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1.0. OVERVIEW

This chapter presents the theoretical and the pedagogic motivation for this research project and attempts to outline the scope of this thesis and its structure.

1.1. MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

The study is an outcome of the attempt made by this teacher-researcher to probe the ‘whys’ and ‘hows’ of the sense of frustration experienced by teachers of English and, to a certain extent, by students as well during the ‘composition’ classes. ‘Grammar’ and ‘composition’ are being ‘taught’ separately even today as if they are independent of each other. While the block-by-block teaching and reinforcement have made students acquire ‘grammar’, composition teaching has not brought about any improvement in the ‘writing’ of students. ‘Composition’ is generally regarded as something ‘mechanical’ which can be ‘taught’ through the normal practice of lecturing, that too in a decontextualised and isolated manner. It is this fact which perhaps leads to the lack of interest and enthusiasm we often witness among students in attempting to write something ‘on their own’. A survey of the history of English Language Teaching at the global level and at the national level (to be exact, in India) seems to support the conclusion that the inevitable link between ‘grammar’ and ‘composition’ has never really taken place.

1.2. HISTORY OF ENGLISH TEACHING IN INDIA

1.2.1. THE IMPORTANT PHASES

The history of English Language Teaching in India has to be seen against the
general and more wider sociolinguistic backdrop of the arrival and growth of English in India and its acquisition of a permanent place in India’s linguistic heteroglossia. The history of English in India began on 31st December, 1599, the day the East India Company (EIC) got its permission to trade in the East Indies, as the subcontinent was then referred to. The plural signifier was to change later into the singular one, ‘India’ which reveals the changing perceptions and priorities of the British in wanting to treat the colony as a single unit for subsequent political domination. This ‘nation-transplant’ (Krishnaswamy: forthcoming) on the Indian subcontinent can be said to have taken place through the English language. ‘Freedom’ in 1947, meant the departure of the British but in everything else the continued sustenance of English became a fait accompli. The infra-structure of ‘the State’, its bureaucracy, judiciary, the educational system and the written functions of all forms of institutionalized establishments were strongly dependent on English and continue to be so to a greater extent even today. Krishnaswamy (ibid) compresses this fascinating history of English in India into well-demarcated five phases:

i) 1600 - 1813 (the pre-transportation phase),

ii) 1813 - 1857 (the transportation phase),

iii) 1857 - 1904 (the dissemination phase),

iv) 1904 - 1947 (the institutionalization phase), and

v) 1947 - 1990 (the identity phase).

Certain important landmarks and events in Indian History serve as convenient points of demarcation in tracing the evolution and growth of English education in India. The following are the landmarks used in this analysis:

1600 - the year in which EIC was granted permission to trade in India.

1813 - the charter of EIC was renewed.

1857 - the year of the great Indian Mutiny and also the year in which the first
three universities were set up at Bombay, Calcutta and Madras.

1904 - enactment of Indian Universities Act which gave the British Government a greater control over colleges and universities.

1947 - the year India became politically independent.

'The Pre-transportation Phase' (1600 - 1813)

This was the period of power struggle by European colonial powers to get a strong foothold in the 'Gorgeous East'. The Europeans, in their race towards domination did not take any active interest in transporting their languages. The East India Company arranged for English education to be imparted only to the employees' children and to the Anglo-Indians. Indigenous education continued to be the mode for all Indians, catered through modern Indian languages at the Patasalas, the Madarassahs, the Persian schools and other native educational institutions. It was only when the EIC became a political power that some centres of learning were started in select places for the imparting of English education. This started only by the end of the eighteenth century. The missionaries started a number of schools and colleges but the medium of instruction was not English. There is no evidence of English being taught as a subject before 1800. But political control led to the emergence of the British bureaucracy which warranted the use of English for certain restricted written functions. The English language did not make any significant impact on the life of the people in the subcontinent. Political/bureaucratic/official use of English was the prominent feature of this first phase of the history of English in India. This was to continue and stay as the general characteristic of the position of the English language in India which could be described as "Restricted Matrical Interaction" (ibid).

'The Transportation phase' (1813 - 1857)

This phase was a period of expansion and consolidation. Attempts at evolving a clear policy line in different areas were made. Open competition system for civil
services was established around 1853. An education policy was formulated in 1854. But this education policy was basically a 'top-down' policy. Universities, colleges and a few high schools started providing English education but primary education was mostly neglected. English education became a passport to government jobs. It also opened up two other avenues: print-media communication and creative writing. But basically, English education and bureaucracy remained synonymous and they formed the integrated operational field of English in India.

'The Dissemination Phase' (1857 - 1904)

Stabilization of the role of English in different domains is the chief hallmark of this phase. There were more Indians using English and the opportunities of learning the language were steadily increasing. English education generated its own socio-intellectual activities in the urban areas. But English was yet to make deeper inroads into the inner areas of Indian life like religion, arts, social customs, etc. Indians did not vacillate between acceptance and rejection of English. They perceived the advantages of the use of English but wanted to reap these advantages without being excommunicated from their own socio-cultural milieu.

'The Institutionalization Phase' (1904 - 1947)

The two world wars, global politics and the Swadeshi Movement redefined the role of English in India. After 1900 the English language got gradually detached from the British rule and was used more and more by Indians as a medium of communication in different domains. Indians appeared to have taken a definite stand on the meaning and role of English in their country. They would use English for certain purposes without losing their identity rooted in their cultural heritage. In that sense, English in India became 'detached' and was treated as a module to be used according to the needs. The number of Englishmen as interlocutors in various domains was reduced to the minimal. Print media and literary activity increased with the leaders using the print-
media effectively. This, on the whole, led to increased educational activity in the teaching of the English language.

'The Identity Phase' (1947 - 1990)

The fifth phase relates to post-independent India. The significant feature of this phase was that the English knowing section of the Indian urban population still remained a miniscule minority. English in India was restricted to certain specific domains. The operational field of English was predominantly the field of the written word. International developments and pressures exerted more influence on the use of English in India and this had made English in India more 'internationally-oriented'.

It is against this backdrop that the specifics with regard to the 'teaching of English' are to be seen all the while keeping in mind the fact that 'teaching of English' is both a segment and an instrument of the more general 'English education'.

1.2.2. THE COLONIALIDEOLOGYOF ENGLISH TEACHING/LEARNING

In the multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic context of India, English education had been viewed differently by different people in different times: “The first communication, and the instrument of introducing the rest”, said Grant (1792), “must be the English language; this is the key which will open to them a world of new ideas” (vide-Parliamentary Papers 1831-32: App.60). He advocated English education in the medium of English because the nature of Hindoostan had to be radically changed if the British empire here were ever to succeed; for Raja Rammohan Roy (1823), English education would be a liberating force in India, paving the way for social and intellectual progress; Charles E. Trevelyan (1826) earnestly believed that English education would bring about an intellectual as well as a moral change in Indian society; Macaulay ([1835] 1967:729) saw the potential of an instrument to rule in the use of English as a medium of education:
We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.

J.S. Mill ([1836] 1951:226) suggested:

What we may hope to do by means of English tuition is to teach the teachers, to raise up a class of persons who, having derived from an intimate acquaintance with European literature, the improved ideas and feelings which are derivable from that source, will make it their occupation to spread those ideas and feelings among their countrymen.

For Alexander Duff, English education was a necessary precondition for the ultimate conversion of India; for Zachary Macaulay, English education is a means to build the English empire through the dissemination of British civilization; and for the people in India education was, from the very beginning, associated with the professional aims of 'Babudom', as rightly pointed out in Essays and Reviews, reprinted from the Englishman (1866:156):

There can be little doubt that were the Government to appoint Chinese as the test for appointments in their service, instruction in it would be as eagerly sought as readily paid for, as in and for what is now called an English education.

The socially and economically privileged were trying to emulate the English Master (integrative motivation) while the lesser-privileged were trying to get some English as an instrument for job opportunities (instrumental motivation).

The colonial ideology of English teaching/learning can be described in terms of the following dichotomies: Orientalism vs Anglicism, Utilitarianism vs Imperialism, and Message vs Medium. The next few sections present these dichotomies in detail.

1.2.2.1. ORIENTALISM vs ANGLICISM

The communication of European knowledge through the native media, without
subjugating the Indian psyche into a merely passive recipient was the general policy of the Orientalists in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The Orientalists proclaimed that they would preserve whatever was worth preserving in the traditional Indian thought and create a climate for accepting western knowledge at those points where the former had become outdated. Hastings, the pioneer in Orientalist education, Lord Wellesley, the founder of Fort William College—Oxford of the East (1800), William Jones, Horace Hayman Wilson, William Carey, Lord Minto and Henry T. Colebrook devoted themselves to foster Sanskrit and Arabic education through the application of western scholarship. But actually their attempt seems to be a projection of the West on orientals; in other words, it is the privilege of the West to reinterpret the Orient to the West. By their translation, no doubt, they popularized the Indian classics in the outside world but there was more of cultural superimposition. But the imperialistic process of the British considered the improvement of morals as the most powerful motivation behind the government’s concern for education. While the Orientalists strove for transfusing the European morality into the indigenous matrix, the Anglicists emphasised that the moral and intellectual regeneration of a depraved and superstitious society could be brought about only by a thoroughgoing English education in the English medium.

The Renaissance paradigm as the revival of classical learning that dispelled medieval ignorance and orthodoxy and the paradigm of Christianity as the regeneration of decadent paganism of the ‘dark’ Middle Ages provided the British a theoretical standpoint (could also be considered a theological standpoint) for introducing English education in India. Based on these two analogies and the notion of ‘primary imperial responsibility’, the missionaries, Charles Grant and Alexander Duff advocated English education to bring about a radical change in the Indian character. Grant (op.cit.: 88-9) points out:

*The Mohammedans, living for centuries with the Hindoos produced no radical*
change in their character.... We are called rather to imitate the Roman Conquerors, who civilized and improved the nations whom they subdued.

Insistence on ‘useful education’, the ‘knowledge of sciences’, ‘the teaching of morals’, ‘formation of character’ as ideals recommended in the charter of 1813 and many despatches after, especially of the two Mills, tended to support the Anglicists’ advocacy of westernized education. As regards enlightening the minds of the people by modern knowledge, the Evangelists of The Grant and Duff schools glorified the English language as the transforming medium in communicating the light of Europe whereas the Orientalists believed that any such modernization could not be exported from Europe but must be carried out in India, on Indian terms.

The real motive of the Anglicists, behind the philanthropic assertion of ‘regeneration’ was ‘conversion of India to Christianity’. The process or regeneration would start with the study of the literature of England — the product of her characteristic civilisation — and prepare the mind of India for the acceptance of the faith i.e., the cultural conversion preceding the religious. Grant (op.cit.:3) envisioned that the people, through the medium of English, would be

...acquainted with our easy literary compositions, upon a variety of subjects; and ... progressively, with the simple elements of our arts, our philosophy and religion. These acquisitions would silently undermine, and at length subvert the fabric of error.

For the Anglicists, the medium was the message. As C.E. Trevelyan ([1838] 1852-53 : 56) said that there was a good amount of

christian teaching involved in a thoroughly classical English education, independently of all direct efforts at conversion.

Beginning from the 1790s, the Clapham Evangelists, Zachary Macaulay, William Wilberforce, Samuel Thornton and Charles Grant worked for European
education in alliance with the doctrine of Christianity. They equated Christianization with ‘reinvigoration of the moribund culture’ and social progress. The degenerated social customs like the Suttee and child marriage provided a strong ground for the anglicists and the Education Act of 1835 put an end to Orientalism. For all the efforts of the colonial masters, English education did not succeed in totally changing the basic socio-cultural tenets of the Indian subcontinent. English had only restrictive functional utilitarian value as far as the Indians were concerned. English was one of the modules which an average well-educated Indian wanted to acquire and use in a need-based manner. In fact, the ancient Indian Society had its own well-established indigenous system of education where the vernaculars were the media of instruction. English in course of time was added to this system and became influential because of the opportunities it provided.

1.2.2.2. UTILITARIANISM vs IMPERIALISM

James Mill and his son, John Stuart Mill ushered in the Utilitarian concern. The Despatch of 1824 reflected the failure of Orientalist education in promoting ‘useful knowledge’. J.S. Mill was always for the ‘useful’ Literature and Science of Europe to be the content of education and he rejected English as the exclusive medium of instruction. His concern was ‘social reform’ through ‘good government’. The educational despatches of J.S. Mill from 1829 onwards were popular for their stress on education of the masses. He wanted vernacular languages to develop so that modernization is established at the heart of the society. The argument in favour of advancement of scientific knowledge among the people of India through,

*Hindu media or Mohammedan media, so far as they were found the most effectual, would have been proper to be employed ... (emphasis added) (Sharp 1920: 92).*
seemed to strengthen the argument for English. Mill believed that

*...the higher tone and better spirit of European literature can produce their full effect only on those who become familiar with them in the original languages* (ibid: 157).

In the same Despatch (1830), J.S. Mill noted that the

*...fittest persons for translating from European languages and communicating European knowledge to the natives are the natives themselves* (vide-Parliamentary Papers 1831-32: 495).

The cause of English education got stronger when the Imperial urge to civilize the colonies according to British ideas got stronger. Charles Metcalfe, an influential policy maker in the government, as early as 1827, emphasized that opening "the stores of European Literature and Science by providing the means of instruction in the English Language" will be the only benefit of importance. The underlying belief was that popularizing European civilization would strengthen British rule in the backdrop of their feudal past and it became partly true with the founding of the Hindu College (1817) sponsored by the citizens of Calcutta. The entry of Macaulay upon the educational scene completely changed the picture. He took sides with the Anglicists forthrightly, talked like a Utilitarian but was basically an Imperialist. Macaulay's Minutes (1835) at one stroke closed the chapter of Orientalism and established English as the only medium of instruction. Pieter Geyl (1955: 20) puts it thus:

*'The answer is short, clear and decisive'. This is how Macaulay settled the great problems of history.*

Drawing support from the founding of the Hindu College as the evidence of the natives' interest in English education, Macaulay proclaimed that Sanskrit and Arabic literatures put together are not worth "a single shelf of a good European library". He asserted that English would do for India what Greek and Latin had done for England
in the sixteenth century. C.E. Trevelyan (1838:43) echoed this view:

What Greek and Latin were to the contemporaries of More and Ascham, our
tongue is to the people of India.

For Macaulay, English education meant higher education for upper classes and the content of education was purely literary. In the report 'The Indian Civil Service' (1853) Macaulay had outlined the curriculum of studies for the ICS, giving primary importance to English, Greek and Latin literature. "Out of a total of 6875 points in the whole syllabus of study, 1500 were given to English literature, 1500 to Greek and Latin, 1075 to French and other European languages and only 750 to Sanskrit and Arabic" (as quoted in Young 1967:724). The vernacular languages were dismissed as 'of no value'. His Filtration theory and the elitist education ended up with creating 'baboos' who had superficial knowledge or intellectual pretensions. Commenting on the over-literary and imitative scheme of education drawn up by Macaulay, Trevelyan, Alexander Duff, et al., Donald F. Macleod, Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, in a speech delivered on 2 Feb. 1866, expressed thus:

The great bulk of our scholars never attain more than a very superficial
knowledge either of English, or of the subject they study in that language, while
the mental training imparted is, as a general rule, of a purely imitative character
ill calculated to raise the nation to habits of vigorous or independent thought.
(as quoted in Maine 1876:ii).

The Wood's Despatch of 1854 and the Education Commission in 1882 recalled the role of the educated elite in diffusing knowledge to the masses in vain. The stage had been set for English education by 1820 by the Governors-General—Elphinstone in Bombay, Thomas Munro in Madras and Bentinck in Bengal who were generally inclined to English education and who varied only proportionately with regard to overtly or covertly contributing to imperialism and proselytisation.
All 'isms' so far discussed had the main objective in common viz., diffusion of western knowledge for 'modernization'. They differed only in 'how and to what extent'. The colonial government's basic ground rule of 'religious neutrality' never took the risk of any ideal technique. Consequently, English education had not succeeded in achieving either the acculturation aimed at by the Anglicists or the East-West synthesis envisioned by the Orientalists. Lord Lugard's 'Subversion of the old order' (as quoted in Corton 1971:239) was effected by the political democracy and individualism which were carried into India by English education and that shattered the imperialistic process. J.D. Cunningham (1849) in his letter to the *Bombay Times* (December 20, 1849) pointed out the ridiculous inconsistency between the goal of English education (communication of European Science and morality to the people) and the means adopted to achieve it:

*By giving young men a superficial acquaintance with the writings of a few of our great authors rather than a full and clear insight into our principles of criticism and speculation; and by a series of puerile tales and meagre historical epitomes, and of imperfect or inaccurate dialects, which are moreover usually written with little idiom and less of perspicuity and elegance.*

English education had become a mere system of information and instruction and the mode of learning was imitative, superficial and inaccurate. It gave no exercise to the mind, developed no faculty in the case of many people. Tytler's (one of the Orientalists) view (1834) that education was nothing but 'forced imitation of the classics' when Latin was the language of education in Europe became true of English education in India. It was held responsible for ill-formed, ill-balanced and snobbish minds. Lord Curzon (1901) aptly summarizes the whole situation:

*Everywhere it was words that were studied, not ideas. The grain was being spilled and squandered, while the husks were being devoured ... But of real living, the life of the intellect, the character of the soul, I fear that the glimpses that were obtainable were rare and dim* (as quoted in Raleigh 1906: 352).
Indian Educational policy, from the beginning is more often an ‘effect’ of the ‘cause’ — the ‘cause’ being the changes and controversies in the educational policy of the English speaking world. The East India Company was new to the problems of Indian education and the fact that in the beginning of the nineteenth century, England itself did not have an Education department or a state policy in education made matters worse. ‘Trial and error method’ seemed to have reigned the scene of education as educational policies were made and unmade according to the rise and fall of the parties among the European servants of the company alone. The intention of using English as the medium of instruction to help pass European knowledge gradually gave way to English as the subject of instruction. English education started at an early stage even before the learner obtained a good knowledge of his mother tongue. The student had to spend most of his/her study time trying to overcome the difficulties created by the medium of instruction. As a result a majority of learners neither mastered the native language nor English and this in turn affected the learning of the liberal subjects in the curriculum. There was no vocational education as envisaged in the 1854 Despatch. Vocational education was redefined as that which meant employment and employment was supposedly assured for all those who passed through the Matriculation examination. Curricular changes made at the beginning of the twentieth century were the result of many conflicting forces working simultaneously; the desire of ‘the officials’ to imitate British educational reforms resulted in the general curriculum becoming loaded; the ability of the teacher in tackling the ever expanding curriculum proved to be a limiting factor; and the desire of the parents who expected their wards to master the three Rs ran contrary to the ‘principles of enriching and expanding’. Consequently a richer and varied curricula was adopted irrespective of the needs of the society, aptitude and efficiency of the learners and of the teachers. To match the curricular changes, new
methods of teaching like the Direct Method were introduced to improve the teaching of English. The knowledge of English promised employment and for the average pupil command over the English language meant torture with no sense of achievement.

What was started as ‘education’ by the East India Company officials got redefined as ‘English education’ with the Imperialists but the uncertainty as to whether English was the ‘message’ or the ‘medium’ continued almost till Independence.

1.2.3. POST-COLONIAL ERA

1.2.3.1. Committees and Commissions

Jawaharlal Nehru reflected the great hopes of the leaders in his inaugural address to the All India Education Conference in January 1948:

*Whenever conferences were called to form a plan for education in India, the tendency as a rule, was to maintain the existing system with slight modifications. This must not happen now. Great changes have taken place in the country and the educational system must also be in keeping with them. The entire basis of education must also be revolutioned.*

The expected revolution materialised neither in education nor in English education; the same colonial experimental experience continued with minor modifications. Inspite of Article 343’s declaration that Hindi in Devnagari Script would be the official language, English continued to be used for ‘Official Purposes’ on the basis of Nehru’s promise:

*... So I would have it as an alternative language as long as people require it and the decision for that, I would leave not to Hindi-knowing people, but to Non-Hindi knowing people (from the speech delivered on August 7, 1959).*

The University Education Commission (1948-49) headed by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, the first Education Commission in free India, stressed that English
would continue to occupy an important place in India's academic and intellectual life. It recommended the following:

(ii) international, technical and scientific terminology be adopted, the borrowed words be properly assimilated, their pronunciation be adapted to the phonetic system of the Indian language and their spelling fixed in accordance with the sound symbols of Indian Scripts;

(iii) for the medium of instruction of higher education, English be replaced, as early as practicable, by an Indian language;

(iv) Pupils at higher secondary and University stages be made familiar with three languages the regional language, the federal language and English (in order to acquire the ability to read books in English); and

(v) English be studied in High Schools and in the universities in order that we might keep ourselves in touch with the living stream of ever-growing knowledge (Naik and Nurullah 1974:434).

Each clause seems to contradict the other in the sense that Hindi (Is it the language specified?) is expected to substitute/replace English and in the same vein it is stressed that English cannot be dispensed with.

The Secondary Education Commission (1953) headed by A.L. Mudaliar proposed three languages — mother-tongue, the federal (Hindi) and English. The children whose mother-tongue was Hindi, were to study a modern Indian language other than Hindi. The commission recommended to replace the traditional system of examinations which was found to be mechanical in techniques and unreliable in conclusions by new methods of evaluation — not only a test of memory, but a realistic appraisal of the student's educational growth throughout his career.

The Kothari Commission (1964-66) insisted on the three-language formula in a different vein: the indispensability of English as a library language and a channel of
international communication and hence the necessity to continue English as medium of instruction in all major universities; and Hindi to serve as a link for the majority inspite of the fact that most of the states in the northern belt would not accept the specified ‘Hindi’ in Devnagari script: But the recommendation of this Commission for setting up special units for teaching of English as a language skill — the first ever attempt to disassociate language from literature — is a milestone in the history of English education.

The National Policy on Education (1968) was seen as working towards consolidating the recommendations of the Kothari Commission; but with regard to English education it worked backwards and recommended that regional languages be made media of instruction at the University stage too. It is another matter that this proposal did not materialise.

The National Policy on Education and Programme of Action (1986) reaffirmed the National Policy (1968) and recommended the transformation of teaching methods to protect the system of education from degradation but said nothing on the medium of instruction.

The Acharya Ramamurti Commission (1990) appointed to review the National Policy (1986) had made solid contributions to the hitherto vague three-language formula. It suggested the co-ordination of the three National level institutions (KHS, CIEFL and CIIL) and the decision making bodies (CBSE and NCERT) to specify the objectives of teaching different languages and the levels of language proficiency to be achieved.

The main contribution towards ascertaining the place of English in education in post-independence India has been made by the Curriculum Development Centres (CDC) set up by the UGC in 1987. CDC’s report stresses upon learner-oriented or enquiry-oriented teaching and proposes a new undergraduate curriculum comprising a General English Course and a special English course to cater to the heterogeneous
tertiary level students. In ‘A Note on the New Curriculum’, the CDC Report on English clearly states the aims and objectives of English education in India:

To cater to the heterogeneous tertiary level student population (the range of linguistic competence is extremely varied since students from both English-medium and regional medium-schools come together at this level), the General English Course is conceived of as comprising different units and modules suited to the different levels of learners. The patterning of the courses is such that students, depending on their linguistic competence at the time of admission, would not only begin their General English programme at different levels but also reach different levels at the time of graduation.

Inspite of the controversial ‘concept of streaming’ the well-meant directives can make English education more meaningful.

1.2.3.2. APPROACHES AND METHODS

An approach is only a philosophical standpoint whereas a method is a well thought out plan for the presentation of the subject matter based upon the selected approach or ‘Correlative assumptions’ (Anthony 1972). An approach deals with the nature of language and the nature of learning and teaching. A method is a body of techniques—how a particular item is to be taught. Methods vary from person to person, from place to place and from subject to subject. Hence within one approach, a teacher can employ different methods. To put it differently, “The organisational key is that techniques carry out a method which is consistent with an approach” (F.M. Anthony in Allen and Campbell 1972: 4-8). Methods are never ends in themselves nor are they good or bad by themselves. They have to be evaluated critically in view of the aims they help to realise in teaching a foreign language.

Grammar Translation Method or the Classical Method of teaching English came to India with the English who wanted to create an English knowing class of people to
run the administration. It was considered to be the safest method in the sense that it has stood the test of time. Arguments that go in favour of this method are: Even the learned teachers of the classical languages like Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic followed this method. Latin, Greek, English, French and German have also been taught by this method. The old generation which is considered to be better versed in English than the new, learnt English by this method and gained proficiency in it. And only this old method suits the ground realities in India — the overcrowded classes, rigid curriculum, heavy workload and the examination system. Inspite of its short-comings (it develops a habit of translation at the thinking level, stops students from thinking freely, neglects reading, makes the listeners dull and passive, learning rules by cramming lasts only upto examinations, to mention the most important points) this method enjoys a privileged position with almost all English teachers in India.

Around 1915, the Direct Method, also called the Natural Method, came as a reaction against the Grammar Translation Method. In the Direct Method, learning precedes grammar. It emphasises speech and activity, banishes any use of the mother-tongue on the ground that its use interferes with the direct association of objects and ideas with their names in English. Since 1925, the Direct Method has been practised in the training Colleges in India. It was tried out in India for a number of years but it failed to yield the expected results. The reasons may be that the text books were not graded as regards grammar and composition; the ideal that grammar and composition should be taught in co-ordination with the reading lesson was not realised; a vast majority of English teachers did not possess sufficient command of the language and the ability to practise it. In addition, there was no proper in-service training and invariably the school inspectors were the interpreters of the Direct Method.

Even as the Direct Method was in vogue, Dr. West's New Method gained momentum in India. In the field of vocabulary selection and control, the work was
first started by Thordyke in America and it was carried on by Dr. West in India (Bengal),
by Faucett in China and Palmer in Japan. West studied the problem of teaching English
in relation to the bilingual needs of the Bengali child. Though devised for Bengali
children, it was considered important for Indian children in general. In his book
Bilingualism, he claims that learning to read in a language is by far the shortest road to
learning to read and write it. The main credit of this method is 'the surrender value';
it means proportionate amount of benefit derived from attending an incomplete course
of instruction — to mean that even the drop-outs can move on the path of self-education
in their life by reading printed English material. But the method could not be successful
and popular owing to the practical difficulty of providing the reading material for all
the learners.

Bilingual Method, a comparatively recent method, was promoted by Prof. C.J.
Dodson. In India Prof. H.N.L. Sastri of CIEFL, Hyderabad, conducted an experiment
and found the method to be effective in Indian conditions. In this method, sentence is
the unit of teaching; mother-tongue equivalents are used to explain the meanings of
new words, phrases, idioms, grammatical points and rules; only during the early stages,
mother-tongue need be used and gradually it can be stopped. Dr. Sastri’s experiment
revealed that the average score of Bilingual method group was 64% against 52% of
the Direct Method group. It is still in an experimental stage and has not become
popular in terms of a sophisticated theory. In practice, on the other hand, a rough and
unsystematic bilingual methodology is being practised now by a sizable section of
teachers all over India. This methodology, in a majority of cases, involves the
presentation of mother-tongue or L1 equivalents to selected L2 items found in the text,
all by the teacher, in a mechanical way. These ready-made, product-centred
presentations do not help in initiating the learners into the process of identifying for
themselves the equivalents of L2 to L1 items and vice versa.
The Structural Approach introduced in our country in the 1950s is the outcome of extensive researches made in the field of English as a foreign language at the University of London Institute of Education by the language experts of the British Council and others elsewhere. Madras had been the first in India, in 1952, to introduce a modern structural syllabus at secondary school level. But most teachers went on teaching English in the traditional manner, applying Grammar Translation method to the structural syllabus and the new text books. Therefore in 1959, the state, through the MELT (Madras English Language Teaching) Campaign adopted a 'Snowball' scheme planned in conjunction with the British Council, a sort of filtration theory applied at the level of teachers. Very soon the term 'Structural' became very popular.

Structural Approach has taken two different forms on the two sides of the Atlantic Ocean — different in origin, usefulness and essentials. One is the Vocabulary Approach (Great Britain) refined by Michael West, Harold Palmer and A.S. Hornby, and the other is the development in linguistics called Oral Approach (USA). It started in USA with the underlying assumption that all languages are structural and systematic. The Structural Approach in India is a combination of both Vocabulary Approach and the Oral Approach. It has been very popular as a linguistic find supported by language specialists all over the world. In passing from West to East, the two approaches have become methods of teaching. In India, this method was generally understood as Direct Method with some additions and alterations here and there plus the play-way method. The pioneering work in this field was done by the British Council and the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad.

In India many versions of structural syllabi have been prepared. Some well-known models were prepared by (i) Madras State, (ii) Committee appointed by the All India Council for Secondary Education, (iii) The English Language Teaching Institute, Allahabad, (iv) CIEFL, Hyderabad and (v) RIE, Chandigarh. The structural syllabus
introduced in Madras was originally prepared under the guidance of University of London Institute of Education. In the other states, the Departments of Education deemed it necessary to make additions to the original syllabus. The result was a hotch-potch syllabus, mutilated beyond recognition, that is to say that Structural Approach in India is a misnomer. In India, the Structural Approach came to be known as Structural Method and was presented as something rigid and sanctified. The sanctity is based on the myth that the Graded sentence structures originated in London are meant for every part of the world. As pointed out by NCERT, there is no continuity between the Syllabi of lower and higher classes:

_The majority of current syllabi lack continuity. The syllabi for the first three or four years of English are usually formed on the structural patterns, but those of the later years are still traditional and bear no relation to the former_ (The Teaching of English in India (NCERT) :10).

Teaching of language was just teaching of grammar. This has not helped in producing language in a majority of cases. Learners learn about the language and not the language. Learners have to learn the language rather than about it which means a shift of focus from usage and grammar-oriented teaching to use and composition-oriented teaching. This thesis is a modest attempt to characterize the facilitating conditions for this shift.

1.3. GRAMMAR AND COMPOSITION IN THE POST-COLONIAL SCENE

1.3.1. Grammar - ‘the unravished bride’

The term ‘grammar’ had meant several things to several people at several times. Down the centuries, the meaning of the word as well as the application of this meaning in actual practice has posed several problems. In the earliest well-formulated linguistic theory of Panini, the term was projected in the dichotomy of Kavya (literature) and
Vyakarna (grammar). Tholkappiam also poses the same dichotomy in ilakkiam (literature) and ilakkanam (grammar).

It is obvious from these examples that grammar is that part of language which is not 'literature'. That is to say, 'literature' is 'the other' if 'grammar' is 'the self'. In this argument 'self' and 'the other' are both interdependent and mutually exclusive. An individual using a language, has a similar dynamic tension between 'territorial imperative' and 'the co-operative imperative' (Widdowson 1983:78); that is between the psychological and the sociological forces operating through an individual. In the 'self' - 'other' problematic, 'self' needs 'the other' for its own identity, that is through differentiation. At the same time, in order to retain its own identity, 'self' has to be away from 'the other', that is reject 'the other'. Extending this problematic to the differentiation between grammar and literature, grammar gets its identity if and only if there is creative use of language. ('literature'). This dialectical operation is the basic principle that underlies the teaching of grammar and composition, where the term 'composition' is used in the sense of composing and creative writing. (The differentiation between 'grammar' and 'literature' has to be seen as between rule-bound use of language and creative use of language.)

The question also arises whether language, grammar and literature can be formulated into a trichotomy. All structuralist theories are founded on 'binary logic'. As Merrel (1985:2) points out, 'binarism' became the fundamental defining principle of the human mind and was seen as underlying all coded systems -- linguistics as well as others. The question of formulating a trichotomy does not fit into the current development of theories. It becomes necessary to clarify a few points here. This thesis is an attempt to apply post-structuralist understanding of language philosophy to language-based activity of composing. Consequently the arguments are based mainly on the theoretical discussions of Derrida and others. Post-structuralism does not provide
the comfort of definiteness as structuralism does. It is out of necessity, that we continue with our language-based activities not out of legitimacy (Derrida 1974: 70). Hence, a sharp argument from the post-structuralist viewpoint is bound to raise several questions.

Continuing with the discussion on the differentiation between 'grammar' and 'literature', it is interesting to note that the dialectical operation between the two forms the basis of the notion of 'foregrounding'. Grammar defines the borders of 'grammaticality' and 'norm'. Creativity breaks these borders with 'deviations' producing the effect of 'foregrounding'. In other words, it is 'grammar' that forms the basis and defines the limits of the medium of expression for 'literature'/'composition'. But 'literature'/'composition' through its deviations, redefines the borders of grammar. Had Shakespeare followed the rules of English grammar strictly, he would not perhaps have had the kind of creative freedom which marks his writing and his contribution to the growth of the English language is undoubtedly great.

In creative writing, the 'principles' or 'rules' or 'norms' of grammar are defined by an artist for purposes of 'foregrounding'. But with the passage of time, this foregrounded item becomes a part of the language, thus expanding/redefining the notion of grammaticality. This is a continuous dynamic process.

It is clear from the above arguments that the relationship between 'grammar' and 'composition' is a universally applicable dialectical operation. If this is not understood clearly the link between 'grammar' and 'composition' can never be captured in classroom practice. Grammar is being presented in such an abstract and reduced form that the learners can never achieve 'linguistic creativity', in the Chomskyan sense. At the other end of the spectrum, 'composition' has also been devitalised by a reductionist approach. The term 'composition' has come to mean some stock essays, letters and reports in the ESL curriculum in question. Thus 'creativity' of the learners...
is being scuttled in our ESL curriculum, at two levels - creativity in language use and
creativity in composing.

This section will present arguments to show how the earlier approaches to
grammar have not been conducive enough to lead the learner in achieving ability in
composition. The term 'composition' has to be understood as the structuring of some
meaning by cross-fertilizing the text of worldly experience and the text of grammatical
rules. Every learner has a module of grammatical rules and that of 'world knowledge'.
The 'world knowledge component' gets enriched by one's day-to-day experience. In
language production the interaction between the 'linguistic schema' and the other level
of knowledge-representation in the mind becomes inevitable and this interaction may
very well be characterized by the post-structuralist term 'cross-fertilization' or 'inter-
textuality'.

...What is produced at the moment of reading is due to the cross-fertilization of
the packaged textual material (say, a book) by all the texts which the reader
brings to it. (Still and Worton 1990: 1-2).

1.3.2. ESL CURRICULUM IN INDIA: PROBLEMS IN DEFINING THE AIMS

Before the integration of grammar and composition in relation to the Indian
ESL Curriculum is discussed, it becomes necessary to characterize the aims of this
curriculum. The question 'why should one learn a second language at all?' would
probably answer many problems found to be highly prevalent in ESL situations in
India. The various names by which English is described — window of the world,
language of modernization, language of science and technology and language of
research — speak for its prominence and continuance all over the world. Ability in
the use of English language is a prerequisite for any person seeking socio-economic
advancement. Any language capable of providing multiple opportunities for successful
survival would become the international language — the position enjoyed by English
today. These factors clearly show that, only in name, English is learnt as a second language whereas in reality, it is almost assigned the primary place, that is in materialistic terms. In the modern world, one seems to use more of his second language. In the context of science and technological development, English assumes, rather is offered the privilege of being the first language, meaning 'the most important language' in most of the countries.

Inspite of the emotionalism that is associated with the native tongue or a national language, one finds the utmost priority being given to English language by a majority of people all over the world. This reversal dismantles the dichotomy of the 'first/second', privileging the 'second' to be of primary importance, in materialistic terms, by subordinating the 'first'; the privileged 'second' language enables the learner/user to get immediate recognition in terms of knowledge in international affairs, science and modernism. This reversal necessitates a critical examination of the existing proposals to break new ground in the ESL situations.

It is not all that simple as it appears to be. The problematization of the dichotomy of first/second language is a continuous process in which privileging and deprivileging alternate in the sense that the reversal is always already in operation. As history has made it, the Indian ESL Curriculum has witnessed this pendulum-like movement in clearly perceptible and magnified proportions.

The history of English teaching that has evolved in India can be divided into two phases: the colonial era and the post-colonial era. The former is characterised by 'integrative' as well as 'instrumental' motivation among learners. In the post-colonial era, people with an 'integrative motivation' have become a tiny minority. The majority of Indian learners have only 'instrumental motivation' for the learning of English. In the post-colonial context English is no longer a master's language but a tool to learn
science, technology and modern developments. Consequently, the aims of the Indian ESL Curriculum need to be reformulated thus:

(a) to have a modern language which provides easy access to modern science, technology and developments (to satisfy the materialistic needs);

(b) to produce the right kind of integration between the language of intimacy and the language of modernity (to strike a balance between materialism and personal, emotional, spiritual experiences).

This characterization of the motivation, as being instrumental, implies the corollary of domains of operation. For many people, English is the language of science, technology and development. It can never displace L1 or mother tongue which has greater operational value in domains that are intimate, spiritual and emotional, that is to say, each language (L1 and English) is primary in certain well-defined domains. It is an interesting division for a native speaker of Tamil. Tamil poetics introduced the division of akam and puram way back in second century B.C., akam literature dealing with the inner self and puram with external reality. English serves as the language that deals with the puram aspects of life while the akam will be taken care of by the mother-tongue. This understanding adds another level of theoretical delicacy. The balance between the akam and puram languages needs to be well-struck. It may be argued that this investigator is making use of the distinction between akam and puram languages and that L2 can also be used effectively in contexts of L1. There is no denying the fact that there are exceptions who can use L2 more effectively than L1. There are also speakers of Tamil settled in North India who cannot write even their names in Tamil which is their mother tongue. These exceptions, however, should not be posed as counterpoints to the arguments presented above. In fact, these exceptions prove the rule which runs through the argument.

The learner has to be prepared in realizing these redefined aims. The term
‘aims’ must come under critical enquiry in terms of its relation to other terms like ‘objectives’ ‘social needs’ and ‘learner needs’. It is possible to put all these terms under close scrutiny. They are all so much inter-related and interdependent that any slight change in the socio-economic-political-cultural atmosphere would make them undergo a seachange. This raises an important issue in the ESL curriculum — the concept of language across the curriculum — as suggested in the Bullock Report (1975). Invariably, all ESL learners are readers too, trained to read in the language of intimacy — to read through and to read beyond, to a certain extent. This critical faculty can well be exploited in ‘reading’ the ‘language of modernization’. Providing the materials that contain the modern knowledge in its plenty cannot make the learner ‘well-equipped’ or ‘well-informed’; (s) he should be guided to ‘read’ and helped to interpret them for better perceptions. This paves the way for the complementary roles that Indian languages and English can play in the Indian social context. It is rightly illustrated by Krishnaswamy, Verma and Nagarajan (1992:192):

*English, which is not the language of agriculture in India, is the language of agricultural universities; English, which is not the language of day-to-day business in the market place, is the language of business management courses in universities; English, which is not the language of daily transactions with the workmen in a workshop is the medium of instruction in Indian Institutes of Technology and other Engineering Colleges; English, which ‘is a window on the world’ is not the language of religion for the vast majority in India.*

This perspective has to be properly understood and reflected through the language policies for ESL curricula of the various stages.

This discussion on the aims of Indian ESL curriculum will be incomplete without a review of the constraints that have a bearing on the realization of these aims. What goes on outside the classroom alone cannot constitute the complete picture of the ESL
curriculum, but the 'physical aspect' of the class-room practice also matters. The 'large class' syndrome which was fairly exceptional in the beginning has become a permanent feature in the present ESL context. The teacher has to most often face around sixty learners most of whom are bilingual. Added to this is the problem of heterogeneity of aptitude and multiplicity of proficiency. The shift from teacher-centred (Uni-directional Process) to learner-centred (Multi-dimensional and Multi-directional approach) in ESL can be smooth only by implementing multi-levelled controls. These constraints, however, should not deter practising teachers or ELT researchers from doing their best. In the context of global economic depression, to expect a small and ideal number of learners in ESL classes in a third world country, that is under the pressure of population explosion, is to ask for the impossible. Any theory or research on the ESL curriculum in question ought to take note of this basic issue. Only a formulation that can work in these conditions is 'ecologically valid' and 'ecological validity' is a vital parameter of all social sciences.

Apart from the regional sentiments which disturb the continuance of international language, there are other constraints which mar the aim of learning English. The 'sentence grammar' which has literally enjoyed an overstaying in the ELT scene has proved to be detrimental to use-oriented learning of English. There is no proper co-ordination among the members of the linear hierarchy—policy makers, curriculum designers, syllabus framers, textbook writers and examination designers. Though there seems to be a total adherence to 'structure' and 'system' with regard to all the aspects of the above said members, there is an implicit unsystematicity that leads to inevitable negative effects. The 'aims' are either ignored or taken for granted and thus marginalized. Text book and question paper patterns assume significance in the aimlessly drifting ESL scenario, invariably leading the learner to master some essays (content) at the cost of learning the language. In the meantime, ESP - the 'tailor
made' courses (Robinson 1980:13) with its focus on 'learner's particular needs' (Strevens 1980:108) started making ripples in the ESL curriculum in question. But the limitation that the 'trained' (Widdowson 1986:6) learner can use the language only in a 'restricted set of predictable situations' diminished its popularity. That is, ESP programmes concentrate on a set of objectives as 'professional requirements'. As Widdowson (1983) points out, the learner gets almost marginalized, in the sense that there is a 'tailor-made programme', an 'idealization'. Because of these factors, the learners at the tertiary level who have had exposure to ESL for over ten years are not able to cope with real situations in life. This fairly long period should have helped the learners take off on their own in the 'use' of second language. Wilkins (1979:84) rightly summarizes the fragmentary nature of the kinds of syllabuses that are used in general in ESL curricula which is very valid for the ESL curriculum in discussion:

*The grammatical syllabus* tackles the question of *how* of language use, the *situational syllabus* concentrates on the *when* and *where* of language use, the *notional syllabus* focusses on the *what of language use*.

What we need is a co-ordination of 'what', 'when', 'where' and 'how' as a means to achieve the end — use-oriented learning of English.

1.3.3. GRAMMAR, COMPOSITION AND EXAMINATIONS IN THE ESL CURRICULUM

The incorrect understanding that 'sentence' is the largest grammatical unit may be the reason for the stunted growth in composition. To correct this mistake the hierarchy of language units must extend through 'discourse' to 'composition' in the pedagogic design. The grammatical structures/patterns presented and reinforced through various forms fill the mind of the learner, leaving little space for 'composition', for the exhausted learner to work on. As the teacher concentrates on 'accuracy' of the
presented grammatical items, the infected learner also does the same and, invariably, 'composition' that comes at the 'fag-end' is a 'hushed-up affair'. Moreover, 'composition' classes are very often punctuated by commands like "No combined work", "No discussion" and "Do it yourself". These, definitely, are counter-productive and negate the possibilities of group work which can work miracles in 'negotiating meanings'.

The term 'examination' in ESL has come to be associated with memorized essays and paragraphs, annotation questions (that is fixing the names and the situations correctly irrespective of the faulty language that is used), gap-filling exercises and decontextualized grammar questions. In short, it examines the learners' ability to recall some essays or short stories which they memorize. These text-based, surface-oriented language tests would not help the learners in developing the skill to 'negotiate meaning' in real-life situations where they are expected to engage themselves in various activities — to speak, listen, read, write, express, explain, quarrel, refuse, refute, promise, etc. The goal of language testing is not testing the learners' knowledge of the 'text' but the learners' ability to 'use' the language to realise certain goals. Another important aspect of the examination syndrome is the fact that the question paper pattern is the most awaited communication from the university before the examination, so that the learners can 'structure' their knowledge of language according to the 'structure' of the question paper. This means a great deal of reorientation for the teacher as well as the taught. Structuring the information from a given text to reproduce it as composition must be replaced by presenting information in one's own perception. This shift is not at the mechanical level of writing, but at the very philosophical foundations of learning and writing. The definable nature of the examination or the 'specific structure' of the question paper has to undergo necessary changes, paving the way for the inclusion of any type of question that could aim more at generating the intellectual
energies of the learner. What matters is not the learner's reproducing ability but the link he makes, reaction —> discovery —> perception, whatever be the context/question.

In Derridian thinking, 'writing' generates "more writing and still more writing" and if 'composition' means 'writing in the extended sense', then 'testing' could mean "more writing and still more writing". Applying structuralist principles to language testing will lead to the production of specified structures vis-a-vis specified meanings which are only artificial from the real-life point of view. In day-to-day life there are so many variables over which no language-user can ever have any control. In consonance with this life experience, one has to move towards a post-structuralist model of testing. Right now, this researcher can only argue from a theoretical point of view as the application of post-structuralist principles to testing is yet to be tried out with rigor. For such a shift to take place in the ESL curriculum in question, a great deal of thinking, research and experiments need to be conducted. This research project is a beginning in this direction.

ELT theorists have been talking about grammar, composition and the link between grammar and composition. But practising teachers such as the present researcher find that grammar teaching and composition teaching remain parallel lines which would never 'merge and slide into the other'. Obviously, one has to decompose the notions of grammar and composition to find the link. Any kind of writing involves originality, creativity and critical outlook whether the topic chosen for writing is traditional or modern; established or new; real or imaginary; mockery or illusory. 'Structural concepts' that dominated the ESL scene in India for decades, have led the learners safely from 'structural grammar' to 'structured composition' which proved to be in most cases, monotonous and directionless and unrewarding. Attempts have althrough been made to preserve 'grammar' in the privileged position and to relegate 'composition' to the secondary status. An attempt to reverse this hierarchy may help
us find the link. The glorified hierarchy makes composition — a derivative form of
grammar — a parasitic mode of representation added to grammar and 'grammar' is
presented and explained as meaningless, sterile forms of 'composition'. Reversing
this hierarchy might lead one to a new concept of composition, a generalized
composition — an ever expanding interpretative domain — that would have as sub-
species 'sentence grammar' and 'structured composition'.

For ages grammar has enjoyed a place of privilege at the cost of composition.
That is, in the binary set of grammar and composition, grammar has a hierarchical
importance. Applying post-structuralist mode of analysis, this hierarchy has to be
reversed — deprivileging grammar and privileging composition. But one should not
stop with this. The new hierarchy has to be unsettled. This process known as
'problematization' in post-structuralist parlance is what is being attempted here. In
the process of this 'problematization', many hitherto suppressed ideas have emerged.

1.4. SCOPE OF THIS THESIS

The notions of grammar and composition, as discussed earlier form a binary
set. This thesis primarily focusses on decomposing composition. This necessity arises
out of the situation that prevails around the notions of grammar and composition,
especially at the tertiary level. The scrutiny of the prevailing notions becomes important
in the context of breaking new ground to accommodate the spontaneous critical faculty
that surfaces every now and then. The notions of grammar and composition by
themselves form a dichotomy; and within the notion of composition, one may find yet
another dichotomy - reproductive/productive: the former is mechanical while the latter
is original and critical. Many issues related to the notion of composition need to be
examined:

Is it explicit teaching of grammar or implied teaching of grammar?
If it is only implied teaching of grammar, does it privilege fluency at the cost of accuracy?

Does this privileging cause tension by suppressing one or the other?

Can this tension be avoided?

If it can be avoided, what are the modalities?

Can ‘composing’ be taught?

Can ‘guiding’ be preferred to ‘teaching’?

“If all readings are misreadings” (Bloom 1973) all ‘composings’ should also be ‘miscomposings’. One can only say ‘the best is yet to be’.

There are many more questions. Not all questions may find a one-to-one answer. It is not the answers that are important. It is the process of exploration which generates newer perceptions and intellectual energies that is important. This will be the basic approach of this research project which is neither completely inductive nor completely deductive. The vibrant relationship between these two theory - building approaches constitutes the methodology of this research.

The major tryout was in the form of “experimental writing sessions” conducted in two selected classes at the tertiary level. The students’ ‘composed scripts’ — as reaction to the ‘prescribed texts’ — are being subjected to critical examination. The composing activity has been directed in the light of post-structuralist perspective, that is, to compose is to decompose and critically think. Constraints of time and space, being what they are, this thesis will take up for examination only a limited number of exercises out of a few hundreds, tried out in the classes.

The notion of creativity that is being projected in this thesis is not the same as the notion of creativity proposed by Chomsky. In the formulation of Chomsky, ‘linguistic creativity’ is the abstract potentiality of the human mind that leads to the generation of an infinite set of (correct) sentences, using a finite set of rules. In the
present formulation, 'creativity' is not seen as something abstract nor is it merely 'linguistic creativity'. Creativity in language is only manipulation of words and structures. But creativity in composition is much more than this. It is manipulation of the 'cultural schemata', 'content schemata' and 'formal schemata' [The distinctions on schemata - Carrel et al. (1988)].

This work does not offer any ready-made solution or packages for the teaching of composition or the teaching of English as a second language in general. Such packages are neither feasible nor desirable. Each class is a new class and each day is a new day. Teaching a second language in an artificial situation of the class-room bristles with all sorts of problems. This thesis only tries to deal with one of the hitherto neglected areas for 'critical examination'. This 'critical examination' is backed up by this researcher's experience as a teacher of English for about two decades and actual class-room experiments (Data in Appendix).

1.5. ORGANIZATION OF THIS THESIS

The thesis has six parts: Motivation for this research, identification of the research gap, scope of this thesis, theoretical backing, analysis of the data and findings, and suggestions for further research. The first chapter, 'Introduction', has three parts - motivation for this research project, identification of the research gap and scope of this thesis. The second chapter, 'The Global Scenario' systematically problematizes the theories that dominated the ESL scene and proposes an alternative strategy for teaching 'composition'. The third chapter 'Analysis' critically examines the scripts of 'Control group' and the "Experimental group". Suggestions for further research constitutes the final chapter of this thesis.

1.6. REVIEW

The first chapter as Introduction to this thesis, discusses the status of English
education in India during the pre-independence and the post-independence era and examines the various issues related to the teaching of grammar and composition in the Indian context. The first section provides some relevant insights into the historiography or history of English education in the pre-colonial context, its idea and force in modern India's intellectual history. It presents the conflicting forces like Anglicism, Orientalism, Utilitarianism and Imperialism which existed side by side in the name of promoting English education and the absence of a committed and clear educational policy. It focusses on the ridiculous inconsistency between the goal of English education — be it communication of European Science or morality to the people or imperialistic purposes — and the means adopted for the said English Education. It also points out that the Committees and Commissions of the post-colonial context did not bring about any material change in the form and content of English education. It analyses the continual changes, that went on in the methods of teaching English, at the international level, backed by new linguistic theories and their echo in Indian Context leading to blind conformity to them irrespective of the needs and aptitude. The second section examines the ground realities that exist in a majority of Indian class-rooms with regard to the teaching of grammar and composition and examinations. The focus is on the non-formulation of adequate aims and the ways of bridging the gap between the teaching of grammar and the teaching of composition. It proposes a reversal in the hierarchy of grammar and composition (by critically examining the privileged position of grammar) to help understand the notions of grammar and composition in a newer perspective.