CHAPTER 2

WRITING INSTRUCTION DOWN THE AGES

*Language is the armory of the human mind, and at once contains the trophies of its past and the weapons of its future conquests.*

Samuel Taylor Coleridge, English poet

Having explored the origin of languages, and how one language or the other came to prominence at different points in history, English’s emergence as the lingua franca, its role and status in India, and how Standard English is preferred for academic purposes in the country, it is now time to examine the evolution of writing instruction around the world. While speech is learned through interaction: a child learns to speak by listening to the adults around him/her, and then imitating them; writing needs to be taught to the learner by someone who knows the art. Thus, an overview of how writing has been taught in some of the prominent civilizations of the world will help in understanding the process of writing instruction and may also yield new insights into the process. James J. Murphy provides a comprehensive overview of the development of writing instruction down the ages in *A Short History of Writing Instruction*.

This exploration will rightfully begin with Greece, which was, as noted in the previous chapter, the leading nation on the world stage before the Roman Empire came into might. Greece was, to begin with, an oral culture, their thoughts and sentiments were expressed through oral discourse, and their standards of eloquence were also oral, never written. In an oral culture, a lot depended on the skill of mastering the monumental amount of information, and the transmission of the same – which was seen as a task safe only in the hands of the expert.
Greek education was oral, musical and athletic, and at the beginning it was family-centered. In due course, education moved away from the family circle, and rhetorical exercises called *progymnasmata* came to be included in the drills of the gymnasiuims, i.e. military and athletic training centers. Further, students were drawn to foreign educators (*metics*) who had come to Greece, and thus the tradition of home schooling weaned.

Wherever education may have been imparted, writing for its own sake was not on the cards for the Greeks for a long time. What was written was meant to be read aloud, and the history of writing instruction in ancient Greece is synonymous with the history of reading instruction. While the development of the twenty-four letter alphabet, from the more complex and confusing array of symbols like Linear A and Linear B, played a crucial role in the spread of writing and consequently writing instruction, it was not by any means rapid. In fact, writing was only functional at its introduction.

In the ninth and eighth centuries BC, while familiarity with alphabetic writing was spreading, its use was mainly in trade and commerce. From the late seventh century to the early fifth century BC, writing came to be seen as a craft, and was used by Homeric rhapsodes (bards) who saw in it a method to preserve Homer; and also by artists who etched writing on objects like pottery and monuments. By the fifth and fourth centuries BC, writing came to be viewed as a help in *progymnasmata*, wherein students learned how to compose narratives, stories, arguments etc. The ends it meant to serve were rhetorical capabilities again. Writing also came to be used for recording civic events and festivals. Archaeological evidence like shopping lists scratched on pottery fragments shows writing was being widely used in Greece by the fifth century BC. During this period, education underwent a shift, and writing was not merely functional, but rather came to be seen as stimulating creativity, and enabling long-term problem solving. It could
“…function as a heuristic, an aid to creating discourse and refining patterns of thinking” (Murphy 12).

When Athenian democracy reached its zenith in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, writing gained new status, and came to play a prominent role in the educational system of the time. Writing became a major complement of the oral features of education, and the training begun in *progymnasmata* was extended to advanced forms of the exercises known as *melete*. The writing composition undertaken as part of *melete* propagated the image of writing as an art, and could be rightfully seen as the starting point for the future development of literature.

But this growth of writing from a functional tool to an art had its fair share of opponents. Plato opposed writing on the grounds that “…it mediated the essential function of primary, direct, oral interaction between thinkers….writing would limit and devalue the important role that memory has in internalizing knowledge” (Murphy 29).

Writing instruction in Greece reached its peak of advancement under Isocrates, and his opinions on writing are revealed in his treatises *Against the Sophists* and *Antidosis*. Isocrates did not view writing as a technical craft or the skill to be mastered by a child. “For Isocrates, writing was a central part of the process of social knowledge and language interaction that could only be mastered at the pinnacle of one’s education and only with the most rigorous training of the best minds” (Murphy 31). *Paideia* or “the virtue of intellectual excellence” (Murphy 15) was once built on the famed Homeric literature which was transmitted orally; however, after Isocrates and his school of rhetoric gained ground, the concept of *paideia* underwent radical transformation, and since then never remained the same.
Roman education is commendable in terms of its system, and its structure. Roman education developed a system whereby students developed a habit or \textit{hexis} of efficacy in expression. This system was propagated through public schools – many students under one tutor – and what is more, they followed the same curriculum throughout the empire. The Romans may have adopted Greek ideas, but they were able to develop a definite structure from that chaos. The Roman tradition divided the skill of rhetoric into five parts, invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery. What remained common to both the traditions was that writing was meant to serve as a means to the end of rhetorical brilliance.

The Roman educational system enabled the student to produce appropriate and effective language in any situation, which was done through a coordinated programme of interactive classroom activities including all the skills viz. reading, writing, speaking, and listening. This system has been best set down in \textit{Institutio oratoria} written by Rome’s master teacher, Quintilian. The teaching method followed five distinct steps:

(1) Precept – which gave the rules that govern the method and system. Rhetoric as a precept thus had its focus on Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory and Delivery.

(2) Imitation – which gave models of language use by others, and involved specific exercises like \textit{lectio} or reading aloud; \textit{praelectio} or the master’s detailed analysis of the text; memorization and paraphrase of the models; transliteration; recitation of the paraphrase or the transliteration; and correction of the paraphrase or the transliteration.

(3) Composition exercises – \textit{Progymnasmata} or \textit{praexercitamenta} were graded exercises in speaking and writing, with levels of difficulty increasing with each succeeding exercise, and incorporation of what has been learned at each stage. The themes included retelling of fables and episodes from a poet or historian; \textit{chreia} or amplification of a moral theme;
refutation or confirmation of an allegation; confirmation of a thing admitted; encomium or eulogy of a person or thing; comparison of things or people; prosopopeia or speaking or writing in the character of a given person; ecphrasis or vivid presentation of details; thesis, or argument for/against an answer to a general question; and laws, or arguments for or against a law.

(4) Declamation – known as declamatio, were fictitious speeches of two kinds – suasoria, political speeches arguing that an action be taken or not taken; or controversia, legal speeches prosecuting or defending a fictitious or historical person in a law case.

(5) Sequencing – which was the systematic ordering of classroom activities to accomplish two goals – one, Movement, from simple to complex; and two, Reinforcement, reiteration of each element of the preceding exercises as each new one appears. (Murphy 77-78)

The most noteworthy feature of this method is that while each element has its individual usefulness, it is their combined effort which creates the facilitas to employ the most appropriate language in each situation. Quintilian also stressed on the need for wide reading to expose oneself to a variety of words, usages and styles; extensive writing to aid the practice of eloquence; and assiduous speaking exercises to perfect one’s rhetoric.

There were detractors of the Roman system as well, including Cicero and Tacitus to modern critics like Martin Lowther Clarke. The Roman system curbed students’ thinking skills, and gave too much impetus to eloquence, and compromised truth for imagination. They went on to say that it created declamators, not orators, and they may have been justified to an extent. But it goes without saying that the Roman system served its purpose well. Moreover, remnants of the system may still be found in the educational practices followed in the Western world.
Latin, as observed in the previous chapter, held the helm for centuries as the medium for education, religion and public discourse, and the earliest reference to another language meriting consideration in a similar vein came in only by the ninth century. Christianity and the *Holy Bible* also contributed to maintaining this status of the Latin tongue over other vernaculars. What needs to be borne in mind is that the instruction of Latin was thorough in all respects – from grammar, spelling and pronunciation to verse composition, critical evaluation and rhetoric, and it continued in this form till the Middle Ages. Though grammatical theory seems to have developed after rhetorical theory, grammar texts from the third century onwards are still extant, with Donatus’ *Ars minor* being one of the most preferred grammar books of the Middle Ages.

Letter writing exercises and the study of different kinds of narrative prose formed part of the *progymnasmata*. The epistolary form received a lot of prominence at the time because of its role in the church’s history and subsequent growth. With the growth of the bureaucracy in the eleventh century, there was a demand for scribes trained in epistolary writing to maintain the ever-increasing needs of correspondence. This training focused on all the details of the letter, from the salutation, to choosing the appropriate words and style while writing to different kinds of audience; what is more, there were elaborate texts which dealt with these topics in minute detail. For example, Alberic of Monte Cassino’s *Flores rhetorici* discusses letter writing in the context of rhetoric, and *Breviarium* by the same author, contains figurative and proverbial expressions, synonyms and other instructions in writing, apart from sample letters.

It is interesting to note how the various *progymnasmata* exercises were also drawn into the epistolary mode. In the twelfth century, it was a common practice to start letters with a proverb or a similar pithy statement, which would announce its theme, a style which no doubt grew out of the practice of elaborating proverbs, which was part of the *progymnasmata*. Instruction
manuals on letter-writing abounded over the course of the next few centuries, and the art spread from Italy to France and thence to England.

By the twelfth century, the major change one would witness in the Roman education system featured the shift from public-school-centered education to the church-led education; the rest of the education system remained more or less the same, with the added focus on grammar, and an increase in the secular content which was being taught. The growth and spread of social, religious and political bureaucracies, with their incumbent need for personnel trained in the art of writing, determined the direction writing instruction would take in the future centuries.

In the later Middle Ages, students memorized and discussed verse units of increasing length and then went on to imitate them in composition exercises. Marjorie Curry Woods points out that the composition practice in the middle ages deviated from the order – invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery, and was rather done in the order – style, memory, delivery, arrangement, and then invention (Murphy 138). That is, they were taught figurative language, followed by exercises in memory and delivery, and then introduced to larger structures or arrangement, before being led through methods of creating longer pieces.

The Renaissance humanists felt that the classical rhetoric’s incomparable blend of thought and expression was compromised on the altars of the highly logical intellectual system of the Middle Ages and therefore sought to revive it by giving rhetoric and oration a leading role in the education of the time. The English grammar school movement started with the establishment of Dean Colet’s St. Paul’s School in 1510. These schools echoed the ambition of the Renaissance Humanists, namely “…the creation of elegant eloquent expression” (Murphy 147). These schools followed a curriculum which combined oral and written composition with literary criticism, all these directed at honing the art of rhetoric, which was advanced by Desiderius
Erasmus. Misleading though the nomenclature ‘Grammar School’ is, the focus was not too much on grammar, but after studying the basic rules, students were encouraged to read widely and in time, through imitation reach the lofty goal of brilliance in rhetoric. The curriculum and the methodology followed in schools remained the same across England. The most significant fact about the grammar school curriculum was that it was through and through a language and literature curriculum, with the sole aim of making the students proficient in Latin.

Writing instruction, or more precisely composition, rhetoric and literature were taught in the upper classes, known as the Master’s Forms. While the intention was primarily to teach Latin, English came to be used to aid the process, and grammar school education was by and large bilingual. Students were encouraged to translate from Latin to English and vice-versa, which was observed to improve the students’ knowledge of the vernacular also. An interesting observation that may be made is that with rhetoric and Latin receiving all the attention, very little attention, if at all any, was paid to learning any other subject, unless of course, it contributed to the development of rhetorical abilities.

With the arrival of the printing press in England in 1477, and paper production starting in the sixteenth century, textbooks to read and copybooks to write were more freely available for the students, and writing came to occupy a more important role in the educational process. This however should not be read to mean that oration ceased to hold the center stage;“…the four-principle composition exercises of the grammar school: letter-writing, verse-making, the theme, and the oration” (Murphy 156) makes this crystal clear.

Imitation had a very important part to play in the grammar school system. A five stage approach viz. (a) translation, (b) paraphrase; (c) metaphrase – i.e. to translate from prose to verse and from verse to prose; (d) epitome – i.e. to reduce the works to their essences; and (e)
imitation, was practiced to enable the students to generate the ornate and expressive language which was required of them. Many books featuring models for imitation were produced during this period. However, students in the higher forms were expected to come out with written compositions which were not just slavish reproductions of the models set before them. The demands placed on the students by such a method would have been frustrating to say the least, but it equipped them with the ability to write well on any subject they set their mind to. A very pertinent detail to be borne in mind is that education during the Renaissance was the privilege of the boys; girls were not given the grammar school education. Women were provided an education of sorts which comprised reading and writing, but the thrust was on developing their skills for a future as a wife and mother, and not as an orator. Further, their training was in the vernacular.

By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, writing instruction in English came to the fore, with Latin losing its privileged position as the language of education, shift from the oral culture to a literate one which gave emphasis to writing as well, and the large scale availability of printed material. The concept of education itself underwent a radical transformation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the establishment of many universities and secondary schools across the British Isles, and an increasingly larger number of the middle classes seeking access to education, and that too in the vernacular. Further, the dynamic literary scene of the century paved the way for the production of literary journals like the Rambler, Spectator and Edinburgh Review, which celebrated good prose. Leading literati delivered lectures on rhetoric, which became a standard part of university curricula.

Religion and education were intertwined in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Educational institutions were mainly run by the church and had on rolls many students who were
in-training to join the clergy. As a natural progression, sermon writing featured as a leading prose exercise. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 required all teachers and students to swear allegiance to the Church of England, and further prohibited dissenters from matriculating from Oxford and Cambridge. The 1702 Act of Union of England and Scotland parliaments conceded the religious and educational freedom of Scotland. This state of affairs led to many students, especially the Anglicans, preferring the Scottish universities over their English counterparts, or choosing to attend an academy run by religious non-conformists before moving on to a “redbrick” university as they were known, which served the middle classes. In these academies and redbrick universities writing instruction in English outmaneuvered writing in Latin, and language teaching itself underwent far-reaching reforms.

The tide of nationalism that swept through the country was good news for the vernacular language and literature. Efforts were made to discover and reexamine older texts in the English language, and also to standardize the language against the rules of Latin grammar. Slowly, word usages, philology and historical and comparative linguistics, found a place in the university curricula. Correspondingly academic writing in English matured and acquired new dimensions. These changes had their fair share of detractors, who still swore by Latin and the classical languages. Literacy for the most part was defined as being able to speak and write in Latin. These objections were overruled as education began to serve needs other than the religious, and moved from the spiritual plane to the utilitarian. Another change of consequence was the shift from writing-to-aid-rhetoric to writing-for-writing’s-sake. Till the nineteenth century, even important examinations were oral, similar to the contemporary open defense of PhD dissertations. The change from an oral culture to a written one was necessitated by the increasing use of writing in the governmental and legal professions, and the demand for literature created by
the reading public, which again was a lead off from the rise of the printing. As a natural consequence of all these, textbooks and manuals which focused on developing good writing skills began to gain favor, and by the end of the nineteenth century even textbooks came to be written in English, gradually pushing Latin out of the preferred slot.

The exact methodology followed to teach writing during these centuries is hard to zero in on, but developing the writing skills of the students was considered the responsibility of every teacher. With the classics featuring prominently in all the disciplines, students were exposed to the best examples, and as English became the language of instruction, writing in English was widely practiced. In the eighteenth century the tried and tested mediaeval pattern of grammar, logic and rhetoric continued to be the norm in linguistic training. Latin grammar was adapted to meet the needs of the English language as well.

The training proceeded from words through sentences to paragraphs and longer compositions. Translation from Latin into English, and later from other foreign languages into English formed an integral part of the writing instruction, which went a long way in improving writing in English. Usage lessons aimed at wiping out dialectal variations supplemented the writing instruction; and exercises involving correcting faulty spelling, syntax and punctuation helped refine the students’ own standards of writing. Samples from English literature were presented for imitation which also led to an interest in literature for its own sake. While the latter gradually developed into a discipline with its own focus, the earlier teachers viewed writing instruction as part of their responsibility, and “Communication skills, written and spoken, were recognized as central to the entire educational endeavor” (Murphy 182).

In the lecture system in place in Scottish and English redbrick universities, professors dictated their lectures so that the students could take them down, and use the thus written down
notes as their textbooks. This system helped the students to imbibe the rigorous physical practice of writing, and also made them familiar with formal English usage. While dictating had these advantages, it also curbed memory, as students were preoccupied with the mechanical process of transferring the words to the page, and their instruction remained on the pages and not in their minds. Critics of the dictates system like George Jardine, of the University of Glasgow in the nineteenth century, suggested that it would be more effective if the students review the lecture in their minds after the class, and commit to writing in the most effective language the ideas they deem most important in the lectures. This observation was given due consideration in the pedagogy which came to be practiced in Britain.

By the middle of the nineteenth century written examinations replaced the oral examination system. There were exercises and essays in disciplines other than the language arts, and the professors were expected to critique them, which meant that writing instruction was not the responsibility of the language teachers alone, nor was it restricted to one course. To sum it up, by the end of the nineteenth century, writing instruction was firmly embedded in the curricula in the British Isles, and proficiency in writing in English was the mark of a true scholar. Another noteworthy change in the latter part of the nineteenth century is that higher education finally threw open its portals to women, who were till then relegated to little or no education, and when that little was provided, it was not of the liberal nature that was available to their male counterparts.

While the eighteenth and nineteenth century witnessed changes in the education system in general, and in English writing instruction in particular, the credit for the modern slant in English studies originated in the Scottish and redbrick universities, and not in the famed universities like
Oxford, Cambridge, Trinity, or grammar and public schools, where the classical tradition of grammar and rhetoric continued till the end of the nineteenth century.

Meanwhile, across the Atlantic, in the United States of America, writing instruction in English was developing in its own way. It did to a great extent reflect the trends and practices followed in Britain, and had the same thrust on the study of classical languages and oral performances. Murphy points out that even more than a century after the first American college was set up, writing instruction in English was derived from writing and speaking in the classical languages (Murphy 216).

True to the prevailing practice, writing was always meant to be read aloud in the eighteenth century American universities, whether it was the composition class or the oratory class. While both the classes involved reading and writing, the composition classes elicited a lukewarm reception from the students compared to the orations. By the end of the eighteenth century the shift from the classical languages to the vernacular was complete.

The eighteenth century also witnessed the rise of literary and debating societies in the universities. These societies gave the students a platform for displaying their writing and speaking talents, and also gave them the opportunity to receive the critiques of others, often from within the societies, and many a time from the whole college. The approval of the class or the college was thus the leading concern of the students. The critique of the professors were meant to help the student improve, and was not seen as a grading or marking procedure. In fact, a final grading and marking procedure was not a very common practice at all and when done, was oral in nature, and was of the nature of a disputation involving the student, and the college president
or trustees. The oratorical culture which prevailed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries definitely helped the cause of writing instruction.

The nineteenth century saw a new emphasis on literary works; poetry, drama, fiction, and essays gained new ground, which consequently paved the way for interpretation and reading becoming more and more important. What is more, this led to a renewed focus on the individual styles of the writers, a precursor of the contemporary “…distinct personal voice…” of the writer (Murphy 225). A notable development of the time was to make the topics for writing personal, which aided individual expression over imitation and pale reproductions. The Industrial Revolution helped to make the tools of the craft – pencils, pens and paper, cheaper and freely available. This helped more people to write, and to write freely; moreover, there was a growing realization of the power and reach of a piece of writing to awaken a large crowd, maybe even a whole country, which an oration could never hope to achieve. This helped to cement the role that writing could play in human relations.

The nineteenth century also witnessed the rise of individualism, spurred on by the new middle class ethos. More and more people sought education, and the old method of oral disputations for a final grading failed with such large numbers. Writing thus stepped in to be the sorting apparatus. The free availability of printed matter meant that anyone could study, which meant that having a college diploma was the only way to set apart the educated from the ones who were self-tutored. This made credentialing at colleges a necessity, and writing was seen as the best way to carry out this process. As a corollary of these developments, usage and grammar started to receive growing emphasis. Professionalism was the new code word of the nineteenth century, and one of the most valued ideals of the new culture. Credentialing from a university
was a prerequisite to be a professional, which once again validated the importance of writing as an assessment tool.

These changes were accompanied by their own repercussions on writing instruction. As Wright and Halloran lament,

   Much of great value was lost in the evolution from the neoclassical rhetoric of the late eighteenth century to the composition course of the late nineteenth. Heuristic theory and procedures virtually disappeared, and the sense of audience was narrowed. In place of a rich array of stylistic forms and techniques was the flat voice of mechanical correctness. The greatest loss was of the sense of a large social purpose for writing, a social role for which a rhetorical art was necessary equipment. Neoclassical rhetoric had focused on an updated version of Quintilian’s citizen orator as the role for which students were being educated. They were supposed to become virtuous leaders of their communities, and effective writing was one of the key abilities they would need to fulfill this responsibility. The new course offered little in place of this ideal. Composition skills were important for success in the new middle-class, professional culture, but there is no evidence that even this somewhat narrow and functionary purpose was made clear to the students. (Murphy 240)

Rhetoric, which was once a major discipline, over the course of centuries, waned to a Composition course, which had to compete with other more important courses to get the attention of the students, by the end of the nineteenth century.

Writing instruction had been a core part of English studies, whether it was in the nineteenth century with its thrust on Greek and Latin classics, or in the twentieth century by
which time Aristotle’s *Poetics* became the centre of the English curriculum. Schools were seen as a preparation for university, consequently universities decided what and how of English studies. Prominent universities of the time often held conflicting opinions on English studies and writing instruction. Harvard spoke of the need to cultivate good language habits, whereas Yale wanted to provide the inspiration of literature to all students, thereby encouraging the innate genius of the students, though this was in reality, only of a few.

The schools were unsure of how to respond to these conflicting interests, and came to adopt pedagogies which leaned heavily one way or the other, but sometimes merged both. There was however reading of literary texts, and some sort of writing in response to them, in almost all schools.

Within the first two decades of the twentieth century, teaching of English became a profession which could command its own respect. Schools were freed from their restricted roles as preparatory grounds for universities, but were instead seen as a grooming ground for the social and economic roles the students would choose for themselves in time. Writing instruction naturally became relegated to utilitarian and functional purposes. In time, teaching of composition became separated from teaching of literature. The consequence of this fall out was that writing instruction met only the vocational needs of the students and could in no way serve their political or personal life.

After the World War I, there was a trend in classrooms to encourage writing about personal experiences, and occasionally to do even creative writing. The aesthetic expressionism of surrealists was seen as a model for writing. Accordingly, writing became an art which could be learned by all, but not taught. The teacher’s role was to provide an environment wherein the learning could take place. By learning to employ language and metaphor to express the personal
experience, and uncover the truth, the individual could realize his/her true self, which contributed to the betterment of society in the long run.

Following World War II, communication courses which covered reading, writing, listening and speaking activities, gained favor, especially in view of their usefulness during the war years in the officers’ training programmes. Writing instruction, in the post-war era followed three main streams of development, literature and composition, linguistics and composition, and the revival of rhetoric. While language through literature was the theme of the literature and composition stream, and knowledge of the structure of the language would create better writers according to the vision of the linguistics and composition stream, the revival of rhetoric reinstated the position of composition at all levels of schooling.

One of the major drawbacks witnessed with regard to writing instruction and thus the writing skills of students in the United States was the introduction of achievement tests in the twentieth century, which was again a consequence of viewing schools as churning out ‘products’ to suit the demands. These machine-graded, multiple-choice questions did not require writing skills, and as teachers strove to increase the pass percentage in these tests, writing instruction fell into oblivion. What is more, with college teachers deciding the school curriculum by the middle of the century, writing instruction got short-changed by the study of literary texts, and all this while college teachers insisted that writing instruction was the responsibility of the school teachers. The natural consequence of all this, was that little or no instruction was given in writing in schools by the last quarter of the twentieth century. However, by the turn of the century, this crisis was addressed by re-introducing writing instruction in schools, strengthening the writing programs at college, and by training graduates to become specialists in writing instruction.
As the twentieth century drew to a close, writing instruction came of age, carving a niche of its own in the school and the college curriculum, and receiving attention, support and encouragement on an unprecedented scale. Though there are diverse fields which claim our attention when speaking of writing instruction in twenty-first century America, the survey done up to this point sufficiently covers the facts on the ground for the purpose of this research.

It is indispensable at this point to understand the educational system of India, and trace its development from the ancient ages to the present day, since it is against this setting that any educational reform, even if it be reconsidering the method of teaching English, takes place. There is a predominant tendency to view Indian education as beginning with the colonization, but this is true only when one considers the teaching of English, and even that to some extent had already appeared on the scene with the Christian missionaries, who arrived much before the East India Company. India had a rich educational legacy of close to two thousand five hundred years before the arrival of the Englishmen. Though the colonizers threw open many avenues hitherto unexplored, they were doing this in a country where education was revered, and the educated person venerated for his learning from time immemorial.

The roots of Indian education lie in the Vedic ages. The Vedic religion had elaborate rituals which naturally called for a system of instruction which would produce proficient scholars and practitioners, who would carry forward the tradition. Though writing was still in its infancy, and memory played the key role in this instructional system, the Vedic masters drew up a blueprint which outlined the ideal teacher, the ideal teacher-student relationship, and a mode of instruction rooted in these ideals. In this ‘gurukula’ system, where the student lived in the modest house of his teacher, usually in the forests, and attended to the household chores and duties,
while receiving the teacher’s instruction, lay the seed of perfection of the ancient Indian educational experience.

In due course, what was originally the study of the three Vedas, namely, Rig Veda, Yajur Veda and Sama Veda, expanded in scope with the inclusion of the six ‘vedangas’ – namely, the Kalpasutras, Siksha, Vyakarana, Chanda, Nirukta, Jyotisha, which were regarded as indispensable to the study of the Vedas. This was further expanded to include other arts and sciences, and together constituted the ‘apara-vidya’. On the other hand, there existed ‘para-vidya’, the quest of the Upanishads, which seeks the Supreme Reality.

While religion played a major role in ancient Indian education, it was not restricted to the priestly class, and was seen as an enlightening and edifying influence on mankind. The Rig Veda states that it is education that renders one superior to others, and not any superhuman physical attribute, while the Mahabharata claims education to be the basis for good character and behaviour. What is more, the ancient Indian education system emphasized the role of the educated in the development of society. The scholar, on the completion of his studies, was expected to pass on his knowledge to others, and also engage himself in life-long learning and teaching to preserve the knowledge. The ideal teacher’s reputation rested not just on his scholarship, but on presence of mind and power of expression. This determined his reputation as a teacher, and also the number of students who would seek his tutelage.

The gurukula system draws our attention to the fact that education and to a greater extent religion in ancient India, did not have the mechanical methods of organization characteristic of later educational and religious systems. Education in ancient India resonated more closely with a spiritual practice and involved the control and development of the mental faculties. Though there were assemblies of learned men and wandering scholars, the concept of a school as we
understand it today did not exist in the Vedic age. It was the Buddhists and Jainas who initiated the institutionalized education system in ancient India. Drawing on the gurukula and the institutional patterns, there gradually developed three distinct types of educational institutions: (1) the gurukula schools, which unlike the previous forest hermitages, were near villages or cities; (2) temple colleges, which developed around a temple, and were supported by land-grants and other endowments; and (3) the agrahara village institutions, which were colonies of scholarly Brahmins who had specialized knowledge in various disciplines and had their own sources of income.

History speaks of Taxila as one of the greatest centers of education in the ancient India, which received students from all over the country seeking the guidance of its revered teachers in various arts and sciences. While it is not certain how this fame came about, it is interesting to note that the teachers of Taxila played a major role in the teaching and dissemination of the Kharosthi script. The system of education most probably was that of the private teacher and his student community. However Taxila started losing its fame after the Huns plundered it in the fifth century AD.

Buddhist monks are credited with the establishment of universities in ancient India. Though it was initially a religious endeavour started within the monastic practice to disseminate the dharma, it gradually expanded in scope in a way similar to the Vedic studies, and came to include grammar, philosophy, astronomy, medicine and various other arts and sciences. The Buddhist universities of Nalanda, Vikramashila, Valabhi, Odantapuri, and Jagaddala were some of the few which rose to the peak as centres of academic excellence in ancient India. Records state that students from even China, Tibet and Korea sought admission at the famed university of Nalanda; those who were trained therein were much sought-after even outside India.
Ancient Indian education had a longer and stronger base in the sciences and arts, contrary to popular belief. The sciences, the arts, medicine and technical education were imparted to students even in that distant past. In fact, engineering, medicine, administrative training, commerce, accountancy, agriculture, cattle breeding, sculpture and painting were some of the eighteen industrial technical arts and crafts taught in Nalanda. There also existed an apprenticeship system which ensured that the arts and crafts were perfected by the aspirant. It is also significant that there was at the time a separate list of sixty-four arts, developed by Vatsyayana, for the technical and cultural refinement of women.

In the beginning of the Vedic age, the language in use was Sanskrit. Writing was not used for the purpose of transmitting Vedic knowledge: there was a strong belief that a mistake of even a single accent while mastering the Vedas could bring about disaster. Writing was used for teaching non-Vedic subjects, like grammar, arithmetic, metrics etc and students would have been taught writing at the primary level.

The students most probably used to write on wooden boards in some kind of colour or on sand-covered ground with their fingers or a pointed stick. This was then followed with the practice of writing on palm leaves on which the teacher had written with an iron stylus, the students were required to practice the script with charcoal ink, which would be later rubbed off, and the palm leaves reused. In the next stage, the students wrote on plantain leaves, and after having achieved the requisite mastery and agility of hand, started writing on palm leaves on their own. Students often got more practice with writing rather than reading, as books were not freely available (Altekar 177).

However, since printing and paper were not around, the books which were written on leaves were costly and could be used only by the rich. As a consequence, the oral tradition of
teaching was considered to be ideal. Further, this tradition required the teacher to give individual attention to each student, which made it all the more perfect as a mode of instruction. The lecture system preferred today with a teacher expounding the topic to hundreds of students was unheard of in those times. Homework consisted of recitation and recapitulation, and the noteworthy outcome of this practice was that students in ancient India had a highly developed faculty of memory and were capable of memory feats which in the modern age would be deemed inconceivable (Altekar 160). The students were also required to participate in debates which helped them to improve their oral communication skills.

What is more interesting to note is that there were no annual examinations for promotion to higher classes: the hardworking student could finish his studies faster, while the lazy one would have to pay the price for his indolence. This was advantageous since each student could work at a pace that suited their intelligence and capacity. The teacher was the final authority on whether the student was eligible for the ‘samavarthan’ or convocation ceremony. However, there were no degrees or diplomas, as we know of them now, in that ancient age. What motivated the students was a sincere thirst for knowledge, not the acquisition of a degree. Thence, unlike the modern system where even an incompetent person cannot be challenged if he has a degree, in ancient ages, the student had to prove his knowledge daily to be respected for the same. It should also be remembered that he did not have access to notes either, all he had was his memory (Altekar 169).

There also existed at the time the practice of enlisting the help of senior students to monitor the progress of the juniors. The senior students thus selected were ones who were proficient in their studies, and this served as their reward in the absence of prizes and scholarships.
The Vedic-Buddhist patterns of education were afterwards taken over by the Islamic influence, following the Mohammedan invasion of India. It is believed that while there was a balance of science and humanities in the Islamic tradition, the former definitely had an edge over the latter. At the primary level, thrust was given to reading, writing and arithmetic; at the secondary and higher stages, subjects like grammar, rhetoric, logic, dialectic literature, philosophy, mathematics, theology, and law were pursued. While private houses provided primary education; secondary education was imparted in mosques and other religious places; and higher education was provided by madrassas and maktabs. For training in arts, crafts and technical subjects, there was the system of apprenticeship or learning under an expert, who offered boarding and lodging to the students.

Technical education received further impetus with the establishment of karkhanas, which were manufacturing centers, which also imparted training in the craft it specialized. These karkhanas had different sections, each devoted to one technical trade or skill, and thus there was a large number of highly skilled craftsmen, which was undoubtedly one of the assets of the land. Though the ancient Indian education system had a lot to commend it, one must bear in mind that once Sanskrit ceased to be the language of the common man, the education system which was Sanskrit-oriented created a deep abyss between the learned man and the common man who was now using different vernaculars, which were in all aspects far removed from Sanskrit.

With the arrival of Christian missionaries, from the 18th century onwards Christian education started gaining foothold in India. But the East India Company forbade the Christian missionaries from propagating religious education, which they considered would conflict with the Company’s interests: this met with strong opposition even from within England and
eventually led to the introduction of the Charter Act of 1813. The Charter Act compelled the East India Company to take up the responsibility for educating the natives, and from 1813 to 1857, the Company set up many schools and colleges in the provinces under its control, thereby ushering in the era of anglicized education in India. However, there was a stiff debate on the medium of instruction, which swung in favour of English, after Lord Macaulay in his strongly worded minutes of 1835 supported the claim for delivering Western education in the English language. With English being declared the court language in 1837, and the government resolution of 1844 permitting the natives to occupy high posts in the government, it was inevitable that English education would grow in leaps and bounds in the country.

In 1854, the East India Company passed an educational development programme named Wood’s Despatch, which is referred to as the Magna Carta of Indian Education. The programme was highly ambitious, and many of its plans remained on paper. However, it led to the framing of clearly defined objectives of education; establishment of a scheme encompassing primary, secondary and higher education; establishment of universities; and training in regional languages and classical languages in schools.

Through subsequent reforms, and policies framed by various commissions under the British, and later under the Indian governments, education in India made significant progress. The Indian education system, though it owes a lot to the British, is in the final reckoning, not a completely English product. It has a rich legacy to fall back on, as this brief overview suggests. Unfortunately it is overlooked and lost in the sands of time. To sum it up, the ancient Indian system of education, as Dr. A.S. Altekar notes was one to be proud of.

The impartial historian will have to note that in the heyday of her glory education in India was broad-based, women and a large section of the masses being admitted
to its privileges and advantages. It was able to develop character and personality, to inculcate civic virtues, and to turn out citizens well qualified to follow their professions and discharge their duties in life. It introduced a high standard of culture and emphasised the necessity of self-imposed discipline and stern regard for duty. It was not only able to preserve the heritage of the past, but also to enrich it from generation to generation. It produced a galaxy of able scholars and thinkers from age to age, who made important contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the spheres of philosophy, logic, mathematics, astronomy, medicine and chemistry. It enabled India to achieve high material prosperity by the excellent arrangements it made for training young men in commerce, industry and fine and useful arts. (263-264)

Altekar observes that the general principles of this Indian educational system namely “…intellectual freedom, individual attention to students, the monitorial system, gurukula ideal, plain living and high thinking, mass education, combination of useful and liberal education, the locating of educational institutions away from the din and dust of the city-life…” (264) had innate strengths; and if it is suitably adapted to meet contemporary requirements, it will deliver excellent results.

English language is seen as one of the most significant vestiges of the colonial rule of India. It has been, without doubt, one of the most important reasons for India’s growth into a scientific, technological and political power on the world stage. Many of the Indian freedom fighters were fluent in the use of the English language, and it is acknowledged that the knowledge of the language helped the country even in getting its independence. The ideas of
freedom were sown and disseminated to a great extent in the hearts of the people spread across the subcontinent and divided by the different vernaculars they used, with the help of this foreign tongue.

English however did not start out as a favorable language in the eyes of the Indians. Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay did not introduce English language education with the noble aim of uplifting the masses. As his words make it evident, his intention was to create a clerical community sufficiently well-versed in the language to keep the wheels of the colonial rule running smoothly.

We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions we govern – a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect, to that class we may leave it to redefine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.

Had he anticipated what is known now, it is doubtful whether he would have contemplated such a course of action. But his words in 1835 paved the way for the beginning of English language education in the country.

The language has since then travelled a long way. It has gone on to figure as a major point of consideration in the National Policy on Education, and has also been cited as the language for higher education in the Ambani-Birla report on education, submitted to the Government of India in 2000. Thus, what was once despised, and then had to face stiff opposition while being adopted as the official language of the country, has now become the second language of the republic of India. In fact, it could even be seen as the first language for many Indians. To be more specific,
today, knowledge of the English language has become one of the USPs of the Indian in the world job market. But, lest one thinks all is well with English in India, David Crystal makes a very pertinent observation on the situation in the countries where English is a strong contender for the position of the official language,

The country may espouse English officially, but only a fraction of the population may be given an opportunity to learn it. The most dramatic example of this gap between theory and practice is India. (The English Language 4)

The tides of change with regard to how the English language came to be perceived by the people, have also been witnessed in the English language teaching in the country. At the beginning, English language education was the need of those who went into government or teaching jobs. However, after the liberalization of the economy in the mid 1990s’, English language, which was once the monopoly of the higher classes, became an important skill to be acquired by people of the middle and the lower classes as well. The main reason for this was the sudden spurt of opportunities thrown open to those who are proficient in the language in multinationals, call centers, and medical transcription centers. Further, those seeking to migrate or desirous of pursuing education abroad also needed to learn the lingua franca.

But the state of English language teaching in the country has become a cause of concern only very recently. Though English is taught in many schools across the country, the lack of competent teachers and the undue importance given to marks instead of linguistic proficiency has severely hampered the way English is taught. Today, a fair share of students who enter the higher education system in the country suffer from major handicaps with regard to their language capability, though they may have studied in English-medium schools. One very critical factor, the policy makers have overlooked is that while the ELT paradigms adopted globally may have a
larger acceptance, it may not address all the issues which arise in teaching English in a country like India where every state has its own language. Instead of adopting the ELT techniques of countries whose native language is English, we may have to develop indigenous techniques to help our students overcome their linguistic deficiencies.

English language teaching in India occurs at three levels – in schools, in the higher education sector, and in private sector training centers. In schools, as has already been pointed out, the focus is primarily on academic achievement, assessed by marks scored, and not on the actual linguistic competence of the students. Further, school teachers for the most part, have little or limited access to the new trends in English language teaching. While the issue is being addressed, it is far from producing any tangible results in the language proficiency of the students.

In the higher education sector, the situation is not much different, but teachers do have more flexibility with regard to how their courses are taught, and have access to emerging trends in the field, which helps them to modify the methodology, by taking into account the needs of the learners. However, it is not prudent to assume that all teachers have or are utilizing the opportunities. Even after obtaining higher education in our country, there are severe linguistic deficiencies in many.

The above-mentioned situation has led to the mushrooming of several language teaching centers in the private sector, which guarantee learners that they will make them proficient in the language within a short period of time. Many of these centers make use of the latest teaching methodologies, including high-end interactive, multimedia software. Unfettered by the constraints of the academic rulebook, the trainers are also freer to innovate and experiment, thereby yielding better results in terms of language proficiency in the learners. These centers
have played a crucial role in transforming the face of ELT in the country, and if their increasing numbers are any indication, is providing yeoman’s service in the field. This realization has led to the higher education sector in the country opening itself up to innovative methods in language teaching, adopting communicative English teaching techniques, and making use of technologies like advanced language lab software to enhance learner efficiency. While this effort has to be acknowledged, it should be noted that many of the learners in the higher education sector were forced to join these academies to make up for what should have been within rights covered by the education given to them in their own institutions.

However, many of these centers are primarily concerned only with the speaking skills of the learners, and very little is done to improve their writing skills. Unless one considers the training given for language testing examinations which focus on all the four language skills of the candidate, most of the other courses are primarily attuned to developing the speaking skills of the learners. This does not make them proficient in the language in the true sense. To assume that being proficient in speaking is equivalent to being proficient in the language would be a very grave mistake, and one which no educationist would concede to. Hence, the focus has to shift to developing all the skills simultaneously, which brings the onus back on the higher education sector, and to a great extent on the school system of the country.

A point which merits due consideration at this stage is the debate about the supremacy of speech over writing. Proponents of this view advocate that speech evolved first and writing later; there are languages without a written code; and that man learns to speak before he learns to write, as the main arguments in their support. In fact, the etymology of the word ‘language’ adds weight to this argument. The English word ‘language’ is derived from the Latin word ‘lingua’,
through the French ‘langue’, which means ‘tongue’. Conversely, ‘tongue’ is an archaic, Anglo-Saxon word for ‘language’, and the usage still abounds in phrases like ‘foreign tongue’, ‘native tongue’ etc. These are strong and valid points, and it is not within the scope of this work to question or repudiate the points therein.

The obvious differences between speech and writing maybe briefly mentioned at this juncture (Harris 4, Crystal, *The English Language* 92-95):

1. Spoken language is often inexplicit. The speakers can refer to the people, objects and so on in the shared environment by pointing with gestures or by using ‘pointing’ words; whereas writers do not share an immediate environment with their readers, and have to make explicit references to people and objects, in order to ensure their writing can be interpreted on its own.

2. Speakers can check whether they are being understood by looking at the listener’s expression, by asking or by being directly prompted. Writers have no means of knowing once the text is finished whether the readers will understand the message; they need to anticipate potential misunderstandings and appropriate levels of shared knowledge.

3. In conversations, including telephonic conversations, speakers are encouraged by ‘listener markers’ such as ‘mm...’ and ‘yes’, and in live conversations by gestures. The writer on the other hand has to find ways of motivating themselves to continue creating a text.

4. The interactive nature of conversation requires a great deal of maneuvering, which would not be found in writing. There are special ways of opening a conversation (*Excuse me…, Guess what…, I say…*); of checking that the listener is following (*Are you with me?…Let me put it in another way…*); of changing a topic (*That reminds me…, By the way…,*
Where was I?...); and ending (Nice talking to you...). Such strategies are replaced by the conventions of organization of a text (prefaces, summaries, indexes, sub-headings and cross referencing) in writing.

5. Speaking by its very nature is usually spontaneous; therefore speakers may not have the time to plan out what they want to say, and their grammar maybe faulty, often containing rephrasing and repetition. But speakers can also backtrack and fill in information that may have been omitted. Precise sequence is not a prerequisite of effective oral communication. On the other hand, writers have to plan in order to achieve both a sequence and a selection that will lead to effective communication.

6. The vocabulary of everyday speech tends to be informal, and more limited than in writing. The incidence of slang, taboo, or empty nonsense words is higher. A writer makes a greater use of vocabulary, and can afford to ponder a while, and look up a word in the dictionary before using it.

7. Speech makes use of a wide range of tones of voice which are difficult to convey in writing (except for may be by using typographical effects and punctuation marks). Writing on the other hand, has its own graphic features like color, capitalization etc. Vocal sound effects can never be satisfactorily captured in writing, nor can written effects such as train timetables, graphs and formulae be easily spoken.

At the same time, discourse analysts have come down heavily on the idea that writing is free-standing, whereas speech is context-dependent. They point out that the transcript of a piece of natural conversation may have references which cannot be deciphered without contextual knowledge or visual information, thus making it ‘context-dependent’; at the same time, a
broadcast lecture on radio may be explicit, highly structured and self-contained, thereby being ‘free-standing’.

While upholding this contention, it is still fairly certain that written language is generally considered more permanent and formal than speech. Written language is also accorded a special status, being used to make something legally binding (contracts), or to provide a means of identity or authority (sacred literature of religions). Its formality also implies that it is likely to be used to provide the standard which society values. Ironically, our speech is often found wanting when judged by the standards of the written language.

Taking all this into account, language teaching becomes a task of momentous proportions because it involves the honing of these two different skills at the same time – along with their counterparts reading and listening. Very often, we focus on one or the other, may be mistakenly assuming that if one is taken care of the other will improve on its own. But this is hardly the case. A case to the point is the over-attention paid to speaking skills, which has had disastrous effects on the learning of writing skills. The reasons for this are evinced by the differences which exist between speech and writing already illustrated. It is obvious then that we cannot allow our students to write the way they talk, anymore than we should insist they talk the way they write. Henry Lee Smith, Jr. contends,

The failure to see and to understand the distinction between standard colloquial speech and the literary language, and the failure to understand the relationship between speech and writing have been, I am convinced, the chief obstacle in imparting to our students both real literacy and a confident competence in speaking. Traditional grammar has been based, understandable enough, on the literary language, but far too often the prescriptive rules which must be followed if we are
To write acceptably have been used as a basis for how we should talk. The result, I am afraid, has been to inject into our population a sort of mild schizophrenia which has produced many afraid to talk and totally unable to write. (Allen 369-370)

It is a known adage that ‘People who write well are more likely to get what they want than people who write badly’. But writing remains one of the least preferred academic skills anyone would want to devote their time to. In fact, writing remains secondary to speaking, and though it is a crucial factor in academic and professional success, it is a skill which gets overlooked more often than not by the majority. The only time that writing becomes important in academic life is when one has to appear for an examination.

Writing has many benefits, one of the leading ones would be that it can create clarity; conversely, a piece of ill-written content could also create total chaos. Writing helps us to understand material better and retain it in memory longer; it helps us in seeing connections and generating new ideas; it enables us to clarify and evaluate thoughts better; it facilitates easier problem solving; and it helps us to communicate effectively. However, it is a task which requires concentration, patience and the ability to sit still, which makes writing well a nightmare for the current generation of students.

Language skills are also an art which is ignored by the education system, especially at the school level, where it could be tackled more efficiently had it been considered a ‘skill’ and not a ‘subject’. For a greater part of the time, we teach students things which they may not need at any point of their lives, while ignoring building on their language skills, which is going to be such a major determinant of their future success. For instance, there is undue compulsion on mastering the arrangement of elements in the periodic table in Chemistry, and metrical patterns and rhyme schemes in literature are to be memorized for examinations, but correct expression in a language
is often underplayed, if not totally ignored. Be that as may be, English at least figures as a ‘subject’ in the school curricula of the country.

In the higher education sector in India, there is a widespread notion that writing skills are important for arts and humanities, but not for science and technology. This is not true, science and technology demands accuracy, brevity and clarity much more than arts and humanities do. A creative writer can afford the liberty of leaving things unsaid and ambiguous, but a scientist or technologist would be creating a risky situation by being vague and ambiguous. This is why it is imperative that students in science and technological disciplines be taught how to write better.

The practice of sound writing skills is crucial in building up the repository of information in all domains, information being mainly stored as written texts. The written form also facilitates easy access and retrieval of information, not to mention comprehension. The wisdom of the ages has been handed down to us in writing. To reiterate, written records are of prime importance in science and technology.

While studying the technical education scenario in the country, it is interesting to note that the impetus for technical education is perceived of as yet another one of the legacies of the British colonial system, though as pointed out while discussing the education in India down the ages, science and craft always found a place in the Indian education system. Driven by a need to have trained lower grade workers for civil and mechanical work, industrial schools were set up by the British in the early nineteenth century. This eventually led to the establishment of colleges of engineering in all the presidency towns. The Thomason Engineering College in Roorkhee set up in Uttar Pradesh in 1847 for the training of civil engineers was the first engineering college of the country. It is now renowned as the prestigious Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkhee.
Since then the country has traversed miles and the higher education system in India on the whole in the post-independent era has been expanding at an amazing pace. Universities, technical institutes, research institutions and professional colleges have been coming up all over the country.

In fact, India now has the third largest higher education system in the world, after the United States and China. But it is worth pointing out that total number of students enrolled in the higher education system in the country does not make up even 6% of the 18-23 age group of the population. This makes it evident that the Indian higher education system has to grapple with serious issues including equity, access and accountability, along with quality while drawing up its expansion policies.

While assessing the quality enhancement measures in the technical education scenario, building the communication skills of the students deserves priority, coming in second only to developing the research culture, which is essential for the progress of the nation and the world. But these two factors are very closely connected. Research findings have to be documented carefully, and conveyed effectively if they are to add to the knowledge base of the discipline. This is where the ability to write with accuracy and clarity becomes a key factor in one’s success as a researcher or a scientist.

The scientific method calls for detailed and faithful documentation. We begin the scientific process by formulating a hypothesis as the proposed solution to a problem, carry out the investigation which yields data, which is compared with existing information on the subject in the analysis stage, synthesized, and then stated as a generalization. It is quite evident that written records are the only means available for carefully building up a knowledge corpus on any topic, which could later serve as a background to further research and development. This is the only
method to ensure there is no duplication of effort and there are meaningful inputs to the knowledge corpus.

In order to equip the students with the requisite communication skills, there are various textbooks and course materials developed by teachers and researchers in English exclusively for engineering students. However these courses presuppose a level of competence in the students, which is found lacking in real practice. This could be due to drawbacks in the current school system wherein English is merely another subject to be mastered and not a skill required for survival in the competitive global scenario. Secondly, there are time constraints with regard to the delivery of such courses, considering they are accorded only a secondary status, which impede any effective outcome. Also hindering the progress of such objectives are several attitudinal issues with regard to the study of English in engineering courses. There is a widespread tendency to ignore and belittle the importance of the same, not only amongst the student community, but sometimes within the teaching community as well. This severely hampers effective learning, and facilitation of learning.

Kerala has prided itself on being the most literate state in the country, ‘literacy’ implying the ability to read and write in the native tongue. It is however unwise on the part of the policymakers to ignore the need for a more effective ELT in the state. Our purpose in encouraging literacy is to have an educated and knowledgeable society. In the modern world, access to many realms of knowledge is possible only if the person knows English. Addition to the existing fund of knowledge for world consumption is possible only if one is capable of translating the native wisdom into English. If our students continue to use faulty structures and ambiguous phrases, they will be deprived of the chance to make a positive contribution to the
world. For it is not merely sufficient that our students are brilliant and technically competent, they should also be able to effectively communicate their ideas to the world. This and correlated issues will be dealt with in detail in the coming chapter.