From Chalkboards to Smartboards: Transforming English Language Teaching in Uttar Pradesh in Light of NEP-2020

Prof. Amit Bhardwaj[1]

[1]Director, Higher Education, Directorate, Higher Education, Uttar Pradesh, Prayagraj, (U.P.) India

Abstract

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has heralded a paradigm shift in Indian education, aiming for an inclusive, equitable, and multidisciplinary learning framework. Among its significant reforms is the renewed emphasis on foundational literacy and multilingualism, which has brought English Language Teaching (ELT) into sharp focus, especially in states like Uttar Pradesh where linguistic diversity and socioeconomic disparities pose challenges. This paper analyses the transformation of English teaching from traditional chalkboard methods to digital smartboard approaches, contextualized within NEP-2020's vision and implementation in Uttar Pradesh.

Keywords: Traditional Education, Smartboard Teaching, English Language Teaching, NEP-2020

Introduction

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 represents a seminal shift in India's educational paradigm, seeking to realign the nation's learning framework with the demands of the 21st century. Its key objectives—accessibility, equity, quality, and technological integration—are rooted in the vision of creating a knowledge society through education that is multidisciplinary, multilingual, and inclusive (MHRD 2–3). Among the various reforms NEP-2020 introduces, its approach to language education and foundational literacy, particularly English Language Teaching (ELT), is both progressive and challenging, especially when contextualized within the complex educational landscape of Uttar Pradesh.

Uttar Pradesh, India's most populous state, reflects the paradoxes of Indian education: rapid expansion of school enrollment coupled with persistent concerns about learning outcomes, especially in government schools. English, positioned as a global and aspirational language, continues to be a symbol of socio-economic mobility and educational advancement. Yet, the disparity in English language proficiency between students in private urban institutions and those in rural, vernacular-medium government schools underscores a deeply entrenched linguistic hierarchy (Agnihotri 110; Kumar 33). English in Uttar Pradesh is not merely a language but a social signifier, often accessible only to the privileged, further exacerbating class divisions in educational achievement.

NEP-2020 attempts to democratize access to English through an approach that balances multilingualism with technological interventions. The policy encourages the development of language across the curriculum, outcome-based learning, and pedagogical reforms that privilege communication over memorization. It recognizes English as an important medium for global competence while urging mother tongue-based foundational education in early years to ensure conceptual clarity and emotional grounding (MHRD 13). However, this vision presents significant implementation challenges in a linguistically diverse state like Uttar Pradesh, where Hindi, Urdu, Awadhi, and Bhojpuri coexist and compete with English for linguistic space in classrooms and communities.

The traditional model of English language teaching in Uttar Pradesh has been largely textbook-centered and grammar-translation based, relying on chalkboard methods and rote learning. This approach has consistently failed to develop communicative proficiency and critical thinking skills. The Annual Status of

Education Report (ASER) over the past decade has shown that a substantial proportion of Class V students in rural areas struggle to read basic English sentences, highlighting an urgent need for pedagogical innovation (ASER 2023).

In this context, the transition "from chalkboards to smartboards" is not just technological but epistemological—it calls for a redefinition of teaching-learning processes, teacher roles, and student engagement. Smartboards, digital content, and online platforms like DIKSHA (Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing) and e-Pathshala are being promoted under NEP-2020 as tools to modernize classroom transactions (Kumar 41; UPEFA 10). These tools can potentially bridge learning gaps by offering multimedia-rich, learner-centric content. Pilot studies in Lucknow, Kanpur, and Ghaziabad have shown modest improvements in learning outcomes where smart classrooms have been effectively integrated (UPEFA 15). However, these successes are often isolated and urban-centric, failing to address the digital divide that leaves rural schools digitally under-equipped and teachers under-trained.

A critical analysis of this digital shift reveals several fault lines. First, infrastructure inadequacy—many schools still lack electricity, internet access, and basic digital equipment. Second, teacher preparedness is uneven; while NEP-2020 mandates continuous professional development, training modules often fail to accommodate the linguistic and technological diversity of rural teachers (Mitra 202). Third, there is a risk of technocentrism, where digital tools are introduced without adequate curricular or cultural contextualization, leading to superficial engagement rather than deep learning.

Despite these challenges, the transformative potential of NEP-2020 remains significant. If implemented with context-specific adaptations, community involvement, and a focus on bilingual resources, the shift from chalkboards to smartboards can pave the way for equitable and effective English education in Uttar Pradesh. This paper, therefore, aims to examine how English language pedagogy is being transformed in Uttar Pradesh in light of NEP-2020, assessing both the promises and the pitfalls of this ongoing educational revolution.

Historical Background of English Teaching in Uttar Pradesh

The history of English language teaching (ELT) in Uttar Pradesh (UP) reflects broader colonial legacies, postcolonial anxieties, and systemic neglect in language policy implementation. English was institutionalized during British rule not as a vernacular of the people but as a medium for producing a clerical elite, a dynamic that post-independence India continued to grapple with (Krishnaswamy and Krishnaswamy 14). In the decades following independence, while English emerged as a global language of science, technology, and upward mobility, its inclusion in UP's public education system remained largely symbolic and peripheral, especially in government-run Hindi-medium schools.

Historically, pedagogical practices in UP were characterized by the grammar-translation method, which focused on literal translation, vocabulary memorization, and the rote learning of grammatical rules. This methodology, inherited from colonial schooling systems, was devoid of communicative engagement and oral proficiency (Agnihotri 112). The emphasis was not on making students competent users of the language but on helping them pass examinations, thereby reducing English to a subject rather than a skill. This approach led to generations of learners with limited expressive abilities and crippling linguistic anxiety, especially when encountering native or fluent English speakers.

The rural-urban divide further compounded the problem. In urban centers like Lucknow and Allahabad, elite private institutions adopted more dynamic and immersive methods of teaching English, often supported by better-trained teachers and access to print and digital resources. In stark contrast, rural schools

faced acute shortages of English teachers, inadequate infrastructure, and outdated syllabi. A study conducted by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) found that in UP, over 40% of government primary schools either had no dedicated English teacher or relied on teachers without formal training in ELT (NCERT 45).

Moreover, textbooks and curriculum design remained mismatched with learners' sociolinguistic contexts. Textbooks emphasized structural accuracy but lacked functional and interactive components. Even today, many learners are unable to relate textbook content to their daily experiences, which alienates the language further (Kumar 29). These limitations are not simply logistical; they are ideological—reflecting the belief that English is a language of the elite and not integral to the cognitive or cultural development of rural learners.

In terms of policy, the Three-Language Formula, designed to promote multilingualism, failed in implementation across UP. Hindi dominated public schools, with Sanskrit often introduced as a third language instead of English in early years. This policy confusion and lack of political will to strengthen English instruction at foundational levels has had a lasting impact. The result is a systemic inequality of linguistic opportunity, where private school learners gain fluency and confidence, while their government school counterparts struggle with linguistic marginalization (Mohanty 131).

The digital revolution, which has transformed language teaching elsewhere, made little historical impact in UP until recently, due to infrastructural limitations. The absence of digital aids like audio recordings, projectors, or internet access has meant that English remained confined to chalk-and-talk routines, failing to tap into the potential of visual and interactive learning. In sum, the historical development of English teaching in Uttar Pradesh has been shaped by colonial residues, pedagogical stagnation, and systemic neglect. These factors have produced a stratified English education system where access and quality are largely determined by location, language background, and class. Any meaningful reform must confront this layered past and recognize the social implications of language instruction as much as its academic goals.

NEP-2020 and its Vision for Language Education

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 envisions a transformative restructuring of the Indian education system, recognizing language not only as a medium of instruction but also as a powerful cognitive and cultural resource. At the core of NEP-2020 is a multilingual vision that seeks to balance the importance of regional and classical languages with the pragmatic necessity of English, especially in a globalized world. This nuanced position challenges the binary of English versus Indian languages and instead promotes functional multilingualism that empowers learners across sociolinguistic contexts (MHRD 12–15).

NEP-2020 asserts that children learn best in their home language or mother tongue, particularly in foundational years (grades 1–5). This recommendation is based on decades of research in cognitive linguistics and pedagogy that highlight the benefits of mother-tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) in enhancing comprehension, emotional security, and concept formation (Mohanty 124). However, the policy also clearly acknowledges the central role English plays in academic advancement, employment, and international communication, and therefore does not propose its exclusion but its progressive and meaningful integration into the school curriculum (MHRD 13).

In this policy architecture, English is redefined not as a privileged colonial relic, but as a "link language"—a tool to bridge knowledge systems and unlock opportunities in science, technology, and global discourse. Its instruction is to move away from the rote-learning paradigms that have plagued Indian classrooms and shift towards experiential, communicative, and competency-based learning models (Kumar

51). Classroom strategies are expected to be learner-centered, using activities such as group discussions, storytelling, project-based learning, and digital media tools that foster real-life language use over theoretical grammar drills.

Another crucial aspect of NEP-2020 is its focus on teacher education and professional development. Recognizing that any pedagogical reform is only as effective as the teachers implementing it, the policy mandates rigorous and continuous capacity building programs for English language teachers. Initiatives like NISHTHA (National Initiative for School Heads' and Teachers' Holistic Advancement) and platforms such as DIKSHA offer open-access digital training modules, many of which now include ELT-specific content aligned with NEP goals (UPEFA 23). However, these initiatives face critical gaps in implementation across states like Uttar Pradesh, where digital infrastructure, teacher readiness, and local language integration remain pressing concerns (Rao 209).

Importantly, NEP-2020 also underscores the role of technology in pedagogy. The policy envisions smart classrooms, online content, AI-assisted language platforms, and mobile learning tools as vital components of English education. In regions like Uttar Pradesh, where English proficiency often correlates with economic disparity and geographic location, such technological interventions hold transformative promise—but only if equitably deployed. Without adequate infrastructure in rural schools, and contextual localization of digital content, there is a risk of deepening the digital divide and reproducing the very inequities NEP seeks to correct (Kumar 77).

Critically, NEP-2020's ambition to integrate multilingualism with digital innovation presents both ideological and operational challenges. While the policy is progressive in its vision, its execution depends heavily on the state machinery's ability to translate national-level guidelines into localized, culturally relevant, and pedagogically sound practices. The lack of clear curricular models for bilingual or trilingual teaching, insufficient teacher autonomy, and the persistent socio-political valorization of English over native languages can dilute the effectiveness of NEP's language vision unless actively addressed (Annamalai 89).

In conclusion, NEP-2020 offers a progressive and pragmatic blueprint for language education that seeks to harmonize linguistic diversity, cognitive development, and global integration. For states like Uttar Pradesh, its success hinges on grassroots adaptability, infrastructural investment, and a paradigm shift in pedagogical ideology—one that values multilingual empowerment as a democratic educational right rather than a hierarchical linguistic competition.

Shifts from Chalkboards to Smartboards: The Digital Turn in English Language Teaching

The shift from chalkboards to smartboards in the context of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Uttar Pradesh reflects a broader pedagogical transformation influenced by the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, which emphasizes technology integration as a catalyst for inclusive and experiential learning. Traditional English classrooms in the state were long defined by static instruction—chalk-and-talk pedagogy, grammar-translation methods, and exam-oriented content. However, the incorporation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tools has begun to reimagine the nature of engagement, interactivity, and language acquisition for both students and teachers.

Pilot programs introduced in districts such as Lucknow, Kanpur, and Varanasi under the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan and supported by platforms like DIKSHA have demonstrated that smart classrooms equipped with interactive whiteboards, projectors, tablets, and audio-visual content significantly improve learner outcomes. According to a 2023 report by the Uttar Pradesh Education for All Project Board (UPEFA), approximately 67% of students in smart classrooms showed marked improvement in listening and speaking

skills, compared to their counterparts in conventional classrooms (UPEFA 18). The visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning channels provided by smartboards foster contextualized and multimodal understanding, which is particularly crucial in English language learning that relies on tone, pronunciation, body language, and immersive experiences.

Beyond just performance metrics, digital tools have also redefined teacher-student dynamics and classroom environments. Smartboards allow for instant feedback, collaborative activities, virtual assessments, and real-time corrections, creating more interactive and dialogic spaces. In urban clusters where such technology has been systematically implemented, there is observable growth in students' language confidence, participation, and vocabulary retention (Kumar 84). Furthermore, digital language labs and mobile-based apps are enabling individualized learning paces, allowing slower learners to revisit modules and faster learners to explore advanced content.

However, this transformation is far from uniform. Despite NEP-2020's optimism, scaling up digital learning in rural Uttar Pradesh faces daunting challenges. Infrastructure gaps, particularly in electricity, internet connectivity, and availability of digital devices, render many schools incapable of implementing smart technology (Rao 215). Moreover, technological determinism—the assumption that mere access to digital tools will automatically result in better learning—can lead to shallow adoption without deeper pedagogical integration. In many government schools, smartboards remain underutilized due to lack of maintenance or teacher preparedness, reducing them to symbolic installations rather than transformative tools.

Teacher training remains a critical bottleneck. Although programs like NISHTHA and DIKSHA have offered digital modules for upskilling teachers in ICT-based pedagogy, many educators—especially in rural areas—struggle with digital literacy, language barriers, and fear of technology (Mohanty 137). A 2022 NCERT survey revealed that more than 58% of English teachers in government schools across Uttar Pradesh had never used a smartboard or digital content in their classrooms, citing lack of training and fear of making mistakes (NCERT 33). This highlights the need not only for technological access but also for sustained, contextual, and bilingual teacher training programs.

Another emerging issue is the absence of culturally localized and linguistically appropriate digital content. Much of the English language software or video content used in smart classrooms is either imported or standardized, often failing to consider regional accents, sociolinguistic diversity, or rural learners' contexts. As a result, there's a risk of cognitive dissonance where learners are unable to fully relate to or benefit from the resources provided (Annamalai 91).

Despite these limitations, the digital transformation of ELT in Uttar Pradesh is a step in the right direction—a necessary evolution driven by NEP-2020's call for innovative, inclusive, and outcome-oriented learning. For smartboards to become more than cosmetic reforms, their deployment must be context-sensitive, teacher-empowered, and infrastructure-supported. The success of this shift depends not merely on hardware but on the humanware—teachers, administrators, and learners who can meaningfully engage with technology to transform language learning.

Teacher Training and Digital Literacy: The Achilles' Heel of English Pedagogy Reform

One of the most strategically significant pillars of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 is its unwavering emphasis on continuous professional development for teachers. Recognizing that teachers are the fulcrum of educational transformation, NEP-2020 envisions a future where educators are not only subject experts but also digitally literate facilitators of experiential and competency-based learning. In the context of

English Language Teaching (ELT) in Uttar Pradesh, this vision necessitates a radical shift in teacher training paradigms—both in terms of content and delivery mechanisms (MHRD 22).

To operationalize this vision, the Government of India has launched national-level platforms such as DIKSHA (Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing) and NISHTHA (National Initiative for School Heads' and Teachers' Holistic Advancement). These initiatives provide online modules, video lectures, interactive assessments, and certification courses in pedagogy, digital integration, and subject-specific instruction. While conceptually robust, the implementation of these programs in Uttar Pradesh has revealed stark disparities across regions and school types (Kumar 45).

Teachers in urban and semi-urban areas—particularly those employed in private institutions—are more likely to possess basic digital literacy, smartphone access, and familiarity with online tools, making them relatively equipped to engage with DIKSHA modules and integrate ICT into English classrooms. In contrast, government school teachers in rural districts often face multiple challenges: lack of stable internet, non-availability of smartphones or computers, absence of digital infrastructure in schools, and linguistic barriers due to English-dominant content in training modules (Rao 198). The assumption that one-size-fits-all in digital teacher training ignores the deep sociolinguistic and infrastructural diversity of a state like Uttar Pradesh.

Moreover, the monolingual orientation of many digital training modules—typically in English or standard Hindi—can alienate teachers from non-Hindi or regional language backgrounds, reducing both their confidence and engagement. The pedagogical models presented in these modules also often adopt urban-centric examples, which do not resonate with the socio-cultural realities of rural classrooms (Mohanty 141). This underscores the need for localized, bilingual, and culturally contextualized training programs that can empower teachers without alienating them.

A 2022 report by the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) found that over 60% of elementary school teachers in Uttar Pradesh had never received structured digital training beyond orientation workshops, and only 18% felt confident using digital tools in ELT contexts (NCTE 18). This digital skill gap perpetuates a dependency on outdated, non-interactive methods, thereby negating the goals of NEP-2020. Even when hardware like smartboards or tablets are provided, their usage remains minimal in the absence of adequate training and pedagogical scaffolding (Annamalai 93).

Furthermore, the current training architecture lacks provisions for post-training mentoring, classroom observation, and feedback mechanisms, which are essential for consolidating learned practices. Training, when conducted as a one-off event rather than a longitudinal, reflective process, results in superficial compliance rather than meaningful pedagogical transformation (Singh 65).

To bridge this chasm, Uttar Pradesh must adopt a decentralized, context-responsive model of teacher development. This would involve building district-level resource centers, incentivizing peer mentoring, integrating multilingual content, and developing low-tech or no-tech training alternatives (such as radio programs or printed modules) for regions with limited connectivity. Equally important is the recognition of teacher agency—empowering teachers not merely as recipients of knowledge but as co-creators of context-specific ELT strategies.

In essence, the challenge of digital literacy and professional training in Uttar Pradesh is not just technological but deeply pedagogical and sociopolitical. It reflects a need for sustained investment—not only in devices and platforms—but in human capacity, cultural sensitivity, and systemic accountability. Without addressing these interrelated factors, the ambitious reforms promised by NEP-2020 risk being reduced to technocratic aspirations disconnected from classroom realities.

Challenges and Prospects: Navigating the Future of English Language Teaching in Uttar Pradesh

While the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 has outlined a progressive and inclusive framework for English Language Teaching (ELT) in India, its realization in Uttar Pradesh is beset by structural, ideological, and operational challenges. Despite increased emphasis on technology integration, teacher training, and multilingual pedagogy, the ground-level realities in the state highlight significant gaps between policy and practice, particularly in government schools serving marginalized communities.

A foremost obstacle is the digital divide—a term that encapsulates disparities in access to electricity, internet, digital devices, and functional digital literacy. According to a 2023 survey by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), nearly 49% of rural government schools in Uttar Pradesh reported irregular electricity supply and lacked basic technological infrastructure such as projectors or functioning smartboards (NCERT 26). This uneven access undermines the policy's intent to universalize smart, blended learning models, disproportionately benefiting urban learners over their rural counterparts.

Further complicating implementation is the inconsistent policy rollout at the state and district levels. While central schemes such as Samagra Shiksha, DIKSHA, and NISHTHA are well-documented and robust in design, their execution suffers from bureaucratic inefficiencies, insufficient funding, and a lack of localized monitoring mechanisms. Teachers and administrators frequently encounter policy fatigue—repeated introduction of reforms without sustained support or clear accountability systems (Singh 92). Consequently, pilot programs often remain isolated successes without meaningful scalability or institutional continuity.

Another critical challenge is budgetary constraint. Uttar Pradesh, despite being India's most populous state, allocates lower per-capita educational spending compared to other major states like Maharashtra or Tamil Nadu. This chronic underfunding restricts the procurement of hardware, the development of bilingual content, and the establishment of regional training hubs (Kumar 92). Without financial commitment, even the most well-intentioned reforms risk becoming performative rather than transformative.

At the ideological level, there exists a persistent tension between English and regional languages, which complicates curricular decisions and parental aspirations. On one hand, English is increasingly demanded by parents as the language of mobility and modernity; on the other, regional language advocates argue for cultural rootedness and cognitive development through mother tongue instruction (Annamalai 94). NEP-2020 attempts to mediate this divide through multilingual scaffolding, yet its operationalization often gets lost in translation—literally and metaphorically. In many schools, English remains feared and fetishized, neither effectively taught nor comfortably learned (Mohanty 147).

Despite these challenges, the future of ELT in Uttar Pradesh is not devoid of promise. Blended learning models, which combine face-to-face instruction with digital tools, are increasingly being experimented with in semi-urban schools. Mobile-based English learning apps like Hello English, Duolingo, and Read Along are gaining traction among students and teachers alike due to their low-cost accessibility and gamified pedagogy (Rao 223). These tools, when aligned with the NEP-2020's outcome-based learning objectives, can democratize access to language resources and promote self-directed learning.

Moreover, the growth of multilingual pedagogical frameworks offers an opportunity to make English teaching more inclusive. By using students' first languages as cognitive bridges, educators can foster better comprehension and retention, especially among early learners (Mohanty 129). Some NGOs and experimental schools in Uttar Pradesh are piloting bilingual textbooks and dual-language instruction that pair English with Hindi or regional dialects, showing encouraging results in language acquisition and classroom participation (UPEFA 27).

Ultimately, NEP-2020 provides not only a vision but also a vocabulary for reimagining English teaching in a way that is equitable, engaging, and empowering. However, its success in Uttar Pradesh will depend on adaptive strategies that are sociolinguistically responsive and administratively feasible. This includes investing in teacher capacity, developing localized curricular content, and establishing cross-sector collaborations between government bodies, ed-tech providers, and civil society organizations.

The path ahead demands more than rhetorical commitment; it calls for a radical pedagogical imagination grounded in on-the-ground realities. If pursued sincerely, the convergence of policy intent, technological innovation, and grassroots adaptability can turn Uttar Pradesh into a model for inclusive English language education in India.

Conclusion: Toward an Equitable English Language Future

The evolution from chalkboards to smartboards in English language classrooms across Uttar Pradesh is more than a technological upgrade—it is emblematic of a deeper pedagogical, infrastructural, and ideological transformation catalyzed by the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. This shift signals India's intent to reimagine English language education through a lens that is inclusive, competency-based, and digitally empowered, aiming to democratize access to both language skills and the social mobility they offer. Yet, this transition remains uneven and fragile. While pilot programs in urban centers such as Lucknow, Kanpur, and Varanasi have shown that ICT-enabled classrooms enhance student engagement, oral proficiency, and interactive learning (UPEFA 18), the digital divide continues to marginalize learners in vast rural belts of the state. These disparities are not merely infrastructural but reflect systemic inequities in access to trained teachers, language resources, and technological tools (NCERT 26; Rao 230).

Moreover, the ideological tensions surrounding English—as both an aspirational and alienating force—persist in the sociolinguistic fabric of Uttar Pradesh. For many students, English remains a language of fear and exclusion, often associated with elite privilege rather than communicative empowerment (Mohanty 147). NEP-2020's vision of multilingual and experiential learning seeks to dismantle these barriers by promoting bilingual pedagogy, early foundational literacy, and flexible curricular design. However, its implementation demands more than policy pronouncements—it requires culturally responsive strategies, decentralized innovation, and consistent monitoring.

The key to sustainable reform lies in human capacity building. Teachers are not just transmitters of knowledge but agents of transformation. Therefore, their continuous professional development, digital upskilling, and pedagogical autonomy must be prioritized (Kumar 101). Equally important is the active engagement of local communities, who can provide the cultural relevance and social support necessary to ground English learning in lived realities.

Furthermore, budgetary allocations must reflect the seriousness of educational intent. Without targeted investment in rural digital infrastructure, context-specific training modules, and low-tech adaptable solutions, the smartboard revolution risks becoming an urban phenomenon divorced from the majority of the state's learners (Singh 98). Policymakers must recognize that equity in English education cannot be achieved through hardware alone—it requires a holistic ecosystem that interweaves infrastructure, ideology, and inclusion.

In conclusion, the transformation of English language teaching in Uttar Pradesh, as envisioned by NEP-2020, holds immense promise—but only if pursued with nuanced planning, grassroots engagement, and a commitment to educational justice. If the state embraces its linguistic diversity, invests in its teachers, and bridges its digital gaps, English can evolve from a symbol of social stratification into a tool for empowerment,

equity, and global connectivity. The chalkboard-to-smartboard journey, thus, must not end with devices, but begin with pedagogical imagination, democratic access, and human dignity.

Works Cited:

- Agnihotri, R. K. "Multilinguality and the Teaching of English in India." *The Aligarh Journal of English Studies*, vol. 28, 2003, pp. 109–122.
- Annamalai, E. *Managing Multilingualism in India: Political and Linguistic Manifestations*. SAGE Publications, 2001.
- ASER Centre. Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) 2023. ASER Centre, 2023. www.asercentre.org.
- Krishnaswamy, N., and Lalitha Krishnaswamy. *The Story of English in India*. Foundation Books, 2006.
- Kumar, Sanjay. *Digital Pedagogy and English Teaching in India*. Sage Publications, 2021.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India, 2020.
- Mitra, Sugata. The Hole in the Wall: Self-Organising Systems in Education. Tata McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Mohanty, Ajit K. "Multilingual Education in India: Overcoming the Language Barrier in the Classroom." In *The Language Issue in Education*, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas et al., Orient BlackSwan, 2011.
- National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). *Status of Digital Competency among Teachers in Indian Schools*. NCTE, 2022.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). *State of English Language Teaching in India: A Study of Government Schools*. NCERT, 2019.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). *Use of Technology in Government Schools of Uttar Pradesh: A Survey*. NCERT, 2022.
- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). *Use of Technology in Government Schools of Uttar Pradesh: A Survey*. NCERT, 2023.
- Rao, Shanta. *English in India: Policies, Pedagogies and Prospects*. Orient BlackSwan, 2020.
- Singh, Vandana. *Reimagining Teacher Training in India: A Critical Pedagogical Perspective*. Routledge India, 2022.
- Uttar Pradesh Education for All Project Board (UPEFA). "Annual Learning Outcome Report 2023." Lucknow: UPEFA, 2023.