status within global power dynamics. The predominance of English may lead to the devaluation of other languages and cultural identities, since educational institutions use incentives and punishments to maintain English's superiority.
5. Resistance and resistance: Some pupils demonstrate resistance or indifference towards punitive measures, sometimes arising from a strong cultural identity or dissent against the perceived inequity of such policies. The existence of resistance suggests that punitive measures may not reliably produce the intended outcomes and may instead counteract efforts, strengthening pupils' commitment to their home language.
6. Inadequate communication of policies: The existence of uncertainty and misunderstanding about the justification for sanctions indicates that rules are not disseminated consistently and effectively. The students' failure to understand the rationale behind the English-only policies may create a disconnect between the policy's intended goal and the students' perceptions of it.
7. Comparison of Educational Objectives and Human Rights: While the aim of these policies may be to improve language proficiency for academic and professional success, they contradict human rights values that advocate for the preservation of cultural and linguistic diversity. The results underscore the tension between educational objectives and people' rights to maintain their language heritage.
8. Long-Term Consequences for Linguistic variety: Favoring English over other languages adversely affects the variety and preservation of languages. The reward and punishment system may contribute to the slow erosion of minority languages, raising questions about their viability in educational contexts and beyond.

The data results suggest that although English-only regulations may be instituted to prepare pupils for a worldwide society, the methods of enforcement might accidentally result in unanticipated and often detrimental consequences. Educational institutions must endeavor to attain a balance between language competence goals and the advancement of linguistic rights and diversity. This involves establishing an inclusive atmosphere that appreciates diverse languages and identities.

### **DISTINCTION FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES**

The distinction between empirical and conceptual is evident in our research, as our findings offer empirical data that is derived directly from the experiences of individuals impacted by English-only policies. On the other hand, the current body of written works, including the studies conducted by Hurwitz & Kambel and Wilson & Corpus, primarily focuses on the theoretical aspects and wider socio-cultural consequences of reward systems and discrimination based on language.

The dataset is specifically focused on educational settings and directly examines the implementation of punishments and rewards within that particular context. The literature offers a comprehensive analysis of the impact of reward systems on academic performance and the worldwide problem of language-based exclusion in education.

**Immediate Influence on Individuals:** The analysis focuses on the direct consequences of enforcing language policies on individuals, whereas the literature provides a more detached examination of how these policies contribute to larger societal and cultural concerns, such as educational disparities and linguistic entitlements.

The patterns identified are derived from narrative accounts provided by individuals, offering a nuanced and subjective viewpoint. However, the literature provides broad observations and conclusions derived

from research studies, which may not fully encompass the individual variations and intricate emotional responses observed in the dataset.

The findings provide a micro-level perspective, concentrating on individual narratives and specific occurrences of punishments and rewards. The literature adopts a macro-level perspective, analyzing the overall impacts of reward systems and language policies on different dimensions of academic achievement, social conduct, and human rights.

## CONCLUSION

The research presented here has thoroughly analyzed the complex relationships among incentives, penalties, and the enforcement of English-only standards in educational settings. The findings illustrate a multifaceted scenario regarding these treatments, which, although intended to enhance English language proficiency, may also have unforeseen psychological, social, and educational consequences.

The study's findings indicate that although incentives may motivate students to enhance their English proficiency, they might inadvertently diminish the significance of native language skills and cultural identities, so reinforcing a monolingual perspective that undermines linguistic diversity. Conversely, punishments imposed on students for using their home languages inhibit their linguistic and cultural expression, resulting in feelings of isolation and anguish.

This research emphasizes the benefits of bilingual education systems compared to English-only approaches, which seek to unite pupils and enhance their academic performance. These efforts advocate for linguistic rights while concurrently fostering inclusivity, enhancing academic achievement, and boosting emotional well-being. The research unequivocally contradicts the notion that suppressing indigenous languages to promote English enhances educational settings.

Therefore, it is essential that educational procedures evolve to embrace multilingualism, ensuring that incentives and penalties do not undermine students' linguistic identities and rights. Educational institutions may cultivate an authentically inclusive society that honors and derives advantages from its cultural and linguistic diversity by promoting an academic atmosphere that regards all languages with equal esteem.

This finding necessitates a serious reevaluation of the role that incentives and punishments play in regulating language use in educational institutions. It necessitates a shift in methodology that recognizes and amplifies the multilingual composition of our educational setting, aligning it more closely with human rights standards and contemporary global realities.

## REFERENCES

1. Sorokin, P. A. (1977). Historical dynamics and socio-cultural change. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 773-797. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847701600601>
2. Buyse, A. (2008). *Human rights, minority rights, and the search for new equilibria: Selected lessons from the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights*. Global Campus Open Knowledge Repository. <https://repository.gchumanrights.org/items/6d666f7b-16b2-4b9a-8c4e-1201751bd1f5>
3. Stahl, W. A. (2001). The church as a social movement: A critique of rational choice theory. *The American Sociologist*, 32(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2001.11495578>
4. DeGraff, M. (2020). The politics of education in post-colonies: Kreyòl in Haiti as a case study of language as technology for power and liberation. *ResearchGate*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342820077\\_The\\_politics\\_of\\_education\\_in\\_post-colonies\\_Kreyol\\_in\\_Haiti\\_as\\_a\\_case\\_study\\_of\\_language\\_as\\_technology\\_for\\_power\\_and\\_liberation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342820077_The_politics_of_education_in_post-colonies_Kreyol_in_Haiti_as_a_case_study_of_language_as_technology_for_power_and_liberation)

5. Right to Education Initiative. (n.d.). *Education, language, and the human rights of minorities*. <https://www.right-to-education.org/resource/education-language-and-human-rights-minorities>
6. Sydney Morning Herald. (2012, February 16). *Children ordered to watch their language*. <https://www.smh.com.au/world/children-ordered-to-watch-their-language-20120216-1tbqq.html>
7. Hindustan Times. (2016, April 20). *School students punished for speaking Assamese, probe ordered*. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india/school-students-punished-for-speaking-assamese-probe-ordered/story-DZ60PIiNyoHHezcdZiS88L.html>
8. Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10(6), 479-490. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171429>
9. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Marxists Internet Archive. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital.htm>