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INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Scope and Objectives

In indigenising English, we have made the language our own... English has been enriched by Indian creativity as well and we have given you back R.K. Narayan and Salman Rushdie. Today, English in India is seen as just another language.

(Manmohan Singh, Hon. Prime Minister of India, Oxford, 8 July, 2005)

On the other hand, a recent headline in the Times of India states:

"Mulayam Wooing FDI, crying 'Angrezi Hatao.'"

UP Chief Minister, Mulayam Singh Yadav maintains that English has been the major stumbling block in the development of regional languages in the country. He has gone to the extent of terming it as "the language of destruction," which has had a telling impact on the economy of the country. His premise is based on the reasoning that the self respect that a country could achieve by using the languages endemic to it couldn’t be achieved through the usage of foreign language known to merely 10% of the population.

(Report in The Times of India, 31st May 2005)

The two above comments, by the Prime Minister of the country and the Chief Minister of the largest state is a telling pointer towards the dialectical positions taken by people regarding the role of English in India. In spite of their differing viewpoints however, the central idea that neither gentleman denies is the important role the English language has played in India, especially in the post-Independence period. The status of English as an international language gives it an important place in the teaching programmes of developing countries. In a country like India where English is an associate official language and has a special role and status, it
assumes added significance for the masses as well, especially the disadvantaged sections of society for whom it can be an effective instrument of economic and social development. This generates a tremendous demand for English education, which is somewhat met by a few public schools and others, such as aided model and Central schools, meant for the middle classes, leaving out a large majority of students who have neither the money nor influence, to seek education, first in government schools and later in non-prestigious colleges – ill equipped, badly managed, and with very poor learning environments. This vast majority thus remains devoid of such a medium of communication that can enable them to compete with their more fortunate brethren.

The present research has its focus in designing a syllabus for “Remedial English” courses in Indian Universities based on the study of Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. The target user for such a syllabus would be the large section of students, who have some basic knowledge of English but need considerable improvement to be able to compete with the privileged section to effectively pursue their academic and professional goals.

However, before going further one needs to explain the word “Remedial English.” It is an accepted fact that every day we learn something or the other in our communication. We cannot attain perfection in our language use. So the word “Remedial English” is used in the context where even after learning English at school and at college, students cannot speak or write correct sentences in English.

1.1.1 The Objectives of Remedial English in the Indian scenario

The status of English as a world language therefore, as discussed above, gives it an important place in the teaching programmes in multi-linguistic countries like India with diverse languages. The role of English in India is especially crucial as it occupies the status of an associate official language, as per the Constitution, and is the medium of communication in official matters, in the bureaucracy and judiciary and is considered an essential and necessary tool in verbal communication and higher education. It acts as an effective instrument of economic and social
development, especially for the disadvantaged sections. Many students feel the
necessity to adequately learn the language and therefore feel seriously handicapped
by their lack of knowledge of English and English Language Teaching (ELT) in
different forms is therefore felt to be necessary. Yet somewhere down the line, the
goals of ELT have got blurred and lost focus. ELT, far from becoming an effective
manner in which students can be systematically taught the English language, has
become an industry, with the mushrooming of English teaching institutes, and their
promises of quick and easy learning, doing excellent business. Most of the teachers
in these institutions do not possess sound basics of the language. Secondly, the
students registering for the course have differing levels of proficiency in the
English language, and a common set course will not be beneficial to all. Thirdly,
there are no standard textbooks targeted towards the student of English who
already has a certain degree of basic knowledge. Most teachers and institutions rely
on grammar books and an eclectic selection of teaching aids, whether well known
ones like the book by Wren and Martin or newer rehashed and revised books with
varied titles such as A Communicative Grammar of English, which however
requires some previous knowledge of English (Leech and Svastika, 1975), A
Practical English Grammar (Thomson and Martinet, 1986), How English Works
(Ann Raimes, 1989) or Intermediate English Grammar: Reference and Practice
for South Asian Students (Raymond Murphy, 1994). These books are undoubtedly
useful for learners of general English, but do not really serve the purpose of
Remedial English courses, in which students come to the classroom already
possessing some basic knowledge of English.

In recent years, there has been considerable focus on the developing of reading and
writing skills of English for various categories of students: foreigners, with
differing needs and cultural backgrounds, for whom English may not necessarily
be a second language, those with learning difficulties, school children with
different levels of exposure to English but one large section has gone largely
ignored. This is the college or university student in India who already has some
basic knowledge of English but who needs a great deal of improvement, not only
to compete in the classroom, but also in the outside world, where English at times
may become the only means of communication with another person. These students have been exposed to varying levels of English through their school days, depending on the kind of school they have attended as well as the socio-economic conditions that prevail in their immediate domains. Moreover, most of the standard materials available for research in most subjects are available either exclusively or most readily only in English and therefore it is essential for students to possess adequate knowledge of the language.

Today, a number of universities in India have started Remedial English courses for students coming in to higher education from non-English medium backgrounds. These courses are aimed at improving the English skills of the student, especially the written skills, in order that they can compete successfully with their peer group, many of whom may have come from English medium schooling. In addition, these courses also aim to improve the spoken English skills of the student. The books used are the traditional tried and tested grammar books, which may be useful for the student of a lower level, but not for a student with higher degrees of proficiency. The selection of materials, methods and syllabus of such courses as they exist today is ad hoc and eclectic with no fixed criteria and the student’s learning is entirely dependent on the discretion of the teacher. What is therefore required urgently is an organized and structured method of teaching English language courses for students requiring Remedial English and with different language learning needs and requirements. Furthermore, in JNU, there is also the added problem that the students in the course range from undergraduate to Ph.D level, and consequently, their level of maturity also differs immensely. JNU would be particularly good for conducting case studies as being one of the premier universities in the country it attracts students from different linguistic as well as different socio-economic and religious backgrounds, thus, allowing for a more diverse spectrum of case studies. The focus, as is natural in Remedial English courses, would be on students coming from non-English medium backgrounds to universities like JNU where the general medium of instruction is English.
The scope and objectives of the present research can therefore be summed up in the following manner:

- To conduct Error Analysis and Needs Analysis on a select sample of Remedial English students of JNU, New Delhi
- To examine language (forms and functions) as used for the specific registers by students of different streams i.e. Sciences and Humanities
- To assess and review the materials currently being used in the program.

On the basis of 1-3 above, work out the specific kinds of choice of material, grading principles and modes of presentation best suited for the above-mentioned students' needs.

Keeping in mind the above objectives, the present study will require three different sets of procedures to be followed:

- Needs Analysis, which will include a brief analysis of the errors of the students
- Register Analysis of the language used in higher education
- Review of the materials and methods used in these programmes using JNU as a case in point

As far as approaches to Needs Analysis is concerned I would be using a combination of learning centred approach and means analysis. The former theory, as propounded by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) makes a distinction between learner centred and learning centred approaches. Learning centred approach implies a “process of negotiation between individuals and society” (Hutchinson quoted in Jordan, 1997: 25) i.e. a compromise between teaching, syllabus, materials and learning needs i.e. what a learner needs to do in order to learn. In addition, a learning centred approach also focuses on target needs or what a learner
needs to do in the target situation. This approach would be combined with the means analysis approach. Means analysis is particularly important while conducting the proposed study. It implies the need to develop Needs Analysis according to means, or in other words, to adapt it according to the prevailing local situation and constraints, for example, cultural attitudes, availability of resources, materials, equipment and methods. It therefore involves a study of the local situation to see how a language course may be implemented best. For register analysis, I would be conducting a survey of the profile of students registered for the Remedial English course. The students enrolled for Remedial English in JNU are likely to come from different social and linguistic backgrounds as well as different streams like humanities, foreign languages, social sciences, life science, physical science, environmental science and computer science. Their academic qualifications range from undergraduate to the PhD level, thereby covering a wide range. The descriptive texts, reports, news items and journals pertaining to the individual subjects of these students will be analysed to find out the nature of vocabulary, the semantic range as well as structure and their specific usage in a particular register. Thirdly, I would undertake an assessment of the materials and methods currently in use in the programme in terms of forms and structure, semantic range and pragmatics of use in order to determine the extent to which these texts serve the specific needs and requirements of the source mentioned above.

1.2 History of English teaching in India

A distinguished professor of English, writing in 1978, compared the state of English in India with that of the cow in our country. “Both the cow and the English language are held in reverence and worshipped but both are in a state of perpetual decline” (Nagarajan 1978: 99)

English language teaching has emerged as an important discipline in India and we spend a considerable part of our resources in propagating English studies. The beginnings of English in India are generally associated with Macaulay’s Minute of 1835. However, it also gained prominence through the activities of the East India
Company in 18th century in which the court of Directors welcomed the efforts of Rev. Swartz, who persuaded the Rajas of Tanjore and Marwar to establish schools for teaching English. As a result, the Rajas granted 250 pagodas per year for the schools. The socio-historical context for the dominance of English was thus gradually taking shape. As a matter of fact, the first book written to teach English was produced in India in 1797. The book *The Tutor: Or a New English and Bengalee work, well adapted to teach the Natives English* written by John Miller was published in Semaphore in Bengal. Macaulay believed that it was necessary to introduce English in India because Indian people could not, at that time be educated by means of their mother tongue. He felt that Indian languages and literatures were of little intrinsic value and Indian history, astronomy, medicine etc. were full of errors and falsehood.

“We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom they govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and color but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine that vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature and to render them by degree fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.”(Macaulay in Aggarwal 1983:11)

The aims and objectives of teaching English in India were thus very clearly defined in the middle of the nineteenth century and did not receive any careful examination until the beginning of the national movement for freedom. To prove that British language, culture, literature and people were inherently superior to anything Indian was the primary purpose for introducing English as the medium of institutions and as a subject of study. Das Gupta (1970: 40-45) has summarized the language controversy at this central point in the history of India. There were three options available as to the medium of instruction: classical Oriental languages (Sanskrit and Arabic), Indian native languages (Bengali, Tamil, Hindi etc.) and English. The choice of English marks the culmination of a demand that had been raising its head from several quarters – Indian, Missionary and British. As early as 1823, Ram...
Mohan Roy had written to Lord Amherst that the Sanskrit system of education could only keep the country in darkness. In Bombay, on the other hand, the emphasis was on native languages. Since government support was available, the movement for the dominance of English became more vigorous. Wood’s despatch of 1854 marks, in a sense, the completion, at least in policy, of the appropriation of “vernacular” Indian languages by English. Though Wood recognized the role Indian languages might play in mass education, the superiority of British language and culture remained unquestioned. The despatch said: “We look, therefore, to the English language and to the vernacular languages of India together as the media for the diffusion of European language. ... (Wood 1854, from Aggarwal 1983:16)”

English, thus, was to be the language of the select elite used in domains of power and prestige; the local languages were for the masses to be used in peripheral domains a situation that has unfortunately continued till date. To quote Das Gupta:

“In 1837 English and Indian languages had already replaced Persian in the proceedings of the lower courts. Thus in both education and the law courts, language became a marker of two separate levels of social operation – the upper level reserved for English, the lower for the ‘vernaculars.’ The policy of administrations, consciously promoted the association of English with a status of privilege...”(Das Gupta 1970:43)

These policies inevitably informed all aspects of ELT in India: methods, materials, teachers and publishers.

English education also continued to be offered by the missionary institutions, which had been operating from the beginning of the 19th century. The missionary curriculum included the Bible, Paley’s *Natural Theology*, Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Bacon’s *Novum Organum*, Plato’s dialogues, Milton’s *Paradise Lost* etc., but excluded Johnson, Addison and Pope. The curriculum was heavily classical. It should be emphasized that at a time when the aim should have been the transfer of useful knowledge to India through the study of English and translations of useful books, English studies took a classical turn in India; and at the same time,
this classical turn coincided with the beginning of the declining status of classical literary studies in England because of mass readership, the growth of the middle class, the demand for ‘useful knowledge’, the growing utilitarian market and other such factors. This left the study of English in India with its emphasis on classical/canonical literature a monument more imperishable than the pyramids of Egypt.

The story of English teaching in the remaining period of colonial rule can be described in terms of a few landmarks:

The establishment of universities in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1857, resulting in selective high education for training future administrators, imparted through the medium of English, which was to lead to social stratification in the long run.

The Indian Universities Act (1904) fixed the area of jurisdiction of universities.

The resolution on Educational Policy (1913), which assigned distinct spheres of activities to universities and high schools, and also gave the universities the responsibility of granting recognition to high schools, placing the latter under the care of provincial governments.

The process of separation of levels of education was continued by the report of the Calcutta University Commission (1919), which recommended the separation of intermediate classes from universities.

The Abbot-Wood Report (1936-37) advocated the basing of primary and middle school education on children’s natural interests and environment.

The Sargent Committee Report (1944) suggested the conduction of refresher courses for all teachers, particularly for those in remote rural areas.

Three broad developments were thus noticed during the colonial period with regard to English education in India.
Level of attainment in English: While during the early years of English teaching in India, the high variety was extremely imitative and formal, the low variety was a broken one called butler English. But during the latter years (1850-1947), with the increase in the number of Indians using English, more varieties came into being.

Interaction with Indian languages: A number of words of Indian origin were absorbed into English e.g.: brahmin, coolie, jungle and so on.

Methodology: In the area of methodology the East and the West shared a meeting ground. Language studies in India had been based on the Kavya-Vyakaran tradition, and the grammar-translation method had been the means of studying classical languages like Sanskrit or Persian. Individual learners who wished to acquire a reading knowledge of another language did so by interpreting texts with the help of a dictionary and a grammar for the rules of inflection and syntax. The grammar translation method as advocated by practitioners like Fraz Ahn (1796-1865) and Jt. G. O Endoff (1803-1865) was practical and easy. It was practiced without the spoken component, with stress on accuracy and using full sentences. These factors partly account for the predominance of the formal mode in Indian English.

On the whole, literary tests were the staple of English teaching in colonial India and they served both as models of good writing and illustrations of the grammatical rules of the language. Shakespeare and Nesfield became the two pillars of English education in India and even their modified versions became a part of the life of the conquered race. English and the teaching of English stayed on in India and created a class of Indian with a strong grounding in English.

After Independence, the goals and priorities in education and more specifically in English education should have been restructured and redefined, as was done in every other sphere of activity. The fact, however, is that English education in post-colonial India has remained a continuation of the colonial experience. English is still the language that examines students in the universities, conducts foreign affairs, and transacts business with the world outside. The numbers wanting to
learn English are increasing every day. As a result, new and unique English
language teaching institutions have seen a huge rise in numbers.

The first Education Commission to be appointed in free India was the University
Commission also called the Radha Krishna Commission, which submitted its
report in 1949. It was the tertiary level, which received attention first. The
committee on primary education was appointed only in 1951 and the Secondary
Education Commission a year later, in 1952. Given the composition of the
University Education Commission, consisting mostly of educationists and liberal
intellectuals, it should have conceived of the role of university education in broad,
universalist terms rather than in relation to the immediate social, political,
economic or even the linguistic context in post-colonial India. In other words, the
Commission did not or would not, go into details, remaining content with general,
often vague, formulations. There was, for example, certain vagueness about the
recommendation regarding the medium of instruction. For the medium of
instruction for higher education it was perhaps for necessary to English be replaced
as early as practicable by an Indian language that could not be Sanskrit on account
of vital difficulties (Aggarwal 1984:86). That this Indian language should be Hindi
was not made explicit, though the Commission stated that Hindi would be the
federal language of the union. Another example of the Commission’s failure to go
into details is that while recommending the three language formula the regional
language, the federal language and English – it did not examine the question of
different learning loads; for example, the load would obviously be lighter in
universities where the regional language was same as the federal language of the
union.

The secondary education Commission (1952-53) was perhaps the first official
body to concern itself with methods and methods for teaching and the evaluation
systems. The Commission was of course dealing with the teaching and evaluation
of all subjects but its observations and recommendations had, and still has,
particular relevance for the study of English. It is indeed a pity that many of the
recommendations of this Commission have not been fully or strictly implemented.
According to the Commission “any method good or bad, links up the teacher and his pupils into an organic relationship with constant mutual interaction. Every teacher and educationist knows that even the best curriculum and the most perfect syllabus remain dead unless quickened into life by the right methods of teaching and the right kind of teachers” (Aggarwal 1984:112-113).

This observation seems especially valid now as we see revised syllabus after revised syllabus failing as a consequence of the indifference, ignorance or inefficiency of the teachers or of the unreality or irrelevance of the methods of teaching. The Commission insisted that “the emphasis in teaching should shift from verbalism and memorization to learning through purposeful, concrete and realistic situations and for this purpose the principles of ‘Activity Method’ and ‘Project Method’ should be assimilated in school practice” (Ibid:l15-l16) on the question of text books however, the Commission once again showed a combination of realism and idealism:

“Single textbooks should not be prescribed for every subject of study, but a reasonable number of books which satisfy the standards laid down should be recommended leaving the choice to the school concerned. In the case of languages, however, definite text books should be prescribed for each class to ensure proper gradation” (Ibid).

Language planning in India can be said to have arrived at a crucial stage in the sixties. After more than a decade of Independence, the relative status of English, Hindi and the other regional languages was still not clear in the minds of people or even in official documents; where this status seemed clear to certain sections it was not acceptable. The anti-Hindi riots in the South as well as the ‘Angrezi-Hatao’ campaign in some parts of the North lent urgency to the problem. And even today this campaign has not died down.

However, back in 1961, the conference of Chief Ministers recommended the adoption of three-language formula in all schools. This meant the use of the regional language, or the mother tongue, when different from the regional
language, Hindi, or any other Indian language in Hindi speaking areas; and English, or any other European language.

The sense of equity behind this recommendation was not in question, the intention was to make the load of language learning equal in all parts of the country and also achieve national integration. But it was an unrealistic formula as it ignored the lack of motivation among students in Hindi-speaking areas to learn any other Indian language, and perhaps consequently, the continuing political opposition in Tamil Nadu to the introduction of Hindi. No wonder the three-language formula was not uniformly adopted, at any rate not in the areas where it mattered most.

The three-language formula was however reiterated by the Kothari Commission (1966). Taking note of the riots in Tamil Nadu, the Commission still recommended that both Hindi and English should be link languages, even though it felt that English could not serve as a link for the majority. It was felt that English should continue as a library language and as the medium of instruction in all major universities and that a reasonable degree of proficiency in it should be essential for the award of a degree. The Commission also recommended that special units be set up for teaching English as a language skill, distinct from teaching it as literature.

The stress on language skills was in tune with the developments at the international level from 1915 to the fifties, by which time the grammar-translation method had made way for the direct method. The emergence of the Direct Method in India, to a large extent, weakened the teaching of grammar as well as literature. Pre-service training for school-level teaching was given importance during this period and there was no focus on in-service training. Usually, the school inspectors were the interpreters of the Direct Method and, as a result, it became the Direct Method of the School Directorate. It was felt that no training was required at the college level. Pre-service training in the colleges of education did not keep pace with the growth of knowledge in the field; the establishment of a number of English language teaching institutes and Regional Institutes of English also contributed to the weakening of the colleges of education so far as the training of English teachers was concerned.
There was, in the fifties and sixties, an unhealthy reliance on foreign institutions, experts and theories. The structural syllabus prepared by the London School was brought to India by the British Council and introduced in Madras in 1952 through the Madras English Language Teaching campaign. The first English language teaching institute was established in Allahabad in 1954 with the collaboration of the British Council. When the All India Seminar on the Teaching of English, held at Nagpur in 1957 suggested the revision of the English syllabus at schools on a national level and accepted the structural approach as the basis for such revision, the services of the British Council were considered essential. The establishment of the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL) in Hyderabad in 1958 was again with the collaboration of the British Council. The Regional Institute of English at Bangalore and Chandigarh and a number of English Language Teaching Institutes were all set up in a similar manner.

Reports on the study of English in India were submitted in 1967 and 1971 by study groups appointed by the Ministry of Education. After the Kothari Commission Report of 1966, the National policy on education was formulated in 1968, largely to implement the recommendations of the Kothari Commission. It noted that the regional languages were already in use as media of instruction at the primary and secondary stages and proposed that urgent steps should now be taken to adopt them as media of instruction at the University level as well. However it is there for all to see that the first observation is partly true as a large number of English medium schools are still flourishing and enjoying a greater prestige than the regional language schools. Proposals that the regional languages be adopted as a media of instruction at the University stage has, till now, received only marginal acceptance. The policy at the same time suggested that every effort should be made to promote the development of Hindi as a ‘link language’ and that the establishment in non-Hindi states of colleges and other institutions of higher education which use Hindi as the medium of education should be encouraged (Aggarwal 1984:231). It also stated that the study of English deserved to be specially strengthened as “World knowledge is growing at tremendous pace” and India must both keep up with this growth and make her own contribution to it.
The next landmark survey was the National Policy on Education and the Programme of Action (1986). However quite disappointingly, this merely reiterates the 1968 policy with regard to the development of languages. The 1986 policy does not make any mention of medium of instruction in its chapter on higher education but states that a major effort will be directed towards the transformation of teaching methods and that urgent steps will be taken to protect the system from degradation.

The Acharya Ramamurti Commission submitted its report in 1990. The report must be commended for making, perhaps for the first time, a frank analysis of the problems in the implementation of the three-language formula. It observed however, that whatever the difficulties or the unevenness in the implementation, the three-language formula had stood the test of time and that it was not “desirable or prudent to reopen it”. Regarding learning of Hindi and English, the Ramamurti Commission made the pertinent observation that the criteria should be not years, but hours of study and even more importantly, levels of attainment. In view of all these considerations, the Ramamurti Commission made the suggestion that the Kendriya Hindi Sansthan, the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, and the Central Institute of Indian Languages – the three national level institutions charged respectively with the development of Hindi, English and modern Indian languages should come together and in consultation with the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) and the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) and the State Governments, spell out modalities of ensuring uniformity in the matter of acquisition of language competency by the students in the school system. The objectives of such a consultation may be:

- Specification of the objectives of teaching different languages;
- Specification of levels of language proficiency to be reached in respect of each language; and
- Specification of the class from the duration for which the three languages will be taught. On the question of language media for higher education
again, the report makes specific recommendation about the steps to be taken to effect a smooth change over from English to the regional languages:

- Production of university level books in the Indian languages: and

- Options to be given to students for taking examinations at all levels in the regional language media.

At the end of this brief survey regarding policy statements with regard to the place of English in education in India a report of the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) (1989), set up by University Grant Commission needs to discussed. The directions stated that the proposed curricula should shift the emphasis from teaching to learning and that the curriculum should be so designed as to make education more meaningful to the needs and aspirations of its beneficiaries as well as to make it socially relevant (CDC Report 1984:4)

The CDC report on English proposes a new undergraduate curriculum, which comprises a general English course and a special English course. The former, which has to cater to a heterogeneous tertiary level student population, would consist of different units and modules suited to different levels of learners. It is unfortunate however, that after discussing learner-oriented teaching, the report has concentrated only on the learners and not the teachers. It is well known that not all teachers can teach the gifted, the average, and the below average students. The 1986 report, which maintained that methodologies would be developed for evaluation of teacher performance through self-appraisal, through peer groups, and also by students has obviously been forgotten. Another point which should be emphasized in this connection is that national committees have never asked the learners why they want to learn English, how they want to learn it, what materials they prefer, etc.

It is encouraging, however to note that the CDC report on English says the following:
“If education was to be viewed as an instrument of human resource development then it was argued, why an M.A programme in English literature (and that too, chiefly British literature) only? It was felt that we should introduce a multiplicity of M.A. courses in English such as M.A in British literature, M.A in American literature, M.A in comparative literature, M.A in creative writing in English, M.A in Modern English language, M.A in English language teaching and so on, as several universities in Britain and America currently do. While there was broad agreement on this need, it was felt nonetheless that the time was not yet ripe for such diversification-chiefly because we do not have the human resources necessary to implement it.” (CDC report 1989:31).

However, there is need for a debate on these issues with a view to find ways of implementing proposals that are both sound and practical. Is the issue in India the lack of human resources or is it the lack of will power? The scheme for the development of autonomous colleges could have designed such programs to accelerate the process of curricular reforms, design courses and reform teaching and evaluation procedures. It is well within the purpose and power of Indians to fashion a country of their dreams.

1.3 Existing research in this area

Recent years have seen a tremendous volume of research work being done on issues of ELT and ESP in various different countries and contests. While the model discussed and developed in the various cases would be country specific and culture specific, most research on syllabus design have taken as their starting point the various theoretical perspectives on syllabus design as provided by Leech and Svastika’s *A Communicative grammar of English* (1975). D.A. Wilkins in 1976 published *Notional Syllabuses*, an issue that initiated a long debate with Brumfit. This was evident in the latter’s articles such as ‘A review of Wilkin’s Notional Syllabuses’ (1978) and ‘Notional Syllabuses Revisited: a Response’ (1981). Munby’s *Communicative Syllabus Design* was published in 1978. The 1980’s saw a large volume of work on issues of ELT and ESP. Apart from Brumfit who wrote numerous other books on the subject such as *Problems and Principles in Second Language Teaching* (1980), *Issues in Second Language Syllabus design* (1981 –
with H.A. Widdowson), *English for International Communication* (1982), R. Ellis wrote *Informal and Formal Approach to Communicative Language Teaching* (1982). Keith Johnson's *Communicative syllabus Design and Methodology* was also published in the same year. Brumfit's *A Communicative approach to Language teaching* was published the following year while A.P. R. Howatt's *A History of English Language Teaching* was published in 1984 and T. Hutchinson’s and A. Walter’s *English For Specific Purposes*, an important work in ELT was published in 1987. This work undertakes an overview of the origins and development of ESP and considers the question of how ESP fits into the general landscape of English Language Teaching. It also deals with procedures to be followed after completion of course design – particularly its practical form as a syllabus. F. Dubin and E. Olshtain’s *Course Design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning* (1986) is also an important book in ELT, which deals in detail with the task of the course designer, beginning with societal needs, then working through the syllabus construction and finally preparation of materials. In recent years, R.R. Jordan’s *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource book for Teachers* (1997) is a useful handbook that provides detailed overviews on the various theories of syllabus design, procedures for Needs Analysis, methodology and the framing and developing of a syllabus while Douglas in his book *Assessing Language for Specific Purposes* (2000) formulates a theoretical framework that provides a basis for developing and using assessments of languages for specific purposes.

In the Indian context too, a large amount of research has taken place on ELT studies in various contexts. Given the special position that the English language enjoys in India, the Government too has formulated various documents on the English language at different times. Agnihotri and Khanna’s *ELT in India* (1995) is an important recent document on the topic. Earlier, Ashok Jha and Rajul Bhargava published *New Directions in English Language Teaching* (1988) and S.C. Sood’s *New Directions in English Language and Literature Teaching in India* was also published the same year. E. Nageswara Rao’s collection of essays *New Horizons in Teaching English* (1992) and Vaishna Narang’s *Communicative Language
Teaching (1996) are also some of the more important works on ELT and ESP in the Indian context. Sood’s work, though now outdated factually, is an important starting point for the present study as he uses under graduate students in Indian universities as the register for his study.

The works stated above is by no means an exhaustive list of the research on ELT the years. It is merely an indicative list of theoretical and practical perspectives and a beginning point for the present study. To the best of my knowledge, there has till date been no published work with regard to the teaching of Remedial English, particularly to college and university level students pursuing higher education.

1.4 In what way is this work going to be different from existing work in this area

As already stated above, to the best of my knowledge there has been no work done on the teaching of Remedial English to college and university students in India, although EFL (English as a Foreign language) and ESP (English For Specific Purposes) courses are very common for students weak in English in countries such as U.K and U.S.A. A large volume of studies on ELT and ESP have been undertaken at both theoretical and practical levels since the latter half of the twentieth century, both in India as well as abroad. The research conducted in the West, apart from UK and USA, concentrates on the teaching of English as a foreign language. The study materials prepared in the West are specific to those areas and are incompatible with the Indian socio-cultural milieu. In India too, there has been considerable work on the teaching of the English language. However, to the best of my knowledge, till date there has been no research undertaken that had the university student in India from a non-English medium academic background, who already possesses a certain degree of knowledge and proficiency in the language as a register for study and who is therefore in need of a course in Remedial English.

This research, as explained above, would try to take into account the present shortcomings of ELT in India. I would look at the various theoretical models of
syllabus design and combined with the results of the data acquired through case studies conducted, aim to construct a model syllabus for Remedial English courses in Indian universities, keeping in mind the various diverse socio-linguistic backgrounds of the students and their present familiarity with the language. The study will not favour the teaching of English language skills through a pre-determined catalogue of structures that all students need to acquire. Rather, it would concentrate on allowing students to gain in communicative competence in the language, which they could use, both in writing and speaking skills. The study will be presented in four chapters. While this opening chapter has dealt with the scope and objectives as well as reviewed some of the literature available in this field, the second chapter will discuss the methodology, and the third chapter would process and analyse the available data. This would be followed by the summary and recommendations to be followed while designing a syllabus for Remedial English in the concluding chapter.